

R48G: The Coming of Postcapitalism:

An archive of blog posts

Preface

This is an archive of posts from the blogs from the old Darwiniana and the Toward a New Socialism blog. The material is diverse yet centered around an examination of the so-called New Age movement. This is an archive achieved in the age of Kindle achieved as a solution to the problem of rescuing blog literature from oblivion. The results are somewhat rough but that is the nature of the original context of creation. The result while not quite at the standard of the ‘pro book publishers’ is nonetheless able to make public issues and ideas that would never enter a standard publishing milieu.

R48G: The Red Forty-eight Group

This archive of posts accompanies several others and will with a new mini-book as introduction become a kindle record of the attempt to explore a whole range of issues form the older Darwiniana blog, now partitioned into four blogs, *Darwiniana*, *Toward a New Socialism*, *The Gurdjeiff Con* and *Last Man There*.

I hope these materials, despite their rough character can be used to create a new left at a time of crisis.

Table of Contents

Archive of posts, 2018/2019

Preface.....	1
R48G: The Red Forty-eight Group.....	1
Table of Contents.....	1
Archive of posts, 2018/2019.....	1
Appendix 1: 2019.....	9
Saying goodbye to bolshevism...toward a new left...stop using the term ‘marxism’.....	11

really....? don't hand marxists a new way to screw up economics...//one better, our DMNC//Yes, a Planned Economy Can Actually Work.....	12
Gandhi, and non-violence.....	13
World history, freedom in the state and freedom from the state.....	15
JFK-9/11: 50 Years of Deep State	17
The eonic effect, the 'ompah' factor: why Marxism gets history wrong...and how to upgrade.....	17
The Bolivarians wasted a golden opportunity...: Maduro should seize the moment, asap, how about our DMNC? a system that would fit Venezuela beautifully.....	19
Is trump a fascist drone? Is trump under hypnosis?.....	19
Amazon.com: Grand Deceptions: Zionist Intrigue in the 20th and 21st Centuries eBook: Brandon Martinez: Books.....	20
don't corrupt ecological socialism with Marx's errors and monopoly of bad theory... has noone heard of the Romantic movement?...//What Karl Marx has to say about today's environmental problems.....	20
Capitalism not a stage of economic history?.....	21
What is evolution?.....	21
Our DMNC model exposes the inefficient incompetence of capitalist corporations... ..	22
The pernicious character of judeo-xtian theologies...should covenantal Judaism be charged as a hate crime?.....	23
Historical materialism left Marxist sitting ducks totally blind to the occult opposition's politics.....	23
Marx's confusion over teleology.....	24
The eonic data as a way out of 'historical materialism'	24
Critiquing Marx's s theories...but giving a pass to his empirical studies.....	24
From working class ideology to the perspective of the Universal Class.....	25
The lost opportunity of the era of bolshevism and its stupidities.....	26
The complete failure of historical theories (including Marx's), and a glance at the eonic effect data set.....	27
So, where does Marxism go wrong...?.....	29
Were Marx's theories to blame?...//Why Did Socialism Fail?.....	31
The failure of Marxism and the need for a new paradigm.....	32
Toward a post Darwinian left.....	33
Share this:.....	37
Marxist scientism, Hegel's revenge and the question of free agency.....	37
DMNC: reconciling social democracy and real communism.....	39
Our DMNC is incomplete?.....	40
Seize the day: can Venezuela complete its transition to real socialism/communism?	42
DMNC and a Commons where everyone is legally a co-owner.....	42
R48G: What is the Red Forty-eight Group?.....	42
The issues of revolution.....	43
Models of history.....	44
Confronting the riddle of world history.....	45
History and Epochal Transitions? problems with 'stages of production' theory.....	46

September 26th, 2018	46
Engels and human control of history...6.5.2 Theory and Ideology: Out of Revolution	48
PressTV-‘Mini nukes were used to blow Twin Towers on 9/11’	49
Capitalism: beginning of the end	50
Need for a neo-marxist upgrade	51
The limits of historical materialism	52
Floating fourth turning points, musical rebellions, clopen societies, hippies and revolutions and other ‘darn’d if...’ question marks	53
selections from Democratic Market Neo-communism	55
-----	63
Appendix 2: 2018	63
The evolution of freedom?	63
October 5th, 2018	63
There is a way out of this confusion and failure of the Marxist mad hatters	65
October 4th, 2018	65
Vanguards, proletarians, and democrats	67
October 2nd, 2018	67
Christianity beyond the occult wasteland...the weak link is...Jesus	68
September 30th, 2018	68
Preface to a final edition of WHEE	69
September 28th, 2018	69
Is there a science of evolution?	73
September 27th, 2018	73
A science of history?	74
September 27th, 2018	74
Popper, a science of history and free agency	76
September 27th, 2018	76
Like a Cheshire cat the ‘eonic effect’ fades into shimmering background as an empirical series of epochal transitions replaces it, and stages of production theory...	77
-----	77
September 26th, 2018	77
The calamity of Zionism	79
September 23rd, 2018	79
The primitive idiocy of political science on all sides.../A multiple-choice test by the New York Times, answer correctly and you are DSA material	81
September 23rd, 2018	81
The therapy racket, exploitation and capitalist psychological rip-offs	82
September 22nd, 2018	82
From Hegel to Marx: Studies in the Intellectual Development of Karl Marx /Hook	83
September 17th, 2018	83
Communism and markets based in a Commons	84
September 16th, 2018	84
...like a bad pointer in c programming	84
September 15th, 2018	84

More on the working/universal class, classes...beyond classes to individuals and back.....	86
September 12th, 2018 ·	86
Some suggestions for a new post-Marxist communist platform.....	87
September 11th, 2018 ·	87
The puzzle of leftist confusion over 9/11...is it finally sinking in?//The New Pearl Harbor Revisited: 9/11, the Cover-Up, and the Exposé – David Ray Griffin – Google Books.....	88
September 11th, 2018 ·	88
Coming of the Gaian Commies.....	89
September 8th, 2018 ·	89
A subject preaching ‘planning’ was never planned and derailed at the start.....	92
September 8th, 2018 ·	92
Israel, Persian Zoroastrianism, and botched monotheisms.....	94
September 7th, 2018 ·	94
The eonic/frontier effect...//Western Civilization 101.....	95
September 7th, 2018 ·	95
Marxist historicism, world history, the eonic effect, bypassing theories.....	96
September 6th, 2018 ·	96
Kant, history, and a challenge.....	99
September 6th, 2018 ·	99
The real mystery of evolution.....	101
September 5th, 2018 ·	101
The real mystery of evolution.....	104
September 5th, 2018 ·	104
Design in history and the falsification of judeo-xtian propaganda.....	107
September 5th, 2018 ·	107
The necessity of a ‘critical marxism’.....	108
September 5th, 2018 ·	108
The real mystery of evolution.....	109
September 5th, 2018 ·	109
Restating first principles on the left.....	112
September 4th, 2018 ·	112
Cross-examining history.....	113
September 4th, 2018 ·	113
A system of epochs done right.....	115
August 30th, 2018 ·	115
R48G: global warming as grounds for revolutionary ecological socialism.....	117
August 10th, 2018 ·	117
system action, free action...//3.5 A New Model of History: Eonic Evolution.....	118
August 7th, 2018 ·	118
Marxist scientism, hegel’s revenge and the question of free agency.....	119
August 5th, 2018 ·	119
DMNC: reconciling social democracy and real communism.....	121
August 2nd, 2018 ·	121
Capitalism: The End.....	122

July 31st, 2018 ·.....	122
The great American treadmill of pseudo democracy.....	124
July 30th, 2018 ·.....	124
Fact checking ‘Grand Deceptions’...//Jewish Bolsheviks and Stalinism?...//Grand Deceptions: Zionist Intrigue in the 20th and 21st Centuries.....	124
July 28th, 2018 ·.....	124
Marxism: a near total record of failure.....	125
July 23rd, 2018 ·.....	125
Human nature and the existentialist/essentialist dialectic.....	125
July 23rd, 2018.....	125
Darwinism/social Darwinism.....	126
July 23rd, 2018 ·.....	126
Blueprint(s) of a semi-specified ‘democratic market neo-communism’.....	126
July 22nd, 2018 ·.....	126
Booknotes: Revolution in the air...socialism never failed because no one defined anything that could be put into practice.....	129
July 22nd, 2018.....	129
With the right vision social transformation will arise spontaneously.....	130
July 20th, 2018 ·.....	130
Toward a Postdarwinian left.....	132
July 20th, 2018.....	132
R48G: we are not required as ‘democratic market neo-communists’ required to defend the record of bolshevism... November 10th, 2017 ·.....	134
The legacy of Stalinism, bolshevism and the Jews.... Grand Deceptions: Zionist Intrigue in the 20th and 21st Centuries.....	135
July 19th, 2018 ·.....	135
The Israelis behind 9/11.... Grand Deceptions: Zionist Intrigue in the 20th and 21st Centuries.....	135
July 19th, 2018 ·.....	135
Don Quijotes in reverse gear.....	136
July 17th, 2018 ·.....	136
Finding your true will?.....	137
July 17th, 2018 ·.....	137
Postmodern politics...maybe these idiots are kidding.....	137
July 17th, 2018 ·.....	137
Demiurgic projections?.....	138
July 17th, 2018 ·.....	138
Dugin idiocy, Shadow of the Dalai Lama, and trump the feckless Hitler parody...	140
July 17th, 2018 ·.....	140
Lachman’s treatment sanitized by media...?//Historian Explains How Donald Trump and the Far Right Weaponized ‘Chaos Magic’ — Just Like the Occult Alternet.....	140
July 17th, 2018.....	140
The ‘working class’ is an abstraction, not a person...we cannot predict or control it	141

July 16th, 2018 ·.....	141
Hyparchic futurism and the postcapitalist potential.....	143
July 16th, 2018.....	143
The need for a generalized historical paradigm.....	145
July 14th, 2018 ·.....	145
Capitalism cannot generate the future of civilization.....	145
July 14th, 2018 ·.....	145
...at a time of social crisis it needs to be said, we don't have a left.....	146
July 10th, 2018 ·.....	146
Marxism as a prelude to a real neo-communist platform.....	147
July 11th, 2018 ·.....	147
The issues of revolution.....	149
July 12th, 2018 ·.....	149
DMNC: beyond the calculation debate...//Dreams of National Capital: Market Socialism, Past and Present The Brooklyn Rail.....	150
July 12th, 2018 ·.....	150
The communist moment is coming, but is the left ready with a real platform? Marxist boilerplate isn't good enough.....	151
July 13th, 2018 ·.....	151
The failure of the Marxist method, Rome and the axial age...//The class struggles in the Roman Republic: introduction to the first German edition.....	152
June 2nd, 2018.....	152
The numero uno chestnut of the histomaticists.....	152
June 2nd, 2018 ·.....	152
The issue of decline.....	153
June 2nd, 2018.....	153
Floating fourth turning points.....	154
June 3rd, 2018 ·.....	154
Utopian/scientific: the problems with 'scientific' histomat.....	155
June 6th, 2018.....	155
The left's long series of lost opportunities.....	155
June 6th, 2018 ·.....	155
The eonic effect as a tool to force close observation of global world history.....	156
June 6th, 2018.....	156
'...there has got to be a better way...//'Did Michael Pollan Kill God? Inside the NYT Food Columnist's Exploration of Magic Mushrooms Altnet.....	157
June 6th, 2018.....	157
Psychedelics, the will, (self-)consciousness, and 'early ape men' intoxicated with '(self-)consciousness'.....	157
June 6th, 2018 ·.....	157
Protestant reformed secular humanism...'atheist' xtianity...the rogue term 'god'...	159
June 13th, 2018 ·.....	159
Communism and Gaian stewardship.....	160
June 14th, 2018 ·.....	160
The revolutionary lessons of Lenin's 'What is to be done?'.....	163

June 16th, 2018 ·.....	163
The eonic effect needs a college course.....	164
June 19th, 2018 ·.....	164
God in history??.....	165
June 19th, 2018 ·.....	165
Is trump a fascist drone? Is trump under hypnosis?.....	165
June 20th, 2018 ·.....	165
Booknotes: From Democrats to Kings: The Brutal Dawn of a New World from the Downfall of Athens to the Rise of Alexander the Great.....	166
June 20th, 2018 ·.....	166
Taking Kant’s TI on provision.....	167
June 21st, 2018 ·.....	167
Are we to suppose that a civilization reaching kardashev scale I still can’t replace markets with planning?.....	167
June 21st, 2018 ·.....	167
DMNC and the rentier question.....	168
June 23rd, 2018 ·.....	168
The illusion of economic theory (Hudson on ancient debt).....	169
June 25th, 2018.....	169
Exposing Darwinism, to no avail...lurking social Darwinist ideology.....	169
June 25th, 2018.....	169
The Bubble and Beyond Michael Hudson.....	170
June 26th, 2018.....	170
Metaphysical beliefs.....	170
June 27th, 2018.....	170
Modernity, revolution and postcapitalism.....	172
June 28th, 2018 ·.....	172
Ideology shared in muddle of evolution/economics...//Economics – Scientific American.....	173
June 28th, 2018 ·.....	173
Beyond the economics/evolution muddle to some sense: the eonic effect.....	173
June 28th, 2018.....	173
Does man have a soul?...//It’s Not Just About Abortion: Without Kennedy, Birth Control Could Be Next Alternet.....	174
June 29th, 2018 ·.....	174
How do you revolt in a de facto totalitarian system like the us?.....	176
June 30th, 2018 ·.....	176
The strategy of neo-communism: Trotsky and the Russian fumbled balls.....	177
June 30th, 2018 ·.....	177
Marxist confusions and DMNC.....	178
Posts on Pinker’s ‘enlightenment now’.....	180
May 8th, 2018.....	180
A Gaian riddle?.....	180
May 12th, 2018.....	180
Is the working class revolutionary?.....	181
May 12th, 2018.....	181

The eonic model beyond materialism/idealism.....	183
May 12th, 2018.....	183
R48G: reform or revolution redux... September 6th, 2017	184
The Israeli connection...one reason many recoil from 9/11 conspiracy theories... 185	
May 20th, 2018.....	185
DMNC, gedanken experiments, murphy’s law, and the foundation of an evolving system with a neo-communist threshold.....	185
May 20th, 2018	185
Dialectics of the ‘dialectic’	186
May 20th, 2018.....	186
Kant’s questions about history as a foundation for a neo-marxism.....	187
May 20th, 2018	187
The status of theories: physics versus economics.....	188
May 21st, 2018	188
Empty rhetoric of democracy without a Commons.....	189
May 21st, 2018	189
Stages of history versus relative transformations and transitions.....	190
May 21st, 2018	190
‘It’s the market economy, stupid’	192
May 21st, 2018	192
Marx/engels foresaw their inability to foresee what a future socialism would be like.....	194
May 21st, 2018.....	194
Need for a neo-marxist upgrade.....	195
May 23rd, 2018	195
Design arguments and atheism.....	196
May 23rd, 2018.....	196
Reformation and ‘secularism’	198
May 24th, 2018.....	198
Capitalism: beginning of the end.....	199
May 25th, 2018	199
Socialism/social democracy.....	201
May 26th, 2018.....	201
The shambles of judeo-xtianity: sooner or later the secular age will move beyond these religions, ...soon!.....	202
May 26th, 2018	202
History as causal mechanics or simple story?.....	203
May 27th, 2018	203
Pseudo-democracy and the ‘end of history’	204
May 27th, 2018	204
Confusions of the working class/revolution model.....	206
May 29th, 2018	206
The trap of historical theories.....	207
May 29th, 2018	207
Flawed historical models using concept of ‘civilization’	209
May 29th, 2018.....	209

...economic determinists denying they are economic determinists.....	210
May 29th, 2018.....	210
XZ.....	211
The eonic effect: detecting a hidden historical driver.....	211
May 30th, 2018.....	211
The question of historical materialism.....	211
May 30th, 2018 ·.....	211
What drives history? Economics?.....	212
April 29th, 2018 ·.....	212
The fading of the religions of the axial era.....	213
April 29th, 2018 ·.....	213
Capitalism not a stage of economic history?.....	215
April 30th, 2018 ·.....	215
Bennett and the concept of hyperparoxysm.....	216
April 30th, 2018 ·.....	216
From the concept of ‘civilizations’ to global differential transitions.....	217
April 30th, 2018 ·.....	217
Capitalism generating postcapitalism.....	218
April 30th, 2018.....	218
Quo Vadis? The Athenian tragedy, and the american...?.....	220
Viking economics, incurable capitalist stupidity of US retards.....	223
History and delusion.....	223
A generalized dynamic of progress more complex than Pinker’s oversimplification	225
Kant’s challenge and the riddle of history.....	226
Communism has never been tried.....	228
...revolutionary communism as a variant of the democratic revolutions of the early modern.....	230
World history, freedom in the state and freedom from the state.....	231
How can the left reach a new historical vision?.....	233
Design in history...histomat versus the eonic perspective.....	235
Fake democracy.....	236
Postcapitalism in the age of climate catastrophe.....	238
Man cannot evolve under capitalist social darwinism.....	239
First and last international.....	240
The core heroic saga.....	240
Free agents and postcapitalist transition.....	242
Macro/micro.....	243
Floating fourth turning points?.....	244
A lot of good reasons to scrap historical materialism for a simplified historical model based on the ‘eonic effect’.....	244
A ‘dialectic’ of revolution/virtual revolution.....	246
Falling between two stools: religious and secular confusion over history.....	247
Beyond pseudo-democracy...at the ‘end of history’.....	248
Once and future modernity.....	250
R48G: from universal class back to the working class.....	253

Need for a new brand of revolutionary movement.....	254
‘Democracy’ without ‘communism’ is a fraud.....	257
Marx and design arguments.....	258
The logic of (r)evolution.....	258
Eonic effects, revolutionary outcomes.....	260
World history: a complex enigma.....	262
Communism: beyond the marxist monopoly.....	263
Embedding mode of production theory in eonic model?.....	264
Historical theories versus the eonic effect.....	265
Bennett and the question of ‘materialism’.....	266

Appendix 1: 2019

Neo-marxism?...//Goodbye Revolution?

April 15, 2019 3 Minutes

We have tried to examine both reformist and revolutionary aspects of our thinking here but the problems with the revolutionary option seem too great for any such outcome. However sooner or later the coming crisis may change that picture. The obvious problem is that revolution is essential in principle but nearly impossible in practice.

Self-styled revolutionaries are often judgmental about reformists but those same rebels can't even stage a protest march in the US and one suspects can't because they won't and are mainly just talkers rehashing marxist slogans in closed worlds of their own club.

And the powers that be have become deadly in the scope of their power. And revolution must deal with covert agencies, imperialists, an immense ‘army’ of wall street capitalists, and an entrenched military... Then again the Tzarist world was probably worse, but it simply unraveled in the first world war.

But the left must disown bolshevism to pursue the revolutionary option. Instead, sadly, the whole cadre is stuck on marxist cliches and fictions about the bolshevik era. A revolutionary path can't simply repeat leninism. A complete reformulation is needed.

We have suggested that Marx's theories of historical materialism and stages of production have crippled the whole subject. Marx prophesied the coming of communism after capitalism but refused to define that and the result backfired in the stupidity of the bolshevik phase, losing a great opportunity. Much of the remainder of marxism is useful but theories of history always fail: an empirical outline of history (we have several here) is enough and an ability to critique darwinism which distorts historical interpretation.

Marx's theory here is surely false: there is no law of history guaranteeing communism, although there is a kind of moral and practical logic to it as an option that men must

create as free agents. In the failure of capitalism some version of the idea does indeed seem like a next step. But the most probable future left to itself would/will be barbarism. As for historical materialism one can see its historic context but at this point it needlessly antagonized several billion religionists. A critique of religion is perfectly suitable but it has to be a good one and the marxist take on religion is dreadfully bad and almost amateurishly ignorant. There is no problem as such with materialism, but the brand of Marx's generation was that dreadful scientism that greeted the era of positivism. Marxists had everything needed to start here with a figure like Kant but they threw away the whole of modern philosophy in the arrogance so visible in Marx to have created some kind of universal knowledge talisman. The universal materialism of someone like J.G.Bennett shows how to pull off that trick: but it requires a new brand of fundamentals: materialism seems to be vanishing into quantum murkiness... Again, Bennett, like Schopenhauer divided the pie into a triad of 'being, function, will', and the material/spiritual dichotomy fails to even arise except as higher level jargon. Marxism can't even handle the issue of simple consciousness (but noone else can either).

We must provide now what the earlier generations refused to provide: a detailed blueprint and a strategy for its realization that is failsafed against stalinist coup d'etat, what to say of leninist coup d'etat (a big debate there, as always). A revolution needs to be a science, with marshals to observe and warn of lunatics making a mess of everything.

If we examine the russian revolution we see the typical jackknife between the Kerensky and the Leninist phase. Again, to this day, it is very hard if not impossible to see what really happened. It sure looks like a leninist coup d'etat, but many assure us it wasn't so.

We have to leave behind such issues and not base the future on that legacy.

It would be better to have one plan/option at the critical juncture of revolution: our 'democratic market neo-communism' would be a good example: it creates democracy, a new type of planned AND market economy with a Commons realized as expropriation, etc... This is a liberal democratic system remorphed into neo-communism and the two are constructed at the same time. That would greatly clarify a revolutionary transition. But revolutionary reconstruction requires something like a science in detail with plans of action at each phase and carried out with care and marshals to observe them. Such plans appeared instantly at the start of world war 2, operations research and all that. And the whole game requires a habeas corpus guarantee, and much else, so that a bunch of fanatics don't castle into covert agency secret police. That happened almost immediately with that famous devotee of democracy, lenin and his cheka....

Saying goodbye to bolshevism...toward a new left...stop using the term 'marxism'...

April 14, 2019

This is our third post on this today: the left needs to be clear about the bolshevik fiasco and critique the whole history, and especially the left needs correct information on the subject, a nearly impossible thing to hope.

In fact the left must disavow any connection with bolshevism and make clear that a socialist project, electoral or revolutionary has moved on from bolshevism/leninism and probably from marxism. We have restated the whole set of issues in just this fashion: a huge amount of material, free online, ten books. Goodbye to all that marx mishamash. A new generation is needed, one not trained by old marxists or bolsheviks...

We have a model for a virtual new movement, The Red Forty-eight Group. I am too old to start a movement even if I were able to do that, so our virtual movement clocks from 1848, so to speak. It makes no explicit reference to Marx as such, or marxism. We have created a super set of all that and can simply disengage and move on (or reengage, wary that the whole history here is anathema to a larger public). Shut up already, and stop using the term marxism...Never try to defend bolshevism. If asked, declare you are far beyond that...

Source: Revolutionary strategy and the electoral road | John Riddell

We should adopt the assumption that communism has never been tried and that bolshevism was just a phantom nightmare, with a marxism that is deeply flawed and too religiously held as supreme dogma.

Source: [Marxism] Goodbye Revolution?

really....? don't hand marxists a new way to screw up economics...//one better, our DMNC//Yes, a Planned Economy Can Actually Work

March 21, 2019

We have been making a similar argument here over and over again for the last few years. But at the same time it is not proven that this can work. Socialism is not a 'for profit' organization that can mutate Walmart technology and not lose money. If one thing is sure marxists would screw it up. Who is going to control this software? Is this state capitalism?

How will you deal with the tens of millions of companies? One central bureaucracy?

And Walmart/Amazon thrive only on exploited labor. And markets are very diverse. Will you ban markets completely? How about flea markets. Small shops. Small farms, NGO's, etc...

Total planning of a total economy and social system is not yet a possibility. The issue is not markets but communism, that is, neo-communism defined for the first time. But the basic point is right: AI and computational software has left Mises/Hayek behind. We have recommended a mixed three sector approach: a planned sector, a (socialist) market sector using licensed resources from a Commons and a low level below a certain

threshold size. that gives three zones of potential, a very rich possibility. And this preserves a complete 'economic genome' of three potentialities, a much richer potential than one planned sector. It is both centralized and decentralized. It allows very small scale semi-capitalist seed orgs which are absorbed immediately at a given size into the high level market sector.

This approach also allows a better interaction with external outstanding capitalisms.

Still, we have been arguing something related to this for years. AI should be able to resolve (almost) the issue of economic calculation that confused the left for a long time....

In The People's Republic of Walmart, we show how contrary to the historic argument of the likes of free market economists Ludwig Von Mises and Friedrich Hayek, economic planning of millions of products and services involving infinitudes of variables in supply chains and lots of non-price information is not just feasible, but works incredibly well.

Source: Yes, a Planned Economy Can Actually Work

Gandhi, and non-violence

February 25, 2019

There are two recent articles on climate activism and non-violence which are open to challenge. What is the basis of the non-violence and why is it so dominant now? The legacy of MLK and Gandhi both is confusing people. The Civil Rights Movement was a special case and it was as much strategic as anything about the morality of violence. Let us recall that slavery was abolished with the Civil War, not exactly an exercise in non-violence.

The case of Gandhi requires examination to see what a crackpot he was and the way his saintly playacting has turned the issue of non-violence into a kind religious axiom haunting the left, the exceptions being the revolutionary socialists and marxists, and others whose violence was often to be sure excessive.

We can easily overlook the hidden idiocy of Gandhi and his embrace of the Bhagavad Gita which he systematically misread: it is a book that explicitly promotes violence as a duty for a warrior (in the context of Hindu caste law. Gandhi's reading is the most peculiar nonsense. And we must ask, what is the basis for the tactics of nonviolence? We can't use Gandhi for anything at this point. He can't even get straight on caste.

Nothing in Hinduism requires non-violence although it has been influenced by Jainism, and the case of Christ is equally dubious, a lot like that of MLK. We have the sermon on the mount, and also Jesus' explicit proclamation of a violent extreme. We can't find a coherent doctrine there. Against the backdrop of the Zealots Jesus is hard to figure: we don't even know if he existed. As soon as the Christians took over Rome, the putative

non-violence of Jesus was dropped in a hurry. Christianity and Islam are both jihadic concoctions, and the idea of jihad was born in the Old Testament. You might well argue that violence/jihad destroyed all three religions, but the question of violence finds little axiomatic force. Frankly the Bible can't help us anymore: its ethics of Moses from Mt. Sinai is a useless myth. The Bible has long since ceased to guide our values. We must find a new way. You can argue that christianity betrayed Jesus, but in the end that argument assumes with materialists that 'Jesus' dead had no further influence on his movement. Those with spiritual beliefs do consider otherwise. Stand back, and we see that christianity staged a slow motion coup d'etat of the Roman monstrosity and then assumed all its powers. Who can say what is the real christianity? The will to power was both cleverly nonviolent and in the end very violent indeed. The point is that christianity in politics was not in the end a non-violent movement. These points may be off the mark, who knows, but the point is that figures like Hedges claim they are following Christ in some way. That's misleading, and claims false authority.

The real source of Gandhi's thinking is the Jain religion, where non-violence is born as a religious theme taken to an extreme, but only in the context of Jain yogis who fasted unto death and were reluctant to step on insects sweeping a path before them. Note that this was a path to enlightenment, NOT a political tactic. It was the personal path of yogis who chose that path and renounced the world step one. Gandhi completely muddled the issue, and made a botch of the Gita, jainism, and indian politics. Do our current non-violent politicians intend any of this? NO, they are not Jain yogis, so, indifferent to insects, they have betrayed satyagraha and are hardly non-violent. Jainism had its own inner integrity as a true outlier in the realm of religion, but let's not pretend that we are following that path. Gandhi is simply in a muddle. Many indian religious figures tried to intervene to restrain him, in vain, but we should not be dazzled by the fake gandhian political drama.

So let us set aside that moral hypocrisy of the religions and consider what is the basis then of nonviolence. Impossible to find as we can see.

One thing is clear, if non-violence had prevailed in the early modern democracy would never have emerged. All the gains of modern freedom are the result of violent revolutions and idea of gandhian non-violence is a later impostor.

Now it may be that a non-violent movement might be a useful strategy for the climate crisis but reading Hedges here one can only conclude that what he aims for will likely never happen. Let such a movement make its trial. Others may see to find a more vigorous way. The advantage of non-violent movements is that they can proceed inside a state. Violent methods produce violent suppression. We are not dogmatic and we must judge our situation carefully because we are minutes to midnight.

What is needed, however seemingly impossible, is a revolutionary resolution against the thugs of capitalism that control the climate system and the US government. They won't even blink confronted with a non-violence movement. We don't as such advocate this: our point is to be clear that if necessary or possible or appropriate we are not forbidden strong and forceful action.

To pick a somewhat absurd example to make a point and which I am NOT advocating: a thousand men slashing the tires of SUV's could bring capitalism to its knees...

The case can be made that non-violence is the only option given the immense power of the state. Perhaps, but that was always the case. We should consider the point, but at the same time be ready as the circumstance arises. Our point is that in principle a revolutionary approach might arise or be needed. The correct analog is the various wars that truly served history. Consider Hitler: Gandhi advocated giving up and submitting to him in the name of non-violence. The judgment of that false sage was terrible and his imitators can like Hedges subtly control and undermine what might be needed.

We can draw no final conclusion here but we should warn the saintly gandhians that we have only a few decades left and a planet at risk. Best to flush out sentimental gandhian nonsense and think clearly about what is needed.

World history, freedom in the state and freedom from the state

World history, freedom in the state and freedom from the state

February 28th, 2018

The legacy of Marxism contains a rich load of potential tools but is marred by the confusions of theory that beset Marx (and Engels) and rendered their work overall a contradictory package in practice. Instead of historical materialism and/or dialectical materialism we have suggested a simple historical outline with modernity a sort of epochal transition (starting in the early modern) as the crucial focus. The progression of economic epochs in Marx is simply not correct as a long range perspective will clearly show: capitalism is gestating from the Neolithic and feudalism in many forms is recurrent. The Middle Ages isn't really feudal, as such. So the whole scheme is a puzzle until we recast the whole problem.

We can inject our eonic model, but that might be controversial so we can simply map out a set of epochal intervals obvious to the naked eye.

(the preface of the paleo/neolithic)

the phase of onset of the State, Sumer, Egypt and era from ca. 3000 BCE onwards
the so-called Axial Age and its succession as an epoch, and this enforces a discipline of balanced study from Greece/Rome across Eurasia to China

the rise of the modern world from fifteenth to the eighteenth century...

We can try to interpret this pattern, or we can just take it empirically as a kind of punctuated series, wary of theories save as a descriptive category of development or civilizational evolution (wary of the term evolution, it just means what it means in conversational lingo).

In this context we can analyze class, economy, and technology empirically as histories or chronicles. Note that we add technological history as separate category: the onset of capitalism is often confused with the industrial (technological) revolution of the eighteenth century.

We can certainly focus on a working class analysis of these various eras and/or look at the whole in terms of multiple classes and posit the motion toward a universal class. But let us note that a working class dynamic is going to be incomplete: there is a double

motion, the onset of the State as one kind of freedom and then almost dialectically a motion against the state as the birth of democracy. We note the resemblance of the democratic and the working class strain.

We should note that 'feudalism' is really an ideological version of the idea of caste that so dominates India: the Aryan cast logic is simply a variant in the occidental middle ages. We can see then that overall the sudden amplification of capitalism in the industrial revolution period looks like the onset of a new epoch of economy, but surely to a close look we can see that that is not true.

We can resolve the question by seeing that democracy can't be fully realized or the State truly fulfilled until we unite the working class, or better the gestating universal class into a common realization, viz. with a communist democracy...

We have both availed ourselves of a theme of proletarian ideology, Marxism, and escaped its rigid formulation which can obstruct clarity.

Let us note then that capitalism is developing at all stages of history even if it suddenly becomes a dominant factor in modernity. We can see that capitalism as economy and technology almost because an independent factor in history, but that's not the same as saying it is a stage of history.

Let us recommend a closer look at the eonic model but without having to take it in full as another theory. But, all in all, we can see that an empirical approach can free us from the confusions that haunt marxist ideas about inexorable stages of economic history.

The working class formulation is so classic and to the point we can work with that, but the idea of a 'universal class', which is really a variant of the individuality of all men given by the great religions, can be an equally valuable approach. We can easily change gears between the two concepts, also mindful that the class interests of the working class can't be made an absolute: the nature of the state and its evolution into democracy and two separate issues, reaching their conclusion in their unification.

Another issue is the question of slavery: it is increasingly clear, although not certain, that slavery is never any kind of necessary stage in history, because it didn't really exist at the birth of agriculture or the State: it appears to be a disease of civilization that grows progressively worse in the era after the rise of State Sumer/Egypt. Thus, it appears that the Pyramids, at first, were constructed by free labor as a sort of military draft.

The dread disease of slavery is really related to emerging capitalism in an obvious sense, and overtakes the State in the later phase of our first epoch???

Whatever the case we cannot ascribe any necessary status to slavery: if the great pyramids were initiated by free labor the arguments for the inevitability of slavery as a stage (suspiciously lurking in Marx) collapse at once.

archive: The question of modernity

December 11th, 2017 •

The need for a larger perspective....of modernity

January 8th, 2015 •

The neo-communist left has to have a far larger universe than that created by historical materialism: it needs a global anthropology that can talk to a generalized modernity/secularism. But what is that? The nineteenth century created a reduced subset to all that in the forms of positivism, scientism, secular humanism, Marxism...

Marxism needs to be rescued from this situation: the situation is not hard to solve: we use

the ‘macro model’ (or you can skip that) to look at what we call the ‘modern transition’ from 1500 to 1800 (approx/) at which point the new era of modernity begins. The early modern clearly shows at once what happened: Marxism jumped on a yippee surfboard in the Feuerbachian reaction to Hegel and downshifted into a very limited perspective. The overall idea was brilliant, however, and can easily be recast to include 1. a larger whole than Hegel and his critics 2. the ‘dialectic’ of the modern transitional with counterpoints in the Reformation/Rise of Science, revolutions from Munzer to the French Revolution. 3 the rise of liberalism, ideas of freedom, philosophies of freedom, 4. German Classical Philosophy....

In general the marxist perspective can’t even handle the Enlightenment very well. The so-called ‘dialectic of the Enlightenment’ started chasing a good idea for a critique and ended up in the hopeless muddle of the postmodern critique of modernity.

In the larger view the issue of communism is 1. a response to the need for a post-transitional ‘revolution’ against capitalism, 2. the need to reconstruct modernity in this new context, requiring versions of the Reformation, Scientific Revolution, rise of liberalism/communism (socialism), industrialization and its technologies and globalization, 3.some reckoning with the complex chords generated: e.g. the Romantic Reaction, the export of buddhism and figures like Schopenhauer, etc...

You can see that the current tactic of trying to use Marxism to challenge all other aspects of modernity is ill-conceived and the route to sterility and scientism made worse.

Last and First Men creates an historical context for not only the larger perspective of modernity, but a still larger context of world history. This approach requires looking at a whole complex (dialectic) of counterpoints, contraries and pairs of opposites.

In specific terms, the new left here needs to study the reality of global religion, from Xtianity/Islam to buddhism, and Confucianism Taoism, etc.. It needs to have a larger philosophy that can work with materialism and idealism in a larger context than simple collision. Etc...

This problem of selecting a small subset of modernity to define secularism haunts the science world whose cadre of poorly educated scientism troopers has created, like Marxism, an extremely narrow subset of modernity that beggars the whole transition to a new era.

It would be nice to ditch the old Marxism and create a larger version that is tuned to the greater whole of modernity, and thence antiquity.

JFK-9/11: 50 Years of Deep State ...

February 25, 2019

Source: A truly shocking book, must read by any citizen: Israel (and the us) as criminal rogues states...//JFK-9/11: 50 Years of Deep State ...where did you agree to Israelis planting miniature plutonium bombs in the twin towers??? – Darwiniana

The eonic effect, the 'ompah' factor: why Marxism gets history wrong...and how to upgrade

February 20, 2019

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=WHEE_abrdg_kindle_johnlondon_PDF2A.pdf

It is possible to consider the model of the eonic effect is too complicated, but in fact it is not. It is a simple methodology with a simple question: using a grid analysis, i.e. a sequential and parallel matrix analysis, does world history show any suspicious patterns? If does indeed! The first question: world history shows a suspicious frequency pattern, and next to that a most curious spatial pattern in parallel. That's it, the eonic effect... That's the 'rustling in the bushes' that suggests something going on where we see only the surface.

How do we interpret this? It has a remarkable similarity to 'punctuated equilibrium PE' but generalized to a more complicated form. PE is like a rhythm: ompah da da da ompah...A beat then no beats then a beat...in principle utterly simple, in practice, ...all we see is historical blur...but if we study history in detail in ALL global sectors (divide world history and the planet by 'longitude' and 'latitude' and then sequential temporal versions of/in these regions) we detect something strange: innovation, advance, development in certain ways is clustered in a non-random pattern...that's the oomph followed by da da da..And the whole thing seems to originate in the middle east and spread outward, but with PE's recurring over millennia in sequence and in parallel. That is strange. It can't just happen: something is making that happen, and it is not man as such...

So what is interfering in human history? The first idiot guess is 'god'. Nope, not god. God wouldn't/doesn't act like PE. The simple non-answer is, we don't know, but it is an evolutionary something with a generalized pattern formation process of some kind. Note that PE is an evolutionary concept because it suggests an 'ompah' (something driving evolution) where darwinism suggest da da da da, etc...(random only, no driver).

More specifically, the 'eonic model' suggests this is a developmental pattern, that it shows 'civilizations evolving' and that while the data is not quite complete the evidence of pattern is clear, IF you study enough books on ALL sectors of world history at all stages since....

We will leave it there for the moment, but we will challenge (and try to easily upgrade) marxist theory (we said theory, Marxism has a lot of stuff that isn't theory, useful stuff) which says that epochs of economic systems provide a sequential solution to the issue of historical dynamics. The evidence doesn't show it. Economic systems are not fundamental, nor do they show a sequential pattern. So economic forces don't seem to qualify for the ompah. That's not surprising. Economic needs are continuous: we must

eat every day, and grow food every year. Larger historical dynamism must be something else.

We can rescue Marxism easily: stay away from theories of economic history and/or the causal relationship of economics to historical systems. Ask what is a system that can replace a capitalism that is destroying a planet? It could have its own ompah, but don't bet on it: we must construct it ourselves, and soon too.

Instead of theory, retreat to 'praxis', recipes of what to do, not brittle theories trying to imitate Newton, and a good case can be made that as capitalism has developed it can be an aberrant process and go out of control and that its economic aspect must be part of a larger solution. Some call that socialism, but the point is clear, capitalism is not our 'ompah' either. Nor is socialism, but it doesn't need to be: it is an idea that emerges during an ompah era as a guide to social reconstruction in the context of aberrant capitalism.

We should consider that socialists don't seem to as yet understand their own idea and have produced their own aberrant systems. But capitalism is about to destroy a planet, so we must upgrade to some sort of new system, some kind of socialism 2.0.

We can debate that but our first point should be clear that the eonic effect isolates a good candidate for the ompah factor, the overall dynamic of historical 'development', granting that this is a bit brief: what the rustling in the bushes really means is still unclear.

Marx claimed that history's economic systems are a sequence of ompahs, but it doesn't work. Look at modernity (modern) capitalism (which always existed since horse trading, truck and barter) is a product of modernity but not the other way around. Modernity as such is in fact one of our ompah beats, a statement that requires careful study...

The Bolivarians wasted a golden opportunity...: Maduro should seize the moment, asap, how about our DMNC? a system that would fit Venezuela beautifully...

February 20, 2019

Maduro appears to have frittered away a golden opportunity. But the game is not up yet: he can simply begin to move Venezuela to full socialism. But what is that? We have suggested many times that ...

Source: The Bolivarians wasted a golden opportunity...: Maduro should seize the moment, asap, how about our DMNC? a system that would fit Venezuela beautifully... –

Is trump a fascist drone? Is trump under hypnosis?

June 20th, 2018 •

we have explored here almost tacitly a rising suspicion of a new outbreak of ‘occult fascism’ (consider the discussions at, say, The Gurdjieff Con) in concert with a global trend toward global dictatorship along with the related but quite different attacks on democracy by figures like Putin (keeping in mind however such idiot fellow travelers like dugin...).

This may be a conspiracy theory til proven otherwise but unfortunately the proof is hard to come by. We ask no belief, only a warning of what occult politics can achieve in complete secrecy, almost complete. How do you prove that some dark yogi or lama hypnotized a politician three thousand miles away? You don’t. It is absolutely deadly, hypnosis by telepathy...

A look at The Shadow of the Dalai Lama might suggest the vast underground here, but that work is perhaps almost too elaborate: the perps have simpler tactics...

It is very difficult to follow the trail here and rare are those who can detect the transnational version of a global ‘deep state’ aspect (there is no such state, only ominous omens...) of this trend.

Trump often appears to act as if hypnotized according to a script (and the russiagate line may be the best line of enquiry at the most direct level). He keeps doing things that seem deliberate attempts to undermine (American) democracy and/or pave the way to a post democratic global politics....

Amazon.com: Grand Deceptions: Zionist Intrigue in the 20th and 21st Centuries eBook: Brandon Martinez: Books

February 11, 2019

Anyone caught up in the ‘anti-Semitism’ racket of false charges by Jews Israelis should read this and related works that have exposed the issues here of Jewish Israeli deceptions and supremacist tactics.

don’t corrupt ecological socialism with Marx’s errors and monopoly of bad theory...has noone heard of the Romantic movement?...//What Karl Marx has to say about today’s environmental problems

February 9, 2019

This quote shows directly that Marx's thinking had a near-ecological aspect. But in the end Marxism has no real ecological perspective. And conclusion is not to try and integrate ecology into Marxism. The result will backfire because ecological thinking integrated with the fallacies of Marx's theories will be a hopeless mess.

The left needs to leave hopeless case Marxists behind, take a few good quotes from his works and start over from scratch....

Has noone heard of the Romantic Movement? An immense resource in counterpoint to/with the Enlightenment is a part of modernity. We don't need the dead hand of Marxists to monopolize ecological thinking...

...all progress in capitalistic agriculture is a progress in the art, not only of robbing the laborer, but of robbing the soil; all progress in increasing the fertility of the soil for a given time, is a progress towards ruining the lasting sources of that fertility.– Karl Marx, Capital Vol 1

Source: What Karl Marx has to say about today's environmental problems

Capitalism not a stage of economic history?

R48G: capitalism is not a stage of (economic) history: marxist production theory is misleading and making the problem worse...did Marx/Engels fumble the ball?
April 5th, 2017 •

Was capitalism a mistake...? We are probably dead by capitalism so the answer is clear...

The whole emphasis of Marxism is confused: the way that capitalism was turned into a stage of history as a stage of production ended up giving it a status it didn't deserve and is one aspect of its persistence in the sense of Marx's concealed bourgeois tendencies assuming this stage of production must exhaust its potential before moving beyond itself, a disastrous gift to the fanatics of capitalist futurism. The potential of this set of fake systems could never be exhausted and the truer circumstance is that this fake stage of history will terminate a planet.

The emergence of 'capitalism' is relative: in a fairly general definition, it goes back to the Neolithic or beyond and is present in all phases of civilization. The equivocation here over capitalism as a modern phenomenon is simply another case of its 'relative' transformations, and the onset of the industrial revolution along with the ideology of such as Adam Smith and the invention of new kinds of financial instruments created the illusion that a new capitalist era had somehow replaced feudalism as a new stage of history.

The study of the eonic effect demonstrates a more complicated picture in which economic systems in various stages and formats are embedded in a larger social context.

Marx and Engels understood all this until they misunderstood it with the creation of 'historical materialism'. A more realistic picture is that capitalism is a set of innovations inside a larger system and that its nefarious character, the object of immediate protest, created the need for an new kind of social system that could control its rogue character. Capitalism was always a rogue process and there was never any reason that the whole of humanity was to be subjected to market forces in the name of the laws of history was a gross fallacy and a decided fumble by Marx/Engels. Marx/Engels were however pretty clear in the 1848 period of the dangers of the situation and the need to act at once to move to a new type of system.

What is evolution?

February 5, 2019

The left needs to re-examine its Darwinian views. Sadly, they are frozen in place (although Marx was suspicious of Darwinism) even as the old paradigm is collapsing. However, paradigms come and go and there is need for a completely generalized view of evolution that stands above the biochemical substrate. No matter how hard you try you can't reduce evolution to chemistry (in its current form). The issue isn't complex: the causal mechanics of chemistry is not able to explain how life emerges and it can't even discuss the issue of consciousness.

The left is so confused it can't read anything that isn't hard core scientism and yet Marxists struggling with Hegel should know better. Our approach has nothing to do with Hegel but that philosopher was alert to the way some ideation factor must exist. We don't have to get into Hegel or debates over idealism and materialism. Our account speaks on its own terms at a metalevel, as far as it can.

This account smacks of idealism, but it is nothing of the kind: the point is that some form factor emerges in evolution and this is behind the reifications of life. However we don't see that directly.

Our discussion is like describing some process on a scratch note book, an eyewitness account of what we see and an inference that we don't see everything. It is totally baseless to call that 'idealism'.

The equations of physics would then be idealism...

In the end the question of evolution is intractable for the reasons above and yet we can see how easily we can at least provide an overall model. The result is simple, elegant and adapted to specifics...

Note that the 'evolution of freedom' applies to history and see the way in which free action and system action 'tutor' freedom as it were and more directly show democracy, socialism and communism as ideas emerge in periods of transition.

Source: Evolution to history: freedom evolving – Darwiniana

Our DMNC model exposes the inefficient incompetence of capitalist corporations...

December 23, 2018

<https://darwiniana.com/2018/12/23/our-dmnc-model-could-gm-far-better-than-the-capitalist-idiots-current-socialize-general-motors/>

Reading this account of GM's incompetent and venal management it suddenly becomes obvious that, we won't just throw out the term 'socialist' but stick to our renamed version, and after the endless diatribes against inefficient socialism, something like our 'democratic market neo-communism' could easily resolve the problems of a prime capitalist corporation. The capitalists have lost the ability to 'do their own thing' and are floundering in pseudo-capitalist degenerations of the genre.

Our DMNC would allow several possibilities: a planned version, but better yet a 'market' version but one in the context of a Commons: such an entity could be run by a neo-communist entrepreneur using licensed resources and/or a managerial group, with mixed planning interactions, it would have any number of labor resolutions from socialist unions to a cooperative subset and would carefully mediate the issue of layoffs, if any, giving guarantees of transitional subsistence and guarantees of future employment. The result would fulfill all the characteristics of a capitalist version but in a far more intelligent version that would be subject to ecological law. And so on: this portrait of GM is revealing. Socialists with half a brain could do this as well as the capitalists. This is not state capitalist or bureaucratic command socialism, but a hybrid of the DMNC type.

Note: Marxists would be unable to carry out this project and would immediately override the subtle difference from conventional socialist nonsense. Marxist have not done their homework, are confused about planning and markets and would immediately induce failure in the above....

The pernicious character of judeo-xtian theologies...should covenantal Judaism be charged as a hate crime?

January 30, 2019

The crisis of Israel is a reminder of the way the bible has spawned an atrocious geographical ideology that deserves our contempt at this point: god acting in Israel? Covenantal Judaism? The myths ...

Source: The pernicious character of judeo-xtian theologies...should covenantal Judaism be charged as a hate crime? – Darwiniana

Historical materialism left Marxist sitting ducks totally blind to the occult opposition's politics

January 28, 2019

The left was blindsided by the action of occult 'Sufi' reactionaries in the Russian revolution (cf. Gurdjieff) and the subsequent manufacture of occult fascism... The old Gurdjieff ...

Source: Archive of the Gurdjieff Con blog, 2008-17: –

Marx's confusion over teleology

January 27, 2019

Marx denounced teleology but slipped it into his theory of stages of production. Marxists are thus using teleological propaganda while denying doing so, a hopeless muddle. The eonic model can point...

Source: Marx's confusion over teleology – Darwiniana

The eonic data as a way out of 'historical materialism'...

January 26, 2019

The eonic model, which can be taken in a simplified form, exposes the limits of historical materialism and economic fundamentalism and could offer a new way to base socialism in history. .

The Marxist brand has failed and is doomed to future failures...

The question of evolution in general, and the related 'evolution' of civilization has been so totally muddled by science, biology, and everyone else that is almost impossible to consider...

Source: The eonic evolution of civilization – Darwiniana

Critiquing Marx's theories...but giving a pass to his empirical studies....

January 23, 2019

Readers of a blog criticizing Marx from the left get discombobulated and I can sympathize in some ways! The point here is that the criticism is mostly of Marx's theories which are naïve and confused over Newtonian causal issues, as are most 'theories' of history. After ten years deciphering the 'eonic effect' I am rarely if ever impressed by attempts at historical theory. NOONE can get the question right, for reasons the eonic model makes clear, without being another theory. The 'theory' of historical materialism and stages of production theory impressed the nineteenth century but seem dated now, a moment in the rise of post-Hegelian positivism and scientism. You can't reduce history to economic issues, eliminate idealism in favor of old-fashioned materialism, prophesy future communism without defining it, etc... The left cannot transform society with that legacy, so once that sinks in a new platform must be developed.

It is a dismal legacy, and yet Marxists tend to bestow misplaced reverence to a figure that has passed into history. But Marxists could perform a service by simply discarding the theories and focusing on Marx's empirical work: his thought on issues of class, exploitation, etc, have survived better than his theoretical monstrosities and speak directly to a descriptive perspective. A selection of Marx's empirical ideas and studies could be a useful summary of the legacy and a way to pass on: a new generation has to stop its misplaced cult worship of a holy founder in the religion of Marxism. The issue now is postcapitalism and we need to escape the dead hand of marxist regurgitators, who have botched every opportunity they had to create socialism. It is a horrendous legacy. We can't afford another bungled marxist attempt to create a world beyond capitalism.

From working class ideology to the perspective of the Universal Class.

January 22, 2019

Source: Were Marx's theories to blame?...//Why Did Socialism Fail? – 1848: The End(s) of History

We have commented already today on this essay but might continue with a discussion of the question of creating working class democracies and its failures.

The problem is that a working class democracy was never defined and in the context of Tsarist Russia undergoing revolution Russian authoritarianism and Lenin's hatred of liberalism turned into a hatred of democracy and somehow the whole idea of democracy disappeared despite the fake elections that were staged as a set of fronts.

But more generally the 'working class' concept is flawed and we see that unless we are referring to anarchism the idea of a working class government ends up meaning government by a vanguard. Here the atrocious idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat entered to generate a hopeless muddle. Marx's cogent insight into the capitalist capture of

liberalism backfired. Liberalism, rights, and finally democracy were turned into outcast notions.

The working class has not performed in the way Marx envisioned. And the focus is finally about working class economic conditions, wages. It is not as such a radical revolutionary class, it would seem. And what happens to all the other classes? Further an ecological socialism must consider a larger set of issues than working class gains.

We have suggested thinking in terms of a, or 'the', Universal Class, the People, with the working class as just one subset of that general classification. We have to ask what happens to all the social sets and merge them into a common category. Why should the working class be the dominant class? It is class all over again. Marxists spend all their time and energy harping on the working class in hopes of some miracle of coaxing them to do their bidding. It won't happen, and has never happened.

But we can envision a working class revolution creating a universal class for the whole of society or we can simply assign all volunteers to the job, even, as Engels, capitalists. Or we can simply think in terms of the People and its Universal Class with the inexorable vanguard which must have a democratic mindset and yet be able to generate sufficient authority to guard a Commons: we have suggested a solution in our model of DMNC. Almost all the revolutionaries have been middle class (a close look at the Russian case however, shows a considerable working class factor but the revolution was in reality created by a vanguardist intelligentsia). Clearly a movement has to recruit from the Universal Class, expect a factor of vanguardism, create an explicit model of democracy built into a communist system, and have a liberal look: we remorph liberalism into communism, and the result is a communism that looks like liberalism. The idea from Marx of a hard shift from capitalism to communism was totally misleading and led to social amputation of all the elements required for a balanced society.

<https://redfortyeight.com/?s=universal+working+class>

The lost opportunity of the era of bolshevism and its stupidities

January 22, 2019

<https://redfortyeight.com/?s=democratic+market+neo-communism>

The fallacies of Marxism are a great tragedy in world history. The Russian revolution created a tremendous opportunity which was squandered completely via the idiocy of Lenin/Stalin, but more the confusion created by marxist theories.

Creating a socialist republic is not inherently more difficult that creating a capitalist republic. The era of Bolshevik created the prime condition and groundwork: the

expropriation of capital. But the result as state capitalism was totally wrong and was in part the fault of Marx who misconceived the whole issue of markets.

Our DMNC model suggests creating a Commons which is a shared resource guaranteed by law and subject to legal redress against anything like top down control by a bureaucracy. It will have the latter and new technologies of real planning are emerging, but the issue of planned economies will be given a counterpoint in a sector of neo-communist markets which can license resources for socialist entrepreneurs, etc...

This kind of mixed system is a slam dunk and can thrive where the dead hand of Marxism generated wrong thinking.

Sadly, a great moment was frittered away: the issue of expropriation now would have to be done all over again. What a wasted chance!

The complete failure of historical theories (including Marx's), and a glance at the eonic effect data set...

December 22, 2018

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=WHEE_5thed_pdf.pdf

Marxist claims for a science of history are mostly pseudo-science and we must rush into the fray to challenge the failure of all parties to produce a science of history. The question was actually addressed by such as Karl Popper in his critique of marxist 'historicism' but his critique applies just as well to the bourgeois versions of historical science. So-called. There is no such science.

The reason is clear: the issue of free agency enters to falsify all claims for a theory, which is supposedly causal.

Here before our discussion below we interject a recommendation to look at the so-called 'eonic effect'. The latter is a large data set of world history, one that begins to show signs of a real historical dynamic. But we are still far from a science of history but instead get an insight into just how complex any such theory would be. The 'eonic model' is not a theory of history, but a set of observations about something we cannot quite see or understand, and this will be a drastic warning to all the idiots ambitious for a theory of history. At least take a minimal look at this data set.

There are all sorts of solutions to the 'free agency' problem: a new kind of post-theory that combines historical dynamism and free agency. The result is not like physics but who says history is like physics. We 'solve' this problem all the time when we use a computer and a mouse: a computer alone is a causal machine, but a tandem computer/user system where the user inputs with a mouse is a lot like history when

‘determination’ and agency blend in a peculiar system of a new type. If you study the code for a mouse you see how the two modes unite into one system. The eonic effect shows the simplest solution in action: first a higher determination acts and then stops as free agency takes over, until the whole thing repeats in a new cycle... The computer/mouse system is the same: the computer performs its task but then starts to idle and wait for input. With the action of the mouse the system processes the input, and then goes into idling mode again, waiting for input. This cycle of activity involves a free agent whose behavior is not ‘causal’ in the sense of physics, but the overall system is well defined...

<https://redfortyeight.com/2018/12/22/up-from-marxism-will-post-marxist-socialists-get-a-second-chance/>

In our previous post today,

we have produced a critical take on the subject of Marxism. This opens up a fairly vast area of discussion. We might start with a critique of marxist theories of history which are not successful. Marx posited a progression of epochs, e.g. feudalism, to capitalism, to communism, and made this into what he claimed was a science. But the whole scheme is useless really. Feudalism must mean the medieval period, but is this really an epoch in itself? It is the decline aftermath from the era of Athens to Rome, in the occident, as it were, and the larger period is the real epoch with no hard and fact economic system. The era from classic Greece to the rise of the modern is a far better epoch if such is what we are looking. This has no intrinsic connection to capitalism which is a gestating continuity that goes back to earliest periods of world history, e.g. the Neolithic. Its sudden amplification in the modern era, especially around the Industrial revolution does not really compromise a new social format. The ‘modern’ period is far too complex to be reduced to an epoch we call Big C Capitalism. And finally the projection of this series into an epoch of Communism is a teleological set of predictions with no solid basis in any science of history, the latter itself mostly theoretical fiction at this point. What is communism? Marx refused to define it, so how could we know it is our future. There are of course multiple other ways to argue for communism: we simply note the intractable confusion of the capitalist ‘era’ (note our sudden use of an epochal jargon, fairly innocent slang at this point) and consider that communism might reify an ethical principle of fairness and equality, just as democracy reifies a principle of freedom (and equality). But Marx was stubbornly reductionist and claimed his theory/theories must override ethical questions on the grounds of science. A useless gesture, in a contrast of utopian and so-called scientific socialism. But the marxist science is a phantom so we are back to the ethical implications of ‘utopian’ schemes of postcapitalist economy. How could it be otherwise: we must put down on paper a set of practical proposals. To abjure this as utopian in the name of some dynamic of communist epochal transition is nonsense and bad theory indeed, and utopian in its own way. And it fatally misled whole generations of Marxists.

There is a much simpler resolution here, if we can extricate ourselves from Marxist dogma: democracy, capitalism and socialism/communism (re)emerge in parallel in the onset of the modern and demand some reconciliation in a viable system. Marx clearly

sensed this in his critique of ‘bourgeois’ democracy but somehow the task foundered in theory, and the hatred of classical liberalism.

The historical record shows this clearly: after all, the first dawn of modernity shows the birth of communism complete with ‘proletarian’ revolution in the ‘communism’ of Munzer. So our subject is not economic epochs but the innovations of modernity reconciled in a consistent system that can braid the key ideas in a viable system, one we must carefully define advance.

So with Marx we find the great critic of ideology and theory in the classic economists himself succumb to theoretical ideology: his ‘science’ is really a propaganda for the inevitability of communism. No such inevitable epoch exists: but it might if men as free agents sit down in the formation of ‘utopian’ rough drafts with ethical considerations to so advise resolve the contradictions of capitalism, democracy, socialism and ‘communism’ in the sense of considering the status of private property and primitive accumulation. Property is theft as the classic slogan has it. Let’s fix that. But in the end the passage to a real communism has never been properly scrutinized by Marxists. The result was the monstrosity of state capitalism, command economies and a total incomprehension of markets and their peculiar properties/theories (the latter mostly mathematical fantasms). Marxists were soon blindsided by figures like Mises and their so-called economic calculation debate. The left still tends to ignore this issue. The extreme views of Mises soon found challengers on the left, but no one has ever really resolved the issue of markets until now, in the era of AI and computational planning, some resolution seems to be coming over the horizon.

There is another very simple solution: the issue is capitalism, not markets, the two are not the same. We can construct a form of communism that embraces both planning and markets. Instead of state capitalism we can pass the property issue into the idea of a Commons, which is subtly quite different and not controlled by the state or the ‘new class’ of one-party ‘bolshevik’ aristocrats, that utter nonsense. The Commons is not controlled by the political state and belongs to everyone. So if you don’t get your share, you sue bastards in the commie cadre of big shots. The Commons is also the ‘possession’ of the ecological totality of nature and there should be protected in some form of ecological legalism, etc...

We have already constructed a tinkertoy model, ‘democratic market neo-communism’ as a set of potential realizations of economic, democratic and socialist/communism potentials. The point here is that we are free of the monstrosity of historical materialism and can freely construct a new form of economic modernity.

So, where does Marxism go wrong...?

January 16, 2019

<https://redfortyeight.com/2019/01/16/the-failure-of-marxism-and-the-need-for-a-new-paradigm/>

Time is short and the global crisis of capitalism and ecology is accelerating. And yet

there is no real left in the old sense. We have gotten Bernie Sanders but a close look shows a very weak leftist platform that co-opts the language of socialism and revolution for something that isn't even social democracy. If he can get elected and do some good, let him do so, but I fear he will put us on a treadmill where the term 'revolution' has been bankrupted. But the radical so-called revolutionary left is hardly any better and has no real activist platform at this point. The reasons are the legacy of bolshevism which turns off virtually the whole population and the flaws in Marxism that bedevil all attempts to create a real movement. The various left groups repeat Marxist slogans over and over but the result goes nowhere.

We have a large number of critical perspectives here and elsewhere. We can make some suggestions for a new approach:

- The revolutionary left in the early modern has created democracy, of a sort, but has never produced a real socialism, let alone a version of communism
- Bolshevism was a fiasco so total that communism may never find a future
- The Bolsheviks had no real defining model of what they were to do and regurgitated their Russian/Tsarist social conditioning and called it communism
- Part of the problem is the theoretical confusion of Marxism and Marx's theories: attempts to produce a science of history have always failed. History is not physics.
- The problem springs from the way Marx obsessed over 'grand theory' and produced a theory of history and this ended up misleading the left: the result is confusing and doesn't work
- The theory of 'historical materialism' is hopelessly flawed and far too limited to really create a useful future social system. The debate over materialism and idealism is a long lost episode of the anti-Hegelian reaction and the rise of positivistic scientism, a phase now very dated. The issue of 'idealism' and its critique is tantamount to saying that physics can't use equations because they are idealistic propaganda.
- The issue of Hegel is a botch by Marxists: we need to look at the larger phase of idealism, one that considers the revolutionary version produced by Kant called transcendental idealism, very different from anything in Hegel who is very elusive in his perhaps destructive post Kantianism...
- To turn Hegel, who is almost always misunderstood, upside down to get to 'a materialist dialectic' is an incomprehensible fantasy that vitiates sound logic and enters Hegel's treatment of ancient philosophies of 'triads' with a heavy handed invention of nonsense. Those who seek economic justice should never have been subjected to this confusing bilge.
- Historical materialism in Marx makes some dubious claims about the economic factor in history. But is economic logic the real backdrop of history? The whole complexity of social culture is reduced to a very limited obsession with economic questions, everything else dismissed as illusion
- The related theory of 'stages of production' is simply a false set of claims: the progression of epochs from feudalism to capitalism to communism is a made up historical fiction that doesn't correspond to the facts.

- Capitalism is not really a stage or epoch of history: it has existed in primitive forms since the Neolithic and its modern apotheosis is a function of the industrial revolution and the various financial innovations of that period
- Marx refused to define 'communism' yet assumed its future was inevitable leaving a void that was filled with the total idiocy of Stalinism
- Stages of production theory made communism seem inevitable and this was said to be science. But without defining what we mean we call hardly call its future inevitable. We must construct 'communism' step by difficult step...
- We must instead take the future of communism on provision on the basis of attempting to define and create it: free agents must create it, there is nothing inevitable about it
- This failure has been a windfall for capitalists: communism is Stalinist, so the evidence suggests. The term communism must be defined to exclude such dangerous nonsense
- Capitalism is equated with markets, but there is a possibility of a communist market in the context of a social commons that makes resources shared but still open to both market and planned operations. We could, say, license resources from the commons to socialist entrepreneurs: the issue of planning was not resolved by Marx in the context of the counterattack over the 'economic calculation' argument...
- Marx was cogent on the way that democracy could be compromised by capitalism but the end result was the total rejection of liberal thinking which in the Bolshevik era entered as explicit rejection of democracy.
- But without democracy communism can't be communism. It is also true that a strong authority is needed to safeguard the 'commons': there are many ways to create this balance.
- Marx's distinction of utopian and scientific socialism was totally muddled: his theories were not science yet sacrificed values on the altar of science, dismissing those who promote socialist values as utopian idealists...It is hard to think of a bigger botch of a subject....
- There is more here, but we can stop for the moment...
- the issue of ecology hasn't even been discussed...

Were Marx's theories to blame?...//Why Did Socialism Fail?

January 22, 2019

<https://redfortyeight.com/?s=marxism+failure>
Democratic Market Neo-communism/in pint

We have discussed this issue here many times but the author of this piece sees the basic point: the bolshevik era never produced any socialisms at all. The Stalinist brand especially was simply a socialist imposter.

There is every possibility for real socialism and in an era of approaching climate calamity we can see that capitalism is coming to an even worse failure than fake socialism. We must figure out where fake socialism went wrong and create the real thing. Part of the problem lies in Marx's misanalysis of capitalism and then in his stages of production theory the prophecy of the coming of communism, which he failed to define. The result was that Stalin ended up being the definer. The coming of socialism is not historically inevitable: it must be defined and then created by free agents, not historical forces. We can see that Marx equated capitalism and markets but the two are not the same: we could have socialist/communist markets if we do it right.

Although the attacks of such as Mises are propaganda the latter had a point: a state bureaucracy cannot replicate the effects of markets with their mysterious 'clearing' mechanisms. Thus planning so far has failed to produce a viable socialism. This issue has evolved and the rise of computational models along with AI may well solve the problem but there is no reason why communism or we should say neo-communism shouldn't have markets. We have created a model in our 'democratic market neo-communism' based on a Commons where a communist market uses shared resources under a license: this is not the same as state capitalism the issue of central control is bypassed. The result could easily produce a system as efficient as capitalism but without bureaucratic tyranny. The thinking of Marx and Marxists has captured the whole field and turned the whole experiment in socialism into inexorable failure. The arena is clogged with fallacious idiocy. The first step is to rethink the problem beyond the dogmatism of the legacy cadres.

In hindsight, with the heavy ideological fog of the Cold War behind us, it is obvious that the state-run industrial systems that both sides mislabeled socialist or communist were never working class governed democracies. So actually, socialism didn't fail—it never existed. But that doesn't explain why the powerful state-run industrial societies of the USSR, Eastern Europe, and China—that everyone falsely branded socialist—failed to thrive

Source: Why Did Socialism Fail?

The failure of Marxism and the need for a new paradigm...

January 16, 2019

I am sorry to criticize Project but to suppress critical thinking at his Marxmail is a gross abuse. I could have provided a lot of food for thought and gotten some exposure of my ten plus books on left/marxist subjects. The left is stuck in marxist idiocy and needs debate, critical thinking, exposes of leftist propaganda, more economic study that is up to date and able to penetrate capitalist propaganda, and in general a kind of theoretical 'repentance' as to the dreadful legacy of marxism/leninism/bolshevism.

On one point I ‘bother’ to do this because the marxist left supports the revolutionary option that gets filtered out in the passage to social democratic thinking which many Marxists rightly suspect of crypto-ideology. That said, our new initiative, even as it tries to maintain a revolutionary perspective, needs to multitask the two options with a revolutionary/evolutionary double analysis. The issue of ‘social democracy’ is not so much some reactionary impulse as a clear sense that a revolution would be hard to bring about and induces a kind of waiting game in conventional leftist radicals. Our critique of Marxism therefore will try to produce a new paradigm that has a revolutionary option, along with a debate and/or ‘last resort’ support for the inevitable confusion of double options.

Looking at the eonic model and then the marxist legacy we can see almost at once the limits of the latter, and its subtle flaws next to its gross oversimplification of world history as economically driven...

Toward a post Darwinian left

Toward a post Darwinian left
July 20th, 2018

Taking up a radical critique of darwinism might be the correct recipe to break old mindsets and set the left into a post-theoretical mode that is wary of theory and ideology. An untold story is the way Darwinism entered the left in a destructive and violent interpretation of class struggle all too apparent in ‘class’ genocides of the bolshevik era. In a strange finesse the right has pursued both a social Darwinist agenda and a post Darwinist innovation that has become enmired in the design argument. The left should simply take over the design argument, in an agnostic mode, and lead the way into a left that is critique of the crypto-ideological Darwin legacy.

A leftist make over on the issue of evolution?
December 13th, 2017 •

One of the most remarkable confusions of modern culture is the way a reductionist version of evolution, viz. darwinism came into being to displace a promising set of starts that were on the right track. The left has been a particular victim of this botched starting point. The left needs a complete make over on the issue of evolutionary theories, and a redress against its tendency to condone implicitly the social Darwinist implications of the natural selectionist perspective and its fundamentalists...

From Lamarck and the teleomechanists to the fallacies of darwinism
October 17th, 2017 •

<http://www.npr.org/2016/08/27/491492977/in-tom-wolfes-kingdom-speech-is-the-one-weird-trick>

Wolfe has raised an obvious point: we have no really convincing picture of the

‘evolution’ of speech, let alone man as a whole. But that problem goes back all the way, and we have no good evolutionary account of the emergence of life, the Cambrian, etc... The problem lies not in the term ‘evolution’ but in the equation of that with random evolution, natural selection. I think the biological community should rescue the situation from disaster and toss in the towel on darwinism. Wolfe has no coherent alternative that I can see but his point is well taken: if you play by the rules then you can’t just throw around the term evolution if it doesn’t explain anything.

I think that the mainline darwinism that came into existence with Wallace/Darwin (I think Wallace was the real source, as Wolfe intimates) has confused everyone and is in reality an interloper: it was long preceded by a soon displaced post-Kantian biology that grappled with the real problems, the teleomechanists who attempted to create a methodology for evolutionary biology that wasn’t reductionist. And it was preceded by the work of the real first evolutionary theorist here: Lamarck, who considered a double aspect to evolution, a high level evolution of forms complexifying, and a lower level of environmental adaptation. Given the evidence of deep time this is the most obvious solution to the overall problem. But darwinism and organizational science somehow got convinced that one level evolutionism was the only way to do science. It is thus sadly frustrating that the right approach in two cases was displaced by the later dogmas of Darwin, mostly from Wallace, who promptly disavowed his own transitional discovery. His stance was a useful way station because it helped biologists to visualize ‘divergence’ with a place holder ‘mechanism’, in this case natural selection. Once divergence was grasped it was entirely apt to try and replace the ‘mechanism’ with something less simplistic than natural selection.

I think biologists, and the Dawkins group, ought to see the handwriting on the wall, and I would recommend a look at the data/model of WHEE (history and evolution.com) to get a feeling for the kind of two level system that Lamarck intuitively saw from the start. World history is not the same as evolution in deep time, quite obviously, but there must be invariant aspects to the kind of two level system we see in world history. The latter can be especially tricky because it adopts a special version for the model in question attempting to analyze the ‘evolution of freedom’. But the latter must have been an aspect of human evolution, and we are suspicious this later historical instance is really a later version of what was true of man from the start: his organismic and cultural evolution as one entity from the start.

I think that this approach can bypass the red herring of design arguments used to produce theological conclusions, and ground the discussion in a look at the overall dynamic of evolution without getting mired in speculations over ‘mechanism’.

http://history-and-evolution.com/whee4th/chap3_5.htm

R48G: we are not required as ‘democratic market neo-communists’ required to defend the record of bolshevism...

November 10th, 2017 •

<https://www.bolshevik.info/once-again-in-defence-of-lenin-a-reply-to-orlando-figes.htm>

We can quote our brief remarks on this good essay from marxist.com (previous post):

It is important for leftists to make their case and try to set the record straight but the facts of the case are obscured on both sides. It is very difficult to fully agree with any account at this point, such is the confusion of historical/partisan accounts.

In any case we have suggested here many times the need for a new communism to distance itself from the history of bolshevism and focus on the future with a new framework rather than the past. As this article notes at the beginning the view of the public in general is so hostile that it is simply holding back the left to feel one has to justify the whole bolshevik legacy.

If the left has to constantly defend the record of Lenin and bolshevism the achievement of a new communism will never happen. It is to be sure essential to correct the distortions of conventional historians, but overall the movement beyond capitalism requires a new initiative whose answer to the charges against and citing the Russian Revolution is that we doing something different and don't have to defend Leninism, etc...

It seems an elusive point for many marxist/leninists but the reality has to be faced. In our two manifestos we have suggested a new approach. In fact the formulation allows a series of approaches.

<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>

But the basic issue is that we have arrived at a stage of mature capitalism in countries that have bourgeois democracies. The model of the Russian Revolution is misleading everyone.

One interpretation of our framework is to simply expropriate capital and ecological resources to a Commons and not necessarily equate communism with the abolition of markets. In postcapitalism a combination of markets (in the context of public ownership), planning and a kind of 'anarchist' lower threshold or indifference level could enable a neo-communist matrix with a lot of reserve potential and diversity of methods.

The example of Lenin is not really what we should up to at this point. We might even interpret our framework as a 'communist liberalism' and/or a 'liberal communism'.

July 20th, 2018

Taking up a radical critique of darwinism might be the correct recipe to break old mindsets and set the left into a post-theoretical mode that is wary of theory and ideology. An untold story is the way Darwinism entered the left in a destructive and violent interpretation of class struggle all too apparent in 'class' genocides of the bolshevik era. In a strange finesse the right has pursued both a social Darwinist agenda and a postdarwinist innovation that has become enmired in the design argument. The left should simply take over the design argument, in an agnostic mode, and lead the way into a left that is critique of the crypto-ideological Darwin legacy.

A leftist make over on the issue of evolution?

December 13th, 2017 •

One of the most remarkable confusions of modern culture is the way a reductionist version of evolution, viz. darwinism came into being to displace a promising set of starts that were on the right track. The left has been a particular victim of this botched starting point. The left needs a complete make over on the issue of evolutionary theories, and a redress against its tendency to condone implicitly the social Darwinist implications of the natural selectionist perspective and its fundamentalists...

From Lamarck and the teleomechanists to the fallacies of darwinism

October 17th, 2017 •

<http://www.npr.org/2016/08/27/491492977/in-tom-wolfes-kingdom-speech-is-the-one-weird-trick>

Wolfe has raised an obvious point: we have no really convincing picture of the ‘evolution’ of speech, let alone man as a whole. But that problem goes back all the way, and we have no good evolutionary account of the emergence of life, the Cambrian, etc... The problem lies not in the term ‘evolution’ but in the equation of that with random evolution, natural selection. I think the biological community should rescue the situation from disaster and toss in the towel on Darwinism. Wolfe has no coherent alternative that I can see but his point is well taken: if you play by the rules then you can’t just throw around the term evolution if it doesn’t explain anything.

I think that the mainline darwinism that came into existence with Wallace/Darwin (I think Wallace was the real source, as Wolfe intimates) has confused everyone and is in reality an interloper: it was long preceded by a soon displaced post-Kantian biology that grappled with the real problems, the teleomechanists who attempted to create a methodology for evolutionary biology that wasn’t reductionist. And it was preceded by the work of the real first evolutionary theorist here: Lamarck, who considered a double aspect to evolution, a high level evolution of forms complexifying, and a lower level of environmental adaptation. Given the evidence of deep time this is the most obvious solution to the overall problem. But Darwinism and organizational science somehow got convinced that one level evolutionism was the only way to do science. It is thus sadly frustrating that the right approach in two cases was displaced by the later dogmas of Darwin, mostly from Wallace, who promptly disavowed his own transitional discovery. His stance was a useful way station because it helped biologists to visualize ‘divergence’ with a place holder ‘mechanism’, in this case natural selection. Once divergence was grasped it was entirely apt to try and replace the ‘mechanism’ with something less simplistic than natural selection.

I think biologists, and the Dawkins group, ought to see the handwriting on the wall, and I would recommend a look at the data/model of WHEE ([history and evolution.com](http://historyandevolution.com)) to get a feeling for the kind of two level system that Lamarck intuitively saw from the start. World history is not the same as evolution in deep time, quite obviously, but there must be invariant aspects to the kind of two level systems we see in world history. The latter can be especially tricky because it adopts a special version for the model in question attempting to analyze the ‘evolution of freedom’. But the latter must have been an aspect of human evolution, and we are suspicious this later historical instance is really a later version of what was true of man from the start: his organismic and cultural evolution as one entity from the start.

I think that this approach can bypass the red herring of design arguments used to produce theological conclusions, and ground the discussion in a look at the overall dynamic of evolution without getting mired in speculations over ‘mechanism’.

http://history-and-evolution.com/whee4th/chap3_5.htm

R48G: we are not required as ‘democratic market neo-communists’ required to defend the record of bolshevism...

November 10th, 2017 •

<https://www.bolshevik.info/once-again-in-defence-of-lenin-a-reply-to-orlando-figes.htm>

We can quote our brief remarks on this good essay from marxist.com (previous post): It is important for leftists to make their case and try to set the record straight but the facts of the case are obscured on both sides. It is very difficult to fully agree with any account at this point, such is the confusion of historical/partisan accounts.

In any case we have suggested here many times the need for a new communism to distance itself from the history of bolshevism and focus on the future with a new framework rather than the past. As this article notes at the beginning the view of the public in general is so hostile that it is simply holding back the left to feel one has to justify the whole bolshevik legacy.

If the left has to constantly defend the record of Lenin and bolshevism the achievement of a new communism will never happen. It is to be sure essential to correct the distortions of conventional historians, but overall the movement beyond capitalism requires a new initiative whose answer to the charges against and citing the Russian Revolution is that we doing something different and don't have to defend Leninism, etc...

It seems an elusive point for many marxist/leninists but the reality has to be faced. In our two manifestos we have suggested a new approach. In fact the formulation allows a series of approaches.

<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>

But the basic issue is that we have arrived at a stage of mature capitalism in countries that have bourgeois democracies. The model of the Russian Revolution is misleading everyone.

One interpretation of our framework is to simply expropriate capital and ecological resources to a Commons and not necessarily equate communism with the abolition of markets. In postcapitalism a combination of markets (in the context of public ownership), planning and a kind of 'anarchist' lower threshold or indifference level could enable a neo-communist matrix with a lot of reserve potential and diversity of methods.

The example of Lenin is not really what we should up to at this point. We might even interpret our framework as a 'communist liberalism' and/or a 'liberal communism'.

Share this:

Marxist scientism, Hegel's revenge and the question of free agency

Marxist scientism, hegel's revenge and the question of free agency
August 5th, 2018 •

The left suffered the philosophical misfortune at birth of being caught up in a narrow version of secular humanism, a reductionist view of science, and, due to the hegelian reaction, a fanatical version of materialist rejection of idealism and a rejection of ideas of free will or simply free agency. The left has always been crippled as a result, Hegel's revenge. In addition, despite an initial rejection by Marx (evidently replaced with a bluff

due to Engels' influence), a strong adherence to the whole Darwinist pseudo-science. Darwinist bolshevism ended up in genocidal wrath applied to class war, a wretched outcome. Who cares about the dialectic of materialism and idealism? The left must adopt an invariant stance.

Further, the fact remains that Marx was not a very successful theorist and saddled 'Marxism' (ideas of social theory as science were mostly primitive scientism), that cultic name-based celebrity worship of a founder, with a complex of theories that simply don't work.

Lost in this 'materialist' idiocy was the idea that free agents with the will to act were/are the only vehicle to socialism: the idea that capitalism is some stage of history moving inevitably toward communism is simply false and we see the system simply going haywire in our time because it has no real directionality, the fiction of markets producing direction being shown up for what it is.

We cannot assume that social evolution is leading anywhere and can see, if we inject the idea of the eonic effect, that historical directionality is something different.

The system that we see has no set future in the near term, and requires for a socialist outcome the determination of evolutionaries/revolutionaries to construct a version of postcapitalism. That is by no means an easy task and Marxism is simply not capable of producing any such result without going into a hopeless muddle of its own refusal to define what is meant or intended.

To a high probability this marxist domination will lead to the same Stalinist outcome as before and for that reason the general public senses nothing but danger from the left, abandoning its canon altogether. Marxists are converts to a cult, while social democrats are remnants able to see the danger but apparently unaware of the limits of their evolutionary assumptions.

The factor of revolution was at least clearer to the era of Marxism in action (it is entirely possible to 'evolve' toward a constitutional refoundation) but philosophical rigor mortis set in very early and the need to find an overall package that was the object of free agents constructing it was lost to the stale jargon of marxist dead thinking.

R48G: postcapitalism requires the action of free agents to create it, not passivity in a mechanical system...

August 23rd, 2017 •

We are caught in the downspiral of what constitutes the 'endgame of capitalism'. But for some reason the left, under the influence of Marxism, seems unready for the challenge. Part of the reason is the simple inability to attract an audience at this point. In the period of the early internationals the canon of Marx/Engels rapidly spread and created a global audience. Now it appears unable to do so, for reasons that are in a way obvious: the factor of bolshevism is a fatal blight on the legacy. These points are actually obvious, almost clichés, but the solution seems to elude the left, which is mostly a remnant as the majority has moved on. But unfortunately activist groups end up floundering in eclecticism without an organizing framework. And the canon is itself flawed and needs to be recast, a very difficult task that is more likely to produce a confused rendering. We have suggested a new approach: move beyond historical materialism to broader view of history, eject from 'stages of production' theory to a view of capitalism that is ad hoc, not systematic. There is no stage of history that is capitalist and capitalism was not the prime

destroyer of feudalism. Capitalism was simply a striking amplification of the capitalism that had existed since the Neolithic in primitive stages. The point was/is to create a social system that can buffer the new economic processes in an intelligent way. In many ways it is a question creating a real democracy, a system of equality in the context of market economies moving beyond that to a higher synthesis.

A new formulation is needed that doesn't require the constant dogmatic reiteration of blanket Marxism, which doesn't mean that legacy can't be cited. But the left is saddled with endless futile attempts to defend their mistakes. In a way the obsessive celebration of the centennial of the Bolshevik Revolution is a distraction. We need to act as if socialism/communism were being considered for the first time, and to be able to simply shrug when critics point to mistakes/flaws/failures of the older left: the stance should be, not of our doing, and our principles won't lead to a repetition there because our formulation is a new one.

Our formulation here is based on the idea that free agency is a key factor in historical realization. Those economic systems don't determine history as such, despite their huge momentum, and that instead of waiting on the 'next epoch' of communism men have to act as free agents to conceive and realize a system that is not letting capitalism to run amok. Calling capitalism a stage of history was a monumental blunder from the start.

Rather we should consider that a communist foundation is needed to create democratic equality. We must as free agents design a system that can match those axioms.

It is a fallacy to think the system of capitalism is evolving to communism: we must instead assume we are free agents an act to create a sane future.

<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>

DMNC: reconciling social democracy and real communism

DMNC: reconciling social democracy and real communism

August 2nd, 2018 •

The left needs a new formulation that can reconcile social democracy and a real communism that is escape from the predetermined failure of social democracy. The social democratic illusion is not such to most of the activist left which is floundering in the alternative with marxist/bolshevik thinking and falling back into social democratic mess of pottage: this is actually strengthening the trend toward false reformism. And the idea of capitalism as a stage in history leads to a failure to define in advance what can replace it: simply chanting 'communism' has proven a recipe for disaster...

Our 'democratic market neo-communism' creates a complete caesura of thought with respect to both extremes. If the reformist left could at least see a 'reformist' path to a real communism it might actually generate a revolutionary situation. But we can see the way talk of socialism, or the 'our revolution' of sanders is really undermining those terms and making everything refer to a muddle of no significance with any terminology.

<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>

R48G: capitalism is not a stage of (economic) history: marxist production theory is misleading and making the problem worse...did Marx/Engels fumble the ball?

April 5th, 2017 •

http://history-and-evolution.com/whee4th/chap6_3_2.htm

The whole emphasis of Marxism is confused: the way that capitalism was turned into a stage of history as a stage of production ended up giving it a status it didn't deserve and is one aspect of its persistence in the sense of Marx's concealed bourgeois tendencies assuming this stage of production must exhaust its potential before moving beyond itself, a disastrous gift to the fanatics of capitalist futurism. The potential of this set of fake systems could never be exhausted and the truer circumstance is that this fake stage of history will terminate a planet.

The emergence of 'capitalism' is relative: in a fairly general definition, it goes back to the Neolithic or beyond and is present in all phases of civilization. The equivocation here over capitalism as a modern phenomenon is simply another case of its 'relative' transformations, and the onset of the industrial revolution along with the ideology of such as Adam Smith and the invention of new kinds of financial instruments created the illusion that a new capitalist era had somehow replaced feudalism as a new stage of history.

The study of the eonic effect demonstrates a more complicated picture in which economic systems in various stages and formats are embedded in a larger social context. Marx and Engels understood all this until they misunderstood it with the creation of 'historical materialism'. A more realistic picture is that capitalism is a set of innovations inside a larger system and that its nefarious character, the object of immediate protest, created the need for a new kind of social system that could control its rogue character. Capitalism was always a rogue process and there was never any reason that the whole of humanity was to be subjected to market forces in the name of the laws of history was a gross fallacy and a decided fumble by Marx/Engels.

Marx/Engels were however pretty clear in the 1848 period of the dangers of the situation and the need to act at once to move to a new type of system.

Our DMNC is incomplete?

January 9, 2019

The history of political systems is mostly a hack of a primitive set of concepts doomed to failure because they are abstractions that soon wear out in the tide of historical collision. Democracies become oligarchies and the idea of communism like a bad pointer in c programming simply crashed at the start due to a lack of definition of the term. A fundamental here is that communism is by definition democratic even though it can also manifest balanced strong authority. The reverse is true: Marx despite the flaws of his theories saw clearly that poorly defined democracies are prey to capitalist domination. The term communism has become a synonym for Stalinism such is the incompetence of marxist/leninist bunglers.

We fail to realize the need for a much more complex set of definitions for political/cultural systems. The idea of a balance of powers remains a key innovation in the rise of modern political systems. The full definition would a large book! Our 'democratic market neo-communism' is still primitive but leaves conventional pseudo-democracy and pseudo-communism in the rear view mirror. The treatment of 'markets' is also novel and this is not the same as free market capitalism...It is also possible that innovation in AI and computational economics will solve the calculation/clearing issues that crippled bolshevik idiocy.

<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>
Our DMNC model no doubt suffers many gaps and is incomplete. We can suggest a few things to think about:

It needs a legal definition of the Commons to escape the confusions of state capitalism. The Commons is a shared set of resources. The state can't decree its disposition beyond the consent of its co-owners.

An ecological socialism needs fine-grain and ecological courts need still another legal definition.

The political system is a balanced democratic system with multiparties AND a presidential system with strong powers to protect the Commons/communism but beyond that no further powers beyond mediation.

The politics is a combined presidential and congressional or parliamentary system. The presidential system inherits the revolutionary/evolutionary cadre as a one party state ON TOP of a multiparty state. The one-party presidential system stands guard over the Commons, but has almost no powers beyond that. It does not regulate the economy or the legal system, etc...

The issue of covert agencies is critical and the system must start over and regulate the formation of deep states run by psychopaths.

The focus is on state communism, but in the context of a new International.

The parliamentary system can be a rough three party triad (or anything else) with a strong defense against any kind of outside funding, etc...

The 'third' party is the source of 'new parties' or new recastings of party aims and tasks,

...

The market economy is run by socialist entrepreneurs and/or managerial cadres and licenses resources from the Commons. It can possibly reduplicate its orgs which then 'compete' moderately to produce efficient production. This system is parallel to a set of planned factors that also mediate the open market system.

The third low level semi-anarchist system allows a range of variant social dna as if to create a zoo of alternate social potentials. This mix is a triadic balance factor but cannot overtake the larger system.

This combination must solve populist economic rights once and for all and yet maintain the equivalent of 'union' orgs to mediate production, labor, and access to the Commons. The result is a kind of socialist 'capitalism' without capitalists.

There is a lot more here, but the point is to remain faithful to the basic concepts of

‘communism’ and ‘democracy’ and yet break the mould of the sterile history of ideas here. Such a system will be ‘differentially equal’, that is marginal inequalities will remain even as the system moves toward the proper redistribution. It will have a strong presidential guardianship, a robust congressional democracy, and a sort of anarchist low level that balances the strong top level authority to maintain the rules of the game. Such a system leaves the current combinations in the dust but is not utopian as it manifests marginal imperfections, etc...

There is a lot more to say here and it points to a huge task of social construction with socialist/communist axioms, save that there is little as a tradition here and much noise from marxist dead concepts. We say to the future: don’t blow it!

Seize the day: can Venezuela complete its transition to real socialism/communism?

January 9, 2019

The history of the US in South America is so grotesque, so unendingly fascist, and anti-democratic that it is a wonder that ordinary Americans can mouth the term democracy for their debilitated rogue state...

Source: The US needs a Bolivarian revolution, and beyond that a socialist rebirth... – Darwiniana

DMNC and a Commons where everyone is legally a co-owner

January 9, 2019

In our model of democratic market neo-communism the system is based on a Commons, not on state capitalism.

Each individual has a legal bond with that Commons and the right of appeal to a controlled work environment. Even a communist system requires labor unions, the mediation of work, production and social interaction must allow both a top down action of ‘socialist entrepreneurs’ and ‘bottom up’ interaction with both production as managerial/entrepreneurial socialist enterprise. That’s the core strain beside which any number of cooperative, etc,...experiments can explore new modes of production. But as automation accelerates a whole new conception of work must be crafted, and allow the social re-creation of work and leisure...

Source: Abolish Wage Slavery: Productivism as an Extractive Industry

R48G: What is the Red Forty-eight Group?

October 31, 2018

This refers to a discussion at the old Darwiniana blog of an imaginary to realized leftist group whose name echoes the heroic saga of the 1848 years. We are still echoing that period when in the wake of the French Revolution the first socialist and communist movements and their philosophies emerged. It is the period of the great Communist Manifesto and its first clarion call. Our group could form into a party or a revolutionary/evolutionary movement at any time but the point here is to consider the need for a new left, beginning with a critical stance toward Marxism itself which provides a background but not as such a current language. In fact the core of Marx's vision remains and our critique tries to detach that vision from the now dated theoretical construct. The theory of 'stages of production' of Marx is problematical and has tended to confuse leftists and it accompanies Marx's refusal to get specific. Our approach is a version of neo-communism that deals with this problem and begins to propose a new form of economic system and politics that can match the prophetic moment of both Marx and Engels and the early socialists from whose work they derived their basic starting point. This is really an attempt to leave behind bolshevism once and for all even as the tale of Marx/Engels turns into the core heroic saga for a new communism based on the expropriation of capital into a Commons. Our view is really that of Marx/Engels in the '48 revolutions, rather than the later codifications of epochal stages of production. But what is the quibble over theory? The epoch of postcapitalism is upon us, effective immediately. We must consider a new and effective communism beyond the harebrained, tragic and premature fiasco of the bolshevik misfire.

At a time of crisis when the fate of capitalism is itself bound up in the calamity of climate change the eerie abstractions of revolutionary vision crystallize into the direct inevitability of a post-capitalism of some kind. We need to resolve the issues of democracy, markets, and ecological socialism. Our 'Democratic Market Neo-communism' is one realization.

We will have more to say as we go along.

You may sign up immediately for your Admit One ticket, invisible ink only...

The issues of revolution

Red Forty-eight Group: the question of revolution...that would mean 'now'
May 24th, 2016 •

As our discussion today makes clear Marxism is stuck in another century. The gist of our manifesto is to take the core paragraph of the original: the expropriation of the bourgeoisie, and set the rest to one side. We don't need a theory of historical materialism,

dialectical materialism, such a strong prejudice against idealism. We need simple praxis not trying to convert everyone to a new philosophy.

We need a core movement that has some Marxist dna, but which operates with its own version of communism, able to decipher the neo-classical economic illusion, ready to fight for control of the industrial apparatus in motion, and ready to create a market communism, possibly on its way to full communism. A market communism with a Commons, as opposed to state control by a one party bourgeoisie calling itself radical, with a cut off point below which some forms of commerce, industry, and agriculture operate independently would be nice. Issues of constitutional balance of powers, core rights (without liberal economic rights of capital), newly defined democracy, national/transnational action to create a global federation....

This movement needs to be fair, republican to carry a future partial democracy, ruthless, non-violent or violent as needed, and with a strategy to limit its own one-party state malfunction. We know such a revolution is possible because all of our modern states began with revolutions, and the core issue of Marxism was to create a form of communism in order to save the bourgeois revolution for 'real democracy'.

http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/reform_or_revolution_20160522: Hedges has some good ideas, but we don't have the luxury of Lenin versus Luxembourg. We need a revolutionary movement that can bring the US dot.gov to its knees. The result will be (market) neo-communism on its way to a new form of society, postliberal democracy, and an economy that can support a large population without growth.

This requires a criminal indictment of the gangster government that wrought 9/11
a position on nuclear questions (disarmament)

a willingness to try and control population

a no growth economy that is able to provide a basic income

an indifference level below which people can live in a hybrid non-totalitarian mode with respect to the state

etc...

Models of history

Falling between two stools: religious and secular confusion over history

February 11th, 2018

Marxists often don't get it: you can't propose an incorrect theory of history and expect people to listen. The confusion over 'theory' endangers their profound framework of insights, taken empirically, as a critique of the capitalist era.

Using the eonic model we can show just how hard it is to grapple with a real theory of history. From there we can stand back and distance ourselves from the syndrome of false certainties and we can also reconcile, or at least defang, the collision of secular and religious historicisms...

archive: R48G: the eonic effect: as a tool to 'debrief' historical theories...

August 11th, 2017 •

The eonic model comes off as wild speculation but the reality is that it is, or should be, an objective tool to expose standard historical mythologies, including those of science and most conventional historians. It can be taken on its own terms or used as a set of questions that will challenge other forms of theory:

first, it challenges deconstructs the mythology of flat history

next, it shows how values must be taken into account, rendering a causal dynamic antinomial

from there it proceeds to expose ‘unflat’ histories, e.g. biblical old testament stories of Israel

it implicitly exposes theistic historicism, e.g. judeo-christian/islmaic ‘god in history’ myths (that depends definitions of ‘god’, to be sure)...

it exposes histories that disallow free agency and keeps open the ‘free will’ debate (free agency allows the introduction of complex hybrids, e.g self-consciousness to mediate freedom, causality)

it transcends the useless ‘materialism/idealism’ debate and the model can be taken both ways, i.e. is independent of the distinction, and it can provide a vehicle for the model of ‘transcendental idealism’, i.e. as noumenal/phenomenal perspective...

it exposes (to a considerable likelihood) the myth of darwinism (natural selection) as random evolution by showing an example of non-random process

it returns the term ‘evolution’ to its correct meaning, as ‘development’

it isolated the ‘antinomy of teleological judgment’ by showing how both teleological and non-teleological interpretations can fail (with a new definition of teleology as a discrete-continuous model)

it shows how the ‘evolution of freedom’ needs to be a practical historical/evolutionary concept

it show how ‘evolution’ is likely to be a global process

it offers a warning that a great deal of innovation in history is macro induced

that’s a reasonable, but short, list: the point here is that we can retreat from hard claims and use these propositions as a set of questions...conventional historiography can’t survive such a difficult challenge, but as with darwinism it will simply try to control opinion behind academic mind control.

Confronting the riddle of world history

Confronting the riddle of world history

January 13th, 2018 •

After all the debate and discussion from the left the stark reality remains that marxist views of history suffer from a flawed foundation in economic fundamentalism. A far broader view is needed that can handle the places of values, the question of free will (or free agency), questions of art, religion, and philosophy. The original perspectives were too narrow and too reductionist after the style of emerging scientism/positivism. We don’t really need a ‘science’ of history, an invitation to fallacy, so much as a simple map

or chronicle done empirically as a backdrop for a value-based account of a futurist project (of socialism/communism).

The eonic effect is somehow very tricky but exposes the false attachment to Darwinism that pervades Marxism with fallacious axioms, but in the end it points to a set of historical subtleties that make mincemeat of most attempts to subject history to social control as ideological fixation on Machiavellian politics, economics, and technology. The complicated enigma disguising a hidden teleology demands a far more complex view of the historical than can be provided by current assumptions, mostly based on premature dogmas of how to do science. The fact remains that both evolution and history elude a scientific foundation and part of the reason is the issue facts and values confounds all attempts at a solution to the riddle.

There is a reasonably simple way out, which is to follow the contours of the so-called 'eonic effect' as an outline which itself solves the problem historical dynamics.

In any case the future of socialism requires moving beyond the failed strategies of Marxism and the confusion it created over stages of history.

History and Epochal Transitions? problems with 'stages of production' theory

Like a Cheshire cat the 'eonic effect' fades into shimmering background as an empirical series of epochal transitions replaces it, and stages of production theory...

September 26th, 2018 ·

History and epochal transitions?

March 26th, 2018 ·

The legacy of Marxism contains a rich load of potential tools but is marred by the confusions of theory that beset Marx (and Engels) and rendered their work overall a contradictory package in practice.

Instead of historical materialism and/or dialectical materialism we have suggested a simple historical outline with modernity a sort of epochal transition (starting in the early modern) as the crucial focus. The progression of economic epochs in Marx is simply not correct as a long range perspective will clearly show: capitalism is gestating from the Neolithic and feudalism in many forms is recurrent. The Middle Ages aren't really feudal, as such. So the whole scheme is a puzzle until we recast the whole problem. We can inject our eonic model, but that might be controversial so we can simply map out a set of epochal intervals obvious to the naked eye.

(the preface of the paleo/neolithic)

the phase of onset of the State, Sumer, Egypt and era from ca. 3000 BCE onwards
the so-called Axial Age and its succession as an epoch, and this enforces a discipline of balanced study from Greece/Rome across Eurasia to China
the rise of the modern world from fifteenth to the eighteenth century...

We can try to interpret this pattern, or we can just take it empirically as a kind of punctuated series, wary of theories save as a descriptive category of development or civilizational evolution (wary of the term evolution, it just means what it means in conversational lingo).

In this context we can analyze class, economy, and technology empirically as histories or chronicles. Note that we add technological history as separate category: the onset of capitalism is often confused with the industrial (technological) revolution of the eighteenth century.

We can certainly focus on a working class analysis of these various eras and/or look at the whole in terms of multiple classes and posit the motion toward a universal class. But let us note that a working class dynamic is going to be incomplete: there is a double motion, the onset of the State as one kind of freedom and then almost dialectically a motion against the state as the birth of democracy. We note the resemblance of the democratic and the working class strain.

We should note that 'feudalism' is really an ideological version of the idea of caste that so dominates India: the Aryan cast logic is simply a variant in the occidental middle ages. We can see then that overall the sudden amplification of capitalism in the industrial revolution period looks like the onset of a new epoch of economy, but surely to a close look we can see that that is not true.

We can resolve the question by seeing that democracy can't be fully realized or the State truly fulfilled until we unite the working class, or better the gestating universal class into a common realization, viz. with a communist democracy...

We have both availed ourselves of a theme of proletarian ideology, Marxism, and escaped its rigid formulation which can obstruct clarity.

Let us note then that capitalism is developing at all stages of history even if it suddenly becomes a dominant factor in modernity. We can see that capitalism as economy and technology almost because an independent factor in history, but that's not the same as saying it is a stage of history.

Let us recommend a closer look at the eonic model but without having to take it in full as another theory. But, all in all, we can see that an empirical approach can free us from the confusions that haunt Marxist ideas about inexorable stages of economic history.

The working class formulation is so classic and to the point we can work with that, but the idea of a 'universal class', which is really a variant of the individuality of all men given by the great religions, can be an equally valuable approach. We can easily change gears between the two concepts, also mindful that the class interests of the working class can't be made an absolute: the nature of the state and its evolution into democracy and two separate issues, reaching their conclusion in their unification.

Another issue is the question of slavery: it is increasingly clear, although not certain, that slavery is never any kind of necessary stage in history, because it didn't really exist at the birth of agriculture or the State: it appears to be a disease of civilization that grows progressively worse in the era after the rise of State Sumer/Egypt. Thus, it appears that the Pyramids, at first, were constructed by free labor as a sort of military draft.

The dread disease of slavery is really related to emerging capitalism in an obvious sense, and overtakes the State in the later phase of our first epoch???

Whatever the case we cannot ascribe any necessary status to slavery: if the great pyramids were initiated by free labor the arguments for the inevitability of slavery as a stage (suspiciously lurking in Marx) collapse at once.

Engels and human control of history...6.5.2 Theory and Ideology: Out of Revolution

December 29, 2018

A passage from *World History and the Eonic Effect* with a classic statement from Engels about man taking control of his own history. Unfortunately the marxist corpus taken as science is not sufficient for the task! The problem is immense! And economic history is only a subsidiary stream inside a larger dynamic.

A close look at the eonic effect will give us a hint of the nature of the problem. Something almost intangible lurks in the background and this both resembles a mechanical dynamism yet also encompasses the realm of ideas. What to do if the 'eonic system' processes ideologies? Marx very rightly castigated theories that are really ideologies, in the realm of economics, but his own theory suffered the problem for the obvious reason that his claim is that history will process the ideologies of capitalism/communism. As we examine the eonic effect over world history we see that associated with the eonic dynamism are every ideological process under the sun: philosophies, art, religion, even on the development of science... The search for a value free science is thus vexed. The scale of the problem pointed to by Engels is so vast that we land in the realm of terraforming, it seems. We must envision a new form of science that far outstrips the mechanical lawfulness resolved in physics.

6.5.2 Theory and Ideology: Out of Revolution

It is ironic that we only begin to observe the eonic effect as we exit its period of action, and as we pull away from the modern transition we are left to wonder if we are at the end of a major evolutionary interval, or whether once again we will fall into the confusions of the post-Axial period with its decline from creativity and advance. It seems that our observation of the phenomenon signals the end of its returns and that we are left to the realization of our evolved freedom in a future of our own creation.

We are left with a sense of wonder, and the realization of the operation of a larger dynamic, even as we witness a rebirth of freedom in its wake. This double birth of democracy in an exact timing is eerie in its strange precision in the silence of the ages, and a clue to the reality of directional evolution. And, having evolved toward freedom, we must wonder if we will witness once again the cycles of decline and fall, as if in a recurrence of Roman *libertas* proceeding to Roman *imperium*. In fact, the ironic aspect of our eonic pattern is that we become aware of it only as its action concludes, and we enter a new future where our evolving freedom passes into our own potential, and we are left

with the existential sense of our aloneness as we grapple with a mystery that is incompletely known to us.

As we contemplate the future of our own freedom we are left with the paradoxes of slow and fast evolution, and of revolutionary action, whose basic question is, how do we bring about historical change. This is a moment worthy of the comment of Engels, stripped of its capitalist versus socialist trappings:

The objective, external forces which have hitherto dominated history will then pass under control of men themselves. It is only from this point that men, with full consciousness, will fashion their own history; it is only at this point that the social causes set in motion by men will have, predominantly and in constantly increasing measure, the effects willed by men. It is humanity's leap from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom.

Engels' language on paper is perfect, in light of our thesis, but the reality that we observe in the progression of civilizations is something vastly more complex than historical materialism can explain. And the attempt by Marx to create a theory of revolutions after the example of the French Revolution and Hegelian dialectic is unsound. The importance of their commentary lies in the way they pointed out the contraction of meaning in the idea of freedom around economic freedom, in the sense of the elite manipulation of economies. It is remarkable this 'second opinion' rushed into the fray, but unfortunately the critique was flawed.

The ambiguity of 'revolution' We can see that as we exit the eonic sequence we will be driven to either go into decline or conceive some substitute for the eonic transitions visible behind us. The concoctions of spurious revolutionary theory in Marx and Engels are the perfect example. With a better sense of the vastness of the eonic dynamic we can remain less naïve about the transformation of whole civilization. The eonic effect shows us 'revolutions' done right!

PressTV-'Mini nukes were used to blow Twin Towers on 9/11'

A series of mini or macro nukes were used to blow apart the Twin Towers on September 11, 2001, an American scholar says.

Source: PressTV-'Mini nukes were used to blow Twin Towers on 9/11

<https://www.presstv.com/Detail/2017/09/11/534825/Mini-nukes-were-used-to-blow-apart-Twin-Towers-on-911>

Capitalism: beginning of the end...

The end of capitalism has begun
December 21st, 2017 •

Re: [Marxism] Fwd: The end of capitalism has begun | Books | The Guardian

<http://www.marxmail.org/msg132083.html>

Paul Mason writes a long, interesting but wrongheaded article embracing the ideas of John Holloway without mentioning him.

<http://www.theguardian.com/books/2015/jul/17/postcapitalism-end-of-capitalism-begun>

<http://www.theguardian.com/books/2015/jul/17/postcapitalism-end-of-capitalism-begun>

As with the end of feudalism 500 years ago, capitalism's replacement by postcapitalism will be accelerated by external shocks and shaped by the emergence of a new kind of human being. And it has started.

Postcapitalism is possible because of three major changes information technology has brought about in the past 25 years. First, it has reduced the need for work, blurred the edges between work and free time and loosened the relationship between work and wages. The coming wave of automation, currently stalled because our social infrastructure cannot bear the consequences, will hugely diminish the amount of work needed – not just to subsist but to provide a decent life for all.

Second, information is corroding the market's ability to form prices correctly. That is because markets are based on scarcity while information is abundant. The system's defense mechanism is to form monopolies – the giant tech companies – on a scale not seen in the past 200 years, yet they cannot last. By building business models and share valuations based on the capture and privatization of all socially produced information, such firms are constructing a fragile corporate edifice at odds with the most basic need of humanity, which is to use ideas freely.

British capitalism is broken. Here's how to fix it

Read more

Third, we're seeing the spontaneous rise of collaborative production: goods, services and organizations are appearing that no longer respond to the dictates of the market and the managerial hierarchy. The biggest information product in the world – Wikipedia – is made by volunteers for free, abolishing the encyclopedia business and depriving the advertising industry of an estimated \$3bn a year in revenue.

Almost unnoticed, in the niches and hollows of the market system, whole swaths of economic life are beginning to move to a different rhythm. Parallel currencies, time banks, cooperatives and self-managed spaces have proliferated, barely noticed by the economics profession, and often as a direct result of the shattering of the old structures in the post-2008 crisis.

We can express hope in citing this speculative analysis, but what real grounds do we have for thinking this is the dynamic that will play out?

I think that it is possible a technological development can bring us 'closer to the other

shore’, but the landing requires our freely created initiative to ‘revolutionize fundamentals’.

Need for a neo-marxist upgrade

Beyond the marxist monopoly of the communist idea...
October 22nd, 2017 •

<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>
The left has tied its head knots with theory, theory that doesn’t really work, but which has turned into a kind of dogma. The whole question of socialism has been frozen in place in terms of a legacy that was too complicated, confusing, and poorly defined.

It shouldn’t be all that hard to create a viable socialist system if we get out of the straight jacket of Marx’s misdefinition of the problem. Marx posited that a set of stages of history would bring communism to capitalism even as the latter replaced feudalism, etc... This theory isn’t really successful and has confused the issue. A more cogent formulation might simply ask for a communist foundation, as a set of axioms creating a Commons: resources from the commons would become a social entity (and not the same as state capitalism) mediated as economic process not unlike the market version save that the question of private property is superceded. The issue of the working class has also confused discussion. In fact, the idea of a ‘universal class’ is really the same as the working class but focuses on the real working class which is much larger than the traditional cliché of workers in factories. The tradition of working class focus is a great one, and is easily adaptable to our larger conception but at this point the problems of social reconstruction are far more complex than the question of industrial labor. We may even be leaving the era of factories and workers. And we confront climate change and its call for a radical revolution beyond the factors of production: an ecological framework that just might lead to a world of no-growth economics...

The idea of communism as a fixed stage beyond capitalism failed to specify what was to be done, and Stalinism filled that void. We need to consider capitalism, or liberalism, and communism as constructivist projects in tandem rather than in opposition. We can even have a system of markets in the context of a Commons. The whole nexus of concepts was misdefined from the start in order to create an effective propaganda about the inevitability of communism succeeding capitalism. In fact, the illusion that capitalism was a stage of history has if anything made the problem worse as we allowed a flawed format to be ‘normal’ as a phase. In reality, the task was to do the job right and create from the start a democratic socialism with elements of both planned and market factors. The market factors proceed without the confusions of private property by reclaiming the entities of ‘primitive accumulation’: it is simply a species of plunder that animates the whole capitalist scheme. Constructing a real socialist communism ought to be as transparent as anything produced in the capitalist legacy: the two are remorphable versions of each other, but with the profound difference of a Commons...

The limits of historical materialism

Kant's questions about history as a foundation for a neo-marxism...

May 20th, 2018 •

Kant in some of his aspects might be a more useful foundation for a neo-marxism than Hegel (who can be rederived via Kant) in the way his view of history non-dogmatically asks a set of questions (answered in their own way by the eonic model) and focuses on empirical research as the basis for conclusions...

R48G: progress toward a perfect civil constitution...

March 21st, 2017 •

The issue of Kant and history...

From our developing blogbook...

the basic intent is to simplify the confusion created by Marxism and jumpstart a new and practical approach using elements of the Marxist legacy taken in reserve.

Marxist historical theory doesn't work and has been critiqued many times. It is a non-teleological crypto-teleological theory about a set of entities far too complex for such a simplified analysis. The danger is that while waiting for the next stage after capitalism we will remain passive until the capitalist era exhausts its potential: the latter will never happen. We will burn out the planet before we exhaust all the useless combinations of capitalism.

We are betrayed by theory here in the puzzle of Marx's complex deliberations and overly complex analysis. And that includes the confusions over the labor theory of value, and the latter makes much better sense if you stop trying to produce a theory. Much of Marx's analysis remains of great interest, viz. analyses of class struggle but overall it belongs to the era of positivism (still quite current) and its 'scientism'. We need to pay our dues to the era of Feuerbach in which Marx and Engels worked and adopt a secular perspective but there are many ways to do that and we need to consider the limits of the materialism of the period which gestated socialist thought. Marx's attempt to create a science confused the issue and the result was never really a science. We see the second international proceed down the garden path of a 'science' that should have been something less ambitious and focused on the practical.

Instead of attempts to rationalize 'stages of production' theory in the fashion of Marx we could do better by considering a classic essay on history written by Kant: there is the issue of teleology is taken explicitly, but the core of the piece is to ask a question about history and refer the question to the future. The analysis of the eonic effect attempts to point to the probable solution to Kant's question which also asks for a demonstration of the passage to a perfect civil constitution.

There is a key to a new praxis: can we detect the solution to the riddle of civil 'evolution'? Indeed we can and the eonic effect (in earlier versions with its 'discrete freedom sequence') shows just this. So, instead of a succession of systems in deterministic directionality we have the prospect of moving toward replacing capitalist

democracy with renewed progress toward a perfect civil constitution. The current madness is hardly perfection! This is the task of free agents nor mechanical systems or economic structures.

Floating fourth turning points, musical rebellions, clopen societies, hippies and revolutions and other ‘darn’d if...’ question marks...

January 1, 2019

Our discussion at Darwiniana reminds of our discussions of ‘floating fourth turning points’ (as if a fourth ‘eonic transition’ beyond the three visible in the eonic effect, check out Crisis of Modernity/Amazon) which is a kind of vague cover term standing for ‘revolution’, cultural transformation, evolutionary transformation, and in general forms of ‘total’ cultural change.

This was a bit of a throw away term, so don’t puzzle too much about its shifting meanings. A revolution is a ‘total’ cultural transformation, almost by definition, and the implied warning arises: does it take into account the awesome complexity of a real culture? The answer can’t be totalitarian. We can see that the Bolshevik fiasco is a perfect example of cultural contraction, of the reasons we have critiqued ‘historical materialism’ and its overemphasis on economic history. To construct a new culture after a revolution is a task so massive one can balk at the prospect. That is not an argument for conservative ‘do nothing’. Culture left to itself will simply decline, sooner later into barbarism. The capitalist culture of globalization is a good example of something two-sided: it has revolutionized global society but all of a sudden become problematical. We seem to have thrived under capitalism but all of sudden it is a calamity of climate change with everyone so brainwashed by ideology no one can do anything about it. The ridiculous Bolsheviks had their five year plan.

In terms of the eonic effect we must distinguish system action (our three turning points, and free action, e.g. a putative artificial ‘eonic transition’).

One definition of a floating fourth turning point might thus be:

a three centuries long planned social transformation that resolves all issues of culture, politics, economy, art, religion, philosophy, technology...etc...

The reply here is, you’re mad! Actually not, the abstraction is useful as a warning. That said, the idea of a floating fourth turning point could mean a ‘revolutionary transformation that is broad enough to create a robust culture that is not the kind of totalitarian horror we get with Leninism/Stalinism. The failure to understand a movie like Grease on the left (see today’s previous post) is an example of the zillion mistakes inevitable in revolutionary action reduced to marxist oversimplifications. The problem is too vast for easy solution, and we couldn’t like the Bolsheviks try to mechanize man beyond occult potentials in a totalitarian gulag for occult gangsters.

We must proceed toward a ‘total’ configuration but that can be done with a kind of balance between control and let go. Karl Popper’s idea of the ‘open society’ is a good one, but one has to wonder at this point: is the case of the US that of an open society? It has managed to create its own brand of totalitarianism. We may as well go ‘paper airplane’ with Popper’s ‘classic book’ which of course was a critique of marxism and communism. There is no reason why a communist transformation can’t learn to balance totality and still be an open society within its own limits, e.g. the expropriation of capital, etc...

In any case, the revolutionary must study the great turning points of the eonic sequence to see the massive complexity of the original three turning points (suspected of stretching backward into the Neolithic or beyond). There is something scary about the dilemma of leaving be versus induced social change. We are now at a point when the question of induced social change confronting climate catastrophe is tabled and won’t go away. Revolutions are dangerous, but now the lack of one is even more dangerous...

This puts the issue of pop culture in context. But a real revolution must study the genesis of art forms in the evolution of civilization. It is not what one thinks. Can a floating fourth turning point generate a creative culture? We can see that Bolshevism was incapable of it. Capitalism is almost worse, but it and a relatively open society there is enough space to outwit capitalist forces, up to a point.

We are left with our question about movies and the occult with a larger question, what was the countercultural movement of the sixties? We still don’t understand it but its status as a sort of fragment from floating fourth turning point experiment, is a cogent analog, if only we understood its dynamic. It was at least a proper parody of a revolution, even a floating fourth turning.

That leaves the left with a question: can a revolutionary movement generate musical movements? And then the far vaster culture of total culture visible in eonic transitions. Clearly not, but one can proceed indirectly with a closed/open society that frets an instrument but allows vast open spaces inside it to allow the mystery of historical culture to flow through it. This is no counter-revolutionary argument. We have reached a point where the chances of revolution are better than those of none, but we need as fast as possible to debrief revolutionary fiascos and see if at least thinking about floating fourth turning points can help us broaden of our vision of social action.

No the counterculture of the sixties wasn’t the answer, but it was the sideshow to a last hurrah of the (second plus international) left’s attempts at revolution and has a funny charm as still another malnourished ‘floating fourth turning point’.

To see the issue of complexity of a ‘transitions’ check out section *6.1.1 From Reformation to Revolution* in WHEE: it is almost impossible to list the issues involved in this (the catch here is that we must in the end have a ten thousand year plan to coordinate a sequence of transitions):

Of all of our transitions, the modern is the most transparent because we have continuous data throughout, and the result shows a clear overall dynamic and interior structure, in a unity stretching from the Reformation and Copernican Revolution to the Enlightenment and French/American Revolutions. And this transition falls naturally into two stages, centered on the seventeenth century, as the Reformation ignites the fast passage, the field

clearing in the wake of the Thirty Years War, to give birth to the seminal first signs of virtually all the characteristic eonic emergents of modernity. The relative transformation of a small piece of Christendom on a northern frontier, the Protestant Reformation, is a classic instance of the 'eonic evolution of religion'. This 're-formation' is at first confusing in that it is a religious rebirth that remorphs into secularism.

Our model summons up the enigma of revolution and solves it indirectly. To be blunt, the thesis of slow evolution fails completely and the cluster of revolutions in the modern transition is no accident. However, these revolutions inside the transition are unique and don't transfer outside the transitional interval. A great deal of confusion has arisen over 'revolution', in part due to the influence of leftist ideologies, which are a secondary response to economic contradictions in emergent capitalism and the post-transitional onset of globalization. But Marx saw the point very well, and categorized modernity as a 'bourgeois revolution'. Whether that is fair or not, or a complete analysis, the point is clear that the center of gravity of the early modern 'revolutions' lies in emergent liberalism, with the ambiguous Münzer a genuine prophet of working class revolution. And that's the point: the full potential is clearly present at the beginning, and the issue is not liberalism vs. socialism, but the outcome of the modern transition, as such. But our eonic 'revolution', to use the apt metaphor of 'revolution', is something else, and as a transition is a response to the entire world system as of ca. 1400, and echoes a recursion on the order of the Axial Age...

selections from Democratic Market Neo-communism

December 12, 2018

The riots in France are already stalled because no one has a program to offer. This situation is close to revolution but has no leadership, platform or connection with socialist or communist legacies, not surprising given the completely unacceptable brands that take the name, as with bolshevism/stalinism. A second bourgeois revolution is hardly the solution, since France is the almost primordial revolutionary exemplar, but of such bourgeois revolution. We need to offer something here that can inspire hope that the classic idiocy of marxism/leninism points anciently to something much better in the future, something that appeals to a general public as sensible, rational, prosperous, ecological, efficient and fair. People (in our present) almost instinctively approve of democracy, but not communism. It should be the other way around. The two poles must meet in a new hybrid. Our version offers an equal stake to all (a Commons), extensive economic rights to employment, health care, education, etc), a system of human rights in a democratic/constitutional communism that restricts libertarian rights of 'property', with a parliamentary system or Congress that is free once and for all of the monied 'bribery' that makes a mockery of current so-called democracy.

This is a selection from the Kindle/public domain PDF of *Democratic Market Neo-communism* transferred back from PDF format to Microsoft Word with possibly quirky results. The point here is to abandon classic communism as the nightmare it is for a version as here that will produce a robust economy, satisfy ecological constraints, and still appeal to a new public, the universal class and its core sector the working class. The way to do that is to create a communism with the look of liberalism, and a liberalism with the look of communism. A difficult task, at first, but with a new set of mental habits the job almost does itself.

The original document needs more work, some amplification and a closer focus on ecological socialism. Start thinking, how construct a neo-communism that will not provoke a fury of refusal in a general public? Our version has three sectors and allows markets run by socialist entrepreneurs/managers to license resources from the Commons to engage in a new form of socialist market. Issues of ‘clearing’ and the hassles of such as Ludwig Mises don’t even arise, in theory. But new forms of planning are visible on the horizon we have a system with immense potential light years from the stolid idiocy of marxist type pseudo-communism with its state capitalism, etc...

We offer to the reader an exercise: how would you construct ecological socialism inside democratic market neo-communism? Quite a tricky task! But actually the job is almost done from the way we set up DMNC. Note the innovation of ‘ecological courts’: issues of ecology and economy require mediation (consider the current riots in France)

Although ecological socialism is invoked at the start as the whole point of the exercise the resulting formulation is a blank form that defines a new type of social economy and should be more specific about what an ‘ecological socialism’ would be like in cultural/political terms. The formula given is easily adapted to multiple forms of ecological transition and allows a hybrid of universal/working class and ecological socialism/communism. Any thinking along these lines must be very careful as to ecological versus universal/working class economics. Reducing the working class to a peasantry in a no-growth economy might certainly be effective in the struggle with climate change. Such an abortive outcome is effectively blocked in our formulation, but as the recent uproar in France makes clear, ecological and working class issues can be end in conflict, especially given the gross blundering of Macron in fomenting an unequal ‘austerity’ package on workers while leaving the capitalist class with increased benefits, no doubt to be paid for by the working class.

Our formulation offers a guarantee of economic rights and if realized resolve such stupidities. But relative wealth equality in an ecological socialism must resolve the issue of growth, or even degrowth, and the question remains, what is a robust version of our own idea? Can this system generate the output needed for its own definition? The answer should be a ‘Yes’ given the way both planned and market processes are conjoined. The

system has the benefits of both planning and ‘free markets’ in a system that can function from day one.

But if a social construct can manage the expropriation of private property the task of ecological socialism is almost accomplished at a stroke IF the resulting social definition inserts its ecological projects and aspirations in specific terms. The format must define the legal form of the Commons and be clear that this is not state capitalism. The highest authority as a ‘Presidential’ head of state with an associated communist party (the overall construct has four types of parties in a parliamentary system) has limited powers and can’t decree economic issues but must ensure the integrity and safety of such a Commons. The details of ecology and economics must be the job of different sectors, such a body of ecological economists/anthropologists. The document selection starts here:

Democratic Market Neo-communism

At a time of developing climate catastrophe it is important to bring to the fore the challenge of revolutionary change. There is no reason why this can’t be followed with an electoral path, but the implications are revolutionary and remain that of constitutional renewal. This approach, even as it can and should inform mainstream activist logic working on issue initiatives and electoral options, is a discipline of thinking on problems holistically, involving social, economic, constitutional and political perspectives in the context of a totalitarian capitalist regime, with global domination as its keynote. Our perspective is thus both nationalistic and internationalist. The times require the dangerous passage of revolutionary regime change, even if this provokes an apparently unrealistic goal, and this must at least be contemplated as a potential option.

The current election of Trump suggests the American system has entered the kind of reactionary deadlock that has too often cursed its history, witness the period leading up to the American civil war. The reign of climate deniers coming the fore simply amplifies an already disastrous situation, created by the American ‘rogue state’ with its imperialist wars fueled by the military-industrial complex, its deep state and uncontrolled covert agencies showing strong evidence of false-flag dark ops, next to a corrupt political system beholden to capital interests. The developing crisis of climate change confronting a political system unable to respond shows a system entering the critical zone. The current system is not stable and we need to consider the dangers in the situation we face. If nothing else the revolutionary option is failsafe logic, the ready fire-extinguisher. But ‘if nothing else’ is not enough as the failure of the powers of be calls for intervention. It is also possible the imputation of revolutionary change can lead to preemptive change on the part of the established regime.

It is important to consider the revolutionary option and to declare in advance what the aims of revolution should be. This is nothing less than what the founders of the American system suggested might be needed, ‘ a republic if you can keep it’. Democracies emerged in revolutionary periods of turbulence and the founding fathers

anticipated the future of this reality. Here we will propose a hybrid of democratic and socialist models in the form of what we call ‘democratic market neo-communism’.

Here the legacy of marxism is both the best and the worst of possibilities. The public will not accept a canon of marxism in its classic form, although this could change. It remains an crucial resource taken historically. We can list some issues that will force a caesura from the marxist legacy:

the bolshevik/stalinist outcome of the Russian revolution the limits of classical economics used by Marx
the failure to consider neo-classical economics and its ideology

exclusive emphasis on the working class rather than the ‘universal class’

the confusions of historical materialism and its stages of production theory

The key problem is that of theories of highly non-linear complexities that require empirical approximations. We will suggest a different historical framework in a short set of notes to the main section. The core of marxist thinking can be adapted to our loose historical model. The reader is ready to go in five minutes with this substitute for theory using

a simple chronology of epochs. We must displace the marxist core to the status of Old Testament to a New Testament restating a key set of ideas, and here the idea of communism, recast as neo-communism, is the best candidate if the proposal can sever its link to bolshevism, and work in the context of democratic logic. The older legacies remain important as reference sources, but we need a streamlined restatement that has divorced itself from stalinist idiocy.

We have proposed therefore a new ultra simple non-theoretical perspective on world history and a return to the era of the emergence of communism in the era of early Marx/Engels. We can focus on their classic Manifesto. But we must restate the issues in a new way and we can’t cut and past marxist boilerplate as a procedure. We propose a simple nexus of ideas, and this centers around what we can democratic market neo-communism.

We can cite the material on this from *Toward a New Communist Manifesto* (pdf, Amazon), and *Last and First Men*, as a companion discussion, and this can serve as the bare starting point for a balanced version of a postcapitalist system. We should re-emphasize the need for an ecological communism and this requires a new view of history and culture, one easily adapted to our different take on world history.

This essay is short, a gesture toward a longer discussion, and a way to jolt thinking into a dialectic on the revolutionary prospect. We have clipped the material to outline form to

jumpstart a new line of thinking about the crisis we face. We must act now, within a time frame of less than a decade to be ready for what we face.

Democratic Market neo-communism: a short sketch...

We will with the core idea of the classic Manifesto of Marx and Engels:

...The distinguishing feature of Communism is not the abolition of property generally, but the abolition of bourgeois property. But modern bourgeois private property is the final and most complete expression of the system of producing and appropriating products, that is based on class antagonisms, on the exploitation of the many by the few. In this sense, the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property... From the Communist Manifesto

Communism/socialism has many confused representations, ours will

attempta to create a very broad blueprint that reconciles many opposites:

The details will be left out as we combine two ideas: the abolition of private property with a system deliberately balancing a set of opposites: planning, markets, top down control, bottom up semi-anarchist autonomy... Many discussions of communism confuse the foundational logic of expropriation with the creation of a particular economic system. But the two issues are not the same: a communist system founded in a constitutional starting point can then proceed to construct an economic system to match. There is no inherent reason why a communist system can't adopt experimental hybrid in a transition to a new kind of neo-communist economic system. Our references imply a discussion of the US system and yet invokes a transnational system.

1. step one is the expropriation of the bourgeoisie, at the high end. We leave a lower threshold to semi-autonomy, subject to regulation. Property, i.e. industrial macro projects, belong to the Commons. All natural resources belong to the Commons. This distinction is important because the control of economic resources by a one-party state is highly undesirable: a separation of powers requires a set of economic bodies, legal and practical, to regulate economic issues.

2. the executive power consists of a strong state that guards the revolution, protects the Commons, but which otherwise has limited powers which are delegated to different branches of government. This sector with be a one party or zero party state, republican with a president and set of guardians, and an elected president. This branch of government requires additional revolutionary challenges to the vices and excesses of authoritarian governments. This requires a global transnationalism in the midst of a communist nationalism, a commitment to a new globalization of states beyond imperialism, robust versions of free trade that are liberated from the capitalist brands of exploitation and out-sourced working classes, and the abolition and reconstitution of all covert agencies and their false-flag conspiracies. The market sector must be divorced completely from military capitalism. The 'deep state' must be exposed, neutralized and

replaced with an open system with established laws as to surveillance, ideological mind control, and political deceptions.

3. a congress (and/or Senate) and a set of courts based on multiparty democracy that is completely free of big money of any kind. It will be

meritocratic, with short elections, state sponsored advertising on an equal basis, etc...: creating a reformed democracy given the grotesque distortions of the american example. This combination of one-party and multi-party systems is a unique innovation requiring careful consideration of its draft status in the realization of a open society in the context of a superset with strong but limited authority.

4. a set of economic institutions and courts to match will mediate the issues of development projects, allocations, planning...the central state will not be allowed to muddle through this sector which operates with a separation of powers. This set of legal bodies must include an ecological court mediating the economic impacts of industrial activity. This overall framework will mediate three sectors of the macroeconomy:

5. the resulting macro economy will be a hybrid of state corporations and entrepreneurial startups created by individuals with licenses to operate with ecological resources.

6. there is a lower threshold below which a high degree of autonomy is left to balance the anarchist pole of the equation. This sector can show many combinations of small-economy/communes/farms/NGO's etc...

7. the system must have strong authority next to a democratic core with rights and liberties and a populist program that deals with labor, education, medicine (these probably free), housing, employment in populist emphases, and move beyond the sterile anti-liberalism of earlier communists.

This system requires many additional details but our snapshot is an attempt to generate a way to break old habits to think in a new way. As the text of Toward a New Communist Manifesto are aware, we have spoken in terms of the universal class rather than the working class. The universal class is the class of all classes and enforces the idea of the equality of all in a common class. A focus on the working class is entirely appropriate in this context and can be brought to the fore as appropriate.

We need a new perspective on history and a rough outline of the context of revolutionary neo-communism: communism is an innovation arising in the wake of the french revolution (in fact its primordial birth was in the early modern reformation, if not the ancient greek utopians). Our model of history is a simple 'narrative' of epochs in a chronology of civilizations.

Economic systems exist inside and influence but do not fully determine these cultural complexes.

Our framework begins with the crisis of climate change. Homo sapiens is a highly destructive species tending to the destruction of all environments in his wake. The modern industrial system has both revolutionized development and handed the curse of environmental scofflaw destruction to this species man. Unrestricted free markets are an emerging calamity.

1. The Crisis of Climate

1.1. The world at two degrees: the crisis of climate forces the issue of regime change: the need for an ecological communism..

2. The failure of capitalism: the failure of capitalism to deal with its generation of climate calamity shows that self-regulating markets are a myth

3. The classic formulations of marxism are entirely apt but we must restate/update the issues and disengage from the legacies of bolshevism, etc... We tend to eschew theories in favor of empirical histories and practical metaprogramming: praxis. There is no simple solution to the problems of economic, historical and evolutionary theories and we need to operate with a set of experimental procedures. Our historical perspective allows a 'dialectic of teleological judgment' in the estimation of history.

4. We must state in advance what system we propose as a successor to capitalist dominated politics: we can derive the idea of the Commons from a categorical imperative in a Kantian republic of ends. We can propose post- capitalism as a crisis intervention in a catastrophe and ideological hypnosis, and the action of free agents able to refound a new economic order on the basis of a new set of values. We can cite in passing the marxist theory of the stages of production leading from the feudal to the communist stage, but our framework is larger than this classic and brittle theory: we consider instead the action of freely creating a new form of economy to deal with crisis.

5. We must both transcend and fulfill the liberal tradition, that is, the result must have a democratic core. The 'end of history' debate was bogus but had a point: the progression of epochs in history shows a definite process beyond mechanics toward the realization of freedom, thence democracy.

The goal of postcapitalist logic must be to establish a true democracy free of the domination of capital powers. Democracy is more than the rights of capital and is founded in the shared ecology of the Commons.

2. History and Evolution

2.1 The marxist theory of historical materialism is a teleological theory of history and puts excessive emphasis on economic determinism. We can propose an empirical outline of world history as a substitute and create a chronology of history since the Neolithic with an extension to the evolutionary emergence of man. In the process we can refound Marx's early objections to darwinism. Our view of history can point to a useful sketch of

a path to a real evolutionary theory even as it remains agnostic as to theory and yet aware of the fact of evolution. This approach can free thinking from the social darwinist curse that has used evolutionary darwinism for social darwinist exploitations and class warfare.

Our new model of history will automatically resolve this issue with a lightweight alternative to darwinian pseudo-science.

2.2 We see world history as a progression of epochs (we can also propose a very specific model of historical evolution to highlight this), of which modernity is the most recent: we see a transition to a new epoch, and the age period that follows. This can help to create a framework of the secular in a new and broader sense and free debates from materialism/idealism dead ends. In the modern case we see the early modern and its immense generation of innovations, with a possible explanation, and a debriefing of Eurocentric questions. This is followed by the onset of a new age period in the nineteenth century. This analysis has a remarkable property: the end of the transitional period around 1800 shows a kind of divide as the character of the historical dynamic changes. We need no hard conclusions about this but it is significant that to a long view capitalism and communism emerge together. It was clear from the start that a successor to capitalism would move in parallel and then overtake the chaotic economic system at the starting point. It is no accident that Marx and Engels appear at this point with a proposal for the new era of economic modernity.

2.3 The basic outline clearly delineates a immense spectrum of emergent properties from the Reformation to the Enlightenment. The sudden appearance of so many innovation near the divide point is not accident. We

see that revolution in the early modern is a strong element in the change of epochs, but we can also see that revolution in the post-divide period will have a different character: the early modern shows a dynamical spontaneity to revolution, while the wake after the divide will require explicit free agency, a point instinctively understood by Marx/Engels who tried to create explicit protocols of revolution, a very difficult task, but one realizable by careful analysis of the steps to a revolutionary transformation. Ironically, however, 'revolutions of free agency' have a higher degree of freedom than dynamical revolutions (which show their historically chaotic character). This elusive set of insights can be taken as reference to our historical model. The point for us here is very simple: we must not apply theories to social constructions. Instead as free agents we must apply praxis, or practical recipes of 'how to' in order to create in freedom a constitutional construct. Our model, we should note, is designed to allow 'theories' only for the past looking backward: the free agent never sees dynamics in the present. This strange model is hard to understand and isn't needed to proceed save to note that we dare not wait for a system to evolve to a new state. Our action as free agents is based on an analysis of the failure of capitalism and the need as free agents to create a new successor.

2.4 As noted the industrial revolution and capitalism emerge very rapidly near the divide point of the modern transition. In tandem emerges a series of chase plane successors and

this are crisis vehicles for a system that is unstable on its way to globalization. Within a mere two centuries we can already see that capitalism is likely to destroy planetary civilization without intervention.

2.5 The year 1848 is in many ways symbolic as the starting point of a new era of world history: its classic revolutions were the first to respond to the emerging dilemma of capitalism and show the first appearance of socialist alternatives. This prophetic moment sets the tone for the new world of bourgeois society as an unstable first stage of modernity.

Appendix 2: 2018

The evolution of freedom?

October 5th, 2018 ·

In Last and First Men we tried to repair the strange meme of Nietzsche of the last man with its perverted view of modernity and freedom. As pirates go, he walks the plank... The question of future human evolution has so many crackpot attempts to solve the puzzle that we are better off remaining agnostic save only to consider that homo sapiens may already have all the required mystery factors hallucinated by evolutionary science fiction: he just can't effect their realization.

Occult fascism picked up the theme and we can suspect it is really a corrupted variant of the kind of new age theme associated with sufism/yoga. Who would have thought Homo sapiens could reach 'enlightenment', hoorah for the human potential movement, wow, who knew? Last or first men, these new age fakers (fakirs?) But what this archaeological site really represents is unclear and the method has only the rarest indication of rumored success with all sorts of second string supermen like the rogue sufi gurdjieff or the circus gurus of India. We can smell the presence of some such vultures in the rise of fascism and indeed with figures like the clueless Nietzsche dropping clues all over the place in strange incomprehension of the scrambled pieces of the puzzle. The completely distorted myth of the kali Yuga is a symptom of the distortion of some ancient teaching that now drives the attempts to destroy modernity. The claims to represent the 'evolution' of man

is still another distortion of that term. And what of that big ditto, the buddhist movement. Bum steer, if you please? Whatever happened to all those smiley faced Arhant? First and last zombies. Sieg heil. What about the capitalist oligarchs? What's their superman rating. Cf. the smelly fart rankings of the gurus at the Gurdjieff Con. The first shall be last, duh.

We cannot expect 'evolutionary nature' to evolve a superman if the result is a mechanical list of 'superman' properties: clearly the issue is the way the concepts of the 'evolution of will' (a not very clear phrase) or the evolution of freedom can't be the result of causal mechanics. So if anything evolution must stop or pause or idle as the will lurks in potential with no realization...

Epochal modernity
June 26th, 2018 · No Comments

The question of modernity
December 11th, 2017 ·
The need for a larger perspective....of modernity
January 8th, 2015 ·

The neo-communist left has to have a far larger universe than that created by historical materialism: it needs a global anthropology that can talk to a generalized modernity/secularism. But what is that? The nineteenth century created a reduced subset to all that in the forms of positivism, scientism, secular humanism, Marxism...

Marxism needs to be rescued from this situation: the situation is not hard to solve: we use the 'macro model' (or you can skip that) to look at what we call the 'modern transition' from 1500 to 1800 (approx/) at which point the new era of modernity begins. The early modern clearly shows at once what happened: Marxism jumped on a yippee surfboard in the Feuerbachian reaction to Hegel and downshifted into a very limited perspective. The overall idea was brilliant, however, and can easily be recast to include 1. a larger whole than Hegel and his critics 2. the 'dialectic' of the modern transitional with counterpoints in the Reformation/Rise of Science, revolutions from Münzer to the French Revolution. 3 the rise of liberalism, ideas of freedom, philosophies of freedom, 4. German Classical Philosophy....

In general the Marxist perspective can't even handle the Enlightenment very well. The so-called 'dialectic of the Enlightenment' started chasing a good idea for a critique and ended up in the hopeless muddle of the postmodern critique of modernity.

In the larger view the issue of communism is 1. a response to the need for a post-transitional 'revolution' against capitalism, 2. the need to reconstruct modernity in this new context, requiring versions of the Reformation, Scientific Revolution, rise of liberalism/communism (socialism), industrialization and its technologies and globalization, 3.some reckoning with the complex chords generated: e.g. the Romantic Reaction, the export of buddhism and figures like Schopenhauer, etc...

You can see that the current tactic of trying to use Marxism to challenge all other aspects of modernity is ill-conceived and the route to sterility and scientism made worse.

Last and First Men creates an historical context for not only the larger perspective of modernity, but a still larger context of world history. This approach requires looking at a whole complex (dialectic) of counterpoints, contraries and pairs of opposites.

In specific terms, the new left here needs to study the reality of global religion, from Xtianity/Islam to Buddhism, and Confucianism Taoism, etc... It needs to have a larger philosophy that can work with materialism and idealism in a larger context than simple collision. Etc...

This problem of selecting a small subset of modernity to define secularism haunts the science world whose cadre of poorly educated scientism troopers has created, like Marxism, an extremely narrow subset of modernity that beggars the whole transition to a new era.

It would be nice to ditch the old Marxism and create a larger version that is tuned to the greater whole of modernity, and thence antiquity.

There is a way out of this confusion and failure of the Marxist mad hatters

October 4th, 2018 ·

Our multiple posts today starting with a look at Kautsky and his supposed betrayal expanded to a series of posts and links to Wikipedia with a portrait of the almost tragic way the generation after Marx and Engels saw the contradictions of the Marxist platform begin to unravel a false consensus and a set of theories we have often claimed are not adequate.

Finally the support of the First World War by the proletarian parties exposed the myth of the revolutionary proletariat. Overall the double failure of the revolutionary and social democratic avenues doomed a whole generation that had a unique opportunity to finally challenge the capitalist juggernaut. Instead the whole left was discredited and the assault of propaganda has driven it into a kind of impotent rehash of slogans. But a strange thing has happened: the idea of capitalism at the end of history has failed on its own terms to the point of threatening planetary destruction and the whole project of socialism/communism has resurfaced to a whole generation that has forgotten the fission and splitting of the original Marxist canon. Instead of trying to indoctrinate a new generation in the same old clichés with nary an indication of what went wrong the first time it is necessary to reassess how to proceed. The classic phrase ‘what is to be done?’ comes to mind save that a mere reference to it causes thinking to shunt into the same old

faulty tracks.

There is a way out of this confusion and failure! We have suggested, by no means comprehensively, but in some detail, a new set of ideas that can point to the failures of Marxism and to a way to break old habits with a set of critiques of the older legacy. Those suggestions are strewn across this blog and to some extent codified in a series of kindle books, free pdf's and several hardcopy texts.

A few ideas here:

historical materialism is a failed theory

the debate over materialism versus idealism was a complete waste of time

stages of production theory misled marxists as they failed to specify what they wanted to do

it implied on the basis of a fiction of economic epochs that communism would replace capitalism

this might be true if marxists had defined what communism was to be

but at the crucial moment the issue was decided by bolshevism in a context of the Russian outlier

the dialectic and dialectical materialism vitiated clear thinking

the culture of Marx worship made clear thinking in new situations difficult

and the term marxism made the subject a kind of dictatorship of a sainted founder

the question of revolution versus reform (for the above reasons among others) could not be resolved

the case of the Russian revolution compounded the ambiguity

the question of democracy and liberalism was confused by their capitalist perversion

the proletariat failed to be the revolutionary class as vanguardism came to the fore

the question of markets was misunderstood, made worse by the propagandas of the calculation debate

the absolutely key issue, what is a socialist economy to be, was barely addressed at all etc...

the key issue here is stages of production theory. The idea of feudalism, capitalism, and communism in a progression of epochs is nonsense as a theory. Worse Marx succumbed to the idea the potential of capitalism must exhaust itself first, etc...A disastrous misanalysis. Capitalism will destroy a planet before its potential is exhausted.

Rather capitalism and communism arose together in the early modern (with intimations of a long early history of proto-capitalism): capitalism and communism are synchronous and this suggests that they are components in an unresolved unity. The point is that instead of the progression of separate entities the nature of the exercise is a constructivist interaction of the ideas that constructs a communism with a realistic economy which reanalyzes the issue of markets...

etc...

We have constructed a detailed model allowing the simulation of multiple practical systems all based on a few key ideas;

communism and the idea of a commons (and the expropriation of capital)

this is not state capitalism

a three sector system of socialist markets, planning and free zone sector

a democratic system beyond capital corruption

an ecological socialism and ecological courts

strong economic and political rights
 most of all a complex of the separation of powers that co-opts Stalinism at the start

That's the briefest sketch: our Two Manifestos, of what we have called 'democratic market neo-communism'. It may be incomplete itself but it addresses all the issues raised above. We don't have to figure out the mess created by Marxist mad hatters: we simply abandon all of that, wary of theories, and with recipes of what to do that are clear, realizable, reconciling planning and markets, defining communism in terms of a 'commons', balancing a strong presidential system to guard communism but without incompetent tampering or control of the economy by a separation of powers, with a parliamentary system that can't be corrupted by exterior monies, etc...

This kind of platform must be stated in advance and realized in a complex sequence open to observation and critique and specific about when and how revolutionary power will create a democratic system, etc...

Trying to figure out Marx and what happened to Marxism is not likely to succeed. A tank that takes a direct hit can't be repaired: it is scrap metal. We must start afresh.

Vanguards, proletarians, and democrats...

October 2nd, 2018 ·

The proletarian revolution theme is fundamental to the left, but history shows that in every case save the union movements which are not revolutionary regime change orgs a vanguard has come to the fore (and unions had their own vanguardism in record time, next to mafia penetration). It is a simple dynamic. Even the current left has a series of vanguards, all spouting proletarian slogans. We can try to decipher Lenin and the Russian case and we can see that Lenin was 'correct' but misrealized his own strategy. A vanguard is simply a neutral concept. We cannot therefore insist on proletarian jargon that is unrealistic and in most case points to the impossible. However, the Russian case had many proletarian aspects or soviets that were suppressed in the end by the Leninists and their wake.

Here is the point: there is no logical contradiction to a vanguard creating a democracy (the American revolution was created by a vanguard smart enough to create something that became a democracy, and/or an ambiguous outcome, a mysterious faux democracy none the less a stupendous advance over monarchic history), limiting its own powers, creating a separation of powers, and then renouncing any control of economic resources, in a self-imposed ascetic discipline. Elements of this and more are part of our model of the DMNC which is entirely open to proletarian and/or vanguardist strategies, the latter however being constrained by a host of failsafes. Even a small indulgence in

revolutionary power for personal gain should set off alarm bells. The Bolshevik case succumbed from the start with Lenin and his Rolls Royce (at that time period perhaps a minor bit), and the rest of it.

The point here, and we don't have to be fanatics about our own model, is that a vanguard can follow a recipe with built in safeguards in advance. Deviation is grounds for revolutionary critique or challenge. Our broad outlines are to use the revolution to expropriate the bourgeoisie, found a commons, yield economic issues to bodies not subject to state dictates beyond axiomatic communism, create market socialism with considerable autonomy next to planned sectors, and yield a low level autonomous sector that sends shows the system isn't totalitarian although it is 'total' system, of a sort. It must create a courts system, a parliamentary system, an ecological court system, and a set of economic and political rights. There are many solutions to this, but we can see the Bolshevik case flunked virtually every test and was a degenerate pseudo-system from the start. The civil war was a severe stress but that is no excuse for the orgy of extrajudicial murder, torture and rapid covert agency domination that come about. Such possibilities must be condemned, and in advance, with marshals/witnesses (ombudsmen) to keep the situation clear. The vanguard will end up guardians of the commons, but have very few other powers, these renounced and given over to a separation of powers.

Again, condemning vanguards leads to a vanguard condemning vanguards. Actually the Russian revolution had a host of more or less socialist 'soviets' but their collision with Leninism was a sordid tragedy.

The result was a hopeless failure from the start.

As we move to correct this situation with populist rhetoric a new vanguard will come into being: again, it is not logically inevitable that such a situation should end up anti-democratic.

Christianity beyond the occult wasteland...the weak link is...Jesus

September 30th, 2018 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/2018/09/30/the-gurdjieff-con-updated-post-on-guru-black-magic-and-psychic-murder/>

Christianity by suppressing spiritual practice ironically cleaned the field of an occult wasteland.

And this passed into occidental secularism, briefly. This makes a kind of progressive culture more efficient with fewer spiritual derelicts and dark mafias. A close look however would show a more complex picture. Look at Rosicrucianism, apparently once a benign leftist movement (as far as I know), in the stream of the reformation, as if trying to correct the picture to no avail. But soon the flood of degenerate occultisms begins, from freemasonry (potentially benign) to the rest of it and we get a figure like Aleister

Crowley, a uniquely unnerving brand of idiot, actually trying to found a religion based on black magic (and raja yoga), and he has in a way succeeded in this. He has certainly converted the intelligence agencies. What a terrible and stupid thing to do. Read Nietzsche all you want, but the idea you can exert your 'will' to do any evil with impunity is so nuts it smells of a set up ('Do what thou wilt' bilge). So what dark mafia or Mephisto on the take stands behind the Book of the Law? The best defense is to realize he understood nothing about the 'will'. A close look at J. G. Bennett shows that after 2000 pages on the subject even he doesn't understand it, but at least he doesn't propose witchcraft as a practice, although the Gurdjieff figure was actually more dangerous than Crowley. (In an era of Wicca we are now beginning to see the male victim of spiritual rape, near to the atrocious male culture next to it).

The weak link is Jesus himself, clearly some kind of mysterious mage. If we suspect a Sufi mafia of Gurdjieffs, an alarm goes off and we can no longer trust proto-sufi Jesus, not that it matters now! A bit late in the day, 'now you tell me' ('why wasn't I told'). If he was anything like Gurdjieff I would skip his religion. But he ended up being marginal to the whole religion he 'founded' which has so much magical symbolism, all of it fake. The question is what spiritual powers operated behind Christianity, especially at its beginning? They never showed their hand. I think the whole game has been abandoned now.

Be forewarned: real self-knowledge is very difficult to come by and public knowledge tends to be bogus on the subject. Can you imagine psychoanalysis granting any resolution to these questions? In fact, the realm of spiritual practice is almost worse... Gosh knows what lurks behind the smiling faces of disciples fawning over their gurus...

Preface to a final edition of WHEE

September 28th, 2018 ·

I am working on a final seventh edition of WHEE and this fragment of the preface (which won't make the final cut due to attempts at humor) may as well reside here on this blog. But the point is made that the public needs a half-hour version of the 'eonic effect' as a reminder of why attempts at historical theory (and evolution) are so confused.

PREFACE

This is a seventh and final edition of World History and the Eonic Effect, the demonstration of a mysterious non-random pattern and dynamic in world history.

Note: the 'sixth' edition is taken as the triple set of books: Descent of Man Revisited, Last and First Men, and Enigma of the Axial Age...

However, the proliferation of editions is misleading, the text passing into the new world of the Kindle is essentially that of the stable fourth edition (2010, the cryptic first edition ca. 2000), to forestall chaotification of the text, with some material demoted to the web, this new preface with a short commentary, and a few rearranged or new passages. A hard cover version is now possible with the Amazon Kindle system, and this in shortened form will become the last hardback edition, replacing earlier hard copy from Xlibris and Lightning Print strewn across the Internet, and still listed at online booksellers. However, the price for hardcovers escalates due to byte download costs, and the basic kindle can be sold for a dollar in world where books are undergoing a metamorphosis. In fact, online versions have been available so far online, the ultimate fate of the capitalist book will be the collapse of cost, the socialist free book. Let it be noted that release from the Darwin paradigm enforced by well-paid tenured scientists and academics required working free of charge outside the system. That just goes to show that Darwinism a form of exploitation. Evolution has produced the end of 'science' as we know it. Since this can only produce a better science the outcome should be welcomed, along with some kind of refund for a century and a half of Darwinism, and a moment of silence for the dead of this theory. Fred Hoyle exposed Darwinism in a paragraph as a statistical absurdity. Yet the entire science community, including trained statisticians, could not reach to this level in a half century. A reminder of the ease of brainwashing academic or other publics. Or else outright sheer cutpurse deception.

The material defies easy reading for many and it is important to maintain this edition more or less intact as reference while providing a guide and summary for a rapid take on the basic theme of the mysterious historical X detected in world history. It seems unstrategic in retrospect to have left bewildered readers with such a complex text when a half hour summary is more than possible as a cash and carry 'aperçu' against reigning paradigms of historical propaganda. It is important for the eonic effect to become common knowledge in an ultra simple form in a society where historical delusion reigns. Beside Darwinism, Old Testament mythology has metathesized into a dangerous ideology: it needs to be exposed. To be sure, the half hour version concludes bibliographically with the reader's exile to library existence, but if you won't read history texts you will be brainwashed. It's up to you. I see no problem with assessing the text as a couch potato interrupting your video streaming with intermittent lite snacking. It might have been better and more profitable to have omitted all reference to Darwinism and the evolution controversy, simply pointing to history: the eonic effect might have stood out without the dissonance of rival views of evolution. By itself the eonic effect is a spectacular discovery, if low key, and with a wink hints of alien arrivals, megalithic supermen founding civilization or theistic/angelic revelationism sales might have soared. But the connection of history and evolution is too close to even joke at such a deception and the eonic effect proceeds with grim precision to the demolition of historical propagandas and in any case Darwinism has been dealt a series of fatal blows and we can begin to see that the issue of evolution is beginning to undergo a paradigm shift, despite the confusing distractions of the Intelligent Design groups which have made their crypto-theological perspective seem like the only alternative to the failure of Darwinism. In fact, the ID groups, disarmed of their theological arms, have a number of insights we may freely pilfer given the way ID logic self-destructs and the abuse in pseudo-theory which has left secularists unnecessarily panic-stricken a new proof of the existence of god has

come into existence. History shows design, but to say this is 'intelligent' without specification is prone to a stealth creationism. Beware, such an argument may well be right, but not if it uses the Old Testament as proof of intelligent design in history. It should have been true by definition that 'god' does not act in history and that design arguments are not about proofs of the existence of god, but teleological complex systems with still unknown connections to some brand of spooky physics. God is beyond existence and therefore does not 'exist' with a reality in 'being' beyond existence. Best of luck with the proof. But being is beyond existence. Meditators discover 'being' all the time without knowing what happened, since 'mind' is in 'being' but not of it. Best not to ask further, it makes no sense. Ideas of 'god' have been corrupted by historical monotheism. There are five-minute versions that can make sense of the idea, but the result can't be taken on faith, and passes into the semantic Beyond of metaphysics, ill-suited to explicate 'design' in living creatures, including that half dead 'creature' homo sapiens, whose gifts of eonic 'revelation' seem to be beyond him. Man was to have been designed a self-conscious being beyond mechanical consciousness, but he seems a robot now, mechanized as an historical drone, condemned to mindfulness workshops to sense his true nature/being. Despite endless controversy, the term 'evolution' is in no wise controversial, a brown paper bag to hold data for some process of 'development', the eonic sequence being clearly destined for that paper bag. Getting into arguments over evolution is to fight over that paper bag: the real issue is vast amounts of data still without a coordinating principle, dumped in that bag. Only a cadre of biologists steeped in the fixation of natural selection could have so confused the semantics of the term and left the field to a species of territorial scholar barking in the night at any dissent to the fantasy (felony) of random evolution.

It is important to be wary of a new false synthesis. Social Darwinists, capitalist promoters of competition as survival of the fittest, and reverse theological obsessives taking natural selection on blind faith as a disproof of the existence of god, will not take lightly the falsification or protestant reformation of their faith religion. The Darwin debate is really a propaganda war, now with its two dominant factions, Darwinism and Intelligent Design, manipulating opinion in what seems at times a fake debate. The public is ill-served by the false alternatives offered, and a real insight into evolution is needed, one that is independent of this clever brand of dialectical propaganda. The reader has here a different perspective, a second, or third, opinion. The perception of the eonic effect suggests the way to a new understanding of evolution because if history is 'entangled' in evolution they must share properties. And if foreshortened history is like a zoom lens to slow evolution we might find that what is too coarse-grained in deep time comes into focus historically, up to a point.

World history is at first a surprising source for the solution to the evolution riddle, and the result also suggests at once the reason for the anomaly in the data about human evolution, the idea so-called 'great explosion', and the inability of the Darwinian paradigm to make sense of the sudden emergence of man. Since we cannot posit the complex evolution of man to slow random evolution, the time factor being impossible, the thesis proves itself, the data yet to be clarified. Evolutionary explanation must explain the appearance of complex language, mind, self-consciousness, art, song, religious, ethical sense, intuitions of a timeless self or 'soul', and what else, and all these in a relatively short interval somewhere in the last four hundred thousand years, or less.

Natural selection is statistically impossible...

The earlier editions have been organized around the so-called 'eonic model', but the development of that is complete and can be displaced into the background under the term 'evolution formalism', which is a descriptive language that is useful but not essential, and which can be described in a few paragraphs. That formulation refers to the category of 'evolution' and speaks of two levels, macro and microevolution. This sounds like a theory but isn't. It echoes 'category' theory because we must define macro and micro in each category of evolution, here the organismic and the historical: in the first macro is speciation, and micro adaptation. In the second macro is the eonic effect, and micro is the free agency inside. That the two categories are nearly the same is not clear at first.

The fourth edition is instead focused on a simple outline of world history in a scheme of periodization that makes 'seeing' the eonic effect very easy. It is thus possible to bypass the 'model' and to simply follow the periodization of world history provided, attempting to visualize the stupendous vista, especially evident in the so-called 'Axial Age' at the core of our discussion. This attempted visualization shows that we can get a 'glimpse' of evolution (up to a point) even if we can't produce a theory to explain it. The eonic model can be confused with a new theory of evolution, but it is not a theory, but a device to assist observation, to help us understand what we are seeing in world history, and probably something about the descent of man. Once that is accomplished we realize where we have been going wrong on the question of evolution theories.

The basic model of the eonic effect has remained stable over all seven editions, and that leaves the author with increased confidence in the method and demonstration. The evolution formalism was almost invented by S. J. Gould with his idea of punctuated equilibrium, which was a great idea before it got darwinized in the process losing its clarity. But to use that term now will invite confusion. What a waste. But take a shifty eyed look as the data shown and 'punctuation' followed by 'equilibrium' is a sneaky crib for the eonic effect, save only that punctuations occur in a series, and sometimes in parallel. The point is that any theory of evolution is about 'what drives evolution', and this should be formally consider a 'macroevolutionary' process, fully compatible with a microevolutionary complement, e.g. natural selection. And this punctuation is sudden. The two levels are fully visible in the eonic effect, and are blended with a Kantian perspective to produce an extension to the 'evolution formalism', an 'evolution of freedom'. It is significant that this is essentially the insight of Lamarck, the real founder of evolutionary thinking, whose work very naturally spoke of two levels at work, a drive toward complexity, and process of adaptation. This first intimation of the distinction of macro and microevolution was lost to the era of Darwinism, even as the distortion of the idea of evolution was proclaimed an advance in science. In any case this 'evolution formalism' points to something that is clearly evident in world history and is probably an invariant, other things being equal, in all processes of evolution. The question is abstracted analogous to Newtonian distinctions in the first and second laws of motion, which describe the presence or absence of a force. Somehow Darwinists have gotten the idea that evolution just happens by chance with nothing to produce it.

The confusions of natural selection are especially dangerous here because they throw us out of whack: we imagine a kind of primordial battle of the beasts and think that this survival game was evolution. But world history itself gives us the remarkable hints of something much different, more benign, and probably beyond our immediate ability to

grasp. We should be humble to acknowledge our evolution is still beyond our understanding. The directionality of the eonic effect shows us that a teleological critique of modern science is lurking in the wings, and there the heuristic thinking of the philosopher Kant on the subject are immensely useful. In fact, Kant gave birth to an early paradigm of biology/evolution, with the methodology of the teleomechanists. The eonic effect, unexpectedly, gives us some insight into ‘teleomechanics’.

If we do nothing else we can convince the reader of the sheer size and complexity of the problem to be solved and the inability of standard theories, leastwise one such as that of natural selection, to account for the emergence of complexity. But history gives us one free gift of data taken as ‘evolution’ at close range. We follow the contours of nature’s answer using periodization to construct a ‘tracker-approximator’, which breaks the problem down into a series of intervals joined by transitions. Scientists talk a lot about Newton’s laws but in practice they are forced mostly to use a ‘tracker-approximator. Like the Kantian noumenon, the historical black box is locked and sealed, and beyond knowledge. Too bad for theories then, they have been used to torment people long enough. We can at least seize high ground with our simple model, there to be philosophic snipers picking off the schemes of propaganda elites need to keep the public under control. The age of Postdarwinism is here, all we have to do is realize it.

COMMENTARY

The prime objective of the book is to demonstrate the unmistakable non-random pattern visible in world history since the rise of civilization and the invention of writing, and to follow a descriptive procedure as we zoom in on that pattern to see what it indicates. The term non-random is relative, but clear enough. If you look downfield to see a woods, the sight is roughly random. But if there is a rustling in the bushes or someone suddenly emerges to view, you this catches you attention because it is ‘non-random’ and you turn your gaze to see what’s going on. The non-random is no more complex than that although it can have multiple interpretations or examples. The eonic effect detects that kind of ‘incident’ in world history and this attracts our attention, if we have even a clue to what happened. This non-random effect springs from the way sudden bursts of cultural development are visible to close study, and we ask what ‘causes’ this. We must distinguish between causality and a principle of sufficient reason because if history study were causal, a break in continuity would have a cause outside of linear history.

...

Is there a science of evolution?

September 27th, 2018 ·

One of the most tenacious confusions that pervade most discussions of science and culture is the idea that there is a science of evolution. We must of course define what we

mean by science, and this usually implies deterministic laws. But no laws of evolution in that sense have been discovered, the silly and amateurish idea of natural selection being no counter argument. It should be obvious: we can't predict the outcome of evolution using scientific laws.

The discussion is confused because there is a *scientific project* as to evolution, and a good one: the collection of data, the piecemeal biochemical analysis, a rough historical sketch of the facts of evolution, and so on, but this is still a convergent research project, not truly a science. Because we suspect teleology, we would have to redefine the meaning of 'science' from scratch. A similar situation arises with a 'science of history' and we have suggested that the 'eonic effect' (which is not a science but a convergent research project) gives us a glimpse of the stupendous scale and complexity of an 'evolutionary' something, showing directionality over tens of millennia and injected creativity and aesthetics... (in our case with the distinction of free agents and system action). The resolution is that 'evolution' is a cosmological process also, and this just might connect with fine-tuning. Whatever the case, the reductionist analysis of evolution has so far failed.

A science of history?

September 27th, 2018 ·

The question of a science of history has been indirectly critiqued by Kant and his analysis is one reason, next to the obvious evidence of the data, that we have introduced the unique innovation of post-theory: the distinction of system action and free action, or free agency. The result is very complex but the basic point is clear.

But in general the eonic model is very peculiar in the sense that it points to a non-random pattern and then is forced to conclude that we see only the phenomenal aspect of something that may correspond to the noumenal. This is an undesirable conclusion for reductionist science, but it is easy to show using our discrete/continuous model that causal succession doesn't work with the data we have. We detect a non-random pattern. Strictly speaking that is all that we can conclude, but the next steps of interpretative chronology and hypotheses (about the evidence, not quite theories) are as inevitable as the lack of full rigor. But we can turn this to our advantage. More than anything else we must at least realize that while the eonic model may lack full rigor it points to what is probably the only way to analyze history. The evidence simply won't allow any longer the conventional forms of analysis. We are stuck with the eonic effect, whatever we conclude about the model. We can devise a remedy a series of questions, hypotheses with a warning about the high probability of getting historical (evolutionary) questions wrong. It is essential to face this fact: the whole legacy of historical materialism is that of a failed theory.

For example, in this minimalist approach we can, instead of claiming that history shows

teleology (or directionality) simply ask if on the basis of the eonic effect we should be wary of anti-teleological assumptions, and point to the way a discrete series shows directionality. One value of our model is that it can reconcile the contradiction between directionality and free agency, and, even better, show how we have exited the dynamical aspect of larger history into a post-eonic sphere of free agency, or so we suspect. The truly beautiful property of the eonic model of the eonic effect is that in a discrete continuous series you exit from the dynamic to your own free agency: we don't need to analyze the system to a theory to proceed. We deal only with the macro effects of the (last) transition (with remaining traces of all previous), e.g. the 'properties' of modernism: reformation, science, art, literature, and politics. We see for example that 'democracy' emerges in the early modern: we don't need a theory of the eonic effect to see the correlation and the implication, which we have already adopted, that realizing democracy is our historical task or best option (unless we are reactionaries, of course, but ant-modernism is a hopeless failure because we can see that our macro effect is anti-conservative, if not directly ideological, in the way that it shows directionality, induces innovations and moves aggressively against the past.

We should note that our association of communism with this pattern is interpretative and not exclusive: the modern transition clearly operates with a spectrum of possibilities and it endorses democracy, so to speak, but also an implication of socialism next to that of liberalism. Our system action operates in a range of potentials and our free agency does the best that it can. The quite late appearance of Marx/Engels and the revolutionary communist movement (notwithstanding the early birth of communism in the early modern with Münzer and More) seems to come just after or straddling the so-called divide. That is good and bad: good because it subject to our free agency, bad because we are deceived in thinking our foundational modernity is purely our own creation and this was a problem with bolshevism which was a crude and debilitating construct not equal to the task of social creation.

So the model gives us a warning: unless we can operate at the level of the eonic effect, and we can't as yet, in the creation of hypercomplex effects, e.g. great art, etc, we are going to risk the superficial. But we have no real choice but to try and to learn. Note the way the Axial Age degenerated into a medieval morass. That would be our fate unless we can learn to operate at the level of the eonic effect. A superhuman task, but perhaps we must 'evolve' to the superhuman! Whatever the case the point is clear that our agnostic approach is still far superior to the phony science of things like Darwinism, and the historiography of Big History.

We have in fact a truly apt guide here in the work of Kant on history, with his challenge to resolve its enigma. This framework clearly impinges directly on what we have discovered. We don't have the full solution, but we must suspect that our discrete/continuous model reflects the Kantian distinction of noumenal and phenomenal, a possibility that suggests why we don't see the hidden dynamic behind our transitions. We can't evade this enforced agnosticism, therefore, and it is at least a positive that our approach enforces our realization of our ignorance.

And it is important to learn the lesson: everyone, EVERYONE, has gotten history wrong, scientists, biologists, Darwinists, Marxists, religionists, everyone. The Israelites remarkably had a sense of the Axial Age, but their interpretation was a hopeless failure in the end.

Our approach can also be called a failure, but only as to theory: instead it hugs the mainline of the evidence, by and large and allows us to operate with limited information in our present to future. And it implies we must graduate to our own 'history creation' as free agents. We have devised a method for dealing with the failure of theory with a robust chronology which can be given dynamical interpretation, but if not we know how to proceed in the rough.

Popper, a science of history and free agency

September 27th, 2018 ·

Popper's views on science have been influential, and his critique of Marxism, Poverty of Historicism is almost a classic but while it is easy to debunk historical theories the fact remains that no theory of history is likely to be scientific in the sense indicated. Along with Isaiah Berlin's critique of historical inevitability the issue charged is the failure to indicate the way free agency enters the analysis making 'historical laws' problematical. That's a fair criticism but to apply it in isolation to Marxists is a bit outrageous. Every tom dick and harry in the historical science charade made this mistake long before Marx and can continue to make it as long as he doesn't tamper with capitalist ideology.

Our model of the eonic effect makes the issue explicit in its distinction of system action and free action and demonstrates, short of laws of history, a way to approach the issue systematically.

Let us note that Darwinism makes the same mistake in the way it posits the construction of free agency via natural selection, as a deterministic, more, a random process. So much for fair critiques.

Like a Cheshire cat the ‘eonic effect’ fades into shimmering background as an empirical series of epochal transitions replaces it, and stages of production theory...

September 26th, 2018 ·

History and epochal transitions?

March 26th, 2018 ·

The legacy of marxism contains a rich load of potential tools but is marred by the confusions of theory that beset Marx (and Engels) and rendered their work overall a contradictory package in practice.

Instead of historical materialism and/or dialectical materialism we have suggested a simple historical outline with modernity a sort of epochal transition (starting in the early modern) as the crucial focus. The progression of economic epochs in Marx is simply not correct as a long range perspective will clearly show: capitalism is gestating from the Neolithic and feudalism in many forms is recurrent. The middle ages isn't really feudal, as such. So the whole scheme is a puzzle until we recast the whole problem.

We can inject our eonic model, but that might be controversial so we can simply map out a set of epochal intervals obvious to the naked eye.

(the preface of the paleo/neolithic)

the phase of onset of the State, Sumer, Egypt and era from ca. 3000 BCE onwards the so-called Axial Age and its succession as an epoch, and this enforces a discipline of balanced study from Greece/Rome across Eurasia to China

the rise of the modern world from fifteenth to the eighteenth century...

We can try to interpret this pattern, or we can just take it empirically as a kind of punctuated series, wary of theories save as a descriptive category of development or civilizational evolution (wary of the term evolution, it just means what it means in conversational lingo).

In this context we can analyze class, economy, and technology empirically as histories or chronicles. Note that we add technological history as separate category: the onset of capitalism is often confused with the industrial (technological) revolution of the eighteenth century.

We can certainly focus on a working class analysis of these various eras and/or look at the whole in terms of multiple classes and posit the motion toward a universal class. But let us note that a working class dynamic is going to be incomplete: there is a double motion, the onset of the State as one kind of freedom and then almost dialectically a motion against the state as the birth of democracy. We note the resemblance of the democratic and the working class strain.

We should note that ‘feudalism’ is really an ideological version of the idea of caste that so dominates India: the Aryan cast logic is simply a variant in the occidental middle ages. We can see then that overall the sudden amplification of capitalism in the industrial revolution period looks like the onset of a new epoch of economy, but surely to a close

look we can see that that is not true.

We can resolve the question by seeing that democracy can't be fully realized or the State truly fulfilled until we unite the working class, or better the gestating universal class into a common realization, viz. with a communist democracy...

We have both availed ourselves of a theme of proletarian ideology, Marxism, and escaped its rigid formulation which can obstruct clarity.

Let us note then that capitalism is developing at all stages of history even if it suddenly becomes a dominant factor in modernity. We can see that capitalism as economy and technology almost because an independent factor in history, but that's not the same as saying it is a stage of history.

Let us recommend a closer look at the eonic model but without having to take it in full as another theory. But, all in all, we can see that an empirical approach can free us from the confusions that haunt Marxist ideas about inexorable stages of economic history.

The working class formulation is so classic and to the point we can work with that, but the idea of a 'universal class', which is really a variant of the individuality of all men given by the great religions, can be an equally valuable approach. We can easily change gears between the two concepts, also mindful that the class interests of the working class can't be made an absolute: the nature of the state and its evolution into democracy and two separate issues, reaching their conclusion in their unification.

Another issue is the question of slavery: it is increasingly clear, although not certain, that slavery is never any kind of necessary stage in history, because it didn't really exist at the birth of agriculture or the State: it appears to be a disease of civilization that grows progressively worse in the era after the rise of State Sumer/Egypt. Thus, it appears that the Pyramids, at first, were constructed by free labor as a sort of military draft.

The dread disease of slavery is really related to emerging capitalism in an obvious sense, and overtakes the State in the later phase of our first epoch???

Whatever the case we cannot ascribe any necessary status to slavery: if the great pyramids were initiated by free labor the arguments for the inevitability of slavery as a stage (suspiciously lurking in Marx) collapse at once.

archive: The question of modernity

December 11th, 2017 ·

The need for a larger perspective....of modernity

January 8th, 2015 ·

The neo-communist left has to have a far larger universe than that created by historical materialism: it needs a global anthropology that can talk to a generalized modernity/secularism. But what is that? The nineteenth century created a reduced subset to all that in the forms of positivism, scientism, secular humanism, Marxism...

Marxism needs to be rescued from this situation: the situation is not hard to solve: we use the 'macro model' (or you can skip that) to look at what we call the 'modern transition' from 1500 to 1800 (approx/) at which point the new era of modernity begins. The early modern clearly shows at once what happened: Marxism jumped on a yippee surfboard in

the Feuerbachian reaction to Hegel and downshifted into a very limited perspective. The overall idea was brilliant, however, and can easily be recast to include 1. a larger whole than Hegel and his critics 2. the 'dialectic' of the modern transitional with counterpoints in the Reformation/Rise of Science, revolutions from Münzer to the French Revolution. 3 the rise of liberalism, ideas of freedom, philosophies of freedom, 4. German Classical Philosophy....

In general the Marxist perspective can't even handle the Enlightenment very well. The so-called 'dialectic of the Enlightenment' started chasing a good idea for a critique and ended up in the hopeless muddle of the postmodern critique of modernity.

In the larger view the issue of communism is 1. a response to the need for a post-transitional 'revolution' against capitalism, 2. the need to reconstruct modernity in this new context, requiring versions of the Reformation, Scientific Revolution, rise of liberalism/communism (socialism), industrialization and its technologies and globalization, 3. some reckoning with the complex chords generated: e.g. the Romantic Reaction, the export of buddhism and figures like Schopenhauer, etc...

You can see that the current tactic of trying to use Marxism to challenge all other aspects of modernity is ill-conceived and the route to sterility and scientism made worse.

Last and First Men creates an historical context for not only the larger perspective of modernity, but a still larger context of world history. This approach requires looking at a whole complex (dialectic) of counterpoints, contraries and pairs of opposites.

In specific terms, the new left here needs to study the reality of global religion, from Xtianity/Islam to buddhism, and Confucianism Taoism, etc... It needs to have a larger philosophy that can work with materialism and idealism in a larger context than simple collision. Etc...

This problem of selecting a small subset of modernity to define secularism haunts the science world whose cadre of poorly educated scientism troopers has created, like Marxism, an extremely narrow subset of modernity that beggars the whole transition to a new era.

It would be nice to ditch the old Marxism and create a larger version that is tuned to the greater whole of modernity, and thence antiquity.

The calamity of Zionism...

September 23rd, 2018 ·

<https://www.counterpunch.org/2018/09/21/israels-anti-semitism-smear-campaign/>

The genre of tragedy emerged in Greek antiquity and it was often claimed that the 'tragic' has been sublated by religion.

But now we can see that religions themselves can be 'tragedies' and the history of

Judaism, but now especially Zionism, has entered this terrain, 'once and for all'. And Xtianity could be so claimed not only in its own way but in relation to its connection with Judaism.

If we use the metaphor of 'tragedy' we might imply that a tragedy is a play and had a beginning middle and end: the end here is the passage finally into a fully secular era beyond judeo-xtianity (and no doubt including Islam). The alternative is centuries more of violence and completely futile attempts to make these religions 'immortal'. The theological foundations of both religions have simply collapsed and the attempt to produce a secular Zionist continuation of Judaism is already visibly a grotesque failure. The solution to a tragedy on stage is to see it through to the end, but the solution to a tragedy in history is to snap out of it: it is simply hypnosis.

So the future is clear: the secular era can certainly found new religions, but those of the axial age are almost certainly crashing in plain view.

The catch here is that since Jewish identity is a religious condition, being Jewish is never secular, a point held in private by sundry enemies with a solution. Let's not get too logical here: it is all madness, enough's enough. But, come to think of it, being Jewish requires if it can a real modernity. That has long since been in evidence and well underway, but if the coming of Zionism has staged a regression, the reality is that these issues are in progress to their own solution. Look at figures like Einstein.

Let's hope we get lucky after being so unlucky.

Instead of just haranguing Jews Israeli it might be more productive for xtians to simply abandon their own religion as a lost cause, exposing judeo-zionism to open air, the vampire can't survive without its xtian host: it can only proceed from salvific to malevolent, the longer you wait.

If there is a religious duty for xtians at this point, it should be to simply exit the judeo-xtian legacy, with no nonsense about the pack of lies in the old testament, ...and the new...Jesus is long gone and ain't going to help. Like Frodo at the end, he simply sailed away, nursing his wounds, never able to comment on the fraud of the resurrection.

An anonymous question: I am asked, in the context of the The Gurdjieff Con Blog, "Why did esoteric buddhists conspire to exterminate the Jews?"

I haven't the foggiest, but you can refer to that blog if you wish. It was always odd; fascism to start wasn't about Jews. How did the issue get grafted onto Mussolini's oeuvre? He himself was puzzled. I would not wish any harm to Jews. But let me note that Zionism has thus ended making me an enemy at war with Buddhism. Funny logic, not so funny.

The primitive idiocy of political science on all sides.../A multiple-choice test by the New York Times, answer correctly and you are DSA material

September 23rd, 2018 ·

Starting with the first question we see that neither the times nor the left has done their homework. Political science on all sides is a kind of primitive thinking that shows us that concepts of government are in their own dark ages. The entire legacy of Marxism is a void that can't handle even a questionnaire (with loaded questions no doubt).

That's not about project's very good analysis but the way the questions point to the absence of any real knowledge by any party of a platform. We may as well forget Marx and start over with a new formulation. And it is hard to see how the DSA has any kind of framework. We should remind the times that 'democracy' doesn't exist yet and that the term has been grafted on American plutocracy as propaganda. The US is therefore not an exemplar of anything. At this point it is a sick joke.

The American system did produce a few innovations such as the separation of powers (which actually existed before, but...). What is democracy: the era of Rousseau shows the way that the definitions were very limited and inadequate: electoral and direct democracy. Electoral democracy is a failure. But should continue as a key component. We have pointed to our model/tool to study the complexity of an overall solution to the question which we call 'democratic market neo-communism'. A complete version would have on the order of a hundred complex components with complex interactions, so obviously we must accept our own criticisms. We discard the distinction between socialism, communism, optionally. The first is a descriptive for the second which is 'strictly neo-'. You should not reference Marx or Marxism here, save as historical footnotes: everything is from scratch. Even this detailed depiction is incomplete. But at least it addresses the questions of state and economy, democracy, markets and planning, etc... The key idea is the constitutional foundation of a Commons as the basis for a neo-communism. Why should workers own the means of production? That, to be sure, is one option at the lower end of three sector system (the anarchist third sector) but overall the 'means of production' reside in a Commons. That requires a careful legal construct and is NOT the same as state ownership. The 'state' apparatus has no direct control of the means of production. That state system has three branches: the presidential, the parliamentary, and the legal, with a new aspect, ecological courts. The economic system is run by a specific set of economic agents, but extra entities, e.g. labor unions, can mediate policies, while 'markets in a Commons' can allow socialist entrepreneurs with licensed resources to create large-scale corporations under close regulation but a relatively high degree of autonomy. This creates a possible managerial 'class' with excessive powers, but a close look, and further development can construct this possibility. The economy is basically mediated by economists, with a many other inputs, we can't eliminate a bureaucratic complication here, as such.

The presidential system is a strong authority with a one-party system of communist

guardians who guard the basic status of the Commons. This matched with a three party parliamentary system with two oppositional parties and a third dialectical formation that can allow the entry of new third or more new parties. This system is focused on ecological socialism, the Commons, a market sector with licensed resources from the Commons, a planned sector and a third lower sector. The presidential party does not allow dissent to the axioms of the system of the Commons but has few other powers in a state of guardianship. Such dissent is tantamount to counterrevolution and implies that one group will seize control of shared resources and leave the rest with nothing. It is not democratic to allow that possibility. But our third party however can discuss such issues. This is the basis of a true democracy. The three party parliament resolves the issues of democracy inside a strong control system of the one party/three party state. Ecology, economic rights, and personal liberties are strongly balanced in this system, which shows up conventional political science as a species of primitive idiocy.

The catch as usual is the resolution of revolution versus electoral paths. But this framework allows both options. The question of revolution is treacherous and requires its own new formulation. We have suggested, for example, a series of failsafes that can block Leninist Stalinist pseudo-revolutions.

Source: *A multiple-choice test by the New York Times, answer correctly and you are DSA material* | *Louis Proyect: The Unrepentant Marxist*

The therapy racket, exploitation and capitalist psychological rip-offs

September 22nd, 2018 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/2011/01/14/freuds-self-serving-three-wounds-nonsense/comment-page-1/#comment-839530>

The era of Freud's fame is long gone now but his legacy is not a good one. Psychoanalysis may be bad science, but Freud got one thing right: transference, a fancy term for the psychological fixation that comes on people in therapy: it is an immensely profitable situation for analysts, and now many therapists of all brands. And it has become entrenched because it is so profitable. And hard to question, yet people are to sit and talk/confess alone with no comment from the psychological agent, who does nothing but sit in silence for hundreds of dollars an hour.

How is that anything but a capitalist racket?

You have a right to protest such an a rip-off (Felix Guttari wrote a book on this as the extraction of surplus value, a Marxist issue)...and it is true that modern psychology has no real understanding of man, let alone a science that could justify the therapy rackets. Needless to say the older world of religion provided such 'services' free...the catholic

church well knew the power of the confessional (transference of a type, and psychological tyranny)

From Hegel to Marx: Studies in the Intellectual Development of Karl Marx /Hook

September 17th, 2018 ·

This is something of a classic that I found again among my bookshelves: it is a classic yet it doesn't really answer the riddle of the Hegel Marx question.

I note a passage on Marx's strong almost malevolent antagonism to and attacks on 'abstract ethical idealism' and sensed (perhaps not for the first time) something closer to the tragic hero than the revolutionary economist.

If you wanted to make the case Marxism was wrongheaded and shot itself in the foot step one, you could start here. Was this scientism, the dark side of shadow Marx, a demonic trump to discombobulate a world historical movement...?? But we forget the first attack on ethical idealism, in a sneaky way, is in Hegel who loses the noumenon, and has no real ethical system at all, strange. The problem with Hegel is ...well what? Schopenhauer spent decades attacking Hegel in a strange *bête noire* mode. Neither quite understood Kantian ethical idealism and its brilliant innovation. There is a case to be made that Hegel was too elusive to be understood and that he ends up in the wasteland of Nietzsche, in the minds of the incomprehending.

To challenge ethical idealism is par for the course, as a philosophic dialectic, but the wrathful rejection is a dead ringer for the sophomoric exercise in evil that overtook the whole Bolshevik experiment. Ethical issues were attacked as utopian, not scientific. It would be a schoolboy exercise in blank verse tragedy to go Shakespearian here, the tragic flaw in a radical movement. And the Marxist even had a dire warning from the so-called Marburg school trying to rush in with a rescue package, called Kantian ethical socialism. They were mostly ignored. A dialectic of materialism and idealism is simple philosophic 'all in a day's work', but I would be wary of thinking one had won that debate. And even physics isn't there any more: even if your 'stuff' is materialist, your 'equations' are idealist abstractions, maybe even platonic forms. The whole debate was not relevant to a socialist as such. Ordinary social moralities of the good, however, should never have been excised in the name of science. But ordinary religious moralities suffer their own flaws and were not adequate to socialism as a critique of capitalism. For capitalists religion is the overhead of hypocrisy, the price of doing business in an economy of religious idiots (and not a few cunning Calvinists). Small wonder Marx got in a huff. But the resolution was even worse.

Communism and markets based in a Commons

September 16th, 2018 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/2018/09/16/lenin-in-the-rear-view-mirror/>

One of the saddest confusions of the Marxist legacy was the idea that a bourgeois revolution must precede the transition to communism. This created the fumbled ball of the Russian fiasco, as it became clear in fact to Lenin who sensibly ditched the distinction (I think) but didn't really have a platform to work with: the fatal ad hoc of Stalinism simply moved into the void.

Although Lenin seems to have shaken loose from the idea, then, more of less, one of the confusions of the Russian revolution was the idea that Russia wasn't ready for communism and that, e.g. Germany, should lead the way. What a horrible mistake. In fact any stage of society should be able to move into socialism.

This is a drastic example of the misleading effects of Marxist theory. A close look at the English civil war shows democratic, bourgeois, and proto-socialist ideas emerging in splendid chaos, together. The bourgeois revolution in the restoration was really close to a counterrevolution.

The issue for us would be to recast the whole subject and simply have one revolution (or electoral transition) that achieves the basic result of a neo-communism from the start: the democratic revolution and the communist revolution are really Janus-faced: they must both happen at the same time. The idea that an era of capitalism must occur in the standards stages of production sequence was a fatal miscalculation. A better issue might be capitalist markets versus communist markets, as with our formulation of democratic market neo-communism. We have suggested a foundational/constitutional 'Commons' that does the work of the 'communism' but leaves open the question of a communist economy which might be eclectic: planned, with a market sector of a kind. It is not clear what Marx thought but he left the impression that communism would abolish markets. But as we see from the (partly sophisticated) calculation debate that is going to be a problem. It is not clear just how Marx's views changed from the era of the 1848 manifesto, but in the end the whole range of issues was botched.

The speculation here is that we can have capitalists with out capitalism, i.e. social capital (the Commons) but with an economy that may still have both planning and born-again markets and/or computational clearing computers and/or AI driven economic systems, and/or our third sector 'let go' semi anarchist completion of a triad.

...like a bad pointer in c programming...

September 15th, 2018 ·

The projection of stages of production theory into the future resembles a 'bad pointer' in c programming: a placeholder that points to nothing suddenly causes s system crash

because a random value takes over the pointer...The failure to specify what they were trying to do made the early communists act incoherently....

Advance specification
June 5th, 2018 ·

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Democratic_Market_Neo_Communist_ver_5.pdf

We have noted twice today the way ‘stages of production’ theory created a kind of fallacious overall view on the part of Marxists as to the way capitalism would yield to communism.

But the later was never really defined and it was thought that nothing should be said in advance on the subject. But it seems clear that Marx thought the key point was that communism would completely abolish the market. In retrospect that seems the wrong approach.

The point of communism is the issue of private property and primitive accumulation. The question of markets versus planning is more complex and can lead to miscalculations. Our DMNC model creates a tool based on a kind of triad to try and prepare in advance for a new kind of system, yet one not as destructive as that which threw the Russian revolution into a set of catastrophes...

Our model of ‘democratic market communism’ doesn’t assume that communism inevitably follows capitalism because capitalism isn’t a stage of history: it is continuous set of processes in history and then a kind of ad hoc Frankenstein of the period of the industrial revolution. It was seen immediately that a response to this phenomenon was necessary. And Marx Engels codified these insights, but in the process they got too theoretical. It would be more practical to consider that the state of society can be continuously (and/or by revolution) adjusted to both the phenomenon of markets and the forms of socialism.

Our DMNC model states in advance the rough outline of what it is going to do and consider a ‘triad’ of three sectors: a planned sector, a market economy based on a Commons however in which entrepreneurs license resources from the Commons. A third sector is a kind of indifference zone below a certain threshold which is simply left to its own, more or less. This model integrates a triad of opposites and evades the kind of hopeless mess made by Bolshevik socialism.

It must include a strong authority to protect communism, plus a democratic parliamentary system completely protected from any kind of external financial control.

There is not enough detail here either, perhaps, but the point is that ‘communism’ is a set of axioms about social foundations. And that doesn’t as such banish forever the realm of markets (nor is this made an absolute contradiction to planning). The point here is that socialism/market economics can evolve together in tandem rather than be absolute opposites each given a stage of history...

Such a system could also interact with both an international and with an external

capitalist outstanding order.

It would simply finish the question of economic rights and provide a robust package of social givens (education, jobs, housing, ...) and this would be a legal/constitutional situation where each individual shares in the Commons.

With time the factor of planning is likely to develop but the seeming contradiction of market communism would find itself in fact a very flexible and dynamic duo/triad. It is important to see that economies are run both top/down and bottom/up and that the kind of economic domination of Bolshevik one party rule over all economic decisions would be a thing of the past...

More on the working/universal class, classes...beyond classes to individuals and back

September 12th, 2018 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/2018/09/11/some-suggestions-for-a-new-post-marxist-communist-platform/>

We have often suggested a larger perspective than that of the working class: the universal class, in a pun on set theory: the set of all subsets of a given class.

Marxists these days hardly know anything about the working class, or so it seems. The left needs to multitask a far larger set of problems than the economics of the working class. But such is the idea that the working class is perhaps one of the largest subsets of the universal class: the focus on the working class can coexist with all sorts of groups and movements. And the universal class reminds us there aren't really any classes: only people. The universal class includes all individuals in their own subset class. The working class is a statistical average or fiction and not even so dominant now as we enter postindustreality, automation, etc...It is more of a nineteenth century idea, of the proletariat, and the Manchester world.

The working class is nonetheless a key focus for the left, obviously, but the situation is shifting now.

And who are really the radicals in society? The working class? I have been in dozens, hundreds of working class job situations, from apple pickers in Washington, to labor pools that charge high, pay low, to roustabouting in Louisiana, to spinach weeders in Arizona desert and I have almost never met a radical in such jobs. Sullen flip the birders at the bosses, should qualify, let's hope. I was usually the only one, confronting the task of explaining exploitation: easy, wages are too low. But revolution? Those fucking commies!

I am too pessimistic, perhaps...

We can't really assign human properties to 'classes'. They/it won't behave the way your

theories expect. And what are the objectives of the 'left'? The point is we need a new kind of movement that is more than economic: at a time of full employment, who will revolt and why? And full employment requires growth, high carbon generation and climate change.

At some point all of that is going to crash in any case.

We need to fight for a new society, not just the wages of factory workers. We need to ask what happens when the music stops: no more growth, a steady state economy, and yet work and economic rights nonetheless.

And we need to act soon: time is running out, and the 'counter-revolution' on the right is well underway.

Our models of 'democratic market neo-communism' are a tool to explore the possibilities. Perhaps still too limited.

If the left will stop its Marx chatter and design a viable, attractive set of social/ecological possibilities for the 'universal' (and/or working) class, with some guarantees of rights and no concentration camps people will become radical (again) overnight. People are starting to taste fear: the future does not look good.

Some suggestions for a new post-Marxist communist platform...

September 11th, 2018 ·

R48G: some suggestions for a new post-Marxist communist platform...

August 3rd, 2017 ·

We have suggested here many times the need for Marxist groups to create an upgrade of the canon and to create a kind of break with the legacy that will send a message that the left is not beholden to an older era of marxism/Leninism defended ad nauseam from Stalinism,

Thus forcing the issue of a dogmatic and defensive posture. This is a hard sell on the left but a sense that an audience can expand via renewal just might be ready for prime time... We can also use our perspectives here to create an umbrella group that can ally with older formations but we need to make the point that something that at least sounds new is needed to break the cycle of mechanized thought...

<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>

Some of the issues here:

focus on the era of 1848 and the heroic era of Marx/Engels and in principle on the birth of communism before the onset of marxism: the Marxist monopoly on communism has alienated far too many

be wary of the classical economic theories in Marx and deal with neo-classical economics and its critique

try to deal with the economic calculation debate and its propaganda which has terminated believability in marxism for so many brainwashed by market hype...

be mindful of the plight of complex theory in the later Marx, and its vicissitudes...
 stop being mesmerized by Capital whose theories are marginal at this point, the basic overall effect as impressionistic being more effective: Marx was unable to complete his project, in part because his theories are so complex and conjectural...
 be mindful of the complexity in Marx: few understand what he is saying and very powerful critics have an immense literature of attack that most marxists have never read
 be wary of theories of history with causal generalizations:
 historical materialism fails strictly speaking as a 'theory'. If what is meant were simply stated as descriptive history it might fare better
 'stages of production theory' in relation to 'historical materialism' is a misreading of history: the epochs or stages indicated don't really work as theory
 that theory is crypto-teleological without showing the basis for such
 capitalism is not a stage of history and claiming it is has served to strengthen its grip as a fictitious era that self-justifies its own faults and claims its need to realize all its potential
 the failure of dialectic and the pseudo-science of 'dialectic materialism'
 the false embrace of darwinism (despite Marx's early warning) and failure to correctly expose social Darwinist ideology
 the biased emphasis on materialism versus idealism, a useless debate...

Etc...

There are some simple remedies for all of this and we have suggested many new approaches...

The puzzle of leftist confusion over 9/11...is it finally sinking in?//The New Pearl Harbor Revisited: 9/11, the Cover-Up, and the Exposé – David Ray Griffin – Google Books

September 11th, 2018 ·

They used to denounce or ridicule '9/11 conspiracy theorists', now they mostly mull over in silence...Perhaps it is finally beginning to sink in...

Although 9/11 research has progressed since Griffin's early books (to say nothing of Meyssan's classic 2002 book) his work remains one of the most useful introductions to the evidence of the 9/11 conspiracy.

It is hard to understand how the left by and large got so derailed here. It is not very hard to see through the official accounts and it remains a mystery how the false paradigm became so dominant on the left. It is a disgrace to the record of leftist investigative journalism and we can hardly speak of a left in this situation: its credibility is suspect, and for what reason?

Source: *The New Pearl Harbor Revisited: 9/11, the Cover-Up, and the Exposé* – David Ray Griffin – Google Books

Coming of the Gaian Commies

September 8th, 2018 ·

We need a new science/philosophy that can deal with a new reality: an extended ‘Gaian’ matrix for human history and civilization, with an evolutionary context behind that. The current Gaian thesis is charming but too limited and attempts a science it can’t so far really achieve.

But we can see that the issue of Gaia can be taken in a way that is empirical and wary of ‘grand theories’ except as conjectures on the way to science. The point is that we hardly have a choice. Standard historical theory is almost completely lame and misleading. The evidence almost demands a Gaian perspective, without giving us a full handle on the meaning of the idea.

As we examine world history we can see that the evidence of the eonic effect demonstrates a field of global action that transcends typical/standard sociological causation theories and instead demonstrates a complex system that is able to act on focal regions, i.e. able to generate starting points as if it were coming into focus on a particular region which is not in the causal succession of a mainline, (our discussion yesterday of the ‘frontier effect’ being an example). Once we see the clear evidence for this we are liable to jump to conclusions and speculate where instead we can take the evidence we have and form a slightly agnostic new ‘world perspective’ that is at least able to save us from ‘flat history’ as a dull mechanics in the wasteland of failed theories of history.

This is daring and dangerous in a world of mythological propagandists but there is a way to proceed that can avoid this in a kind of neutral cosmological mystery that sees planets and biospheres as a new field of a future science. Here we must proceed with great caution lest we conclude that cosmic entities are ‘conscious’ beings of some sort. Perhaps they are! But we don’t yet have the proof or the kind of theory that can handle this. We don’t have to speculate: using the eonic model we can simply consider the global context of civilization and the existence of a mysterious design factor behind the emergence/evolution of civilizations.

This would make a great ‘seed ideology’ for a global community, indeed a futuro-communist world civilization that is able to integrate the local into the global in a manner that must be defined beyond Darwinist/capitalist genocidal pseudo-science with a realization that ‘evolution’, social or organismic, has a mysterious teleological component, a global locally focal injection process, and a comprehensive set of historical exemplars of what is going on, despite the ongoing mystery of that, and the problems with bringing about a science of the subject. But as noted we have empirical grounds to

proceed and can, and must, consider global hypotheses for a new sociological foundational way of thought.

We should note that figures like J. G. Bennett discussed here have done a lot of the work here although these efforts are still inadequate, but they do contain a series of pointers about the ways we can produce intelligent definitions of the factors of consciousness and will, so liable to misinterpretation.

The distinctions of hyponomic, autonomic, hypernomic, for example, might remind us that a cosmological body can be a theatre of life but not itself 'alive', that the issue of the 'will' in nature is a direct relation to the idea of scientific laws, and this can free us of false attributions of 'consciousness' in contexts where that is inappropriate, etc...

Clearly the whole subject could nose-dive in mystical confusion, but our current knowledge could hardly be called anything but confusion.

The evidence of the eonic effect is unavoidable: there is a global component to the emergence of civilization and this should be taken into account by those whose revolutionary/socially constructive ambitions assumed that 'man makes himself' entirely alone without assistance from some deeper process. The left can profit from this without entangling the subject in false theological obsessions since we are not talking about 'god', but, well, some Gaian hyper process...the 'cosmic mom' no doubt...

Gaian evolution
March 5th, 2018 ·

R48G: the eonic effect and the mystery of the 'Gaian' evolution
October 22nd, 2017 ·

The eonic model ironically resolves the issue of historical theories by applying a kind of sequential/parallel grid matrix and this suggests that after so much futile effort to find a theory of history the reason for the failure lies in the implications of this grid matrix. By 'grid matrix' we refer to the way that discontinuity applies both sequentially and laterally producing a long range sequence and a set of synchronous effects, a sort of mini-multiverse effect (metaphor only).

In this context it is counterproductive to propose simplistic attempts at theories of history: there is a real dynamic but it is something we could never have suspected and the full empirical resolution there is still premature: we don't have the full range of evidence needed to come to a full conclusion. That point should be obvious for the earlier evolution of man: we don't know how it happened, period....

some older posts...

R48G: the difficulty of resolving historical theories...
June 27th, 2017 ·

World history contains a hidden surprise but it cannot easily penetrate the hold of current social/historical ideology because the factual basis for such a complex entity eludes any simple resolution.

It requires an exercise in visualization of obscure moments of that history, and that requires reading books...that makes the public vulnerable to ideological manipulation, to say the least...

R48G: detecting historical dynamics...the eonic effect as a test of the data of world history...
June 23rd, 2017 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=eonic+effect>

We have often discussed the ‘eonic effect’ as an alternate historical framework. Actually it not a completed theory or even a definite framework: rather, it works as a ‘test of the data’. We make a series of assumptions about history but fail to see how beyond religious historicism the field of modern scientism does no better. One might consider the way that a kind of orthodoxy is enforced by the new field of Big History which completely misses the point.

The eonic effect can be taken as a series of warnings: as we try to apply various models to world history we discover the unexpected, contrast of discrete and continuous processes. This is an empirical given, whatever we make of it. We can use the ‘model’ as a warning to be wary of dogmatic theories and simply operate with chronicles and empirical histories. It is also a warning that causal systematics just won’t work on history and that we must deal with free agents who are in a kind of hybrid state in a larger mix, partly causal but probably teleological. We cannot reduce this complexity to simplistic analyses of the type of historical materialism (or neo-classical economic models). One value of the eonic model is that the condition of historical determination operating on free agents is intermittent and subject to a end phase where the ‘eonic effects’ cease and free agents are bound to try and take over their own history. That’s a huge and dangerous task, and a new left must be able to operate via all categories, not just the economic. The eonic effect is a warning that virtually all parties have gotten history wrong. We must operate on the defensive and try to operate with a non-dogmatic constructivist practice. The eonic model is probably too exotic for brain-dead Marxist but it can at least suggest wariness about overly complex analyses that are soon millstones around one’s neck.

A subject preaching ‘planning’ was never planned and derailed at the start...

September 8th, 2018 ·

We are constantly beset with propaganda about the failure of ‘communism’ but in fact it is better to say that it has never been tried. Marx Engels always refused to define what should be the outcome of the abstraction invoked and that seems to have left the Russian revolution in the grips of the ad hoc, a ‘hack’ from the start that was never able to really get off the ground and soon derailed into a dangerous experiment without any guidelines for how to proceed. This resulted in figures like Stalin claiming the confusion they created was ‘communism’, to the great propaganda future of their opponents.

If we define ‘communism’ as democratic, for example, then a Stalinism outcome is not communist and should be considered fair game for cessation. The left could have operated this way in the early years in the early years of the Russian revolution and spared the world a wasted opportunity gone sour.

Communism has never been tried...
May 4th, 2018 ·

March 1st, 2018 ·

The Bolshevik era is a test case of the failure of Marxist theory, yet we often fail to see why. The problem can be seen in the muddle over whether Russia had to first pass through a stage of capitalism and variants of this confusion are visible in all factions, until Lenin broke the logjam, but with an equally flawed formula.

We should recast the whole subject to a new formulation which can adopt a communist foundation from the start, but redefined to allow a developmental mix that can still include markets. Lenin almost got it right until he got it wrong, followed by Stalin’s monumental lunacy which was never communism at all.

The point is that democracy and communism must emerge together in a match that can possible allow market economics to coexist in a complex mixture that is beyond the illusions of private property, the predatory fictions of ecological plunder of the Commons...

The Bolshevik fallacies are really inherited from Marx’s flawed analysis...

In general, there is no reason why development in the context of communism can’t be the basic starting point.

Marxist confusions
March 21st, 2017 ·
Two Manifestos

We have tried to suggest a way out of the stalled left, stalled by Marxist dogma among other factors.

I seriously doubt that in the US at least that the Marxist legacy will work anymore either as theory or as praxis. It is however very difficult to even communicate with these idiots. Let us recall how Marx struggled with theory and then seems to have given up as the task was completed ad hoc by Engels. The whole initiative was far better served at the start in the period of the 1840's when Marx/Engels reckoned in a simplified and very effective manner with the elements of capitalist critique. In a way the appearance of The German Ideology however began to token the onset of Big Theory in the reaction to Hegelianism. The struggle for theory clearly exhausted Marx who began to obsess over the completion of his work. We need to free ourselves of the dogmatic confusion that came into existence and that led the second international astray.

Anyway we have produced a path to a new approach: you can start this today without theories, in a set of simple issues about history, economic systems, and the constitutional definition of a society that can function as a form of neo-communism. It doesn't even require the abolition of markets, and the whole task can be on of a transitional democratic experiment.

But we are out of time on the issue of climate and it is hard to see how the Marxist world can be evaded in the creation of a new left. I can only recommend all this to just such Marxists, given a sober warning they are in the way at this point.

We have proposed elements so simple they can be adopted without chronic perplexities (despite the near extravagance of the eonic model, which can be used in a simplified fragment) that plague Marxists who are so confused they can't function. But despite all our criticisms, Marxists are the only group with a commitment to postcapitalism. We can suggest leaping out of one's skin and remorphing to a new left. The eonic model is useful as a form of shock treatment:

Our suggestion is that we need a communist foundation in the Commons, with a hybrid system of planned economy and market economy with a lower sector in a semi-anarchist autonomous mode. Such an approach fail-safe's against the monstrosity created by bolshevism which was never really in the legacy at all, as many noted: we live in a fully developed capitalism in the so-called democratic context. We can move to something new with far greater effect and intelligence than the mass idiocy of the Bolshevik derailment which in any case was hijacked by Stalin. We have nothing to do with that, or with the monstrosities we see in the case of china (and even Russia, still, in its putinesque degeneration from degenerate pseudo-communism).

So much of the struggle over Marxism is pointless sophistry. We need to open the window for some fresh air. While the issue of the eonic effect it perhaps too exotic for a practical movement it nonetheless answers to a classic query of the philosopher Kant and can be taken as what we suspect is the case with a simple foundation in secular modernism as a new epoch in world history. The sudden appearance of modern capitalism (in reality it was invented ages ago) was immediately met with its dialectical complement, socialism/communism. This contrast is entirely apt as the system begins to explore a new a superior form of democracy/economy. As the planet starts into climate

calamity the facile idiocies of capitalist obsession seem both out of date and grossly primitive.

Israel, Persian Zoroastrianism, and botched monotheisms...

September 7th, 2018 ·

Our previous post considers the question of ancient israel, an elegant and direct exemplar of the eonic effect, yet, sadly, at the same time a suspected failure on its own terms in a context admittedly so confusing we can hardly expect any other result. The Israelite and Greek 'axial' cases directly exhibit the eonic effect, and the timing of the Israelite is downright spooky: the period from ca. 900 to 600 BCE roughly shows the direct action of the mysterious macro factor. The Israelites uniquely detected this but tragically confused it with 'god', and not only that a very tribal god. The god innovation was a botch from the start, yet we can't be sure exactly what happened and why.

Small wonder the Israelites thought they detected 'god': what do you call something that can move tribes, induce religions, change geopolitics for whole nations, and this directly over a transition region in the space of several centuries? Unfortunately, while spectacular, this isn't 'god' in history. Here the whole question of monotheism foundered in a new tribal myth.

Thus there is a catch here: the Israelite case was relatively primitive and instead of completing a trend toward universalization became closed in on itself and turned into a nationalistic religion.

It is hard to second guess the larger 'macro effect' but given the evidence the suggestion is of a kind of failure. Perhaps there was a logic to this, however, but it is clear that as Christians soon pointed out the larger trend toward 'monotheism' required a universalism the Israelites proclaimed yet failed to achieve. Note that the 'macro' effect doesn't determine the outcome as such: it merely generates a potential starting point, like some archetype, 'create a monotheism', say.

As further evidence of this we must note the parallel Persian case which produced a second monotheism from the Aryan source. This is the clincher: what to say if suddenly at the conclusion of the transition, at the exact point of the 'divide' a foreign power invades, takes prisoners and transports these tribal monotheists, Semites, to the exact zone of a parallel group of budding monotheists, Aryans?

It is beyond miraculous and something the Israelites sensed, 'god' is moving 'our' chess piece across the board. Unfortunately the 'noise' of misinterpretation caught up with this stunning experiment which we not very helpfully point to as the 'macro' eonic effect. Whatever it is, it can't be 'god'. We have to suspect monotheism escaped from its sources and started mythologizing a too primitive theism, still mired in tribalism. In any case, the further suspicion is that the clear aim of this hybridization was the creation of a transcultural Aryan/semite post-tribal seed universalism out of two

monotheisms. But that never really happened. The account of the Exile is somehow garbled and the issue of the Persian Zoroastrians never quite gelled. In fact, some have accused the Israelites of getting monotheism from the Zoroastrians, and then adapting it to their tribal coloring. Whatever the case the tribal 'goddism' of 'Jehovah' seems like a botch, as the Christians quietly concluded.

All in all, we can't be quite sure here because a strong tribal starting point might have been the only way the whole affair could have come about.

But one thing is clear the tribal trappings of Israelitism never reached universalization, a point drastically obvious in our own time. The Zionist appropriation of modern 'israel'/Palestine is a pathetic endgame of great sadness, and given the evidence of the holocaust one must suspect 'Jews' have a lot of enemies who wish to be done with their botched religion. To Jews I would say: stop preening your feathers and face historical facts.

The eonic/frontier effect...//Western Civilization 101

September 7th, 2018 ·

Source: *Western Civilization 101*

This kind of puzzled discussion is grist for our mill in terms of the 'eonic effect' or model. Most of the confusions fall away at once when we move beyond the concepts of 'civilization', 'Europe', etc, and think in terms of the 'eonic sequence'. The model discusses the 'frontier effect': the way each phase in the 'sequence' moves to a new starting point: the immediate clarification of puzzle of the sudden eruption in Europe (not of Europe) of a new transitional zone.

Let us note that the modern transition is NOT a European phenomenon, as such, but, most strangely yet very logically, a sudden transformation at the rough frontier of the old Roman Empire: Germany, Holland, England, France, and Spain (with northern Italy a special case). This phenomenon makes no sense without the eonic model.

Why for example was a backwater like 'israel' in of all places ancient Canaan suddenly a source of creative advance? Once again we see the frontier effect, at the exact boundary/boundaries of the old Egyptian and Mesopotamian arenas in a prior cycle.

This model tends to avoid the term 'civilization(s)' and instead looks at a common global oikoumene in formation and we can see that the concept of 'western civilization' is a confusion from the start. Strictly speaking instead of the term 'civilization' which so confused Toynbee and Spengler we think in terms of (differential) transitions in an eonic sequence: consider the transition in archaic Greece: 900 to 600 BCE (with a flowering of classical Greece just after this): this differential transition generates an oikoumene, the Hellenistic as a new civilization or better simply 'oikoumene'. Similar effects are visible in china, India, and the strange Persian case which so strangely suddenly hybridizes with the Israelite at the precise point of the 'divide' point of the 'common' transition. These

spooky effects are extraordinary...

In the modern case we see already the creation of a global oikoumene both assisted now complicated by the phenomenon of modern capitalism: clearly this oikoumene will start to undergo some kind of challenge to the 'economic integrator' factor, but the overall point is clear.

Again let us note the frontier effect: why are the superintelligent Scandinavians not the creators of modernity? Because they weren't at the exact frontier zone where we find Germany, Holland, England, France and Spain. Strange indeed.

Let us note that our transitions can't fully control their outcomes which have tended to generate transient imperialisms in a confusion over just the kind of biased concept like 'european civilization'. A close look at, say, Indian interaction with England shows the ambiguity of this imperialism: many Indians in the nineteenth century testified to the great value of the English phase, a dangerous thought, confronting the army of near barbarians creating the 'British empire', etc...In the end the British sphere could pass away in the upsurge of a great indict futurism...

The term 'western civilization' is thus almost devoid of meaning and misses completely the far more specific processes at work.

Let us note that the North American and Russian spheres were never frontier zones in our sense, and like ancient Rome in the wake of Greece, usurpers and mostly barbarians making a mess of everything.

This kind of analysis solves all the problems but is so strange to beginning students that generally they just draw a blank. It takes time to understand what is being said...

Marxist historicism, world history, the eonic effect, bypassing theories

September 6th, 2018 ·

We have attempted in two mini-manifestos to bypass the Marxist corpus (but embracing its heroic saga up to 1848) and create a simple resolution of evolutionary/revolutionary praxis.

First, Marxism has a bad theory of history. This theory is demonstrably limited, indeed fallacious. No praxis can be based on a flawed theory, therefore any praxis that does isn't going to work for a new social transformation. The Bolsheviks used this theory and failed, they were so harebrained that they hardly count. Current Marxists persist in all the details of this theory, and are not likely therefore to have a real opportunity. Why? Because Marxism has a bad theory of history, and no praxis can be based on a flawed theory. If they get another chance they will end in the same hare-brained mess as before. Why? Because you can't base a praxis on a false theory.

Instead of a ‘theory’ of history let’s recommend a set of empirical chronicles based on broad divisions:

the Neolithic

the period of high summer and Egypt (which also introduce Africa to our discussion, they also probably include the new world since there are ambiguous hints of early discoveries of the Americas)

their successions and diffusion zones: an increasingly globalizing mega-oikoumene, Mesopotamia, Indian and Chinese successions, etc...

the so-called ‘axial period’ which can call the ‘sampling of Eurasia’: we can focus on a broad sample: Greece Rome, Israel/Persia, India, China...

the period of the great religions

medievalism

the rise of modernity

We note that economics is not fundamental to this ‘evolution of civilization’, although the core emphasis on ‘production’ is quite suitable here. But the dynamics of these evolving ‘civilizations’, Civilization, is very practical and robust.

Lurking in the background is the ‘eonic model’, an optional approach already subsumed in this chronicle. Note: you can hardly go wrong with this approach because it isn’t a theory. It shows a clear epochal series, but this is still conjectural.

The point here is that we are rid of feudalism, capitalism, communism as successive epochs.

The epoch of modernity shows not the birth but an expansion of capitalism, which probably originates in the Neolithic, which shows an expansion of capitalism, followed by capitalism in the wake of Sumer, which shows an expansion of capitalism outside of state economies, and this invents the truck stop for trade routes (using bullock carts), quite capitalist. The emergence of communism/capitalism is not successive but synchronous: a hint we may have to hybridize the two (check out our model in our two manifestos)

Our chronicle follows the eonic effect, or else the eonic effect follows our chronicle. A look at this pattern and/or eonic effect shows that we won’t arrive at a theory of history any time soon. So it is better not to bluff the public any more here. ...This data is tough, and just getting a bibliography set up is a HUGE job.

Again, the Marxist approach, despite many nuggets of useful material, is a false theory and will lead to failure, as evidenced already by history. Why? Because, ditto, cf. the above...

Using the above we can reconstruct what we need without pretending to fully understand the enigma of world history.

We must construct communism inside ‘capitalism’ and vice versa, with a liberalism that is communist and a communism that is liberal.

A hybrid of communism and capitalism seems mysterious: it merely means we must find a socialist equivalent of markets (computers, AI...), and/or some form of 'market' inside a socialist culture. In our model we base the system on a Commons, which is the socially shared set of resources reclaimed from 'private property' or primitive accumulation, etc...

Once the Commons is guaranteed, and the politics made democratic as constitutional communism, the issue of markets becomes secondary: we can do with or without, who cares as long as socialist axioms prevail, or at least pervade. Our 'capitalists' can become social entrepreneurs and license resources from the Commons. There is no reason a former capitalist can't manage resources now in the Commons after the fashion of a 'market' of some kind (or druther). The number of possible innovations here is very large and we can simply bypass the 'rabble of Ludwig Mises' trying to cavil the calculation debate.

Our democratic system has many versions: in one version we have a four party state: a party of communist originals who are guardians of the Commons, own no private property and are 'ascetics of socialism'. They have the power severely limited of simply acting as figureheads but with the power to safeguard against counter-revolution. This higher party would have no rights to intervene in the overall function of the system, and it would also be a guardian of civil rights (along with a system of courts and checks and balances).

Civil liberties within a communist context would be fundamental...

This system needs to solve the 'working class' aspiration to economic rights from the start. But it must also consider the coming 'impossible' world of degrowth, ecological limits, etc...

A parliament of a triad of parties includes two relative opposites and a third dialectical 'party' that can spawn new parties to replace elements of the basic dyad.

The issues of ecological socialism are fundamental and regulated by ecological courts. The economic system is triple, another triad, planned sectors, a socialist market sector, and a third lower indifference level system of disparate elements, a let go as an 'anarchist' potential, farms, shops, agencies, ngo's, etc...Anything that becomes large scale enters the larger system...etc... Half the problems with 'capitalism' are solvable by simple regulation. Our 'market' sector would be thus highly regulated, yet able to function in many ways like a market...etc...

This system must unlike previous models here be able to both set an international AND create a 'socialism in one country' (more or less). That way, a viable global communism can built itself piece meal, and/or generate a revolutionary globalization.

This system could have Big Chief Eagle Feather as head of state, or even the queen of England (since the brits will soon follow suit here in the International), or both, who cares?

Kant, history, and a challenge

September 6th, 2018 ·

It is essential to get past the 'end of history' morass and move beyond historical materialism and Hegel: A far superior method based on Kant's original essay on history, or Kant's Challenge, can transform awareness. This can bypass the end of history confusion by looking at the question from another angle. The online netbook is perhaps too simple, but it contains the basic issue in systems analysis form. Hegel 'Spirit' in history is too mystical. The basic issue is stated more directly using the 'macro model'. We see 'freedom emergence' in history in that context. Historical materialism has mis-stated the issue here also. It is a hopeless muddle that has confused every generation of Marxists and made them a closed cult defending the muddle ad infinitum. Time to drop it and try a new perspective.

Last and First Men also states the issues clearly: last-and-first-men.com

It is almost impossible to decipher the 'end of history' meme. The model in WHEE is more useful and never really deals with the 'end of history'.

Instead it answers the questions asked by Kant in his short essay. The model of the eonic effect gives an elegant and highly suggestive solution to the questions asked by Kant. The solution given in the eonic or macro model is so simple and elegant that it simply sails by the complexity of Hegel to Kojeve to Fukuyama. None of that really clarifies Kant's basic challenge. It might suggest one of the meanings sometimes given, as the entry to a new epoch. I don't know. Or it might instead be taken as a discourse related to another: the timeless aspect of a teleological system. The macro system 'touches' the directionality of world history in terms of the intermittent action of its basic driver, the 'end' in a pun on 'ends' as 'goals'. But that is a bit speculative. The whole muddle of the 'end of history' is too opaque to determine much of anything.

The eonic model answers directly to each of the main issues of Kant's essay, ignoring the rest (it is not a commentary on that essay). Part of Hegel's problem was that, as Kant warned, the issue of his challenge was premature. The world would have to wait for more data. And that is correct: we live now in the first generation to have enough data to see the solution to what Kant wondered about.

The basic solution to the question of a progress to a civil constitution is implicit in the model in its 'discrete freedom sequence'. But the simple point is that the stunning emergence of democratic revolutions in the early modern is confusing us a little. I have criticized marxists but they alone analyzed this and came up with the charge of bourgeois revolution. And everyone forgets that the first 'democratic' (power to the people) revolutions in the early modern was Munzer's Peasant Revolt with its 'communist theme': communism came BEFORE what we call democracy. In fact democracy, pace Locke, rapidly downshifted in the worst case of the 'democratic' revolution, the decidedly bourgeois revolution of the Americans, who compromised on slavery! We

don't often realize this outcome was close to a fraud, even as it created a large-scale mockup of a democratic something. But a closer look shows not only Munzer (and the ambiguous bourgeois Luther) but the English Civil War with its near-Cambrian profusion of potential in the many 'queer' profound experimental movements, Levelers, Diggers, ... Let us recall the ambiguity of Locke as a counter-revolutionary. The analysis of such as Marx and Engels here is appropriate, and they saw that 'democracy' in this outcome was problematical, as it had been in Athens.

What is the solution in terms of the 'eonic model'? There is none: the macro system spawns on one level a kind of ideal abstraction and the first glimpse of this is communist!! The whole nexus devolves into realization as a crude form of democratic yet elitist Frankenstein that ended up in the Civil War, and which was always vulnerable to usurpation by the capitalist class.....etc..

The action of the 'end of history' is really an abstraction we look back on from our present. We shouldn't use the term in this model. The eonic model is very clear: after the phase of system action generating the modern transition the system defaults back to free agency, which means we are on our own. A first costly experiment to fix 'bourgeois democracy' as 'real communist democracy' was a train wreck, and is Strike One, bolshevism, in the new era in realization. In antiquity, after the axial age the whole system simply declined from its height, and never recovered. Will that happen again? Looking at the fiasco of current American 'democracy' is not grounds for optimism. We need to ready for a base hit and not Strike Two at a moment of crisis when the capitalist usurpation as 'bourgeois democracy' from 'bourgeois revolution' has now produced a calamity of a system of markets that cannot respond to climate change. The idea of capitalism as the 'end of history' in this sense is a semantic calamity, and a social apocalypse in the making. But the problem is ours to solve. It is a practical question of a revolution, a new economic system, a postliberal system of freedom and rights, and a possibly transitional system of hard authority to lay the foundations of a system received from the 'expropriation of the bourgeoisie'. We need to get cracking with a practical set of blueprints. It is not longer 'revolution first'. 'Revolution first' has already failed. We need a sense of a global/national federation of socialist republics, this time with something better than the fiasco called out as Strike One. But willy nilly events will prove Marx right in a way: we must respond to the situation that arises, which could be chaos globally at four degrees of temperature rise. The bourgeoisie failing action will soon be castled in air-conditioned bunkers ruling over mass genocide.

Use my model, it is much simpler and the verdict is simpler: the moment to construct a new postcapitalist system is at hand. Nothing in Hegel, Kojeve, or Fukuyama says anything against this. There is no end of history. Look at classical antiquity in the Occident. It went into decline that slowly but surely ended in a medieval period. Then the macro system jumpstarted a new beginning, right on schedule in the fifteenth century (often confused with the Renaissance, which was something else). That action is long since over, and we are on our own. The American system is pretty much as Marx predicted. With the invention of the CIA the system has mutated into an enigma of crime,

empire, covert ops, and political lunatics. Such a fast decay over a mere two centuries is another puzzle.

The real mystery of evolution

September 5th, 2018 ·

Although we have been critical of Bennett's thinking here it is useful to cite this author as a reminder to naive theological design proponents of the complexity of the whole question of design and that theistic injections almost invariably confuse the issue.

The real issue with Bennett is not theism but the nature of the space-time model (or lack of one) that stands behind his brilliant but odd idea of 'hyparxis' in his triple dimensions of time: time, eternity, hyparxis. This was new age spooky physics before its time and while Bennett's thinking probably nosedives it is true that he well realized the problems physics is now having.

Bennett is one of the few people who grasped that some kind of form factor, to cite our own term used here to point to evolutionary intangibles, stands behind the (teleological) spectacle of speciation which so confusingly moves between design and the environmental adaptation that blends two modes out of the larger directionality of evolution.

There is nothing simple about 'evolution' and its real elucidation remains for a science of the future.

Hyparxis, and evolution in a nutshell?
April 18th, 2018 ·

This quote is from an older post

The question of hyparxis, at the risk of a botch of Bennett's far more complex account, might be considered with an analogy: a writer has the plan in mind for a book, but this is still potential, and by analog 'timeless/spaceless'. As he moves to compose the book the realization is an interaction of the potential idea with a temporal actualization and a series of parallel and/or sequential drafts, in a discontinuous series and or discontinuous set of alternates or drafts. The interaction of time and eternity is via the hyparchic dimension as just this discontinuous series as the book takes shape in a directional and willed action of creative writing. Early drafts suffer issues of quality and the cyclical hyparxis interaction with the potential generates an uphill qualitative transformation.

Note: this sounds like a creationist account on the surface, since the ‘writer’ is a kind of creator. But in fact it is not: the ‘will’ in this account is taken up into a far more complicated system of cosmic triads and the ‘human will’ could never be taken directly either as an absolute analog or as a reference to an evolved entity such as man.

The hyparchic regulator: evolutionary form factors in a timeless dimension?

April 18th, 2018 ·

If you want to overdose on Bennett consider the below. However I do not endorse so much as suggest ‘brain stretching’ with a new age mystic who knew more physics than most physicists...

JG Bennett on speciation, individuality, eight term systems...a warning biology is probably not even remotely close to a theory of evolution

September 27th, 2016 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=darwin+paradigm+shift>

My study of the macro effect is a good introduction to the real problems with theories of evolution. But it doesn’t go far enough. It is hard to go farther, because we don’t see what is behind the phenomenological surface of what the eonic model exposes as outer evidence of a deep dynamic. But it is clear what is missing, a mysterious form factor and its intermittent action over the course of history. I have used Schopenhauer to try and help here and this might imply that there is a timeless (and spaceless) component to the macro sequence.

I had a funny experience yesterday after writing the post above at the link: I suddenly realized I had rediscovered J.G.Bennett’s core idea for an account of evolution, if we can apply the term to his thinking. I went back to read the last arcane sections of Vol I of his *The Dramatic Universe*, which I hadn’t read in many years, and found, presto, a version, far more sophisticated, of my basic suspicion about the eonic effect. However Bennett went off the deep end as to world history and muddled his work. The eonic model is far superior there...

In a nutshell (it would take a hundred page account to really explain his theory) Bennett has a new view of space time with three temporal dimensions, time, eternity, and hyparxis, the later being the interaction of time and eternity. That seems nonsense from the get go but one might at least try to follow his idea: after, the noumenal would be beyond space time and modern physics is getting uncomfortably close to ‘happening’s that transcend space time, spooky physics... The eternity dimension (his account is very complex and uses a framework like that of general relativity) often expresses a timeless pattern in relation to the temporal dimension. Bennett constructs an ingenious and useful ‘systematics’ of n-term systems and moves to apply this to three domains in nature: the hyponomic, autonomic, and hypernomic. He has a fancy version of ancient Samkhya with a version of ‘hyperdialectic’, which is like the law of three forces in Ouspensky, except far superior. But it is a drastic conjecture. However it resolves the problem with

evolution by showing how the life realm (autonomic) emerges as the ‘reconciliation’ or third aspect (not unlike the Marxist negation of the negation) of the active hypernomic and the passive hyponomic. Bennett’s n-term systems convincingly rise along a cascade of complex entities from a groundstate ‘hyle’ to corpuscles, particles, 0, 1, 2 term systems, ‘things’ or four term systems (from hydrogen, an elementary ‘thing’ to pieces of wood), to e.g. viruses (five term) to cells (six term) to organisms (seven term) to the concluding level of ‘individuality’ (eight term) systems. Man is a partial (or failed) organism version of an individualizing organism. But beyond that Bennett most ingeniously constructs the level of the biosphere as a complex entity that regulates the level of speciation: in this account the species is an eight term system, and speciation occurs in a very complex (and not quite clear) relationship to the biosphere.

Here’s the kicker: we see that ‘evolutionary’ processes are keyed by a timeless pattern in the eternity mediated by the ‘hyparchic regulator’. I wouldn’t have the foggiest at what that meant, until I realized I had rediscovered a variant in the way the eonic effect shows a timeless aspect interacting in time with a discrete series that seem to show action from the hyparchic future.

I must have botched Bennett’s complicated systematics, but the point is clear enough in a gist.

I have a rule, to leave the eonic model alone and not attempt to apply add ons. But there would be no harm in a separate book dealing with this (I had some intimations of this in the Conclusion to Enigma of the Axial Age).

Such an explanation wouldn’t even enter the consciousness of those now in the realm of Darwinian scientism. It would be factored out of discussion at once as new age goop. But while there isn’t a sufficient scientific basis for Bennett’s framework it is carefully thought out by someone who was a master of modern physics, general relativity, Kaluza/Klein stuff, and much more.

A species thus requires something far more than what biology has now. But is there any way to redo this material along the lines of science? The closest science can come to this scheme of time is in the still gestating spooky physics of nonlocality, etc... So science is proceeding apace. But the failure to distinguish the hyponomic from the autonomic and the total absence of a conception of the hypernomic is what has left biology in the sterile wilds of scientism.

The level of individuality as the real potential of man is worth the price of the book in discussions scattered against the immense undergrowth of four volumes of reasoning of someone with an IQ of 200 (and a lot of blind spots). But the material is important and the scattered chestnuts remarkable, and in this case unnerving: man is a degenerate octopotent being regressed to the septempotent level as creature potentially an ‘individual’ (the octopotent level) who was failed to complete this stage. A remarkable insight into the human struggle.

The real mystery of evolution

September 5th, 2018 ·

Although we have been critical of Bennett's thinking here it is useful to cite this author as a reminder to naive theological design proponents of the complexity of the whole question of design and that theistic injections almost invariably confuse the issue.

The real issue with Bennett is not theism but the nature of the space-time model (or lack of one) that stands behind his brilliant but odd idea of 'hyparxis' in his triple dimensions of time: time, eternity, hyparxis. This was new age spooky physics before its time and while Bennett's thinking probably nosedives it is true that he well realized the problems physics is now having.

Bennett is one of the few people who grasped that some kind of form factor, to cite our own term used here to point to evolutionary intangibles, stands behind the (teleological) spectacle of speciation which so confusingly moves between design and the environmental adaptation that blends two modes out of the larger directionality of evolution.

There is nothing simple about 'evolution' and its real elucidation remains for a science of the future.

Hyparxis, and evolution in a nutshell?
April 18th, 2018 ·

This quote is from an older post

The question of hyparxis, at the risk of a botch of Bennett's far more complex account, might be considered with an analogy: a writer has the plan in mind for a book, but this is still potential, and by analog 'timeless/spaceless'. As he moves to compose the book the realization is an interaction of the potential idea with a temporal actualization and a series of parallel and/or sequential drafts, in a discontinuous series and or discontinuous set of alternates or drafts. The interaction of time and eternity is via the hyparchic dimension as just this discontinuous series as the book takes shape in a directional and willed action of creative writing. Early drafts suffer issues of quality and the cyclical hyparxis interaction with the potential generates an uphill qualitative transformation.

Note: this sounds like a creationist account on the surface, since the 'writer' is a kind of creator. But in fact it is not: the 'will' in this account is taken up into a far more complicated system of cosmic triads and the 'human will' could never be taken directly either as an absolute analog or as a reference to an evolved entity such as man.

The hyparchic regulator: evolutionary form factors in a timeless dimension?

April 18th, 2018 ·

If you want to overdose on Bennett consider the below. However I do not endorse so much as suggest 'brain stretching' with a new age mystic who knew more physics than most physicists...

JG Bennett on speciation, individuality, eight term systems...a warning biology is probably not even remotely close to a theory of evolution

September 27th, 2016 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=darwin+paradigm+shift>

My study of the macro effect is a good introduction to the real problems with theories of evolution. But it doesn't go far enough. It is hard to go farther, because we don't see what is behind the phenomenological surface of what the eonic model exposes as outer evidence of a deep dynamic. But it is clear what is missing, a mysterious form factor and its intermittent action over the course of history. I have used Schopenhauer to try and help here and this might imply that there is a timeless (and spaceless) component to the macro sequence.

I had a funny experience yesterday after writing the post above at the link: I suddenly realized I had rediscovered J.G.Bennett's core idea for an account of evolution, if we can apply the term to his thinking. I went back to read the last arcane sections of Vol I of his *The Dramatic Universe*, which I hadn't read in many years, and found, presto, a version, far more sophisticated, of my basic suspicion about the eonic effect. However Bennett went off the deep end as to world history and muddled his work. The eonic model is far superior there...

In a nutshell (it would take a hundred page account to really explain his theory) Bennett has a new view of space time with three temporal dimensions, time, eternity, and hyparxis, the later being the interaction of time and eternity. That seems nonsense from the get go but one might at least try to follow his idea: after, the noumenal would be beyond space time and modern physics is getting uncomfortably close to 'happening's that transcend space time, spooky physics... The eternity dimension (his account is very complex and uses a framework like that of general relativity) often expresses a timeless pattern in relation to the temporal dimension. Bennett constructs an ingenious and useful 'systematics' of n-term systems and moves to apply this to three domains in nature: the hyponomic, autonomic, and hypernomic. He has a fancy version of ancient Samkhya with a version of 'hyperdialectic', which is like the law of three forces in Ouspensky, except far superior. But it is a drastic conjecture. However it resolves the problem with evolution by showing how the life realm (autonomic) emerges as the 'reconciliation' or third aspect (not unlike the Marxist negation of the negation) of the active hypernomic and the passive hyponomic. Bennett's n-term systems convincingly rise along a cascade of complex entities from a groundstate 'hyle' to corpuscles, particles, 0, 1, 2 term systems, 'things' or four term systems (from hydrogen, an elementary 'thing' to pieces of

wood), to e.g. viruses (five term) to cells (six term) to organisms (seven term) to the concluding level of 'individuality' (eight term) systems. Man is a partial (or failed) organism version of an individualizing organism. But beyond that Bennett most ingeniously constructs the level of the biosphere as a complex entity that regulates the level of speciation: in this account the species is an eight term system, and speciation occurs in a very complex (and not quite clear) relationship to the biosphere.

Here's the kicker: we see that 'evolutionary' processes are keyed by a timeless pattern in the eternity mediated by the 'hyparchic regulator'. I wouldn't have the foggiest at what that meant, until I realized I had rediscovered a variant in the way the eonic effect shows a timeless aspect interacting in time with a discrete series that seem to show action from the hyparchic future.

I must have botched Bennett's complicated systematics, but the point is clear enough in a gist.

I have a rule, to leave the eonic model alone and not attempt to apply add ons. But there would be no harm in a separate book dealing with this (I had some intimations of this in the Conclusion to Enigma of the Axial Age).

Such an explanation wouldn't even enter the consciousness of those now in the realm of Darwinian scientism. It would be factored out of discussion at once as new age goop. But while there isn't a sufficient scientific basis for Bennett's framework it is carefully thought out by someone who was a master of modern physics, general relativity, Kaluza/Klein stuff, and much much more.

A species thus requires something far more than what biology has now. But is there any way to redo this material along the lines of science? The closest science can come to this scheme of time is in the still gestating spooky physics of nonlocality, etc...So science is proceeding apace. But the failure to distinguish the hyponomic from the autonomic and the total absence of a conception of the hypernomic is what has left biology in the sterile wilds of scientism.

The level of individuality as the real potential of man is worth the price of the book in discussions scattered against the immense undergrowth of four volumes of reasoning of someone with an IQ of 200 (and a lot of blind spots). But the material is important and the scattered chestnuts remarkable, and in this case unnerving: man is a degenerate octopotent being regressed to the septempotent level as creature potentially an 'individual' (the octopotent level) who was failed to complete this stage. A remarkable insight into the human struggle.

Design in history and the falsification of judeo-xtian propaganda

September 5th, 2018 ·

The eonic effect is evidence of a considerable ‘design argument’ but the irony is that the judeo-christian memes of theistic design in history are falsified by this much deeper form of design argument. In fact, the issue of a ‘designer’ is a red herring and the creation of a neo-pagan ‘Jehovah’ in the Israelite tradition was a theological form of propaganda from the start. This myth quite obvious lingers to this day and has become the horrific basis of exploitation and cultural genocide of the Palestinians.

The design in history stands beyond cultural ethnocentric interpretations and points to a universal global culture in formation.

Design argument falsifies theistic historicism
May 9th, 2018 ·

The eonic effect shows the way a design argument falsifies ‘theistic design’ arguments.

WHEE and the design question...//History and Evolution website
September 15th, 2017 ·

The resistance to debriefing natural selection has an ideological component for a capitalist age, but also raises the issue of design with figures like Dawkins (foolishly) explicitly using selectionist arguments to promote atheism, a foolish strategy. The design issue won’t go away,

and Darwinists simply lost the argument. But the ID camp has frittered away its victory on religious issues, maybe...the issue of design in history muddles the logic of most in the ID camp, although the Dembski/Behe version is free of this, it appears. The issue of design raises perfectly good scientific questions that science must finally address but so far cannot do so. The question of design is teleological, the issue of ‘god’ simply up in the air, and as early as Kant the question of teleology and biology was raised explicitly as a warning about Newtonian physics. This correction to reductionist thinking was long long ago: two centuries later we are still stuck on a point that an amateur, as here, has the upper hand on the question! But no one has produced a real theory of evolution, certainly not the ID camp...

World History and the Eonic Effect (online at site, free PDF or Amazon hardback/Kindle) is a good way to tackle the missing pieces of the design puzzle, useful for tackling the question of a directed system. The material is a reminder that the problem remains unsolved because we don’t full observe ‘evolution’ in deep time or in history.

But we can track it, and infer the reality of a mysterious ‘form factor’. We end also by considering the claims for ‘fine tuning’, and a cosmic aspect to the emergence of life...

Source: History and Evolution

The necessity of a ‘critical marxism’

September 5th, 2018 ·

<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>

We have proposed a series of ways we can use the eonic model without getting involved in theory or speculation. At some point we might try a theory, but in the end we are given everything we need to proceed in practical terms without having to fully explain the eonic effect.

And if we consider the confusion the Israelites generated with the Old Testament account of the Axial Age we would do well to proceed with caution as to the generalization of the eonic model. We have to face the fact that we will be condemned to make a mess of this data if it becomes the object of unrestrained speculation. But there are a host of simple and practical uses of this kind of model and it can be a way to create a superset of the Marxist/socialist legacy. We can do this easily because Marxism and socialism are output of this system, late effects near the divide point, and thus have a special status. But they may also be instantly flawed results. We can take Marxism as an historical object and move to incorporate it in a larger and more flexible framework of the eonic model which suggests that a postcapitalist outcome, or else a critique and regulation of such, is desperately needed and clearly indicated by the pattern we have discovered.

We are out of time to replace Marxism but unless we do we will inherit another flawed version of postcapitalism that is vitiated by inadequate theories. This is very easy to correct but does the left have the will to do this?

Let us proceed as if marxism is obsolete but relatively easy to upgrade with variants of the eonic model, that is, no model at all, but a chronology with structure detectable empirically and with indications as ‘eonic emergents’ (e.g. the innovations of modernity) given as such with or without explanations. In the end we need to stay free of too much theory and the legacy of both historical materialism and neoclassical economics are both liabilities. Our manifestos suggest a form of praxis with a time line model of the eonic effect in the background as a possible tool and most of all a warning that it is very hard to get history straight. Neither Marx nor the economists succeeded there. But the legacy of Marx points to something desperately needed: a challenge to unrestrained capitalism whose effect has suddenly shown itself to be a terminal catastrophe in the onset of climate change...

The real mystery of evolution

September 5th, 2018 ·

Although we have been critical of Bennett's thinking here it is useful to cite this author as a reminder to naive theological design proponents of the complexity of the whole question of design and that theistic injections almost invariably confuse the issue.

The real issue with Bennett is not theism but the nature of the space-time model (or lack of one) that stands behind his brilliant but odd idea of 'hyparxis' in his triple dimensions of time: time, eternity, hyparxis. This was new age spooky physics before its time and while Bennett's thinking probably nosedives it is true that he well realized the problems physics is now having.

Bennett is one of the few people who grasped that some kind of form factor, to cite our own term used here to point to evolutionary intangibles, stands behind the (teleological) spectacle of speciation which so confusingly moves between design and the environmental adaptation that blends two modes out of the larger directionality of evolution.

There is nothing simple about 'evolution' and its real elucidation remains for a science of the future.

Hyparxis, and evolution in a nutshell?
April 18th, 2018 ·

This quote is from an older post

The question of hyparxis, at the risk of a botch of Bennett's far more complex account, might be considered with an analogy: a writer has the plan in mind for a book, but this is still potential, and by analog 'timeless/spaceless'. As he moves to compose the book the realization is an interaction of the potential idea with a temporal actualization and a series of parallel and/or sequential drafts, in a discontinuous series and or discontinuous set of alternates or drafts. The interaction of time and eternity is via the hyparchic dimension as just this discontinuous series as the book takes shape in a directional and willed action of creative writing. Early drafts suffer issues of quality and the cyclical hyparxis interaction with the potential generates an uphill qualitative transformation.

Note: this sounds like a creationist account on the surface, since the 'writer' is a kind of creator. But in fact it is not: the 'will' in this account is taken up into a far more complicated system of cosmic triads and the 'human will' could never be taken directly either as an absolute analog or as a reference to an evolved entity such as man.

The hyparchic regulator: evolutionary form factors in a timeless dimension?

April 18th, 2018 ·

If you want to overdose on Bennett consider the below. However I do not endorse so much as suggest 'brain stretching' with a new age mystic who knew more physics than most physicists...

JG Bennett on speciation, individuality, eight term systems...a warning biology is probably not even remotely close to a theory of evolution

September 27th, 2016 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=darwin+paradigm+shift>

My study of the macro effect is a good introduction to the real problems with theories of evolution. But it doesn't go far enough. It is hard to go farther, because we don't see what is behind the phenomenological surface of what the eonic model exposes as outer evidence of a deep dynamic. But it is clear what is missing, a mysterious form factor and its intermittent action over the course of history. I have used Schopenhauer to try and help here and this might imply that there is a timeless (and spaceless) component to the macro sequence.

I had a funny experience yesterday after writing the post above at the link: I suddenly realized I had rediscovered J.G.Bennett's core idea for an account of evolution, if we can apply the term to his thinking. I went back to read the last arcane sections of Vol I of his *The Dramatic Universe*, which I hadn't read in many years, and found, presto, a version, far more sophisticated, of my basic suspicion about the eonic effect. However Bennett went off the deep end as to world history and muddled his work. The eonic model is far superior there...

In a nutshell (it would take a hundred page account to really explain his theory) Bennett has a new view of space time with three temporal dimensions, time, eternity, and hyparxis, the later being the interaction of time and eternity. That seems nonsense from the get go but one might at least try to follow his idea: after, the noumenal would be beyond space time and modern physics is getting uncomfortably close to 'happening's that transcend space time, spooky physics... The eternity dimension (his account is very complex and uses a framework like that of general relativity) often expresses a timeless pattern in relation to the temporal dimension. Bennett constructs an ingenious and useful 'systematics' of n-term systems and moves to apply this to three domains in nature: the hyponomic, autonomic, and hypernomic. He has a fancy version of ancient Samkhya with a version of 'hyperdialectic', which is like the law of three forces in Ouspensky, except far superior. But it is a drastic conjecture. However it resolves the problem with evolution by showing how the life realm (autonomic) emerges as the 'reconciliation' or third aspect (not unlike the Marxist negation of the negation) of the active hypernomic and the passive hyponomic. Bennett's n-term systems convincingly rise along a cascade of complex entities from a groundstate 'hyle' to corpuscles, particles, 0, 1, 2 term systems, 'things' or four term systems (from hydrogen, an elementary 'thing' to pieces of

wood), to e.g. viruses (five term) to cells (six term) to organisms (seven term) to the concluding level of ‘individuality’ (eight term) systems. Man is a partial (or failed) organism version of an individualizing organism. But beyond that Bennett most ingeniously constructs the level of the biosphere as a complex entity that regulates the level of speciation: in this account the species is an eight term system, and speciation occurs in a very complex (and not quite clear) relationship to the biosphere.

Here’s the kicker: we see that ‘evolutionary’ processes are keyed by a timeless pattern in the eternity mediated by the ‘hyparchic regulator’. I wouldn’t have the foggiest at what that meant, until I realized I had rediscovered a variant in the way the eonic effect shows a timeless aspect interacting in time with a discrete series that seem to show action from the hyparchic future.

I must have botched Bennett’s complicated systematics, but the point is clear enough in a gist.

I have a rule, to leave the eonic model alone and not attempt to apply add ons. But there would be no harm in a separate book dealing with this (I had some intimations of this in the Conclusion to Enigma of the Axial Age).

Such an explanation wouldn’t even enter the consciousness of those now in the realm of Darwinian scientism. It would be factored out of discussion at once as new age goop. But while there isn’t a sufficient scientific basis for Bennett’s framework it is carefully thought out by someone who was a master of modern physics, general relativity, Kaluza/Klein stuff, and much much more.

A species thus requires something far more than what biology has now. But is there any way to redo this material along the lines of science? The closest science can come to this scheme of time is in the still gestating spooky physics of nonlocality, etc...So science is proceeding apace. But the failure to distinguish the hyponomic from the autonomic and the total absence of a conception of the hypernomic is what has left biology in the sterile wilds of scientism.

The level of individuality as the real potential of man is worth the price of the book in discussions scattered against the immense undergrowth of four volumes of reasoning of someone with an IQ of 200 (and a lot of blind spots). But the material is important and the scattered chestnuts remarkable, and in this case unnerving: man is a degenerate octopotent being regressed to the septempotent level as creature potentially an ‘individual’ (the octopotent level) who was failed to complete this stage. A remarkable insight into the human struggle.

Restating first principles on the left

September 4th, 2018 ·

The Marxist left often fails to see how they curdle thinking with associations that invoke a nightmare vision in a general public successfully brainwashed by massive doses of neoliberal hype.

The solution in principle is simple: restate the proposition in simple language without using Marxist jargon or any references to Marx and make sure the project of socialism/communism is a vehicle to produce democracy, real democracy. In addition the whole question of populist economics needs to be solved at a stroke. The result can and should be highly popular and able to inspire once again a mass following. But the past needs to be dropped and the Marxist left needs a new discipline: a novel speech without the classic boilerplate...

The move beyond stale Marxism
April 4th, 2015 ·

I think a future communist left has to completely leave behind the Marxist-Leninist corpus. The prejudice and negative memory is too great. There is absolutely no reason why discourse can't assemble the history of Marxism, select certain ideas for development and restatement, and yet move into a new and fresh statement of what is relevant and active.

The overall corpus is potent yet flawed, and almost everyone will resist anything like a Leninist repetition. And yet in the end, it will tend to veer towards that. We need to really answer the 'end of history' question, and that is not easy. And yet it is fairly clear in principle: communism emerges from democracy so that democracy can emerge from communism.

We should do what older leftists refused to do: plan in advance and create what Marx disliked: versions of 'blueprint communism' that we can assess in advance, and make the basis of intent in communicating to skeptical majorities.

There are many weak spots in Marx's thinking. We need to move past the 'holy founder' fallacy that has come to animate the left, where any critique of Marx/marxism is buried at once in jargon rehash.

But the core of Marxism is reasonable enough and could survive handily a 'translation' into a framework larger than historical materialism. The latter attempts to make some very extreme speculative claims about a theory applied to world history. Such theories are almost always false: instead the general drift of economic determination in history and modernity would be enough.

Cross-examining history

September 4th, 2018 ·

R48G: a new approach to history: the eonic effect as a series of questions...
December 6th, 2017 ·

We have discussed many times the problems with historical materialism, and historical theories in general.

A way out is to consider a set of hypotheses in the form of a series of opposites e.g. is historical teleological, etc...

We can force ourselves to examine the historical record very carefully without necessarily having to commit ourselves on a brittle theory

This can also be a warning that perspectives on history will be someone's propaganda. Requiring a critique and exist strategy.

The eonic model is useful because it can't be turned into a theory, forces one to study history, and study it in a balanced examination of all periods and times...

R48G: the eonic model as a set of questions...
October 28th, 2017 ·

The eonic model is useful because it cogently isolates a non-random pattern in world history but leaves it as is, open to interpretation and practical use as an outline based empirically. The more elaborate model can be left as set of questions and a warning that no one gets history straight...these questions can themselves take the place of the complicated model:

What is the non-random pattern in world history?

What is a non-random pattern?

does it show evidence of a dynamic?

what is the significance of the 'transitions' that create the pattern?

does the pattern suggest a series of epochs or world eras?

are these intervals equal in length, what is the frequency?

if the pattern is only visible since the invention of writing what hypothesis can we make about earlier periods?

Do the transitions in the pattern suggest 'discontinuity'?

what is the resemblance of this pattern to 'punctuated equilibrium'?

what was the 'axial age' and what is its place in the non-random pattern?

what does the term 'evolution' mean and does it apply to this pattern?

is the term 'evolution' a synonym for 'development'?

what does the pattern suggest about non-random patterns in deep time?

does the pattern show meta-genetic 'evolution'?

what is the relation of history and evolution?
 can we deduce the pattern from the logic of history emerging from evolution?
 is the pattern deterministic or does free agency enter as a variable?
 how does free agency or 'free action' interact with system action?
 does free agency alternate with system action?
 can we deduce the pattern from a root idea of the 'evolution of freedom'?
 can the idea of 'self-consciousness' be used to describe the changing character of free agency under system action?
 how does the pattern relate to the histories of economy and technology?
 are economy and technology continuously creative where the pattern is creatively discontinuous?
 If the pattern shows discontinuities what happens at their endpoints?
 does the nature of free agency change at the end of the discontinuities?
 what does the pattern suggest about 'medieval periods'?
 if the pattern acts when unobserved what will happen as the pattern is discovered and observed?

that's enough: as is evident the questions themselves can take the place of a speculative theory: but we should formalize any number of interpretations and weigh the evidence most of all these questions force us to study world history and the bibliography here is quite considerable!

You can stand back from eonic model, but it enforces examination of the whole of world history //3.5 A New Model of History: Eonic Evolution

We have tried to create a super simple version of the 'eonic effect' and its model, but it is worth considering the larger model: the three sections 3.5, 3.51, 3.52, from WHEE give an overall sense of that model and its mysterious complexity, yet transparent outer effect. This model explains why so many have thought history has a spiritual aspect lost in 'materialist' explanations. It is true, although we have long since moved beyond such terms as 'spiritual' in a universal materialism closer to Kant than Marx (with echoes of J.G. Bennett), but able to recast the core them of marxism in a new form. This model is able to easily deal with issues of religion and equally their critique in a way that makes secular humanists look clubfooted... You can even critique this model but you are left with a device that forces you to examine the whole of world history in detail, mission accomplished.

Source: 3.5 A New Model of History: Eonic Evolution

A system of epochs done right....

August 30th, 2018 ·

The eonic effect shows the very simple (and still mysterious) solution to the question of historical epochs: there is a long and a short version, the long is speculative but strongly suggested, the short is right under our noses as an empirical given: the era beginning with Egypt/Sumer ca. 3000 BCE, the era beginning in proximate antiquity, and the rise of the modern...: this is pegged around a series of transitions, which some may find too speculative. In fact, we need to explain why these epochs begin with so much creative innovation. The sequence is challenged by the seeming Eurocentrism of the modern transition: there is a very logical reason for this, if you care to pursue the material: http://history-and-evolution.com/whee4th/chap3_5_3.htm

Here are your 'epochs', or simple intervals, if you don't like the term 'epoch'. We need more data for the first three, but in fact these are the only candidates for any such progression of epochs: either there are no such epochs, or the list starts roughly with these three. This can be taken as a falsifiable hypothesis. These are 'relative' transformations (like the annual tree rings in a tree) and there are no visible absolute beginnings, leaving us to wonder about the Paleolithic.

Transition 1 ?Mesolithic transitions

Transition 2 ?Proximate start of Neolithic ca. -8000

Transition 3 ?The Middle Neolithic interval ca. -5400

Transition 4: The birth of civilization, interval before -3000

Transition 5: The 'Axial' period, interval before -600

Transition 6: The early modern, interval before 1800

Note that this sequence has a trick to it: the translations occur at ca. 2400 year intervals.

Stunning, but we don't know why...It must be a significant clue... The term 'birth of civilization' is really a placeholder: 'civilization' is really a creation of the 'Neolithic', etc,...However, the Sumerian 'transition' was a stunningly creative one...

You can take this list and throw it against the wall: try and refute it, by all means. But the final three epochs are really a no-brainer. For whatever reason we see three obvious 'eras': the succession to Egypt/Sumer, the succession to the axial interval, and now the succession to the modern transition, now a global oikoumene.

You can try and set your own periodization but the likelihood it will not work as well as this one, whose great virtue is a kind of simplicity (compounded by a mystery).

Where did Marx go wrong? He confused feudalism with the medieval period (Middle Ages!) of the second epoch, and capitalism with the rise of the modern epoch. We can't confuse epochs and economic systems, it confuses the question.

We are confronted with a modernity slanted toward capitalism, but we can transform that

modernity into a socialist outcome. It is not surprising that attempts to do so, so far, failed: they miscalculated the dynamic they were dealing with (Marxists).

There is a simpler solution to the issues: reconstruct the democratic revolutions around a socialist foundation, precisely what all parties said from the beginning until they got confused by theory. We don't need a theory of history to do that. That is very different from saying that capitalism must continue till it exhausts its potential, to be followed by communism. Such a notion is pernicious.

Socialism is without meaning until you construct such a social system, with an economy. Marx tended to think that there would be a total transformation beyond markets. Doesn't look like it. In our model, we consider 'markets' under the condition of a Commons, no private property (that is large-scale capital, your personal teddy bears are not the issue, etc...)

The most probable outcome is what we see in proximate antiquity: decline into a medieval period. (A close look shows 'declines' of various kinds in the wake of Egypt/Sumer, perhaps: consider the centuries ca. 1500 BCE onward, but there is still creative potential going on, it is a mixed situation, but nothing like the explosion of early Sumer, etc...)

Our pattern of epochs has a complication: the axial age shows parallel global action, very dumbfounding. We can't produce a theory of this mysterious system. But we shouldn't propose useless theories as a substitute.

If socialism is going to happen it will happen in the context of this system, and all that means is that socialism is a modern conception. That's it (there were of course many proto-communists in early Greece!)

This eonic effect is the obvious way to reform the Marxist confusion, but the result needs to be left to an empirical history so we stay within the bounds of reasonable interpretation.

Note that here capitalism and socialism are not in a sequence but synchronous: that actually makes sense. A socialist (communist) foundation but some solution to the question of economy (which may or may not have vestigial transforms of so-called 'markets').

Debriefing historical delusion
December 12th, 2017 ·

R48G: detecting historical dynamics...the eonic effect as a test of the data of world history...
June 23rd, 2017 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=eonic+effect>

We have often discussed the 'eonic effect' as an alternate historical framework.

Actually it not a completed theory or even a definite framework: rather, it works as a ‘test of the data’. We make a series of assumptions about history but fail to see how beyond religious historicism the field of modern scientism does no better. One might consider the way that a kind of orthodoxy is enforced by the new field of Big History which completely misses the point.

The eonic effect can be taken as a series of warnings: as we try to apply various models to world history we discover the unexpected, contrast of discrete and continuous processes. This is an empirical given, whatever we make of it. We can use the ‘model’ as a warning to be wary of dogmatic theories and simply operate with chronicles and empirical histories. It is also a warning that causal systematics just won’t work on history and that we must deal with free agents who are in a kind of hybrid state in a larger mix, partly causal but probably teleological. We cannot reduce this complexity to simplistic analyses of the type of historical materialism (or neo-classical economic models). One value of the eonic model is that the condition of historical determination operating on free agents is intermittent and subject to a end phase where the ‘eonic effects’ cease and free agents are bound to try and take over their own history. That’s a huge and dangerous task, and a new left must be able to operate via all categories, not just the economic. The eonic effect is a warning that virtually all parties have gotten history wrong. We must operate on the defensive and try to operate with a non-dogmatic constructivist practice. The eonic model is probably too exotic for brain-dead Marxist but it can at least suggest wariness about overly complex analyses that are soon millstones around one’s neck.

R48G: global warming as grounds for revolutionary ecological socialism...

August 10th, 2018 ·

We are almost at the Gaian endgame: we need a revolutionary movement reborn from the internationals of the twentieth century, able to create a complete break with that past without frittering away the opportunity in facile reformism and yet not smothered in Marxist dogmas.

The perspective on the working class is shifting toward the question of the environment and the planet. Some form of neo-communism can be taken to solve the problem of social democracy by fiat within a structure of the communism, create a platform of socialist populism and be done once and for all with the economic equality problem: something far more difficult has come over the horizon: climate disaster, ecological socialism as a priority, degrowth economics and lifeboat socialism.

Such a situation needs immediate consideration because the Stalinists are lurking in the background, along with the ‘air conditioned bunker’ capitalist remnants in waiting.

Our twin manifestos offer a one-state solution in the context of a new international in a post-Marxist gear...

Modernity, revolution and postcapitalism...
December 14th, 2017 ·

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=The+Crisis+of+Modernity_ver6.pdf
<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>

Our discussions today reinvoke our discussions of modernity and revolution with a focus on the possibility of postcapitalism.

There is nothing simple about this and we have suggested a hybrid in our manifestos that evades the ‘utopian’ fallacy with a combination of democratic/republican politics, blended market and planned economic organization and a ‘dialectical’ balance counterpoint in an autonomous low threshold semi-anarchist sector. A ‘revolution’/transition to such a system would correct the flaws of the misconstrued Russian Bolshevik revolution. Such a transition might be chaotic but the framework would contain that chaos as the system stabilized around a set of ‘communist’ axioms in the idea of the Commons: this system doesn’t pit capitalists against communists so much as create a constitutional version of basic communism that can balance markets and socialism with an experimental transition to postcapitalism... The charge of ‘utopia’ won’t work here because we have carefully remorphed something that we know has worked (in quotation marks): the American republican experiment which morphed into democracy of a kind with a capitalist hybridization never taken into account by the constitutional foundation.

system action, free action...//3.5 A New Model of History: Eonic Evolution

August 7th, 2018 ·

The eonic model always sets a clear distinction of ‘system action’ and ‘free action’ and the result is different from a deterministic system because it points to a field of realization,

and the results may differ from anything predictable. It is like a computer with or without a mouse: the latter shows the factor of ‘free action’ setting a system into a different outcome: we cannot predict, and are forced to write histories of what happened after the fact.

The eonic effect shows in fact several different possibilities: the era of transition shows a relatively high degree of determination, while the other era after the transitions show a relatively high degree of free action, but in the context of that determination. One level sets direction, while another realizes the outcome of that directionality, and may well fail

or change direction. In this system a higher macro effect performs system return in relatively far future to reset direction. Current history is blind to these distinctions, and economic theories ignore such effects. Our free action is not the same as economic action, nor completely distinct. But the larger picture shows something like the difference between a realizable idea, and its realization. But economies are prime candidates for a distinction of system action and free action (the distinctions of macro and microeconomics come close or are a version of that), but, again, this is not the same as the eonic systematics which crosses all boundaries of culture: economics, technology, art, politics, religion, etc... But the eonic effect shows a larger directionality beyond the temporal stream while (as far as we know, economies do not, although Marx considered there was such a directionality???)

An example, completely exotic, of the distinction of system action and free action lies in the history of the tragic genre: the genre seems to show temporal determination in the Greek axial transition, but its realizations are ‘free action’: something seems to invent a genre, while someone, a tragedian, produces examples. We can see just how fast the genre dies out in the wake of the transition, strong evidence for this interpretation. In general if we examine the era of the axial period we see a high degree of system action, while later the result is free action: compare the classic era of Greece Rome and the later decline of the whole occidental system...

We might argue that capitalism in its modern form shows such macro determination. The problem is that the same can be said of communism, which is born at the dawn of the modern transition in the sixteenth century. There is no contradiction in a double determination: the challenge is a kind of dialectic, i.e. a system with socialist but other economic effects, semi-capitalist or otherwise.

Clearly the challenge is simply a viable economic system in the context of socialism. The idea of a permanent phase of ‘capitalism at the end of history’ is gross propaganda. As we must suspect, the macro futurism of the eonic effect can’t be expected to find realization via markets, quite the contrary, the outcome thus is proving highly destructive....

Source: *3.5 A New Model of History: Eonic Evolution*

Marxist scientism, hegel’s revenge and the question of free agency

August 5th, 2018 ·

The left suffered the philosophical misfortune at birth of being caught up in a narrow version of secular humanism, a reductionist view of science, and, due to the hegelian reaction, a fanatical version of materialist rejection of idealism and a rejection of ideas of free will or simply free agency. The left has always been crippled as a result, hegel’s revenge. In addition, despite an initial rejection by marx (evidently replaced with a bluff due to Engels’ influence), a strong adherence to the whole Darwinist pseudo-science. Darwinist bolshevism ended up in genocidal wrath applied to class war, a wretched

outcome. Who cares about the dialectic of materialism and idealism? The left must adopt an invariant stance.

Further, the fact remains that Marx was not a very successful theorist and saddled 'marxism' (ideas of social theory as science were mostly primitive scientism), that cultic name-based celebrity worship of a founder, with a complex of theories that simply don't work.

Lost in this 'materialist' idiocy was the idea that free agents with the will to act were/are the only vehicle to socialism: the idea that capitalism is some stage of history moving inevitably toward communism is simply false and we see the system simply going haywire in our time because it has no real directionality, the fiction of markets producing direction being shown up for what it is.

We cannot assume that social evolution is leading anywhere and can see, if we inject the idea of the eonic effect, that historical directionality is something different.

The system that we see has no set future in the near term, and requires for a socialist outcome the determination of evolutionaries/revolutionaries to construct a version of postcapitalism. That is by no means an easy task and Marxism is simply not capable of producing any such result without going into a hopeless muddle of its own refusal to define what is meant or intended.

To a high probability this Marxist domination will lead to the same Stalinist outcome as before and for that reason the general public senses nothing but danger from the left, abandoning its canon altogether. Marxists are converts to a cult, while social democrats are remnants able to see the danger but apparently unaware of the limits of their evolutionary assumptions.

The factor of revolution was at least clearer to the era of marxism in action (it is entirely possible to 'evolve' toward a constitutional refoundation) but philosophical rigor mortis set in very early and the need to find an overall package that was the object of free agents constructing it was lost to the stale jargon of Marxist dead thinking.

R48G: postcapitalism requires the action of free agents to create it, not passivity in a mechanical system...

August 23rd, 2017 ·

We are caught in the downspiral of what constitutes the 'endgame of capitalism'.

But for some reason the left, under the influence of Marxism, seems unready for the challenge. Part of the reason is the simple inability to attract an audience at this point. In the period of the early internationals the canon of Marx/Engels rapidly spread and created a global audience. Now it appears unable to do so, for reasons that are in a way obvious: the factor of bolshevism is a fatal blight on the legacy. These points are actually obvious, almost clichés, but the solution seems to elude the left, which is mostly a remnant as the majority has moved on. But unfortunately activist groups end up floundering in eclecticism without an organizing framework. And the canon is itself flawed and needs to be recast, a very difficult task that is more likely to produce a confused rendering. We have suggested a new approach: move beyond historical materialism to broader view of

history, eject from 'stages of production' theory to a view of capitalism that is ad hoc, not systematic. There is no stage of history that is capitalist and capitalism was not the prime destroyer of feudalism. Capitalism was simply a striking amplification of the capitalism that had existed since the Neolithic in primitive stages. The point was/is to create a social system that can buffer the new economic processes in an intelligent way. In many ways it is a question creating a real democracy, a system of equality in the context of market economies moving beyond that to a higher synthesis.

A new formulation is needed that doesn't require the constant dogmatic reiteration of blanket Marxism, which doesn't mean that legacy can't be cited. But the left is saddled with endless futile attempts to defend their mistakes. In a way the obsessive celebration of the centennial of the Bolshevik Revolution is a distraction. We need to act as if socialism/communism were being considered for the first time, and to be able to simply shrug when critics point to mistakes/flaws/failures of the older left: the stance should be, not of our doing, and our principles won't lead to a repetition there because our formulation is a new one.

Our formulation here is based on the idea that free agency is a key factor in historical realization. That economic systems don't determine history as such, despite their huge momentum, and that instead of waiting on the 'next epoch' of communism men have to act as free agents to conceive and realize a system that is not letting capitalism to run amok. Calling capitalism a stage of history was a monumental blunder from the start. Rather we should consider that a communist foundation is needed to create democratic equality. We must as free agents design a system that can match those axioms.

It is a fallacy to think the system of capitalism is evolving to communism: we must instead assume we are free agents an act to create a sane future.

<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>

DMNC: reconciling social democracy and real communism

August 2nd, 2018 ·

The left needs a new formulation that can reconcile social democracy and a real communism that is escape from the predetermined failure of social democracy. The social democratic illusion is not such to most of the activist left which is floundering in the alternative with Marxist Bolshevik thinking and falling back into social democratic mess of pottage: this is actually strengthening the trend toward false reformism. And the idea of capitalism as a stage in history leads to a failure to define in advance what can replace it: simply chanting 'communism' has proven a recipe for disaster...

Our 'democratic market neo-communism' creates a complete caesura of thought with respect to both extremes. If the reformist left could at least see a 'reformist' path to a real communism it might actually generate a revolutionary situation. But we can see the way talk of socialism, or the 'our revolution' of sanders is really undermining those terms and making everything refer to a muddle of no significance with any terminology.

<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>
 R48G: capitalism is not a stage of (economic) history: Marxist production theory is misleading and making the problem worse...did Marx/Engels fumble the ball?

April 5th, 2017 ·

http://history-and-evolution.com/whee4th/chap6_3_2.htm“>a href=”http://history-and-evolution.com/whee4th/chap6_3_2.htm”>http://history-and-evolution.com/whee4th/chap6_3_2.htm

The whole emphasis of marxism is confused: the way that capitalism was turned into a stage of history as a stage of production ended up giving it a status it didn't deserve and is one aspect of its persistence in the sense of Marx's concealed bourgeois tendencies assuming this stage of production must exhaust its potential before moving beyond itself, a disastrous gift to the fanatics of capitalist futurism. The potential of this set of fake systems could never be exhausted and the truer circumstance is that this fake stage of history will terminate a planet.

The emergence of 'capitalism' is relative: in a fairly general definition, it goes back to the Neolithic or beyond and is present in all phases of civilization. The equivocation here over capitalism as a modern phenomenon is simply another case of its 'relative' transformations, and the onset of the industrial revolution along with the ideology of such as Adam Smith and the invention of new kinds of financial instruments created the illusion that a new capitalist era had somehow replaced feudalism as a new stage of history.

The study of the eonic effect demonstrates a more complicated picture in which economic systems in various stages and formats are embedded in a larger social context. Marx and Engels understood all this until they misunderstood it with the creation of 'historical materialism'. A more realistic picture is that capitalism is a set of innovations inside a larger system and that its nefarious character, the object of immediate protest, created the need for a new kind of social system that could control its rogue character. Capitalism was always a rogue process and there was never any reason that the whole of humanity was to be subjected to market forces in the name of the laws of history was a gross fallacy and a decided fumble by Marx/Engels.

Marx/Engels were however pretty clear in the 1848 period of the dangers of the situation and the need to act at once to move to a new type of system.

Capitalism: The End

July 31st, 2018 ·

The end of capitalism has begun

December 21st, 2017 ·

Re: [Marxism] Fwd: The end of capitalism has begun | Books | The Guardian
<http://www.marxmail.org/msg132083.html>

Paul Mason writes a long, interesting but wrongheaded article embracing the ideas of John Holloway without mentioning him.

<http://www.theguardian.com/books/2015/jul/17/postcapitalism-end-of-capitalism-begun>

<http://www.theguardian.com/books/2015/jul/17/postcapitalism-end-of-capitalism-begun>
As with the end of feudalism 500 years ago, capitalism's replacement by postcapitalism will be accelerated by external shocks and shaped by the emergence of a new kind of human being. And it has started.

Postcapitalism is possible because of three major changes information technology has brought about in the past 25 years. First, it has reduced the need for work, blurred the edges between work and free time and loosened the relationship between work and wages. The coming wave of automation, currently stalled because our social infrastructure cannot bear the consequences, will hugely diminish the amount of work needed – not just to subsist but to provide a decent life for all.

Second, information is corroding the market's ability to form prices correctly. That is because markets are based on scarcity while information is abundant. The system's defense mechanism is to form monopolies – the giant tech companies – on a scale not seen in the past 200 years, yet they cannot last. By building business models and share valuations based on the capture and privatization of all socially produced information, such firms are constructing a fragile corporate edifice at odds with the most basic need of humanity, which is to use ideas freely.

British capitalism is broken. Here's how to fix it
Read more

Third, we're seeing the spontaneous rise of collaborative production: goods, services and organizations are appearing that no longer respond to the dictates of the market and the managerial hierarchy. The biggest information product in the world – Wikipedia – is made by volunteers for free, abolishing the encyclopedia business and depriving the advertising industry of an estimated \$3bn a year in revenue.

Almost unnoticed, in the niches and hollows of the market system, whole swaths of economic life are beginning to move to a different rhythm. Parallel currencies, time banks, cooperatives and self-managed spaces have proliferated, barely noticed by the economics profession, and often as a direct result of the shattering of the old structures in the post-2008 crisis.

We can express hope in citing this speculative analysis, but what real grounds do we have for thinking this is the dynamic that will play out?

I think that it is possible a technological development can bring us 'closer to the other shore', but the landing requires our freely created initiative to 'revolutionize fundamentals'.

The great American treadmill of pseudo democracy...

July 30th, 2018 ·

This article suggests we can repeat the reform movements of the past one more time, etc...Isn't the right conclusion the failure to ever really create a democracy and the inherent pseudo-democracy of a system that is captured by capitalism...the whole system in its current state is beyond repair, it would seem...

We must be wary of channeling radical energy into limits outlets doomed to betray all efforts condemned to the Great American Treadmill...

Source: *Reich: Here Are 6 Reasons for Hope in the Trump Era | Alternet*

Fact checking 'Grand Deceptions'...//Jewish Bolsheviks and Stalinism?...//Grand Deceptions: Zionist Intrigue in the 20th and 21st Centuries

July 28th, 2018 ·

This book points out, what is too often suppressed if true at all, that bolshevism was crypto-Jewish/supremacist and hugely dominated by Jews and their contempt for gentiles and further that the Stalinist phase saw a large number of Jews in the covert agencies and their genocidal operations. Few leftist gentiles realize the way they have been marginalized. Jews have apparently killed far more gentiles than Hitler Jews, a charge hard to accept all at once...but all this needs to be fact-checked in a controversial book that extends into a controversial claim even as it points, with increasing certainty of being right, to the involvement of israel and the US in the 9/11 false flag op, a truly stunning, and very alarming expose (but not the first time) of just how sordidly criminal both governments really are. One thing seems clear, Bolsheviks, Jewish or gentile, had very little respect for human life and slid into mass murder based on an ideological perspective that now seems obscure, if intelligible at all...

https://www.amazon.com/Grand-Deceptions-Zionist-Intrigue-Centuries/dp/1615778411/ref=sr_1_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1532799348&sr=1-1&keywords=9781615778416#customerReviews

Marxism: a near total record of failure

July 23rd, 2018 ·

In early 1845, shortly after he had been expelled from France, Marx penned his famous “Eleventh Thesis on Feuerbach”: “The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point, however, is to change it.”

Source: *Marx’s materialist conception? of history revisited* | *International Socialist Review*

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=historical+materialism>

Over 150 years after Marx made this famous statement we confront a world no closer to communism/socialism than it was in the wake of 1848. We are immersed in Marxist boilerplate syndrome by Marxist groups stuck in the nineteenth century. Not a single initiative by communists has ever succeeded, and that includes Cuba, china, etc..., cancerated pseudo-communism. Marxism has proved the greatest gift to the right one could imagine allowing the conclusion that there is no alternative to capitalism... We should include ‘social democracy’ in this indictment so that we don’t end up simply fueling even worse compromised distortions.

No one with new insight can break through this monolithic bastion of boilerplate bullshit. Every single initiative on the left toward creating a postcapitalist society has failed. What is worse is the closed mind syndrome that makes any discussion whatsoever impossible.

We have tried to suggest many reasons for this, one of them the completely useless ‘materialist conception of history’ and the stolid and indifferent rote repetition of its tenets in an age where such a theory simple dries away potential recruits in droves.

Human nature and the existentialist/essentialist dialectic

July 23rd, 2018

To deny the existence of ‘human nature’ based on Darwinism is sure fire way to get it wrong. Not that the concept can’t be challenged on other grounds.

But everything in the evidence of human social and evolutionary history suggests the reality of some versional depiction of human nature, a debate perhaps needing new terminology.

The ‘existentialist’ red herring is dated concept at this point and the issue of human ‘essentialism’ has to be tabled given the larger realm of evidence of human historical

emergence...

Source: *How evolutionary biology makes everyone an existentialist* | *Aeon Essays*

Darwinism/social Darwinism

July 23rd, 2018 ·

The challenge to ‘social darwinism’ on the right is more than understandable but the liberal media tend to be stuck in conventional Darwinian thinking and are forced to ‘hem and haw’ about what darwinism says isn’t what darwinism really says. Left ezines have enough resources to be able to examine the paradigm shift in biology that has exposed Darwinism for what it is: a pseudo-science based on the mythology of natural selection. It is the latter that animates ‘survival of the fittest’ ideology and the right challenge is to challenge Darwinism itself and not get into the brainwashed idiocy of the conventional Darwin propaganda machine...

Source: *Politicians love to talk about “survival of the fittest.” They don’t know what that means* | *Salon.com*

Blueprint(s) of a semi-specified ‘democratic market neo-communism’...

July 22nd, 2018 ·

<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>
To see the point about the failure to specify a practical blueprint for communism by the Marxist legacy we can point to our ‘Two Manifestos’, on ‘democratic market neo-communism’, and the relative specification of particulars. One has to admit at the start that this scheme is itself incomplete, but at least makes the point that the older Marxist legacies were condemned to operate in a void, and then let gangster regimes take over the whole potential.

Here are a few things that must be specified in advance to create a viable communism, this particular version making a few new assumptions of its own, the first being that markets and capitalist markets are not the same: a market can exist under communism under certain conditions, the model here pointing to a constitutional communism that constructs a Commons. Once that is done the issue of markets falls into place next to a

parallel sector of planning. This model requires the revolutionary expropriation of capital but it could be modified to an evolutionary version in which a majority votes in a new constitutional communism that will create a Commons... (tall order in both cases, but only because all these ideas have been discredited by bolshevism)

Here are some of the things that must be specified in this version:

- the nature of a revolutionary (evolutionary) transition
- the status of counterrevolutionary operatives trying to destroy the new foundation: the issue of arbitrary arrest, revolutionary detention and arrest and the legal rights of relevant parties: gulags are illegal in such a system, the detention of counterrevolutionaries must be considered carefully...
- the question of the powers of a revolutionary cadre
- the immediate declaration of the rights of citizens undergoing revolutionary transition
- the illegality of arbitrary arrest by revolutionary agents
- the existence of revolutionary observers and marshals to preserve revolutionary order and civil discipline as to rights and liberties
- the status of surveillance in such a system...
- the nature and transition to a Commons
- the Commons in the context of extra national 'rogue' capital, trade relations with such
- the national/transnational definition of such a Commons
- the issue of socialism in one country and/or an international
- trade relations in the context of socialism in one country

- the steps to construct a three sector system: the market, planned, and 'third sector' fields of operation: the planned, market, and third/'anarchist' sectors...
- the nature of the market system as a way to forestall calculation debates...
- the interaction of market and planed sectors....
- the nature of the democratic system to come into being: a parliamentary system with no chance of financial corruption (all elections should be state run or regulated by fair witnesses, but open to challenge from external agents enforcing honesty, and fresh external party creations as relevant... etc...)
- a strong foundation of economic rights, observed/enforceable by economic courts and labor unions
- a balance of powers between legal, executive and parliamentary bodies
- the nature of equality in such a complicated system: the foundation of a universal class as the end point of the social evolution of classes at the point of revolutionary transition
- new bodies of ecological law to create an ecological socialism: a constitutional definition of ecological socialism
- ecological courts to mediate economic/ecological contradictions/conflict
- economic courts to mediate economic issues, planning decisions, the status of economic entities/corporations
- the nature of the 'communist entrepreneur' and the nature of the 'social capital' licensed from the Commons
- the relative transient inequality of wealth possible to communist entrepreneurs: strong wealth taxes, etc...but some degree of 'equality wobble' in such a complex system of different sectors: a new idea of 'permanent revolution' or readjustment as new marginal

inequalities if any emerge in such a complicated mix
 labor unions to consider the degree of social realization of economic rights: such unions
 are necessary because the economic foundation is already a nearly intractable complexity
 with unpredictable economic variations/wobbles
 the nature of the executive branch and its powers: the executive can be isolated from
 economic social capital in a division of powers: its task to be the guardian of the
 Commons, and no doubt foreign policy
 (in the American case the treatment of covert agencies, their abolition and enforced
 restart, assuming any such bodies are needed or at all wanted)
 the issues of imperialism, militarism, armaments industries and the passage to new
 international beyond imperialist criminality and rogue state ops
 the nature and fate of a revolutionary party transitioning to a multiparty parliamentary
 system
 the separation of social capital and executive power: a system quite different from state
 capitalism
 there can be a one party state of the executive but one limited to specific guardian status
 with no powers beyond guardianship of communist fundamentals and foreign policy
 issues...: a one party system on top of a three plus party system. The top 'one party state'
 is simply a finesse of limited powers of guardianship, perhaps with real platonic no-dacha
 guardians with free cafeteria meal-tickets who have renounced all property, ascetics of
 communism...
 and this in relation to a two party parliamentary system with a wild card 'third or more
 party' slot for external innovations entering the fixed system
 the overall system would be thus a four plus party system...

This is perhaps enough to start: a real neo-communist (the term 'communist' can never
 really be used again in isolation from its 'neo-', the same is true for the terms 'Marxist'
 and 'Leninist') system as we see is VERY complex but some such specification is
 necessary in a world in paranoid fear of Bolshevik Stalinist legacies. A complete
 conceptual rupture with the past is necessary. Any such projection is essential given the
 howls of protest inevitably arising in any system that is too vague to preempt stains and
 authoritarian napoleon figures (recall the 'revolutionary' post-revolutionary character of
 the historical napoleon...)

We have also considered a 'third sector' below a certain threshold: a sort of 'wild zone'
 of open social entities that allows a kind of let go for very small economic enterprises and
 institutions. Any such economic entity that becomes too large is immediately
 expropriated to the Commons, but a certain amount of open-ended social let go should be
 allowed (and it might be a source of innovative socialist entities)....

For the old left to have embarked on Leninist social reconstruction with absolutely none
 of the above settled in advance was a calamity and one that may have destroyed the
 whole idea for good.
 But trying again my be inevitable so we must not wreck a second chance or allow idiot
 Marxism to spoil the chance.

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=stages+of+production+theory>

<http://darwiniana.com/2018/07/22/booknotes-revolution-in-the-air-socialism-never-failed-because-noone-defined-anything-that-could-be-put-into-practice/>

<http://darwiniana.com/2018/07/19/the-legacy-of-stalinism-bolshevism-and-the-jews-grand-deceptions-zionist-intrigue-in-the-20th-and-21st-centuries/>

<http://darwiniana.com/2018/07/22/191855/>: How ‘stages of production’ theory misled a century of leftists and wrecked man’s socialist opportunity

Booknotes: Revolution in the air...socialism never failed because no one defined anything that could be put into practice...

July 22nd, 2018

Reading through:

Revolution in the Air: Sixties Radicals Turn to Lenin, Mao and Che

Max Elbaum

July 21, 2018

We can comment at length over a series of posts, but it is useful to record a first impression of this book, or rather the history of the left it describes.

Although somewhat daunted by the complexity of the history here and wary of snap judgments one is struck with a strange perspective: we did not see the failure of the left up to 1989. We rather saw a leftist void with no platform performing a ritual dance of imaginary socialism that never came into existence because it had no platform or blueprint, no one knew what they were talking about and the few actual ‘communist systems’ such as Russia, china, etc, were never communist at all and hence no conclusion can be drawn. The simply concocted authoritarian fantasies based on fictions and tidbits of jargon as fantasy socialism. It is a remarkable portrait: in every case the left acted with no real plan of action or realizable script. It is all gear spinning with no engagement of the clutch. Check it out: this is not exaggeration. At no point in US history did anyone get straight what they were supposed to do. You can see it in the endless equivocation over ‘Marxism-Leninism’, an exercise in futility that wobbles between conversion and disillusion and then back again, with not final outcome.

In one way this is a dismal portrait: every initiative depicted was a failure not because socialism is unworkable but because no one had a definition of what it should be, instead spinning in circles around completely irrelevant substitutes. It is a striking portrait and

confirms our analysis in our many posts here that marxism by refusing to make definite constructs of a revolutionary society left a void that could never be filled where instead bits and pieces of fragmentary marxism rose and fell in 'Alice in wonderland' absurdities. It is actually possible to be realistic as a result: if socialism was never tried because it was never defined then the dissolution after 1989 was a good thing since now the real thing could conceivably come into existence, if someone can define a socialist society and economy.

Our current situation then has waited a generation after 1989 for the remnants to dissolve leaving a new opportunity. And another strange development has come into being: the capitalist system has itself shown itself to have reached the end of the line in an ecological catastrophe of its making and the destruction of democracy via inequality as devastating as any in the socialist vein.

We are left then with two pieces of a puzzle, imaginary socialisms, and really existing capitalist failure, as a challenge to reassembly in a viable system finally defined and more or less a postcapitalist system of some kind.

Our two manifestos: <http://darwiniana.com/?s=two+manifestos>: Two Manifestos, as an experiment have tried to define something specific, however limited: 'democratic market neo-communism': this formulation could be tried tomorrow and to a high probability could succeed because it is practical and answers to the critiques of both socialism and communism with practical suggestions. The point is that it is a set of practical steps to be taken in succession, generalized recipes. The 'left' is free of the endless chasing its own tail in attempts to figure the real socialist ideology, the pros and cons of Marxism/Leninism, with endless variants, etc... Let us again recall the American Revolution, mindful that such a 'revolution' was a very limited 'bourgeois revolution': it 'succeeded' in quotation marks because it created a script of action that could be put into practice and which had some democratic potential, at least. But the point here is that its agents did not try to spawn theories. They produced recipes and practical men has a sense of what to do, and then did it. If the result was flawed at least it didn't end up in the hands of dictators who could not imagine a result except via concentration camps. Nothing in socialism implies the need for such camps. So if they came into existence it was because after tearing your hair with no plan of what socialism is you are reduced to putting the other mad haters in the game away in 'extra-social' detention, and still no definition of a system to be realized.

With the right vision social transformation will arise spontaneously...

July 20th, 2018 ·

The issue of revolutionary strategy simply tokens the stalled/frozen left. In fact, it is at first almost impossible to believe such a strategy is possible any more.

But the real problem is the inability of the left to see the limits of the older era and its Marxist ideological constraints. A genuine renewal at the level of theory would by itself ignite a new energy devoted to truly radical change. But any such project/hope must be

clear about the failures of bolshevism and stop its religious Lenin rants, what to say of Stalin and his gangster socialism. The public simply won't listen to anything Marxists say, however unfair it is to blame all the ills of later socialism on that seminal figure. But Marx's theoretical framework must itself be renounced (with a judicious restatement of much of its core) because it is itself flawed and unable to generate a viable blueprint for the future. The Gordian knot was/is superfluous, redefine terms and it disappears. The automatic progression of epochs into postcapitalism simply isn't going to happen according to formula and a new philosophy of man for the left is needed, one that can stress the action of (revolutionary) free agents who can construct a postcapitalist system that is viable politically and economically. This is not social democratic compromise. Lost in all the confusions of sloganeering about leftist dynamics is the simple consideration that a constitutional communism (based on a Commons) is entirely viable and can be separated from the tricky issues of creating a postcapitalist economic system. The older left confused the two and the result was the entry into socialist reconstruction (a la the Bolsheviks) on the basis of a set of theoretical fallacies that ended up with a Stalinist cutting the Gordian knot. But what was that Gordian knot? A muddle of Marxist theory that could not separate simple communism foundations from the kind of economic fake socialism that confused the legal and economic polarity.

Red Forty-eight Group: is revolutionary action a viable strategy...?
December 5th, 2017 ·

Red Forty-eight Group: is revolutionary action a viable strategy...? The docket of basic charges: criminal conspiracy and racketeering by dot.gov
<http://darwiniana.com/?s=red+fortyeight+Group?>

We won't answer the question just yet, here: the basic answer being 'no, but'....But these situations can suffer sudden unraveling and the 'no' answer should not under any conditions forestall preparations for the social calamity that will hand those ready a revolutionary opportunity. The fascists will be ready, so the left had best have everything ready.

We have mostly confined discussion to producing a more up to date 'popular' post-marxism that can distill the gist of Marx and Engels and create something that will be usable by a broad spectrum of world views: historical materialism was too limited and, while it is fine the way it is as an historical classic of economic/historical analysis, seems like an episode in early positivism. The left needs to talk a broad list of languages beyond its interior jargon, religious, philosophical, mega-secular, etc... It is very easy to create the net equivalent for our time, with its changed cultural mix, from new agers to a host of new cultural types. We have in Last and First Men tried to create a superset model of history, useful, and not especially controversial, save to Darwinists, to integrate ideas of modernity, revolution/evolution, and the place of the left in the context of the explosion of capitalism in the period synchronous to the French Revolution, etc...

The point here is that this model can embrace true 'dialectical' (we don't use the term) pairs of historical generators: here capitalism and its communist counterpoint born together and multitasking in parallel.

Using new materials we can change the mechanized habits of the old left which are defunct and unable to respond to the current crisis. Some of the issues integrated are:
 history, historicism, and evolution
 world religions in the dynamic of the axial age
 economic determination vs. macro determination
 modernity in terms of a finite transition model
 a Kantian socialism remembered as the parallel to Marxism
 etc...

The question of practical revolutionary action invokes the impossible, waiting on possibility, in the nonce compiling the docket of charges against the American system, at the least: beyond a general examination of capitalist limits in relation to communist challenges we have
 the legacy of rising imperialism since the end of the nineteenth century
 the moment of the Gilded Age
 the ambiguity of the New Deal
 the onset of neoliberalism
 the invention of covert agencies
 the legacy of antidemocratic coups
 the legacy of assassinations, exterior, interior: the JFK evidence
 the criminality of 9/11 and the cover-up of the criminal conspiracy
 the question of Israel and its influence
 the place of wall street, finance, etc...

From this we can document a charge of governmental racketeering and grounds for what the Founding Fathers demanded (given a republic if you can keep it): a new revolution if you can't keep it.

Toward a Postdarwinian left

July 20th, 2018

Taking up a radical critique of Darwinism might be the correct recipe to break old mindsets and set the left into a post-theoretical mode that is wary of theory and ideology. An untold story is the way Darwinism entered the left in a destructive and violent interpretation of class struggle all too apparent in 'class' genocides of the Bolshevik era. In a strange finesse the right has pursued both a social Darwinist agenda and a postdarwinist innovation that has become enmired in the design argument. The left should simply take over the design argument, in an agnostic mode, and lead the way into a left that is critique of the crypto-ideological Darwin legacy.

A leftist make over on the issue of evolution?

December 13th, 2017 ·

One of the most remarkable confusions of modern culture is the way a reductionist version of evolution, viz. darwinism came into being to displace a promising set of starts that were on the right track. The left has been a particular victim of this botched starting point. The left needs a complete make over on the issue of evolutionary theories, and a redress against its tendency to condone implicitly the social Darwinist implications of the natural selectionist perspective and its fundamentalists...

From Lamarck and the teleomechanists to the fallacies of Darwinism
October 17th, 2017 ·

<http://www.npr.org/2016/08/27/491492977/in-tom-wolfes-kingdom-speech-is-the-one-weird-trick>

Wolfe has raised an obvious point: we have no really convincing picture of the 'evolution' of speech, let alone man as a whole. But that problem goes back all the way, and we have no good evolutionary account of the emergence of life, the Cambrian, etc...

The problem lies not in the term 'evolution' but in the equation of that with random evolution, natural selection. I think the biological community should rescue the situation from disaster and toss in the towel on Darwinism. Wolfe has no coherent alternative that I can see but his point is well taken: if you play by the rules then you can't just throw around the term evolution if it doesn't explain anything.

I think that the mainline darwinism that came into existence with Wallace/Darwin (I think Wallace was the real source, as Wolfe intimates) has confused everyone and is in reality an interloper: it was long preceded by a soon displace post-Kantian biology that grappled with the real problems, the teleomechanists who attempted to create a methodology for evolutionary biology that wasn't reductionist. And it was preceded by the work of the real first evolutionary theorist here: Lamarck, who considered a double aspect to evolution, a high level evolution of forms complexifying, and a lower level of environmental adaptation. Given the evidence of deep time this is the most obvious solution to the overall problem. But Darwinism and organizational science somehow got convinced that one level evolutionism was the only way to do science. It is thus sadly frustrating that the right approach in two cases was displaced by the later dogmas of Darwin, mostly from Wallace, who promptly disavowed his own transitional discovery. His stance was a useful way station because it helped biologists to visualize 'divergence' with a place holder 'mechanism', in this case natural selection. Once divergence was grasped it was entirely apt to try and replace the 'mechanism' with something less simplistic than natural selection.

I think biologists, and the Dawkins group, ought to see the handwriting on the wall, and I would recommend a look at the data/model of WHEE (history and evolution.com) to get a feeling for the kind of two level system that Lamarck intuitively saw from the start. World history is not the same as evolution in deep time, quite obviously, but there must be invariant aspects to the kind of two level systems we see in world history. The latter

can be especially tricky because it adopts a special version for the model in question attempting to analyze the ‘evolution of freedom’. But the latter must have been an aspect of human evolution, and we are suspicious this later historical instance is really a later version of what was true of man from the start: his organismic and cultural evolution as one entity from the start.

I think that this approach can bypass the red herring of design arguments used to produce theological conclusions, and ground the discussion in a look at the overall dynamic of evolution without getting mired in speculations over ‘mechanism’.

http://history-and-evolution.com/whee4th/chap3_5.htm

**R48G: we are not required as ‘democratic market neo-communists’ required to defend the record of bolshevism...
November 10th, 2017 ·**

<https://www.bolshevik.info/once-again-in-defence-of-lenin-a-reply-to-orlando-figes.htm>
We can quote our brief remarks on this good essay from marxist.com (previous post):

It is important for leftists to make their case and try to set the record straight but the facts of the case are obscured on both sides. It is very difficult to fully agree with any account at this point, such is the confusion of historical/partisan accounts.

In any case we have suggested here many times the need for a new communism to distance itself from the history of bolshevism and focus on the future with a new framework rather than the past. As this article notes at the beginning the view of the public in general is so hostile that it is simply holding back the left to feel one has to justify the whole Bolshevik legacy.

If the left has to constantly defend the record of Lenin and bolshevism the achievement of a new communism will never happen. It is to be sure essential to correct the distortions of conventional historians, but overall the movement beyond capitalism requires a new initiative whose answer to the charges against and citing the Russian Revolution is that we doing something different and don’t have to defend Leninism, etc...

It seems an elusive point for many Marxist/Leninists but the reality has to be faced. In our two manifestos we have suggested a new approach. In fact the formulation allows a series of approaches.

<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>
But the basic issue is that we have arrived at a stage of mature capitalism in countries that have bourgeois democracies. The model of the Russian Revolution is misleading everyone.

One interpretation of our framework is to simply expropriate capital and ecological resources to a Commons and not necessarily equate communism with the abolition of

markets. In postcapitalism a combination of markets (in the context of public ownership), planning and a kind of ‘anarchist’ lower threshold or indifference level could enable a neo-communist matrix with a lot of reserve potential and diversity of methods. The example of Lenin is not really what we should up to at this point. We might even interpret our framework as a ‘communist liberalism’ and/or a ‘liberal communism’.

The legacy of Stalinism, bolshevism and the Jews.... Grand Deceptions: Zionist Intrigue in the 20th and 21st Centuries

July 19th, 2018 ·

We cite this book still one more time because it is really two books: the first half, with its analysis of Israel and 9/11 is must read, but the second half is more controversial, or, at least, needs a critical fact check. But I recommend leftists read it because of its attempted expose of Lenin and Stalin and among other issues the Ukrainian famine induced deliberately by Stalin.

These accounts need critical examination, but I fear they are more or less on the mark despite the way the author skirts dangerously more controversial issues, such as the issue of holocaust history and his (correct) discussion of the large number of Jews in the Bolshevik movement, and their strong participation in the legacy of the various secret police formations. However, at the point where the author claims that Jewish secret police agents in the Bolshevik period/periods killed more people than Hitler one gets a little leery of the way this invaluable book in its early chapters starts to get into dangerous terrain...But no one has the nerve to really examine these questions the way this author does, so we are left to our own fact checking...

Source: *the Israelis behind 9/11.... Grand Deceptions: Zionist Intrigue in the 20th and 21st Centuries*

The Israelis behind 9/11.... Grand Deceptions: Zionist Intrigue in the 20th and 21st Centuries

July 19th, 2018 ·

The outrageous behavior of the Israelis climaxes in their manipulation of the 9/11 crimes, as this book makes clear...

Source: *Booknotes: Grand Deceptions: Zionist Intrigue in the 20th and 21st Centuries*

Don Quijotes in reverse gear...

July 17th, 2018 ·

A quick read of Lachman's book: *Dark Star Rising* (Amazon/Kindle)

Lachman provides a number of insights into the lead up/background to the trump phenomenon, but he is too close to his subject(s) and ends up giving them a degree of validation they don't deserve and in the end a nullity figure like trump couldn't possibly be aware of any of the issues of the recent occult antimodern movement. That he might have an angle on the 'power of positive thinking' of Norman Vincent pealed is neither remarkable nor very intelligent. The power of the will to change reality is an idea so ancient it is laughable to find it thought original in any sense. Practitioners of amateur meditation methods have rediscovered the 'will' next to 'being' thousands of times. It happens weekly to droves.

This treatment has made a kind of postmodern genius out of a complete idiot. And the background, figures like guenon, Evola, etc, are complete dunces behind their spiritual veneers. They cannot grasp the phenomenon of modernity and turn in circles in the same old new age/old age crackpot nonsense over the kali yuga and the evils of the modern age. It is a pack of nonsense. Over at The Gurdjieff Con this phenomenon has been analyzed for years including the so-called Traditionalism that has become a pseudo-philosophy of reactionary anti-modernism. The claim for some primordial spiritual vision behind the world religions, at the core of this 'ism', is a species of nonsense. The emergence of civilization is all of a piece and, while the Neolithic period might well have been seminal in a way we have forgotten, it was itself simply a stage (or set of its own epochs in transition) on the way to one and the same world we live in now. It is the only candidate for a birth time of religion in civilization, and, mirabile dictu, we suspect they meditated with primordial yoga. Surely the modern period is at par. But in a way Lachman has lodged an arrow in the heart of the trump phenomenon because he has shown the impoverished nature of the cultural/spiritual resources at work. The trump phenomenon can't last long in the same sense that Nazism and occult antimodernism couldn't last long: their interior logic is so specious that the attempt to carry out a program rapidly falls apart. You would think that those who denounce modernity could expose capitalism, or place in climate change. But these postmoderns with trump wish to prevent any regulation of this catastrophe. We can hardly expect trumpism to last very long if it tries to revive racism, etc... But such movements, like Nazism, can cause immense damage on the way to oblivion. Let's hope this useful exposure to the realm of the alt-right will prove the undoing of the whole field of idiocy, alert to the global conspiracy against democracy and modern freedom at work in multiple zones, not the least the realm of Putin and his svengali Dugin, an idiot non-pareil in this confused counterattack against modernity, the lot a set of don quijotes in reverse...

Finding your true will?

July 17th, 2018 ·

A lot of nonsense is being perpetrated by new age thinking and flotsam Rosicrucianism about the 'true will'. One thing is clear, Crowley never found his true will and his whole shtick is a pile of rubbish, a very Faustian rubbish with a hidden Mephisto factor. It might help to look at Bennett's *The Dramatic Universe*: the study of your 'will' is a task at least as hard as quantum mechanics and requires knowledge and study, not ritual magic, and that over years and years of careful study. No material has ever existed on this subject, although it is clearly latent in the Christian corpus which made a total muddle of all of it. Perhaps likewise Bennett, with the demonic gurdjieff lurking in the background. And that's assuming that the Bennett version is on the mark, which is doubtful. But at least it can forestall the really stupid indulgence in the trash left behind by Crowley et al.

Postmodern politics...maybe these idiots are kidding...

July 17th, 2018 ·

Rightist thought is a highly vulnerable and mediocre combination of ideas and it lacks any real historical dimension. To be the victim of Evola at this point is almost beyond imagining, but at least operators in this realm are complete idiots, whatever their artificial power (cf. Putin and his operations, seemingly successful, but open to collapse sooner or later as demented stupidity). It is useful to study the eonic effect and to see the way it points to the real historical dynamic that stands behind the real progression of civilization. We are living in a decline of modernity now, but that doesn't justify postmodern substitutes. The right is totally oblivious to this larger dimension and thus completely vulnerable to challenge, if people with any sense can extract themselves from the hypnosis of conservative operators of mostly nonsense. Evola? maybe they are kidding. Just the kind of fourth rate new age idiocy that would appeal to Putin and trump. Thus the movement of Traditionalism which inspires many reactionaries is a completely mythological antimodernism and is wrong about the source of religion which has the same roots as all the other material in the eonic effect: we see that buddhism and monotheism are part of the eonic effect, not some esoteric nonsense about the kali yuga...

At least we can see that all these people are standing on quick sand.

One of the key confusions now is postmodernism, although I think its day is passing. The idea of a 'postmodern' age and of 'post truth' is complete bilge, as is the Nietzschean fad and its evidence of philosophic degeneration.

archive: nothing in world history makes sense without an understanding of the macro effect...

July 26th, 2017 ·

Nothing in world history makes sense without an understanding of the macro effect...

September 18th, 2015 ·

http://history-and-evolution.com/whee4th/chap4_1.htm

The influence of bad science, bad history, and bad education backing them up has made WHEE a book almost impossible to understand, but it is actually a very practical study of the way history follows a basic developmental logic.

Why are scientists unable to deal with this? 1. they can't handle anything that doesn't follow reductionist causality...2. they can't therefore handle the place of free agency in history, which is like studying a zoo with no animals...3. they can't follow the simple logic of discontinuity given the endless confusion created here by religious thinkers... 4. most of all they can't grasp that there is something wrong with darwinism...

Demiurgic projections?

July 17th, 2018 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=demiurgic+projection>

At the start of Dark Star Rising Lachman discusses briefly the fact that occult politics is not a monopoly of the right and cites Gandhi to the contrary...

Here we should interject a warning to the left to NEVER be tempted to imitate the right in this vein.

Please read Lord of the Rings on this: that book is very peculiar and, unlike the Harry Potter series, warns against ANY use of occult magic. The only thing to be done is to return the 'one ring' to the cracks of doom. That's it. If you so much as put the ring on the dark lord will be 'advised' of your presence and whereabouts. The book issues dire warnings against any magic at all. Many who enjoy that book may not realize just how deep its thinking is. Others in the age of Aleister Crowley will pooh pooh that and exclaim, what are you afraid of: 'dare, will, know, and be silent'. What to do?

Follow the program set out by Frodo the Hobbit, please. In fact, the realm of occult magic is strictly for suckers, amateurs, and it is worth remembering how little success Crowley had: he was a complete amateur throughout and yet sacrificed all his moral capital on black magical junk, the backwash of Rosicrucianism whose legacy is highly ambiguous and despite Lachman's suggestion in decline by the nineteenth century (if it had a virtuous moment at all). Such people are orcs in the making and on their way to

becoming demons. But by the same token those who choose that way just might get a shot at occult fame and glory on their passage to hell. The only gang that seems to have penetrated occult politics was the dark side buddhist, but that movement had centuries, millennia of build up and its action was a Gotterdammerung one shot deal that extinguished its future, be forewarned, notwithstanding the realm of dark side Tibetan buddhism. Small wonder the Dugin/trump realm is so half-assed.

Here leftists should consider what has been pointed to many times on this blog: that it already has an occult dimension, one totally concealed behind the front called 'historical materialism'. So concealed one hardly knows anything about it. No there isn't a faq on this, and no you won't find out. I think the effort failed and it is not a case of directed revolution: on the contrary, man makes himself and if some power intervenes it must soon stop and let man proceed, usually to his inevitable failure.

Here j. g. Bennett, no doubt unwittingly, and beside the rightist occultist gurdjieff, stumbled into the one genuine case of the real occult from the left.

We have no real solid knowledge here, but we must suspect without proof of any kind that some variant of Bennett's demiurgic powers (we changed the name to devangelic powers and then to 'spirit mat x' and then to...(keep the terms on the move) in Enigma of the Axial Age) jumpstarted a leftist movement in the wake of the French revolution, in the precise period of the 1848 revolutions. This is not the same as the 'eonic effect' and its transitions, although the latter show the emergence of modern revolution... There is nothing more to say because we don't know, but if there is one thing that seems clear the hidden occult left stripped leftists of any occult nonsense for their own protection.

Be forewarned and don't go around playing in the mess of rightist occult pottage. Take Gandalf's warnings to heart!

The realm of 'demiurgic powers' is far far beyond the realm of rightist occultism. So the left should be wary of frittering away its heritage in the occult flotsam and take a dash of pride in having a touch of the real thing. But it is also ominous that the left resembles the early Christians in this regard: the outcome can be 'success, but...', mindful of the contradictions of christian success.

Note: Lachman's book isolates the rightist Evola, postmodernism, Nietzsche and Dugin: in the context of Putin, etc...

These are easily defeatable combinations of no great depth. Letting them gain play to the extent we see is almost inexcusable. These rightists are all mediocrities; to be defeated by them is beyond belief. And they are nowhere near the Hitler occult nexus which is something far beyond the current mess of pottage...

Dugin idiocy, Shadow of the Dalai Lama, and trump the feckless Hitler parody...

July 17th, 2018 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=trump+fascism+occult>

We have discussed the issue of trump and occult fascism here from before the 2016 election, to not much more avail than Lachman in his new book which doesn't seem to get beyond superficial (it is almost insuperably hard to penetrate this realm) psychological clichés...but I haven't read his book as yet...

For a good depiction of occult magic in some detail it is useful to read the classic Shadow of the Dalai Lama to get a sense of how the occult angle can go very deep and is almost completely concealed...Even this expose of Tibetans might be a failure on its own terms...the dalai lama, like trump, is no more than a decoy and the book cited here is perhaps too complicated: much simpler method of mind control are on the loose 'out there'.

many discussions at The Gurdjieff Con blog...

Trump is too feckless to be a real fascist or Nazi but perhaps the 'chaos' effect from the Dugin side is real enough. Dugin has no real understanding of any of this...These amateurs lust for the 'real thing' but can never find it. But the damage possible at ordinary political levels is great...

Dugin is a complete idiot who doesn't grasp his own subject. The connection with figures like Aleister Crowley will no doubt be dropped from discussion.

No one in the know dares mention the real tactics and dangers here...

The article at Alternet brings up the question of Nietzsche but that figure was not knowledgeable about occultism and despite his reputation for nihilism he was mostly a failure at philosophy and a trasher of Schopenhauer...

Lachman's treatment sanitized by media...?//Historian Explains How Donald Trump and the Far Right Weaponized 'Chaos Magic' — Just Like the Occult | Alternet

July 17th, 2018

I haven't read this book as yet but from these articles about it would seem clear the issues are being sanitized around cult jargon and don't penetrate the real occult dimension behind trump. The article, perhaps the book, gives trump far too much credit as some kind of Svengali, but the evidence makes clear that he is a complete nullity being manipulated by something hidden. Lachman seems to reference that but apparently can't

close the case (not surprising) or else he is being ‘psychologized’ by the media reporting on him.

Trump, it would appear is a drone for some occult conspiracy, and this is connected but much deeper than his Putin connection. The question of Dugin and chaos magic indicates this, but that figure is almost as confused as trump. The real issues lie in the question about occultism in dark side politics. Here trump is mere fart out the backside of covert Svengali politics. Trump often looks like a parody of Hitler by hidden groups who couldn’t figure out the dark side occultism behind Hitler (esoteric Buddhist black magic?) Apparently Lachman merely tokens the issue but can’t take it further, which is forgivable...

This is a very dangerous situation, but fortunately trump is so incompetent that he can’t pull it off. He can do a lot of damage in any case...

Cf. discussions at The Gurdjieff Con....

Source: [*Historian Explains How Donald Trump and the Far Right Weaponized ‘Chaos Magic’ — Just Like the Occult | Alternet*](#)

The ‘working class’ is an abstraction, not a person...we cannot predict or control it

July 16th, 2018 ·

We have discussed many times the idea of a universal class. This does not negate the emphasis on the working class but only gives a warning that the abstraction the ‘working class’ is not a person and won’t behave as expected for that reason. The older conception of a revolutionary proletariat no longer works very well, to say the least. We can play it both ways with the idea of the working class and that of a universal class...

R48G: working class vanguard leading to a new universal class...December 9th, 2017 ·

Although the classic focus on the working class remains the keynote of any real majoritarian/democratic initiative it is useful to consider the larger framework of the ‘universal class’ so-called in order to really see the way in which social division as class struggle needs to yield to a platform that deals with all classes and subsets thereof. The working class focus can end up neglecting the real crisis unfolding: the ecological crisis, the onset of degrowth and no growth economics, the neglected ‘lumpenproletariat’, the ambiguous middle class, and ultimately the ‘bourgeoisie’ itself which is under threat of liquidation in the working class ferocity model.

We need a coherent plan that can give a focus to the working class but point to a unification of classes in a transitional socialism/communism that can mediate class differences beyond class struggle in a unified Commune.

Red Forty-eight Group: universal versus working class...
January 24th, 2017 ·

One of the reasons we changed the terminology of our (socialist/communist) ‘Red Forty-eight Group’ from working class to universal class

was to obviate precisely the difficulty we see now in discussions of the Women’s March: the splintering of focus between issue activisms and a more general leftist perspective, or set of perspectives. The universal class is really a superset of the working class and we can change gears immediately to consider a working class version of both the universal class and the ‘Red Forty-eight Group’.

The point is that the universal class is also the set of its own subsets and that includes the various issue subsets from Black Lives Matter, to Feminist groups and orgs, to much else, including the spectrum of socialist groups.

This approach automatically allows parallel groups to work together while at the same time sending a set of suggestions about considering a larger set of perspectives.

In general we have a huge list of issues that come together as separate yet unified into one larger perspective

ecological economics in itself or as a version of a new socialist/communism: the Red Forty-eight Group with a floating core as ‘democratic market neo-communism’ is thus an ecological powerhouse in potential in the context of socialism

and this brings to the fore the number one crisis of capitalism next to economic justice: climate change

socialist, economic justice

neo-communist, the issue of private property

revolutionary action and political structures versus electoral/evolutionary

markets versus planned economies

anarchist initiatives and their challenges to revolutionary activism

democratic initiatives in the context of the communist/socialist sectors

economics and technology: universal basic income and automation

national versus international perspectives: we focus on a national economy, but the larger question of a federation of socialist nationalism emerges powerfully to challenge populist distortions we see now...issues of trade arise to complicate thus the whole formula: this is inevitable (and the older internationals in theory had all of this down pat)

Here feminism and race get thus powerful associations with a larger action

We can make analogous statements about ‘socialism’ frequently referenced, meaning in reality social democratic activism of various types. All such can be welcomed, but critiqued under the context of our universal category...

The Red Forty-eight Group isn’t an actual party or association (it could be) but is a set of abstractions (based on the once and future revolutions of the ‘1848’ legacy). It can be

used as a benchmark for the different brands on the left, now in a state of confusion. It also allows for a post-Marxist equivalent that can invoke that classic legacy but detach from it.

Hyparchic futurism and the postcapitalist potential

July 16th, 2018

Bennett's idea of hyparxis is on somewhat shaky grounds but it points to possible leftist futurism that stands beyond the inexorable degeneration of capitalist globalization...

R48G: hyparxis and revolutionary futurism...
December 11th, 2017 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=R48G+revolution>
https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=The+Crisis+of+Modernity_ver6.pdf:
<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>

We have made a number of dialectical feints back and forth between evolutionary and revolutionary perspectives but overall our task here seems to be advocating from the sidelines the discipline of truly revolutionary activism. The sidelines are not really OK, but it is still something. It could be cowardly, but maybe not.

As the Trump era approaches we are going to see intimidation in action and the result may be ambiguous jargon on the issues of activist projects. In fact we have seen that already with the Sanders theme, 'Our Revolution', about which we have performed rain dances and other semantic 'propaedeutic'.

We leave open the option of solidarity with these potentially co-opted perspectives, potentially the only really practical avenue.

We are stuck with a strange situation: a true neo-communist perspective must consider more than the economics of the local working class. What about all those jobs that went to an international working class?

We should proceed as before with at least the idea of virtual revolution as a gedanken experiment with the possibility open at each point of activation of this potential. (The women's march to come is an interesting development indeed (one might have wished a more comprehensive protest, but the platform is excellent). One might note in passing that a women's march was one of the key triggers of the Russian Revolution!)

The point here is that we can be theoretical and potentially practical at the same time. In the first case the perspective of revolution is a way to remind ourselves that real change is very difficult in the system that we have, and that this system is in fact regressing to the right.

One of the key issues is that evolutionary politics can be stuck in a nationalistic focus on

the economic gains of one sector of the system, e.g. the working class. But the working class is an international entity and the problems in any case are far larger and complex than the economic. We need at least in principle a comprehensive platform of the kind the older Marxism had. We can't we use that? We can certainly use it as a backdrop but we have a more complicated situation now, and in any case the American case, being that of a fully developed capitalist system, demands what in many ways would be a first: a post-Marxist set of core principles that reflect the legacy but which speak to the reality of postcapitalism. The context here is more than economic, it is an ecological crisis, and the solution is going to conflict with economic issues.

In any case the crisis we face we should be daring enough to challenge conventional activism with the almost insuperable yet somehow more logical demands of a revolutionary platform. This barely exists and strangely the Marxist left has very little to say here. Perhaps like poker players they are biding their time.

I fear that strategically it is proving counterproductive to have challenged the Marxist canon. Actually we have embraced it, but with a demand that it refresh itself for a new era. Look at Leninism: it simply doesn't apply to our situation, although in a desperate moment some of its aspects might replicate themselves. Overall we must move on from a failed legacy. (The first step to moving on is to read about ten bios of Lenin, if you have the time...he is a compelling figure).

But in general it would be of great interest to think in a wholly new way, and in this case with respect to the American system...

The point here is simply that capitalism is self-destructing, more than anything else due to climate crisis, and we confront the need for a whole new system:

a new economic system

a new political system, a new form of democracy

a new foundation beyond private property

new approaches to growth/no growth sustainable economies

a nationalistic platform in an international context

exposes of the reality of the American system: the imperialistic context, the military-industrial complex, wars manufactured for profit, the covert agencies and the deep state, the corruption of politics by capital, the reckoning of criminal conspiracies and getting it straight on 9/11 and the false flag ops we can only suspect are at the core of the corrupt and criminal system of politics current, and this includes, stunningly, complicity in the international drug trade.

This is a fairly stunning set of required elements but we should at least construct the full list, create a party and a platform that can deal with them, and an aspiration to a group in motion that is a party of the main party, etc...

So there it is: a virtual solution to the above from a not yet senile old timer: a platform, two manifestos, a proto-party: the Red Forty-eight Group, a first born succession if not successor of the classic Marxist Old Testament with its 1848 focus: the once and future revolution and/or a working class evolutionary party as a focus of social democratic bluffing one's way to a revolution.

The Red Forty-eight Group needs a huge set of study projects, among them the secular future (and equivalent) of religion, the nature of economic theories, practical training systems and boot camps, a set of communes and cooperatives, etc...

The Red Forty-eight Group is a template and a basically neo-communist conception. At the start of Last and First Men, Nemo declared that every kid on his block was Captain Nemo, thus nemini...this new left could Nemini in motion, and/or a question like the Who Am I? of the Advaitists. Nemini x factors...plus three finger salutes, a cult, an army, a party, a commune, smorgasbord...

The need for a generalized historical paradigm

July 14th, 2018 ·

The Marxist left has produced an historical paradigm that doesn't work and which no one really accepts beyond the cultic assemblies of the various sectarian groupings.

A study of the eonic effect, while controversial to some due to its critique of darwinism, can help to extend historical vision into empirical observation rather than speculations about economic determination, useless debates over idealism versus materialism or fallacious abuse of 'dialectics' to slip mysticism into leftist discourse.

Source: *History and Evolution*

Capitalism cannot generate the future of civilization

July 14th, 2018 ·

Expecting the dynamic of capitalism to generate the future of civilization is unrealistic: the legacy of past civilizations shows something different...

R48G: climbing Mt. Improbable...Fukuyama's false historical driver is no better than that of 'historical materialism'

May 9th, 2017 ·

In their place, he suggested that the modern scientific method coupled with technological advancement, alongside market capitalism as a form of mass information-processing for the allocation of resources, could explain how humanity had successfully managed to develop – haltingly, but definitely – on an upward course of civilizational progress.

We have repeatedly critiques ‘historical materialism’ but Fukuyama’s motor of history is no better. A look at the eonic effect shows that something far more complex is involved than science, technology, or market capitalism. This could hardly explain the descent of man or civilization since the Neolithic.

The eonic effect shows that a complex macro driver operates behind the scenes to ‘climb Mt. Improbable’.

Fukuyama jettisoned Hegel’s implausible metaphysics, as well as Marx’s idea of ‘dialectical materialism’, as the proposed motor of historical synthesis. In their place, he suggested that the modern scientific method coupled with technological advancement, alongside market capitalism as a form of mass information-processing for the allocation of resources, could explain how humanity had successfully managed to develop – haltingly, but definitely – on an upward course of civilizational progress. The catch, however, was that we had now gone as far as it was possible to go. Liberal democratic capitalism was the final stage of Historical synthesis: no less inherently contradictory form of society was possible.

...at a time of social crisis it needs to be said, we don’t have a left...

July 10th, 2018 ·

The left needs to act now, but...

At a time of social crisis it needs to be said, we don’t have a left. The Marxist cadre is dysfunctional, incompetent, hidebound, and armed with a whole set of fallacies, failed histories, and nothing that is viable for a future evolutionary/revolutionary path. The phase of Leninism is not a viable source of imitation.

Do we have to start over...?

R48G: beyond the Marxist straight jacket to a new strategy of ‘constructivist neo-communism’

August 17th, 2017 ·

The core ideas of Marxism are actually viable extracted from their brittle theory wrapper: class struggle, capitalist critique, etc...But the issue of ‘stages of production’ has created a dubious theory of history which critics can use to challenge any concept of a postcapitalist futurism.

The whole thing can be redone in a way that frees Marxists from their own straight jacket and allow a new strategy of ‘constructivist neo-communism’ in the sense of free agents in history applying a critique to social capitalism and thence freely creating a successor. And this will roust passive leftism from its doldrums of teleological fantasies of theory about their circumstance.

<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>

Marxism as a prelude to a real neo-communist platform

July 11th, 2018 ·

From the 'Core Heroic Saga' to a new statement of the postcapitalist transition
March 29th, 2015 ·

<http://rs21.org.uk/2015/03/08/leninism-2/>

I think the communist left is stalled and the inability of leftist parties to expand at a moment of such global crisis is ominous.

To me the problem is not hard to analyze in principle, whatever the solution in practice: social historical forces 'freeze' after a prolonged period of stasis or stability in the mechanization of habit, and conditioned action. This can befall even successful organizations. But the specter of Stalinism in one's historical account makes the problem almost impossible.

Part of the problem is the 'shattered nerves' of those who review the legacy of bolshevism: they are hip to invent anything but. The Occupy movement was really 'anything but'. Chomsky and many others, as 'anarchists', are strongly 'anything but'. We need to move to a realistic 'anything but' the capitalist endgame of a burnt out planet. But the tide is turning. The case for market domination is beginning to lag even in the minds of ordinary TV consumers of ideology.

And yet the moment for a new left is likely to stall again, ...and again. What is needed is a clear rethink of fundamentals, a complete restatement that eliminates all clichés, boilerplate and all the stale arguments about Marx's theories, etc...

Last and First Men tries to invent some solutions here:

Treat the saga of Marx and Engels up to 1848 as the 'Core Heroic Saga', but attempt to create a superset of the classic canon using new language, jargon free, and moving swiftly to the issue of modern neo-classical economics and its expose as a pseudo-science. The dated theories of Marx waste all the energies of leftists forced to defend them in the studied and instant counterattacks of trained anti-Marxists. Who cares? Start with fresh analyses of the modern economy as it is, and focus on the vulnerable marginalist fiction scenarios at their Achilles' Heels.

Downplay historical materialism and try to create a new world history that is not based on the crude logic of nineteenth century scientism. LFM tries to create an historical framework based on an analysis of the Axial Age, the modern transition, and the larger evolutionary account of man, freed from Darwinism.

The left's stance on religion, the evolution of religion, and the Feuerbachian critique is largely a failure at this point. The US now has far more Buddhists than Marxists. These people won't even look at a Marxist analysis of anything at this point.

The modern transition produced one of the most fantastic sequences of original philosophic geniuses, from Spinoza to Hegel and yet now all of that is thrown away for

the crudest of reductionist thought systems. How did that happen? A leftist can't even discuss Kant without a fierce reaction of scorn. A strange mindset for those whose efforts must found a living culture. Looking at the Stalinist litanies of dialectical materialism we must protest the goal of repeated imposition of Bolshevik 'crud'.

The issue of Darwinism haunts the whole radical left coming out of the Second International. Who really won the Scopes Trial? It looks like a victory for Darwinist science. Eighty years later we see the right's think tanks with an expose of Darwinism far superior to the academic ideology of evolution.

Last and First Men shows a way to escape from Darwinism within the context of a non-religious historical analysis. The left is completely addicted to Darwin, but the reality is that Darwinism is killing the left.

There are a lot of ways to expand this analysis but the key issue is that the old left is a mechanized terminal thought system. The cure for that doesn't even have to be leaving it behind. Simple refreshing can be enough. Lettuce is lettuce, but the week old lettuce is instantly recognizable.

And this leaves the tricky questions of Leninism. I think that here we can try it both ways. The historical sequence leading to Lenin was unique and won't recur. Or is that wrong? A crisis is coming that will demand those who are ready to seize the initiative. That's the real 'lenis': being ready to lead the movement into a new postcapitalist era. That seems so unlikely we do nothing. But we should act as if the neo-communist moment is to come. And it must be 'neo', because the forces of reaction will be instant in their counterattack at senile 'paleo-communism'.

It is, btw, time to drop the term 'Marxist' given the strange cult of personality that now freezes the real legacy of Marx.

And the new atheism is a demonstration of the way the older secular humanism got stuck in reductionist thinking. The issue of 'god' hamstring the current left, because they have already lived through the failure of the 'new atheist' movement in an older incarnation, secular humanism of the era of Feuerbach. IN a world of several billion theists, atheism is the wrong strategy. For myself I have no opinion on the 'god' question. After the revolution you can ask me again. Till then the issue is Kantian indecidability. In that context a radical leftist should be ready to discourse courteously with theists, atheists, and the many 'in between's'. If we examine the historical framework of Last and First Men we see that the modern transition has the same foundation as the Hellenic and Judaic transitions, one on top of the other. So we need not gaze backward for an 'age of revelation', that misnomer nonetheless worth flashing once before the eyes of religious conservatives. The modern transition makes the Judaic 'transition' with its age of Revelation look like a kiddie ride at Disneyland. And we should definitely not try to make a god religion out of the modern instance. That said, the materialist interpretation has gotten too hard. The great yogis of antiquity were also 'materialists' in the canon of Samkhya. So the brief moment of hard materialism which served to stun the rightist religious reaction may have served its purpose. A religion of atheism isn't needed for a new communism. After the revolution, ask me again.

The issues of revolution

July 12th, 2018 ·

Red Forty-eight Group: the question of revolution...that would mean 'now'
May 24th, 2016 ·

As our discussion today makes clear Marxism is stuck in another century. The gist of our manifesto is to take the core paragraph of the original: the expropriation of the bourgeoisie, and set the rest to one side. We don't need a theory of historical materialism, dialectical materialism, such a strong prejudice against idealism. We need simple praxis not trying to convert everyone to a new philosophy.

We need a core movement that has some Marxist dna, but which operates with its own version of communism, able to decipher the neo-classical economic illusion, ready to fight for control of the industrial apparatus in motion, and ready to create a market communism, possibly on its way to full communism. A market communism with a Commons, as opposed to state control by a one party bourgeoisie calling itself radical, with a cut off point below which some forms of commerce, industry, and agriculture operate independently would be nice. Issues of constitutional balance of powers, core rights (without liberal economic rights of capital), newly defined democracy, national/transnational action to create a global federation....

This movement needs to be fair, republican to carry a future partial democracy, ruthless, non-violent or violent as needed, and with a strategy to limit its own one-party state malfunction. We know such a revolution is possible because all of our modern states began with revolutions, and the core issue of Marxism was to create a form of communism in order to save the bourgeois revolution for 'real democracy'.

http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/reform_or_revolution_20160522: Hedges has some good ideas, but we don't have the luxury of Lenin versus Luxembourg. We need a revolutionary movement that can bring the US dot.gov to its knees. The result will be (market) neo-communism on its way to a new form of society, postliberal democracy, and an economy that can support a large population without growth.

This requires a criminal indictment of the gangster government that wrought 9/11
a position on nuclear questions (disarmament)
a willingness to try and control population
a no growth economy that is able to provide a basic income
an indifference level below which people can live in a hybrid non-totalitarian mode with respect to the state
etc...

DMNC: beyond the calculation debate...//Dreams of National Capital: Market Socialism, Past and Present | The Brooklyn Rail

July 12th, 2018 ·

<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>

A useful and interesting discussion of market socialism. We should insist that despite the resemblances our ‘democratic market neo-communism’ is something different altogether. The idea of Commons is not the same as ‘state ownership’ of anything. Next, despite the problems the idea of ‘socialism in one country’ is a vehicle at the starting point: it can invoke an international but at the same time allow a possibly crude but effective form of communism to function, day one. Its three sector structure can reconcile a triad of contradictions. Its market sector simply does an end run around the calculation debate which is in any case approaching obsolescence in an era of computational markets and AI approximations to markets.

The three sectors of markets, planned economics and a third lower threshold sector allows a lot of diversity in a system that we know can function if we know that market systems can function, a system that we know can function since planned economies (concealed from view in jargon) can function: witness the degree to which the American economy has planned elements, far more than we realize. Such a system requires a strong executive with powers solely to be a guardian of communism, with the larger economic power to be distributed through a parliamentary system rendered impregnable against monies, a set of economic and ecological courts, and in its lower threshold level a considerable diversity of ‘let go’ structures and potentials, from small shops, farms, light industries, etc...

The question of efficiency and the calculation debate remain yet are in practice bypassed as we envision a system that is not a utopian perfection but an evolving complex realizing increase stages of neo-communism. It will set all capital to the Commons but establish a constitutional foundation of a shared economy, but not dictate the actual form of the economy beyond its populist guarantees of jobs, education, etc, in a robust package of ‘economic rights’....

Source: *Dreams of National Capital: Market Socialism, Past and Present | The Brooklyn Rail*

The communist moment is coming, but is the left ready with a real platform? Marxist boilerplate isn't good enough

July 13th, 2018 ·

The whole of bolshevism was a wasted opportunity and part of the problem was the wrong analysis of Marxism

November 24th, 2017 ·

<https://www.dropbox.com/preview/Public/Two%20Manifestos%20version%202.pdf?role=personal>

We have repeatedly criticized Marxism on the grounds of its theoretical limits.

Its historical materialism is a world view too constrained for us now, and the stages of production theory is simply wrong. There is no inherent law of historical setting a progression from feudalism to capitalism to communism. And this view of the matter resulted in a collision of liberalism and its supposed opposite in a communism that was never even specified in advance. The whole of bolshevism was a wasted opportunity and part of the problem was the wrong analysis of Marxism.

In our manifestos and many posts here we have suggested a new approach that is a hybrid of markets, planning (and a third autonomous lower level), a reformed political system as real democracy, based on a constitutional neo-communism or Commons.

This set up should invoke a new international, but it must be a version of 'socialism in one country' and be able to work on that basis.

The point here is that capitalism isn't going to evolve into communism without the action of free agents to bring it about. It is easy however to derive a logical 'inevitability' based on the need for a shared foundation as real democracy beyond the bourgeois brand.

First is the evolutionary version which might generate its own revolutionary outcome. But the next opportunity must not be bogged down in Marxist fallacies and Marx worship.

The failure of the Marxist method, Rome and the axial age...//The class struggles in the Roman Republic: introduction to the first German edition

June 2nd, 2018

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=historical+materialism>

Despite any number of interesting insights, the Marxist style analysis of roman empire misses the mark and fails: the method of historical materialism simply cannot grapple with the overall complexity of historical development.

The study of social relations of production is a great one but Marxists turn it into an absolute and eliminate the factor of consciousness. Why on earth do that? We cannot reduce civilization to relations of production as some set of 'laws of history'.

Our eonic model rapidly uncovers a larger outline as an answer in terms of an evolutionary developmental process behind world history. It is not a complete analysis but it shows the larger dimension of historical progression: there we see the roman republic, in concert with the Greek city states, emerge in the context of the axial age. This beginning point requires study to be able to see the later phenomenon of decline in context. Marxist analysis fails to see this larger context, and also fails to see the parallel emergence of monotheism in the Middle East and the way two or more strains of 'eonic timing' later produce the world of Christianity and its take over of the roman world. This religion is something more than class struggle of the relations of production. This is not mystical history either, the whole subject remaining mysterious in its dynamic.

The comparison to modernity is misleading: modern civilization is suffering from capitalism, and this is not the same as 'decline'.

The theme of socialism or barbarism is nonetheless cogent, but the Marxist monopoly of communist/socialist models is strangling the left in a kind of straightjacket. The empirical study of class relations in the roman republic is a gripping topic, but the materialist method fails to really resolve the issues....

Source: *The class struggles in the Roman Republic: introduction to the first German edition*

The numero uno chestnut of the histomaticists...

June 2nd, 2018 ·

We have endless posts on historical materialist

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=historical+materialism>

The quote re: the essay *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* is the numero uno chestnut of historical materialists, quoted obsessively over and over (I am almost sick of it): if Marxists would simply study relations of production empirically and not try to create a pseudo-science out of it they would be far more successful...

Karl Marx uncovered the hidden mainsprings that lie behind the development of human society from the earliest tribal societies up to the present day. As he explains in a celebrated passage from his preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*:

“In the social production which men carry on they enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will; these relations of production correspond to a definite stage of development of their material powers of production... The mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, their social existence (which) determines their consciousness.”

This is the numero uno chestnut of historical materialists: if Marxists would simply study relations of production empirically and not try to create a pseudo-science out of it they would be far more successful...

The issue of decline

June 2nd, 2018

Alan Woods cited today raises the issue of ‘decline’ for modernity in the context of the decline of the roman (republic) empire...

The analogy doesn’t really work.

Ever since Spengler wrote his classic nonsense on the subject (he thought modernity the decline of a civilization starting in 1000 AD) the issue of decline gets thrown around in all sorts of combinations...

Here our eonic model suggests that it is entirely possible for modern civilization to go into decline, but certainly predicts nothing...But...! by analogy with antiquity that decline would be far in the future, a millennium from now. But the idea is dubious and the eonic model only shows an outline and does not predict what happens in the in between...In any case we are onto the game and can intervene!

The point woods is making is really that capitalism is creating a crisis and we must deal with that. But that crisis is not decline: if anything the world system is so flush with ‘progress’ (?), innovations, expansion, that it is overheating and likely to spin out of control in euphoric idiocy, plus ecological insanity, bad news but not decline in the sense of the roman empire...Relative to the eonic timer modernity is at the two century analog point ca.400 BCE when the Athenian democratic experiment falls apart and the roman republic, still vigorous, enters the empire phase that will break its republicanism...such

analogies don't quite work and aren't really part of the model, but a rough guess is in order.

And the model spots at once the current decline in democracy that must be met with restoration and/or reinvention.

Here we can suggest that democracy must be reborn, hopefully in a true socialism.

Unfortunately, the Bolsheviks may have blown the chance and it is Stalinism that seems the barbarism...

But I go with the socialist future if that can manage to create a better take than it has now...

We have created a tool for this, 'floating fourth turning points'...(a kindle book, and many posts here)...the 'eonic effect' begins to dissolve as we begin to observe it and we will move to try and understand and replicate it, perhaps, best of luck...

Floating fourth turning points

June 3rd, 2018 ·

Floating fourth turning points?

February 20th, 2018 ·

We have suggested an idea of a 'floating fourth turning point' as a human creation of its own eonic effects, a truly stupendous task requiring operating on a scale of tens of millennia. It would be useful to at least think about it and to try to estimate what is really behind the eonic effect because we have a system of stupendous potential. Leftists might use the idea to see how primitive is the idea, so far, of socialist transformation in Marxism.

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=floating+fourth+turning+points>

R48G: transitions versus civilizations...floating fourth turning points...

October 10th, 2017 ·

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=The+Crisis+of+Modernity_ver6.pdf

We have suggested that we have to upgrade 'revolution' to something more general and comprehensive that includes the fundamentals of the whole of modernity. We can see how the Russian revolution ended up collapsing the categories of social construction into the brittle ideology of the second international, ultimately the result of the contraction of Marxism around nineteenth century positivism. That was an attractive set of tenets for the time but it is not believable to many now, even given the reality of religious reaction attempting to restore itself as socially dominant.

The idea of the 'floating fourth turning point' is a 'curious notion' attempting to generalize the idea of a revolutionary social transformation and is both practical and preposterous, food for thought...

Utopian/scientific: the problems with ‘scientific’ histomat...

June 6th, 2018

R48G: the distinction of ‘utopian’ versus ‘scientific’ socialism seems dated now...
November 28th, 2017 ·

In crafting historical materialism Marx generated his classic distinction of utopian versus scientific socialism.

But if we find the theory of historical materialism collapses as not particularly scientific or accurate we are left with the larger categorical of utopian socialism. If we find the term ‘utopian’ unsuitable on its own terms we should move to what it essentially means: that socialism is adopted on the basis of a set of values that define its meaning and counsel action based on that, basically a kind of ethical injunction or a derivation of consequences from a set of assumptions, e.g. of fairness, equality, and the retribution against primitive accumulation. There is hardly any other approach and the cul de sac of histomat’s stages of production seems dated now. We arrive at a communist foundation via a set of derivations, e.g. a Kantian republic of ends must honor the individual as a person and establish his rights as version of categorical imperatives, etc... We move toward socialism then as free agents embracing a blueprint for a juster social framework. To have condemned this as utopian was in retrospect a blunder although the point Marx was making seems cogent on other grounds given the confused thinking of his contemporaries. But there is not real way to scientize history and the issue of values is implicit.

We can base the question, not on utopia, but on the idea of democracy, and democratic revolution. We move past Rousseau in a medium prior to the crystallization of electoral democracy as democracy to a larger definitional context of democracy as implying a Commons beyond private property (as capital), a full equality of persons in the context of basic freedom, with a constitution foundation that is basically a constructivist version of communism. This approach does not need to stage a final termination of capitalism (save as a definition in classic form) in that a hybrid of planned, statist, market and autonomous or anarchist sectors can move to self-harmonize in a system that assumes basic democratic and economic rights. This can’t be dismissed as utopian unless we dismiss democracy as utopian...

The left’s long series of lost opportunities...

June 6th, 2018 ·

The whole of bolshevism was a wasted opportunity and part of the problem was the wrong analysis of Marxism

November 24th, 2017 ·

<https://www.dropbox.com/preview/Public/Two%20Manifestos%20version%202.pdf?role=personal>

We have repeatedly criticized Marxism on the grounds of its theoretical limits. Its historical materialism is a world view too constrained for us now, and the stages of production theory is simply wrong. There is no inherent law of historical setting a progression from feudalism to capitalism to communism. And this view of the matter resulted in a collision of liberalism and its supposed opposite in a communism that was never even specified in advance. The whole of bolshevism was a wasted opportunity and part of the problem was the wrong analysis of Marxism.

In our manifestos and many posts here we have suggested a new approach that is a hybrid of markets, planning (and a third autonomous lower level), a reformed political system as real democracy, based on a constitutional neo-communism or Commons.

This set up should invoke a new international, but it must be a version of ‘socialism in one country’ and be able to work on that basis.

The point here is that capitalism isn’t going to evolve into communism without the action of free agents to bring it about. It is easy however to derive a logical ‘inevitability’ based on the need for a shared foundation as real democracy beyond the bourgeois brand.

First is the evolutionary version which might generate its own revolutionary outcome. But the next opportunity must not be bogged down in Marxist fallacies and Marx worship.

The eonic effect as a tool to force close observation of global world history

June 6th, 2018

How can the left create a new framework? A suggestion from the eonic model...

November 18th, 2017 ·

After a year plus of new material critiquing Marxism we are left with the feeling of talking to a void.

The cadre of Marxists is too rigid for any new conceptions and revolves in a series of clichés. We have suggested in any case that much of Marxism can reach the future if the overall framework drops its theories and operates in a more flexible manner.

A new view of history is required and we have suggested the eonic model in a minimalist form as a means to dissolve theories like historical materialism. Leftists don’t seem to understand that a false theory repeatedly debunked simply brings Marxist momentum to a halt as the critics on the right prevail...

There is a way to adapt the eonic model to the crypto-teleology of epochal communism as per the Marxist canon: the eonic sequence generates a potential and it is left to man as revolutionary to produce the realization of democracy as communism. The ‘end of history’ is a potential and we see this strangely at the level of political emergentist formations, e.g. democracy...and communism, still not realized. Historical directionality brings man to threshold where he must complete the operation. That potential lies in the concept of the ‘evolution of freedom’ which has visible aspects in emergence of civilization. This formulation is better because it resolves the issue of teleology and yet leaves man to ‘make himself’ as an autonomous individual.

‘...there has got to be a better way...!’ Did Michael Pollan Kill God? Inside the NYT Food Columnist’s Exploration of Magic Mushrooms | Alternet

June 6th, 2018

Indic religious figures often indirectly bemoan the reality of their religious culture by noting how many impostors roam the field and that real enlightenment is ‘one in a million’.

That means that out of 15 million yogis in India fifteen are the grand total... There has got to be a better way. Thus one should surmise that ‘accelerated paths’ are the wave of the future given that man’s birthright is a ‘real consciousness’. Endorsing psychedelic spirituality, if only as a research project, is thus on the table: but the catch as with the advaitin warning that ‘enlightenment’ is not an ‘experience’ is that psychedelic ‘experiences’ are transient. But this kind of research could point to a liberation from illusory paths to liberation...

Source: *Did Michael Pollan Kill God? Inside the NYT Food Columnist’s Exploration of Magic Mushrooms | Alternet*

Psychedelics, the will, (self-)consciousness, and ‘early ape men’ intoxicated with ‘(self-)consciousness’

June 6th, 2018 ·

darwiniana.com/2018/06/06/there-has-got-to-be-a-better-way-did-michael-pollan-kill-god-inside-the-nyt-food-columnists-exploration-of-magic-mushrooms-alternet/comment-page-1/#comment-836632

States of enlightenment are also, beyond the question of ‘higher states of consciousness’ completely ordinary, the same as ordinary consciousness, like music in different octaves,

but with a kind of clarity that the more usual 'mechanized' states of consciousness lose, simply 'seeing'. Hence the jargon, you are already enlightened, there is nothing to achieve.

This situation arises in relation to the almost primordial theme/meme of 'one pointedness' as the road to this consciousness of consciousness (jargon, jargon). If we stop thought for a second we experience that enlightenment, sort of, as a test case. This raises the question, why does man's natural condition get lost? One answer, as with the meme of 'stopping thought' is that 'mind' is a complex form of mental software that entered homo sapiens (or marginally homo erectus, or even chimps???) and this tends to distract man and displace consciousness into mechanical acts of mind. (Zenists are always talking about no mind. Mind is like your personal computer, but far more complex and confusingly mixed with elements of consciousness, confusing the issue of stopping thought). Man is a very complex being, and often fails to understand himself at all. In many ways the issue is not simply consciousness, but understanding 'what the blazes is happening to me, who the heck am I?'

It is said over and over, the one and only sutra, that persistent one pointedness results in real enlightenment very quickly, but this is almost impossible to achieve. Perhaps because there is no mechanical causation as such. We can't cause the mind to stop, or to stop being causal (to the extent it is causal).

We have to wonder, at the fringes of science fiction if some way could be found to deal with this perpetual stalemate that can produce a result that isn't result, and on the spot, quickly. Here we see psychedelics are 'causal' inductions, only, or else maybe there is a way here...

We should note a distinction of consciousness and attention. Consciousness is a state, but attention is an act of will, voluntary (if we say, 'concentrate', we mean willfully focus mind, or beyond mind/thought), that manipulates or acts on the mind to expose that consciousness, the ego yet not the ego, what does this mean? Thus the missing issue is the 'act of will', and the 'will' is consistently denigrated in yoga, but explicitly considered in Sufism (and in garbled forms in monotheism, the will of god, etc...). As with Bennett often cited here, we can distinguish functionality (mechanical situations), being and will, he was a student of sufism. The issue of consciousness is one of 'being', and there are paths of being, meditation, say, and paths of will, very rare, (unless ordinary monotheism). But the path to the 'will' and the path to 'enlightenment' in the end are probably the same, or very similar. Yogis have to indulge sneaky uses of the 'will' to meditate...

If we follow Schopenhauer past his possible mistakes (and past Bennett whose 'will' is a realist thesis) we see that the 'will' has a noumenal aspect (the whole range of issues has a strange resemblance to Kant's transcendental idealism). Bon idee! Problem solved if we reflect on this beyond all the hopeless jargon. We experience ego and think it the will, and it is, but also it isn't: there is a hypermental version of the will, and it is associated with the man of miracles (more bad jargon), but everyone exerts his real 'will' once in a (great) while, and the effect seems to spring from nowhere, yet influence causal events. If yogis bypass the will or claim to it is because the 'path of will' passes the land of some horrible monsters. The man of the 'will' is soon bewitched by the chance to be a magician, a true superman of the will, and is soon on Faust's path to hell with ghastly

experiments in the land of witchcraft and wonders. The Christian world's theme of repentance, more bad jargon, is really about paths of recovery from derailed derelicts of the will. The culprit can be 'saved'. Nice if it were true.

We have to wonder if early Homo sapiens didn't have frequent bouts of 'real consciousness'. Bennett explores this 'myth' of early man drunk on consciousness in a kind of euphoria. A later mechanization seems to have befallen man. But the real history is still unknown...Nonetheless we should note that primitive man, so-called, and men in advance technological civilizations are about equal in their potential for 'real consciousness'.

Let's wonder if psychedelic research can help here in the future but remain mindful of the need to cultivate consciousness, and to understand who we are: we are a very complicated mechanism and if we don't understand ourselves we remain unconscious (but still conscious in one way, note the reversal in the usage of the term 'conscious', must be a clue of some kind....Many jargons thus distinguish consciousness and self-consciousness...)

Note then that 'understanding' is a complex mystery, often unmentioned, more complex than knowledge, as both will and consciousness. We often sense that what we know we may not understand. Understanding is the Cinderella in the world of big words like consciousness. Right under our noses, yet crucial to the whole question which cannot, as such, be reduced to a chemical equivalent, as far as we know...from what we have said we see that consciousness and materiality (chemistry) are related, twins so...?

Note: this approach may still misunderstand certain aspects of these questions...

Protestant reformed secular humanism...'atheist' xtianity...the rogue term 'god'...

June 13th, 2018 ·

As monotheism dissipates it might be helpful to recast secular humanism in a broader perspective. A typical example might be the design argument: an atheist can equally examine design arguments beyond fallacious efforts to theize such thinking ...

Ironically the eonic effect shows the way beyond theistic historicism as found in the Old Testament...

Xtians themselves might do better with an 'atheist' xtianity, noting the quotation marks: the semantics of the rogue term 'god' are so protean we must be wary of general negations...

The eonic effect as evidence of a mysterious design?

January 10th, 2018 ·

Design in history...? Marx's historical materialism contains the 'design' argument of 'stages of production' theory...
December 8th, 2017 ·

The charge of design thinking only makes sense for hard core Darwinists.

In fact the evidence for 'design' in history is overwhelming, but the term 'intelligent design' is wrong because the term 'intelligent' tends to be crypto-theistic and implies a 'mind'.

Who knows? Maybe Hegel was right...

Or Schopenhauer, with this 'Will in Nature'?

Now it may be that I have under interpreted the eonic effect which is a purely phenomenological model. And the evidence of 'design' is very strong indeed. But the term 'hyper-intelligent' (or hypo-intelligent) design might be better: 'hyper-intelligent' would mean some natural process that is a de facto equivalent to something/who that is 'intelligent'.

An AI learning machine seems to be intelligent would be thus 'hyper-intelligent', ???

The evidence of design in history is given by the bare description of the 'eonic effect': some kind of hyper-intelligent process stands behind historical emergence in the development of civilization. The evidence for saying this is very strong. We see some kind of hyper-machine that can regulate teleological functions over history, but in a way that 'evolves freedom' rather than producing determined outcomes.

Massively complex 'machines' perform this operating with directionality over tens of thousands of years and able to induce the stub beginnings of whole civilizations...etc...

World History and The Eonic Effect, fifth edition, Kindle/free PDF

Communism and Gaian stewardship

June 14th, 2018 ·

As examine the eonic effect it dawns on us that evolution has to be a global process: the idea of piecemeal evolution is unrealistic as science even though it is endlessly promoted as science (scientism). We lack a real framework for correct analysis of this, and of evolution. But we can wistfully look to a future of science and cast the issue planetary life in a larger cosmological context.

In any case the left tends to cling to Darwinian ideology in the name of materialism but even the right has moved on (although it is conveniently contradictory and hypocritical about both design arguments and social Darwinist economic ideology...

We are left with the simple thesis that life has a cosmological basis and has some mysterious connection to Gaian/planetary dynamics...Here the issue of 'communism', which is a larger idea than the conventional legacy, emerges as failsafe for planetary

ecology: whatever we think of capitalism the evidence is increasingly clear that it can't maintain a planetary ecology and that it is not able to generate a long term future...

R49G: communism in a Gaian context...

October 10th, 2017 ·

We have been hard on Marxist theory because (unlike liberalism, at least before Fukuyama) it tries to enforce a theory as a preliminary to action. But communism/socialism doesn't really need an historical theory: it can be a constitutional framework based on deductions of fairness, the flaws of capitalism, etc...It is a construct of free agents acting historically according to principle in the attempt to craft 'right economy'. And we would probably see this as a realization of 'real democracy' beyond the limits of 'classic liberal' versions.

But we have also suggested an historical model of our own with the same potential for wrong theory. However, as noted many times, the eonic model is not quite a theory, but a set of observations with some preliminary generalizations. In a way the factor of incomplete evidence enforces a better logic! We must find the full pattern. But we do see a pattern in world history, a complex sequential/gird logic in a non-random pattern whose dynamic is elusive yet outwardly clear from what it does:

we can simply note that world history shows a non-random pattern
 this implies some kind of dynamic
 this dynamic like punctuated equilibrium operates in intervals with a rapid initial transition
 that dynamic is partly invisible (like a noumenal aspect)
 but we can construct a default chronology as a progression of epochs, with evidence since the invention of writing
 this system operates in parallel and sequence
 we don't need a theory to operate and the system is so complex a theory is not yet possible
 the data issues a warning to be wary of reductionist historiography
 The parallel effect is dramatically evident in the axial era, the sequential in three intervals from ca. 3000BCE\the onset of modernity is the third epoch (they are probably seven or more) and is barely underway...

the system restarts at each epoch in a new zone or set of zones
 the most recent epoch is the onset of modernity with a massive jumpstart effect in Europe, heretofore outside core world history as of the Roman empire (just to scotch Eurocentric confusions)
 a frontier effect can explain the placement of this modern transition...
 the system is clearly 'teleological' but in a very difficult and abstract way: sequential grid logic is more complex than simple directionality...
 the system alternates system action and free action...we are now free agents in the wake

of a transition, and free to act at will, within obvious constraints
 If we lose the early modern innovations we will go into decline...
 we thus exit the most recent transition as free agents and in fact operate with the
 injections of the new epoch, and we don't have to understand this system to proceed
 this system shows a clear trend of injected neo-political formations with a democratic
 focus, in parallel to socialist and communist versions...The interplay of capitalism and
 communism is a characteristic property of modernity, and should be a no-brainer, but...

this system is a kind of Gaian 'evolutionary' matrix and as we exit its last effect we enter
 the era of a final globalization...we must move to a higher level of civilization that can
 construct its own planetary civilization. It is very doubtful if unrestricted free markets can
 resolve this situation...Time to face reality...
 There is thus absolutely no reason this has to be finalized as a capitalist system of free
 markets, the latter showing severe distortions...

We can see that this system stands beyond economic histories and touches all aspects of
 culture...

There is one catch to this analysis: we have not claimed that this is an exclusive dynamic
 for the whole of history. Christianity emerges outside the eonic effect but clearly in its
 wake (the reason we also are so confused about Judaism). This requires an additional set
 of concepts.

In general this is an 'open system': space aliens could arrive and interfere. spiritual
 powers of some kind, if they exist, could create religions, outside the matrix but using a
 set of prior materials. But they cannot be the source of that the larger dynamic (here the
 Jews became confused because they the issue was 'god in history', doesn't work). Men in
 their confusion can construct entirely distorted deviations. But the basic overall dynamic
 is almost cosmic in its elusive grandeur.

Here's the interesting part: we don't as yet have to agree with all this to operate. We can
 use this to replace historical mythologies and theories but we can just as well critique it.
 But we can't undo the facts of the case. For example, Axial Age or not the clustering of
 innovation is a reality we can't ignore. The period of Archaic/Classical Greece shows
 massive innovation, whatever its place in a larger suspected system...
 We can't resolve this to technological, economic or religious categories, but all of them
 have their place in the system we detect...

We need to wake up and note the way that 'free agency' can result in screw ups.
 Compare Athenian Greece, and Rome...Decline is likely to be our fate unless we can
 maintain balance etc...Capitalism looks to be moving us into advanced civilization and
 then in twinkling into barbarism. The idea of communism, wrested from Marxist dogma,
 is an open field to resolve these secondary dilemmas...

This leaves us with the question, what the blazes is a Gaian system? I can't say, as yet. I
 note that J.G.Bennett thought he had an answer without seeing the eonic effect, and it was
 based on ancient Samkhya. Clever, but dubious. We can explore that later (already have,

in fact) but we are missing something very drastic in our perceptions of cosmic life. Let's hope the new era will lead us to a new level of understanding...

We are at a moment of peril and should consider just how stupid we have been in handing history to capitalist hyenas. Idiot...Fukuyama gets a pretty big booby prize. Marx/Engels et al. quite obviously the start of attempts to prevent disaster...

The revolutionary lessons of Lenin's 'What is to be done?'

June 16th, 2018 ·

There has been so much vilification of this work even on the left that it is hard to sort out the confusion.

Our stance here is to provide both evolutionary and revolutionary versions of our models of neo-communism. The great value of the revolutionary approach is that a set of social axioms can be established from the start, where the evolutionary approach tends to chaotify in ad hoc muddle. But the revolutionary version needs to consider babe Ruth who once pointed to the bleachers and hit a home run: a revolutionary transition needs to have its act together to produce a viable postcapitalist system and economy. All the efforts to defend Lenin fail to consider the lack of a program and the way that communist ideology was misleading them. Given the opportunity, and the bad luck of the civil war that envenomed everyone, the Bolsheviks Lenin struck out. But the issues of the Lenin's work remain. It is fundamental to focus on a working class emphasis (or better yet the universal class, in our formulation) but in the end the 'iron law of oligarchy' (there is no such law, but the point is apt) will tend to generate a vanguard. But that vanguard must then get it straight with a home run on the first attempt and Lenin's vanguard did not. Note that the American Revolution, despite populist elements of all kinds, was in the end a top down feat with a vanguard that created a something that could morph into a democracy.

If we are unsure of what is to be done we should revert to democracy creation, but this time with all the critiques of bourgeois democracy in mind and a new set of axioms based 'communism' that will ensure a 'real democracy' (that was essentially the original vision of marx/Engels before they got confused). The point here is there is nothing wrong with a vanguard, but it needs to get it right in the brief launch window of options...It seems the hatred of liberalism of the era of the early bolshevism seeded the program with anti-democracy. There might be a vanguard authoritarianism (founding fathers) at the start but it must in the end create a democratic system. We have suggested a different mix: communism that is a liberalism, and a liberalism that is a communism.

Note: this article tries to defend theory while we critique that here. But we are using the term in a different sense...: economic theories tend to always fail: we emphasis praxis, but the article uses theory almost as 'praxis'...

Source: The Revolutionary Lessons of Lenin's 'What is to be Done?'

The eonic effect needs a college course...

June 19th, 2018 ·

The previous post raised the question of historical study using the eonic effect. The eonic effect should be the subject matter for a college course, but unfortunately professional historians are extremely critical of anything that smacks of 'speculative' history and would never allow such a course. Perhaps that can change.

The charge of speculative is unfair given the extreme range and depth of survey reading that uncovers the derandomizing factor. You can't seriously claim any more that history emerges at random. Unfortunately, at that point speculative interpretation just might become a problem. But the problem isn't solved by ostrich efforts to ignore the evidence. We have proposed what we call the 'eonic model' which attempts to try and interpret the almost unfathomable strangeness of the eonic effect (a pattern of evidence) with mixed results. But why not simply follow the model and then turn around and deal with it critically.

We have tried various ways to adopt a minimalist approach. The mere statement that world history shows a non-random pattern is itself minimalist. A less minimalist approach suggests that world history has an embedded teleology, shows directionality, exhibits a cousin process to 'punctuated equilibrium'...

And that raises a related complication: the eonic model's challenge to Darwinism. That shuts down discussion immediately and you may as well be in exile in a foreign country. In fact, the public is imprisoned in the Darwin paradigm which is actually the most speculative theory of all time.

The eonic model can be a first taste in visualizing true evolutionary models, no easy task, as we have seen from history. The eonic effect indirectly clobbers Darwinism by showing what a non-random developmental process is like. The Darwin paradigm is effectively dead, but the reign of propaganda continues, complicated by the rightist assault using intelligent design arguments.

I think the issue is more than just optional: theories of history can be fatal to large numbers of people: look at Old Testament mythology, Marxism, at social darwinism, capitalist propaganda (end of history themes are not speculative history???)

I think that the eonic effect will someday be common knowledge so all we can do is wait...

Check out history-and-evolution.com for the large and growing resources free/Amazon/kindle on this subject.

One should note also the difficulty most have in actually obtaining relevant books. Having access to a good university library, and/or being able to roam the stacks, is a tremendous tool. The era of the internet is going to change this: we are close to having the equivalent online, but not quite yet...

God in history??

June 19th, 2018 ·

For some readers the question of ‘god’ in history is an article of faith, but the eonic effect both shows how that thinking arose and why it is probably false.

In a strange irony the eonic model is a descendant of theistic historicism, hopefully setting the record straight.

The discussion in WHEE (world history and the eonic effect) completely disallows the idea of theistic historicism (of the judeo-xtian brands) but some will protest that the eonic effect can have no explanation that isn’t theistic: the effect is so stupendous that one is at a loss for explanation which will defy causal theory altogether: what can act over millennia in a teleological process that shows ‘intelligent’ manipulation of all levels of culture in a series of transitions that act on temporal time slices of geographical regions, this globally in a precise timing....? The answer is, it looks like ‘god’ but the ‘god’ hypothesis won’t work. Consider some specifics: god is omnipotent, by definition. But the eonic effect is not the effect of omnipotent action by any means and shows all the limitations of space-time effects (but with some suspicions about spooky physics, and Kantian noumena). Further an epochal series shows intermittent action and seems to switch on and off, where a divinity would be omnipresent at all times and places. etc... We have easily falsified the ‘god’ hypothesis, and further we should move cogently to ‘debrief’ the Old Testament mythology as having passed long ago its ‘sell by’ date. (to put it mildly).

In fact we have consistently adopted an agnostic approach to the eonic effect, relenting slightly in Enigma of the Axial Age (a follow up to WHEE) by considering a Gaian level cosmological model of life/civilization, more a passing thought than an actual theory. But the basic point is that we can detect the eonic effect without knowing what it is.

Is trump a fascist drone? Is trump under hypnosis?

June 20th, 2018 ·

darwiniana.com : search : ‘trump+fascism’

we have explored here almost tacitly a rising suspicion of a new outbreak of ‘occult fascism’ (consider the discussions at, say, The Gurdjieff Con) in concert with a global

trend toward global dictatorship along with the related but quite different attacks on democracy by figures like Putin (keep in mind however such idiot fellow travelers like Dugin...).

This may be a conspiracy theory till proven otherwise but unfortunately the proof is hard to come by. We ask no belief, only a warning of what occult politics can achieve in complete secrecy, almost complete..How do you prove that some dark yogi or lama hypnotized a politician three thousand miles away? you don't. It is absolutely deadly, hypnosis by telepathy...

A look at The Shadow of the Dalai Lama might suggest the vast underground here, but that work is perhaps almost too elaborate: the perps have simpler tactics...

It is very difficult to follow the trail here and rare are those who can detect the transnational version of a global 'deep state' aspect (there is no such state, only ominous omens...) of this trend.

Trump often appears to act as if hypnotized according to a script (and the Russia gate line may be the best line of enquiry at the most direct level). He keeps doing things that seem deliberate attempts to undermine (American) democracy and/or pave the way to a post democratic global politics....

Booknotes: From Democrats to Kings: The Brutal Dawn of a New World from the Downfall of Athens to the Rise of Alexander the Great

June 20th, 2018 ·

Although wary of direct correlations of different phases of the eonic effect the resemblance of our period with the waning of Athenian democracy during the Peloponesian war and the lead up to the Alexandrian era (followed by the destruction of the roman republic, quite a bit later) is truly unnerving: another democratic experiment subject to destruction...The situation is especially dangerous because the defenders of democracy as established politics is no longer really democratic beyond form and unable to repair itself...

One hesitates to say it but the resemblance is almost uncanny and leads one to wonder what is going on.

In a precise and weird timing the millennial turn started what has been a direct assault on democracy (the seeds were already in the neoliberal era, cf. 'Democracy in Chains), with a real wallop of explicit attacks in the trump era...the dawn of a brutal new era? The whole game seems transparent, except it isn't, quite...

Taking Kant's TI on provision

June 21st, 2018 ·

Being dogmatic about Kant is going to backfire and the trend of the current culture will be to completely eliminate such a figure but his significance and that of TI (transcendental idealism) remains: the solution is simple, be aware of what he said, and take it dialectically on provision or as an hypothesis, and as a warning of the dangers of the simplifiers. And at this point the obstacle of quantum mechanics looms for stubborn realists, although a Kantian resolution is to be sure not as such warranted. If the question of the noumenal is metaphysical then so is the extreme 'materialism' enforced by the flatlanders. Disagreeing with Kant is no excuse for not being aware of the larger platonic warning that resurfaces in Kant of the way we live in a limited dimension of culture... Quibbling philosophers will make short work of Kant, or so they think: be wary, the whole question is treacherous, as is the monumentally confusing Critique of Pure Reason. Grasping the transcendental deduction can be almost impossible. Use secondary sources! Start with the antinomies and consider brain Magee's anecdote about grasping the essence of Kant as a youth in bed pondering those mysterious logical contradictions: cf his Confessions of a Philosopher...

The antinomies of Kant in the last section of the Critique show that 'reality' as taken doesn't really make any sense...the demonstration is so simple that it is a mystery of platonic wisdom we are so deluded...etc...

And study the eonic effect: the mysterious sense that the pattern of history is partially invisible is related to the basic issue...

Are we to suppose that a civilization reaching kardashev scale I still can't replace markets with planning?

June 21st, 2018 ·

First things first...planet earth needs to first reach the stage of civilization, then Kardashev scale type I

What stage will produce communism? The Kardashev Scale – Type I, II, III, IV & V Civilization

December 9th, 2015 ·

We have reached a turning point in society.

According to renowned theoretical physicist Michio Kaku, the next 100 years of science will determine whether we perish or thrive. Will we remain a Type 0 civilization, or will we advance and make our way into the stars? Theorists assert that, as a civilization grows larger and becomes more advanced, its energy demands will increase rapidly due to its

population growth and the energy requirements of its various machines. With this in mind, the Kardashev scale was developed as a way of measuring a civilization's technological advancement based upon how much usable energy it has at its disposal. Beyond the fallacy of technological measures is important to consider...

Source: The Kardashev Scale – Type I, II, III, IV & V Civilization

The Kardashev scale and the macro effect of civilization emergence/evolution
December 9th, 2015 ·

The issues of the Kardashev are of intriguing and probably important, but the question of 'civilization' and 'physics' suffers from a reductionist framework. The energy requirements for larger and larger civilizations begs the question of being able to do with less, not just more. The planetary economy expands, and the Amazon forests are gone. Is the solution an expansion of energy scale to expand the sphere of devastation?

Would really advanced civilizations need to travel to other stars? Isn't the 'soul' factor, beyond physical knowledge, a much simpler space ship? This 'criticism' merely exposes this thinking as gedanken experiment...all to the good, and what are the energy requirements of Frodo the Hobbit's shire, and is the edifice of the Dark Lord a Type I,II, or III civilization?

The obvious problem arises that human psychology doesn't advance even as physics advances. Science can't get man straight, can't get evolution straight.

And a look at WHEE's study of history shows that man can't get history straight. The latter is forgivable: it takes time to observe the dynamics of civilizations evolving. And the process seen can't resolve to physics, or causal science.

We can see that controlling civilizations requires more than energy computations: we must study the way the larger 'evolution' of nature generates the clear dynamics of the macro effect in world history. If we can't understand that having unlimited energy will be pointless. It is not the road to anything remotely like a 'superman'.

DMNC and the rentier question

June 23rd, 2018 ·

Our idea of 'democratic market neo-communism' is not really a completed model and is a tool to sort through the contradictions we impose on ourselves by our own definitions. This partial model might well adapt the framework of Michael Hudson's analysis in 'Killing the Host': the 'rentier' issues it raises demand a complete recasting of economy and society: it is hard to see how compromise is going to work, despite the way we have

already a built in ‘compromise’ in the way markets and planning are brought into coexistence and this in a way that bypasses state capitalism and its fallacies...

The illusion of economic theory (Hudson on ancient debt)

June 25th, 2018

Although the left tends to lump together all economists as a category, the classical economists such as Adam Smith were quite different from the current crop of neo-classical economists with their complex mathematical models.

Those models using complex calculus are in essence fraudulent and demonstrate physics envy more than anything else.

It is remarkable that this situation persists without much in the way of critical examination even by those in other areas such as that physics who would be laughed out of profession if they proposed some of the nonsense dressed up in mathematics that has overtaken economics...

One of the most compelling sequences in the Oscar-winning *Inside Job*, Charles Ferguson’s indictment of Wall Street’s role in the 2008 global financial meltdown, involved not the banker culprits but their supporting cast. These were the Ivy League accomplices. Ferguson mightily skewered these economists for the cover they gave the sub-prime Hampton dwellers whose rescue turned out to be a pretext for one of the largest reverse-Robin Hood wealth transfers in history. Though for the foreseeable future they enjoy their tenured posts, control prestigious academic journals and continue to prey on the unformed minds of students, the speculative financial implosion has shaken confidence in the economics academy.

Source: *Michael Hudson—Bronze Age Redux*

Exposing Darwinism, to no avail...lurking social Darwinist ideology

June 25th, 2018

It is surely no accident that evolutionary theory, Darwinism, persists in the same way and for the same reason that mathematical economics does: the bad odor of social Darwinism lurks over the whole subject based on the fallacy of natural selection, exposed over and over again to no avail...

R48G: the eonic effect as a resolution of evolutionary theories

December 6th, 2017 ·

Although the eonic model says nothing directly about evolution in deep time it does provide a way to debrief ideas of random evolution such as the Darwinian absolutes about natural selection. The left should renounce its older attachment to Darwinism and move beyond crude materialism to an open view of evolution as an unsolved enigma. The social Darwinist core of capitalist logic needs to be deprived of its veneer of evolutionary science and the great delay in the needed paradigm shift is surely in part the result of the capitalist domination of social, even scientific, institutions

The Bubble and Beyond | Michael Hudson

June 26th, 2018

The book traces how industrial capitalism has turned into finance capitalism. The finance, insurance and real estate (FIRE) sector has emerged to create “balance sheet wealth” not by new tangible investment and employment, but financially in the form of debt leveraging and rent-extraction.

Source: The Bubble and Beyond / Michael Hudson

Metaphysical beliefs

June 27th, 2018

Religion, visions of a Ghostseer, and the double whammy of metaphysical beliefs...
April 14th, 2018 ·

<https://www.alternet.org/news-amp-politics/what-sam-harris-and-new-atheists-got-wrong-religion-and-christian-right-arent-our>

We discussed this article from Alternet in the previous post: here we can examine the issue of religion and the new atheists. In fact we have discussed the issue here many times since 2005/2008: <http://darwiniana.com/?s=new+atheism> and many posts on religion: <http://darwiniana.com/?s=religion>

The rise of modern atheism is a classic aspect of the reformation, but enters a new phase in the post-Hegelian era of Feuerbach and the rise of secular humanism which prefigures in some ways the confusions of the new atheists.

One of the strangest muddles of the new atheists lies in their inability to distinguish religion in general from monotheism and a failure to consider the complicated history and diversity of ‘religion’. What does the term mean? We can’t just indulge in blanket

rejection of 'religion' taken in general and never really defined. Further we can confuse religion with all forms of spiritual belief. We can reject 'a' religion or even all religions but that is not the same as rejecting all spiritual belief, e.g. beliefs in a spiritual realm, an after life, a soul, and the question of 'god'. Atheism has modern momentum because monotheism rapidly became flawed by set of superstitions about 'god', pop theism. It is significant, as with the IHVH glyph, that many traditions warn of the abuse of 'god' reference and judaism/christianity/islam perpetrate an immense confusion about 'god'. That is in many ways the strength of modern atheism, if not the 'new atheism' of the harris/dawkins/hitchens brands. A close study of a figure like Kant might have saved secular humanism from its dogmatism, and its complete rejection of all spiritual beliefs: a new metaphysics of scientism has replaced the older metaphysical systems of philosophy, religion, etc... We should also note both Hegel and Schopenhauer, the first often charged with atheism despite his musings on 'geist', the second a definite atheist but with 'spiritual' beliefs as the Will in nature. A close look at early Christianity suggests some primordial Indic Schopenhauer repackaged the Indic 'samkhya' with a 'god wrapper', the cosmic triad became the Will of God. clever legerdemain.

A simple question confounds all parties, point blank, full stop: do ghosts exist? The answer is neither yes nor no but, we don't know. Kant's classic opener was his Visions of a Ghostseer (some demand if be called Dreams of a Spirit Seer) as the epistemology of spiritual metaphysics came to a kind of climatic moment of faith/skepticism. Here emerges the issue of faith, not christian faith, or faith in god, but an experimental/hypothetical adoption of particular beliefs, often spiritual beliefs. We can be atheists, yet have spiritual beliefs, like the buddhists, of many kinds. The Tibetan book of the dead purports to break the 'death barrier' as a witness to the beyond, but nothing of what they said about the bardo has a true basis as factual knowledge. But such beliefs are a different kind of religious belief, but there is no reason why such beliefs ought to be banished from secularism. Such a proposal would be self-defeating despite the adamant denial of beliefs in ghost/souls/bardo states by scientists. Where's the proof works both ways as a new form of scientific faith comes into existence...Let us note in passing that the true founder of darwinism, Alfred Wallace, came to believe in ghosts, which can't evolve by natural selection.

The failure of the new atheists to consider the issue of religion in history further undermines their branded atheism. In a very strange set of ironies the realm of polytheism suddenly seems to make more sense than the confused monotheism that came to replace it, a statement to be taken on provision (not that again!), 'gods' exist in some realm of higher nature while 'god' purports to be beyond nature or existence (???): the buddha Gautama insisted on the reality of a god realm, taken in a rational and quite unworshipful sense. Could he prove it? Does his claim for enlightenment override rational skepticism? We don't know, but many take his assertions on faith.

Let us note the issue of the axial age and its demonstration of the epochal transformations of religion in world history. We can't lump together all the religions since the Paleolithic and reject them out of hand without study as religious archaeology. And in the end the modern secular era is itself a kind of 'age of revelation' (being quite wary of such language) from the perspective of religious history and/or our eonic model. Just as buddhism and monotheism were axial age 'reformations' so the modern reformation

arises promptly in a new epochal shift, one that produces early modern atheism. The problem with atheism is the inability to define the ‘god that doesn’t exist’: they win all the battles about ‘god’ superstitions, but lose the war because the nature of ‘god’ remains mysterious, and may not have anything to do with ‘existence’ as cosmic personality, the one-god (male) pantheon. Atheists right in their disbelief in this sense but then founder in the larger confusions of (a post-theistic) ‘god’.

Finally, we should consider whether ill-conceived notions/brands of ‘atheism’ aren’t simply prolonging the reign of the axial era religions: the views of the new atheists are so narrow as to make a religious perspective the last refuge for, well, beliefs in ghosts!! A muddle over spirits from the dawn of homo sapiens, the chronic ghostseer. Must be a species characteristic.

Modern secularists need to do better than the ‘new atheism’...

We haven’t discussed the issue of bible belt Christianity, as in the Alternet article: we must note that ‘religions’ remorph and change and the conservatized brands of historical Christianity are often deviations. Also reformation Christianity had capitalist and communist brands! the deviated bible belt fundamentalism shows Christianity in decline...we might discuss this further later...

Modernity, revolution and postcapitalism...

June 28th, 2018 ·

archive: modernity, revolution and postcapitalism...

June 29th, 2017 ·

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=The+Crisis+of+Modernity_ver6.pdf

<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>

Our discussions today reinvoke our discussions of modernity and revolution with a focus on the possibility of postcapitalism.

There is nothing simple about this and we have suggested a hybrid in our manifestos that evades the ‘utopian’ fallacy with a combination of democratic/republican politics, blended market and planned economic organization and a ‘dialectical’ balance counterpoint in an autonomous low threshold semi-anarchist sector. A

‘revolution’/transition to such a system would correct the flaws of the misconstrued Russian Bolshevik revolution. Such a transition might be chaotic but the framework would contain that chaos as the system stabilized around a set of ‘communist’ axioms in the idea of the Commons: this system doesn’t pit capitalists against communists so much as create a constitutional version of basic communism that can balance markets and socialism with an experimental transition to postcapitalism...The charge of ‘utopia’

won't work here because we have carefully remorphed something that we know has worked (in quotation marks): the american republican experiment which morphed into democracy of a kind with a capitalist hybridization never taken into account by the constitutional foundation.

Ideology shared in muddle of evolution/economics...//Economics – Scientific American

June 28th, 2018 ·

Entire professions of economics and (darwinian) evolution remain fixated in a core set of fallacies, summarized in this boilerplate patch...

This statement is pure rubbish with so many fallacies it is almost incredible. The entire biological and economic community turns in circles around a core set of fallacies, beginning with the fallacies of natural selection. Economies are designed for the simple reason that economic agents as designers create economic facts which add up to economies of some kind. Here the darwinian fallacy is taken to promote an anti-government ideology, when in reality there is a entire potential for top down economic strategies, especially at the point where unregulated capitalism has become so dangerous.

“As with living organisms and ecosystems, the economy looks designed—so just as humans naturally deduce the existence of a top-down intelligent designer, humans also (understandably) infer that a top-down government designer is needed in nearly every aspect of the economy. But just as living organisms are shaped from the bottom up by natural selection, the economy is molded from the bottom up by the invisible hand.”

Source: Economics—Scientific American

Beyond the economics/evolution muddle to some sense: the eonic effect

June 28th, 2018

darwiniana.com/?s=eonic+effect

The eonic effect shows the problems that confound standard theories of economics and evolution.

The relationship of world history to evolution seems to mix two categories, but that is not

the problem. The problem is the huge scale of both subjects and the lack of any evidence that can lead to a reasonable analysis.

The eonic effect provides that, sort of, up to a point: we get a stunning clue that behind the bottom up and its fallacies there is a top-down macro effect seen in a frequency pattern with a distinct resemblance to punctuated equilibrium (the latter is not a theory but a cogent metaphor). Get the right bibliography and read several hundred books and the point will become clear, and not until then. Til then you will flounder in perpetual sausage making in academic jargon promising a new paradigm in either subject.

This raises issues of scale, teleology, directionality in a global diversity, the search for a unit of analysis other than the toynbean 'civilization', and much else.

The eonic effect and its model succeed because they Don't produce a 'theory': the subject is too complex and the analysis invokes a kind of theory we don't have yet because it must include free agents.

Science already has a glimpse of this: look at the computer code for a mouse and its dramatic transformation of a causal argument. The result may be causal in a new sense, but the result must take into account 'choice' as input to a causal system.

The eonic effect does not solve the problem but points to the way the real dynamic, although concealed, leaves its traces over the course of history. We see the footprints of a mystery, but that mystery we can infer might be connected to a larger cosmological process or design behind evolution/history, like a fine-tuning argument. Evolution is guided by some mysterious macro effect. The relation of evolution and history arises from seeing the way that man emerges from evolution into history as a budding free agent, and this is really a later stage of the birth of the animal...

If we study the eonic effect we see that economies are bound up in the evolution of civilization and the rise of modern capitalism (with seed ideas of socialism) is bound up in the transformation of modernity. It has not real independent evolution, although at each stage 'evolution' in the slang sense occurs with the new economies and technologies invented outside the eonic effect....

Cf. history-and-evolution.com...

Does man have a soul?...//It's Not Just About Abortion: Without Kennedy, Birth Control Could Be Next | Alternet

June 29th, 2018 ·

These dreadful developments should also from a sideline be seen to challenge conventional secular humanism whose view of man is so narrow that it has stalled the passage beyond religion and allowed these to fester in imaginary versions of christian doctrine and tradition rife on the religious right.

Take the example of soul: a narrow materialist view negates the idea and at once a religious perspective halts in its passage to a post-religious secularism. What is the status of the issue of soul? It is a metaphysical question, but it is so on each side. We are in the

end forced to a kind of agnosticism on the subject, but with varying degrees of belief or non-belief based on the facts of religious history. Let us consider this: man creates his soul as he works through existence. The idea of fundamentalist Christians that abortion is murder is simply nonsense: the immensity of potential organisms latent reproductive processes has nothing to do with soul. The egg/sperm conjoined do not create a soul. That is surely nonsense. To think therefore that contraception/abortion somehow murder souls is a gross distortion and a failure to see the relation of material nature and the spiritual. The reality is probably that the human organism like spooky physics has relation to a non-temporal dimension: that is what confuses the issue, but it is not thus a question of soul. Life does not bestow knowledge as such of the questions of 'soul'. The reality may be worse than we imagine: only a few have real souls and these are created in life. The sufis have said so, and we have noted many times that certain sufis actually have a technique to inject a soul seed in man, a hyperdimensional 'object' that grows from within the human body like a chrysalis: this legacy is mostly rumor, and its reality uncertain even to the Sufi Islamic public, but many have considered the issue of soul in terms of the various 'bodies' (astral, etc...). Such an entity is actually 'material' but in another mode of materiality. This tradition may have existed in ancient Egypt and passed into early Christianity and then was lost. It may explain the confused and incomprehending mutation of christian doctrine into salvationist mythology as theologians who didn't understand anything began to make it up. At the other extreme we the buddhist perspective (a confusing variant of the hindu) of reincarnational and/or 'anatta' (no soul) doctrines.

The reincarnational view is not really a soul question but, as noted, the mysterious space/time anatomy of man which seems to impinge on a timeless aspect, the never born never died dimension of the organism pointed to by yogis. But this is probably not the same as 'soul'. We must consider Kant and his warnings to be wary of metaphysical judgments...After many millennia we have never in public produced a sound view of these things. And that includes the kind of errant nonsense spouted by bible belt (and much traditional) Christianity. The idea that every egg and sperm once conjoined produce a soul is a complete set of errors. Any other view is a travesty of the reality of nature in connection to a larger dimension of the organisms of animals and the potential individuality of man. In any case a 'soul' entity that entered a body that aborted its fetus would simply react like someone who missed a bus: get the next one.

We must in any case be critical of secular humanism that equal extreme leaves the whole set of questions in an opposite limbo and the sheer stupidity of much religious thinking contracts to the kind of false theology visible on the religious right.

We are left with three broad suspicions that linger as hypotheses in a complexity that defies easy analysis: conception is not soul formation, man has a space/time framework that impinges on a kind of spooky physics that generates what looks like reincarnation, 'spiritual action' generates its own seed soul (and temporal material action is potentially perfectly good at this) but we don't know precisely what this is, and finally there is an additional explicit 'soul formation' of the sufi type that involves what they call completed man. The latter is a kind of luxury in a context where man has a 'sort of soul' based on his action over time, and in successive lives, if any.

Man as homo sapiens probably acquired a soul in some sense at the dawn of speciation,

connected with mind, language, art/creativity, and a proto-religious sense of the 'spiritual', a sort of temporary 'Chevrolet' soul and package deal for smart apes that allows him to traverse history and solidify this gift of nature, and this is not the same as the 'complete man' process, nor does require belief in god or allegiance to religion. Here the religions may be right that man can fritter away this grub stack, and in the words of gurdjieff, perish like a dirty dog. So, everyman comes to have a 'sort of soul', at least for a while, as his future is contingent on his life and values as he moves to complete this process.

Here Christian theology has totally muddled the whole question and even attempted to create a theological monopoly of its nonsense.

Source: It's Not Just About Abortion: Without Kennedy, Birth Control Could be Next/
Alternet

How do you revolt in a de facto totalitarian system like the us?

June 30th, 2018 ·

We don't have to issue revolutionary rhetoric to answer this question: we must at least consider the net equivalent to revolution and that can occur indirectly. Which means we must consider that activist politics and 'get out the vote' hand wringing is too insipid to produce anything: the last forty years shows the left has accomplished nothing and this has emboldened the right which is nudging into place increasingly repressive measures from militarized police to gerrymandered districts. Now in a new phase trump is actually explicit about fascism. bang, you're dead, eh?

What do we mean by revolution? American democracy is broken and can't lead to change?

March 16th, 2016 ·

[http://therealnews.com/t2/index.php?](http://therealnews.com/t2/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=31&Itemid=74&jumival=15887)

[option=com_content&task=view&id=31&Itemid=74&jumival=15887](http://therealnews.com/t2/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=31&Itemid=74&jumival=15887)

What do we mean by revolution? We confront the reality of the US government, in the context of a global set of states: revolution means we indict that government over issues of neo-liberalism, criminality as with 9/11, and now most critically failure to act on climate change. We indict that government and proceed to overthrow it by whatever means we can. Electoral means are unrealistic at this point. So we are in the position of the early rebs confronting the British Empire, except that our situation is more desperate.

A revolution is usually a military operation and involves a cadre of revolutionaries, etc... we are back in the obvious after a good deal of 'shades of definition' of the term.

The term via the Sanders 'revolution' seems to refer to an economic populist movement dealing with, e.g. wages, etc...

but this isn't revolution in the real sense.

Since we are dealing with the core issue of capitalism, we are talking about a system of

neo-communism to attempt the overthrow of that system. We should have had this in motion a long time ago: we may be too late.

I think a modified 'communist' revolution after the model of the American revolution remorphed around a 'neo-communist' set of principles is the best option. But the legacy of marxism/bolshevism is probably not going to work, even as the core of marxism will remain the starting point.

In any case, a revolution now means a transition to a postcapitalist system. We should be preparing for that, realistic as a plan or not. We MUST have this plan in readiness. The moment of real revolution will suddenly come and a viable movement will be ready to act. I think that marxist groups are too stalled to perform this, so we can envisage a new movement using streamlined elements of marxism, which is like a Model T Ford, updated without false compromises. Social democratic compromises are possible, but they aren't revolutionary.

Looking at the American election of the last year we see a spectacle of an entire year wasted and resulting in nothing, with a danger of regression and virtually no discussion of real issues, or climate change. It is incredible, but the democratic system is broken: an entire spectrum of candidates can't even discuss climate calamity on its way. The problem is capitalism, and the system must stage a revolution beyond capitalism. It isn't going to be able to pass laws in Congress to deal with this.

The strategy of neo-communism: Trotsky and the Russian fumbled balls...

June 30th, 2018 ·

At the risk of misunderstanding both Trotsky and the Russian revolution we might note the resemblance of Trotsky's perspective and our own: the idea of the need for a bourgeois democratic revolution to precede the passage to socialism was rejected by Trotsky and the history of the Russian revolution bears this out. We have essentially said the same thing with important differences all the way through.

First the idea of socialism in one country must coexist with an international. If one zone can construct a special kind of communism in one country this would actually be far more conducive to an international that succeeds.

We have consistently suggested that our 'democratic market neo-communism' can be applied to any social economy in any nation at any stage of development. We don't have to be stuck in the illusory stages of production theory. The reason we can do this in our formulation is because we see the task at hand, creating communism as the task of creating a Commons in the wake of the abolition/expropriation of private property/capital: this is a constitutional foundationalism, not a blueprint for the economy to go with which must be constructed very carefully, possibly by a different group of people in no sense allowing Stalinist caudillo ad hoc communism to gain dominance.

After all, the Bolsheviks soon saw the nullity of the bourgeois revolution in Russia, and Lenin stumbled via the NEP into trying to construct a hybrid, and of course the international aspect loomed in the background as still another confusion: we have suggested that the NEP tokens our idea of a market/planned double sector solution, while the international aspect can coexist with ‘socialism in one country’. Again the Bolsheviks ended up agreeing with us: socialism in one country was their only option, which didn’t exclude a massive international. It looks like the Bolsheviks were trying to agree with us! Note also the way the Chinese revolution aborted: it was again trying to invent our DMNC: they finally introduced a market sector but this failed and succeeded by not being truly communist: it let foreign capital perform a stealth market roll back of communism, a communism that could not tolerate a democratic resolution. Still another tragic near miss trying to invent our DMNC. What might have happened was a market communism that was under the rubric of a Commons. This is the bizarre outcome of all parties to the second international: they were braindead on how to proceed, mostly because the triad of planned, market, anarchist, democratic and one party/many party, one country/permanent revolution pairs of opposites eluded them. A solution is needed in advance that is ready for the juggernaut of contradictions with a strategy that can survive them.

In the early twentieth century, most Marxists held the view that any future Russian Revolution could only take the form of a “bourgeois-democratic” revolution.

Source: *Assessing Trotsky*

Marxist confusions and DMNC

May 11th, 2018

<https://www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2018/05/what-made-marxism-so-deadly/>

This is a cogent analysis but we should not forget that the birth of democracy was almost more violent: the English civil war killed proportionately more people than the first world war, and ended, as did Bolshevik communism, in retrograde motion because it couldn’t quite define ‘democracy’ at all. Pseudo-democracy finally arrived, Parliament and its oligarchs...sounds familiar.

One issue with Bolshevik communism is the foundation in historical tsarism and the resulting inability to equate communism with the completion of democracy: the action by a dictator to direct a ‘communist’ experiment was fallacious from the start but somehow part of the dna of Russian autocratic history.

The larger difficulty, pointed to here many times, is the tendency emerging from marxism to unwittingly negate liberalism (hence democracy) in the attempt to define using ‘stages of production’ theory the fixed historical transition from capitalism to communism. But a subtle fallacy lurks there, as noted here many times. We may wish to reach some form of postcapitalism but we might consider ‘markets’ beyond capitalism and communist democracy that is a transformation not quite antithetical to the universe of ‘liberalism’. The tendency of marxism is to posit an ‘epoch’ of postcapitalism as ‘communism’ but a

more realistic view might consider communism as a challenge to create a robust economics on a par with the obsession with free markets: Marx Engels seem to have thought communism would completely abolish markets but looking back we can see that 'markets' and the obsessive 'free markets' of the capitalist era are not necessarily the same: we can create a mixed system in a context of the creation of a commons (the equivalent of the expropriation of capital) where markets exist in relation to planning, not phony market socialism, but real markets with resources licensed from the Commons, to allow a robust economic communism. We sense a contradiction where none need exist. These markets could even have socialist entrepreneurs competing with planned sectors whether less efficient or not, with considerable autonomy, and internationalist interactions, but only in the context of shared resources.

Here the question of authority defeated the Bolsheviks, as well it might have given the context of the civil war. But there we find simply another challenge to produce both democracy and strong authority, a trick anticipated by the founding fathers. Consider:

a system of democratic market neo-communism, based on a Commons beyond private property

this contains both planned and market sectors, plus a third 'autonomous' or lower indifference level of 'let be', more or less of our Two Manifestos...

this system must not only balance planning and markets but anarchic democracy and authority: we could envisage a four party state, with a 'one party' state of presidents with strong authority, but limited to the defense as guardians of the Commons with no direct interference in the economy or other politics, save some foreign policy aspects: all the other functions of state and economy devolve to other agencies, parties and courts: a three party mix as a deliberate triad to promote a parliamentary system absolutely protected from external commercial influences: the three party system would regulate economic issues with ecological courts to regulate economic environments and economic courts to mediate planned and market interactions. This system could be dynamic with relatively small degrees of 'differential equality' in a 'permanent (r)evolution' form basic raw communism to a more sophisticated version. This system might still require 'labor unions' in the mediation of labor issues. etc...the variants are multiple. This approach, while it would certainly consider a new international, would attempt to produce an heretical idea of 'socialism' in one state, one that would interact with foreign markets as such but also in a 'dialectical' mode with or without conflict with a robust self-defense of the local system and a potential sedition of the world system (non-violent?) toward postcapitalism...(let us note that china has produced an abortive version of this: the system suddenly allowed markets in the context of (pseudo) communism...it is not adequate to our definitions)

We are still in transition to a definition of democracy and are confronted by a spontaneous rebellion of the 'Diggers' of the English civil war demanding an open Commons...

Posts on Pinker's 'enlightenment now'...

May 8th, 2018

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=pinker+enlightenment+now>

We have had a lot of commentary on Pinker's new book: the links...

We can comment further in a new blogbook on the way.

If pinker is really a conservative is clear enough, but radicals have often failed to grasp the implication of the ideology of progress...The classic but flawed Dialectic of Enlightenment confused the issue for many and we see the indirect attack from pinker, even more flawed...

A Gaian riddle?

May 12th, 2018

The eonic model ironically resolves the issue of historical theories by applying a kind of sequential/parallel grid matrix and this suggests that after so much futile effort to find a theory of history the reason for the failure lies in the implications of this grid matrix. By 'grid matrix' we refer to the way that discontinuity applies both sequentially and laterally producing a long range sequence and a set of synchronous effects, a sort of mini-multiverse effect (metaphor only).

In this context it is counterproductive to propose simplistic attempts at theories of history: there is a real dynamic but it is something we could never have suspected and the full empirical resolution there is still premature: we don't have the full range of evidence needed to come to a full conclusion. That point should be obvious for the earlier evolution of man: we don't know how it happened, period....

some older posts...

R48G: the difficulty of resolving historical theories...

June 27th, 2017 ·

World history contains a hidden surprise but it cannot easily penetrate the hold of current social/historical ideology because the factual basis for such a complex entity eludes any simple resolution.

It requires an exercise in visualization of obscure moments of that history, and that requires reading books...that makes the public vulnerable to ideological manipulation, to say the least...

R48G: detecting historical dynamics...the eonic effect as a test of the data of world history...

June 23rd, 2017 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=eonic+effect>

We have often discussed the ‘eonic effect’ as an alternate historical framework. Actually it not a completed theory or even a definite framework: rather, it works as a ‘test of the data’. We make a series of assumptions about history but fail to see how beyond religious historicism the field of modern scientism does no better. One might consider the way that a kind of orthodoxy is enforced by the new field of Big History which completely misses the point.

The eonic effect can be taken as a series of warnings: as we try to apply various models to world history we discover the unexpected, contrast of discrete and continuous processes. This is an empirical given, whatever we make of it. We can use the ‘model’ as a warning to be wary of dogmatic theories and simply operate with chronicles and empirical histories. It is also a warning that causal systematics just won’t work on history and that we must deal with free agents who are in a kind of hybrid state in a larger mix, partly causal but probably teleological. We cannot reduce this complexity to simplistic analyses of the type of historical materialism (or neo-classical economic models). One value of the eonic model is that the condition of historical determination operating on free agents is intermittent and subject to a end phase where the ‘eonic effects’ cease and free agents are bound to try and take over their own history. That’s a huge and dangerous task, and a new left must be able to operate via all categories, not just the economic. The eonic effect is a warning that virtually all parties have gotten history wrong. We must operate on the defensive and try to operate with a non-dogmatic constructivist practice. The eonic model is probably too exotic for braindead Marxist but it can at least suggest a wariness about overly complex analyses that are soon millstones around one’s neck.

Is the working class revolutionary?

May 12th, 2018

Although the classic focus on the working class remains the keynote of any real majoritarian/democratic initiative it is useful to consider the larger framework of the ‘universal class’ so-called

in order to really see the way in which social division as class struggle needs to yield to a platform that deals with all classes and subsets thereof. The working class focus can end up neglecting the real crisis

unfolding: the ecological crisis, the onset of degrowth and no growth economics, the neglected ‘lumpenproletariat’, the ambiguous middle class, and ultimately the

‘bourgeoisie’ itself which is under threat of liquidation in the working class ferocity model.

We need a coherent plan that can give a focus to the working class but point to a unification of classes in a transitional socialism/communism that can mediate class differences beyond class struggle in a unified Commune.

Red Forty-eight Group: universal versus working class...
January 24th, 2017 ·

One of the reasons we changed the terminology of our (socialist/communist) ‘Red Forty-eight Group’ from working class to universal class

was to obviate precisely the difficulty we see now in discussions of the Women’s March: the splintering of focus between issue activisms and a more general leftist perspective, or set of perspectives. The universal class is really a superset of the working class and we can change gears immediately to consider a working class version of both the universal class and the ‘Red Forty-eight Group’.

The point is that the universal class is also the set of its own subsets and that includes the various issue subsets from Black Lives Matter, to Feminist groups and orgs, to much else, including the spectrum of socialist groups.

This approach automatically allows parallel groups to work together while at the same time sending a set of suggestions about considering a larger set of perspectives.

In general we have a huge list of issues that come together as separate yet unified into one larger perspective

ecological economics in itself or as a version of a new socialist/communism: the Red Forty-eight Group with a floating core as ‘democratic market neo-commuism’ is thus an ecological powerhouse in potential in the context of socialism

and this brings to the fore the number one crisis of capitalism next to economic justice: climate change

socialist, economic justice

neo-communist, the issue of private property

revolutionary action and political structures versus electoral/evolutionary

markets versus planned economies

anarchist initiatives and their challenges to revolutionary activism

democratic initiatives in the context of the communist/socialist sectors

economics and technology: universal basic income and automation

national versus international perspectives: we focus on a national economy, but the larger question of a federation of socialist nationalism emerges powerfully to challenge populist distortions we see now...issues of trade arise to complicate thus the whole formula: this is inevitable (and the older internationals in theory had all of this down pat)

Here feminism and race get thus powerful associations with a larger action

We can make analogous statements about ‘socialism’ frequently referenced, meaning in reality social democratic activism of various types. All such can be welcomed, but critiqued under the context of our universal category...

The Red Forty-eight Group isn’t an actual party or association (it could be) but is a set of abstractions (based on the once and future revolutions of the ‘1848’ legacy). It can be used as a benchmark for the different brands on the left, now in a state of confusion. It also allows for a post-marxist equivalent that can invoke that classic legacy but detach from it.

The eonic model beyond materialism/idealism

May 12th, 2018

We keep repeating our critique of marxist theory, suggesting a different approach, e.g. cf. history-and-evolution.com ‘s WHEE:

One of the reasons to suggest the macro model of WHEE to replace historical materialism is that it can stand beyond materialist/idealist debates and operate at a higher level of abstraction, and...:

1. transcends the economic where HM emphasizes it that allows a larger view of culture and shows a model where the economic is in principle a subcomponent
the dynamics of civilizations and economies are different
 2. it does not select a subset philosophy to explain the whole (although the idea of a model is a partial exception)
instead it embraces all known historical philosophies, and religions and knowledge forms, and not only that, their evolutions over time
 3. it embraces the framework of science but stands outside by not applying naive causal explanations
 4. yields a structure that shows the action of facts and values together
 5. provides an example of how a large scale system evolves (development over time)
 6. corrects misperceptions about random evolution
 7. has a definite lineage in Lamarck’s lesser theory (not his theory of adaptation) and the Kantian teleomechanists, the first theoretical biologists
in this context
 8. gives a clear rationale for the massive appearance of revolution in world history during the early modern
 9. bypasses the confusing ‘end of history’ discourse
 10. reconciles dynamism and free agency
- etc...

R48G: reform or revolution redux... September 6th, 2017 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=virtual+revolution>

Our seemingly consistent critique of ‘reformist leftism’ is, of course, misleading because we have also made ‘compromise’ a studied angle with our idea of ‘virtual revolution’ which embraces the whole contradiction. That in addition to hybrid of markets and communism. This is not really compromise but quiet desperation.

The issue is not so much the superiority of either pole but the increased control by a totalitarian capitalism that seems to preclude revolutionary actions. That is misleading and partly the result of too much wrong thinking but the issue remains to find a vehicle, any vehicle, that can lead to some kind of change. But the issue of revolution, however unrealistic at first, won’t go away because the current regime is actually closing in on reformism, as with the anti-union successes, and everyone will discover too late that real options no longer exist. Actually, the problem lies in the way the problem has been analyzed and the confusing interpolation of Leninism Stalinism into definitions of communism, with analog confusions from Mensheviks.

We have suggested seeing revolutionary communism as, in part, a variant of the democratic revolutions of the early modern and adapting economic thinking to that kind of foundation, save that we derive the nature of democracy from axioms of fairness and equality: the logical requirement of communism of some kind in the creation of a Commons. To bring capital under control need not imply the total absence of markets. The two ideas are logically separate, perhaps...

Classic Marxism confused the issue, we suspect, in the way it posits a stage of communism to follow a stage of capitalism, in turn after a stage of feudalism. Such an analysis simply doesn’t correspond to the way world history unfolds and enforced a rigid antithesis of communism and capitalism. But as noted, after the expropriation of capital into a neo-communist Commons, it is still possible to have markets, no doubt in a balance of planned sectors. In addition we have propose an autonomous sector below a certain threshold given a touch of anarchism to a highly complex overstructure that must break new ground economically but which has the potential to both recast communism as democracy and economically as a viable experiment that can evolve and provide the net equivalent of capitalism in a truer form under the aegis of ‘democratic communism’. This is not a social democratic compromise but could mimic that in early phases, e.g. moving toward an electoral constitutional convention, say, that could found communist axioms. In fact, a revolutionary situation is emerging but the old Marxist left is not ready. Get ready!

So, the social democratic band music is now stealth revolutionism, not so stealthy, more or less in the open. The eerie background music is, no, revolution is the first necessity. But this formulation can move into new ground in a threatened future to a reformist slingshot to a revolutionary situation likely to emerge in the coming chaos of climate catastrophe.

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Democratic_Market_Neo_Communist_ver_5.pdf

The Israeli connection...one reason many recoil from 9/11 conspiracy theories...

May 20th, 2018

Israeli connection? why so many evade the issue? //Solving 9-11: The Deception That Changed the World: Christopher Lee Bollyn
April 1st, 2017 ·

This is a good piece on 9/11 that I had missed (it is expensive to get all these works...) In the previous post we considered the minimum evidence generating suspicion. This book, unlike many in the truther field points to one reason so many are ‘mum’s the word’ on these questions, the shocking claims of an Israeli connection...

Source: Solving 9-11: The Deception That Changed the World: Christopher Lee Bollyn: 9780985322588: Amazon.com: Books

DMNC, gedanken experiments, murphy’s law, and the foundation of an evolving system with a neo-communist threshold...

May 20th, 2018 ·

R48G: how would DMNC function in practice?
March 27th, 2017 ·

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Democratic_Market_Neo_Communist_ver_5.pdf

Our link to the Roberts’ blog provokes some interesting questions about the functioning of our ‘democratic market neo-communism’ which is taken as a three sector system comprising a planned sector, a market sector, and an autonomous sector. This system would be neo-communist, that is, with capital expropriated to the Commons, to ecological courts, and would be subject to a strong presidential system protecting the socialist foundation next to a congressional system able to mediate economic projects via electoral systematics. Thus the market sector would allow entrepreneurs to license resources from the commons, and even raise funds via socialist equivalent of investment processes. The planned sector would produce a set of overlapping systems of enterprises free from state domination but ‘planned’ in governmental agencies with carefully defined powers and responsible to a set of economic rights for all classes of the universal class. This system would have a lower autonomous sector where so to speak the ‘reserve dna’

of different economic systems would linger vestigially, and/or produce a robust mix of market, cooperative, agricultural, light industrial subsystems allowed to stage an 'archaeology' of semi-capitalism on a small scale. Or whatever... We have left this system slightly undefined but it is hard to see how some kind of vigorous form of postcapitalism with remnant presocialist elements could not thrivingly emerge. This system would promote a strong equality but would not be in a final state of full equality necessarily. It might resemble in some ways a version of 'Viking economics' but would in principle be quite different and a completely new form of economy. This, please note, is not the same as the many versions of 'market socialism' which have been the object of much discussion and critique.

Dialectics of the 'dialectic'...

May 20th, 2018

darwiniana/com: search: dialectic of the enlightenment

The classic Dialectic of the Enlightenment is a cogent analysis, classic, but flawed by its own Marxist assumptions and the tone of superiority that Marxists tend to get into in the sense they have a universal standard of judgment.

But there can be no doubt the basic idea is completely reasonable, as such. But the mystery of the Enlightenment is the mystery of world history itself, and of the eonic effect lurking in the background. The dynamic of history doesn't really follow a dialectical path, pace Hegel, and in any case the 'marxist' dialectic is not really a well-founded 'logical' (!) discourse.

Beyond that the confluence of terminologies, indict/Buddhist, and philosophic/rational confounds the whole debate: what is the relationship of yogic enlightenment and rational enlightenment? A strong case should be made that the two are basically the same, the western rational version however remaining as yet in the foothills of a new take on the tradition of meditative enlightenment. Despite its counterintuitive echoes the notion of the equation of the two makes more sense than one might realize, this despite the instant banishment by the putative philosophes of 'mysticism' to the 'counterenlightenment, also a useful line of enquiry. But a perusal of Schopenhauer will show the connection forthwith and its is often forgotten that the 'Enlightenment' period was a first 'archaeological' expedition into realm of buddhism/yoga and its legacies, which have flooded the west, with whatever result...

The limits of instrumental reason are really a later development of the 'Enlightenment' focus on reason in a more general sense, consider how the idea of 'Reason in History' emerges in its own counterpoint to the rationalists and scientists of scientism...

The enlightenment? how about a dialectic of 'marxism'?

March 23rd, 2017 ·

The leftist critique of the enlightenment was misguided: the Frankfurt school produced a false judgment in the way it wished to blame the holocaust on the enlightenment, a disastrous misunderstanding. The leftist needs a foundation in the modern in a fashion more general than the enlightenment theme as such, but the basic point is clear. The eonic model solves this problem in a flash by suggesting by stepping back and showing the way the period of the enlightenment is part of a far larger process that constitutes the modern transition. The danger here is the suggestion that marxism could critique and recreate modernity in a kind of self-enclosed 'postmodern' recreation of a new era. It does not have the resources to do that. There is absolutely no problem trying to critique the enlightenment but it is essential to see the complexity of the period and its multiple versions in descant. How can we critique enlightenment values if they stretch between French, German, etc...realizations?

What we need is a 'dialectic of marxism' to enable a recasting of its foundations and a movement to a new and creative successor...

Kant's questions about history as a foundation for a neo-marxism...

May 20th, 2018 ·

Kant in some of his aspects might be a more useful foundation for a neo-marxism than Hegel (who can be rederived via Kant) in the way his view of history non-dogmatically asks a set of questions (answered in their own way by the eonic model) and focuses on empirical research as the basis for conclusions...

R48G: progress toward a perfect civil constitution...

March 21st, 2017 ·

The issue of Kant and history...

From our developing blogbook...

the basic intent is to simplify the confusion created by marxism and jumpstart a new and practical approach using elements of the marxist legacy taken in reserve.

Marxist historical theory doesn't work and has been critiqued many times. It is a non-teleological crypto-teleological theory about a set of entities far too complex for such a simplified analysis. The danger is that while waiting for the next stage after capitalism we will remain passive until the capitalist era exhausts its potential: the latter will never happen. We will burn out the planet before we exhaust all the useless combinations of capitalism.

We are betrayed by theory here in the puzzle of Marx's complex deliberations and overly complex analysis. And that includes the confusions over the labor theory of value, and the latter makes much better sense if you stop trying to produce a theory. Much of Marx's analysis remains of great interest, viz. analyses of class struggle but overall it belongs to the era of positivism (still quite current) and its 'scientism'. We need to pay our dues to

the era of Feuerbach in which Marx and Engels worked and adopt a secular perspective but there are many ways to do that and we need to consider the limits of the materialism of the period which gestated socialist thought. Marx's attempt to create a science confused the issue and the result was never really a science. We see the second international proceed down the garden path of a 'science' that should have been something less ambitious and focused on the practical.

Instead of attempts to rationalize 'stages of production' theory in the fashion of Marx we could do better by considering a classic essay on history written by Kant: there is the issue of teleology is taken explicitly, but the core of the piece is to ask a question about history and refer the question to the future. The analysis of the eonic effect attempts to point to the probable solution to Kant's question which also asks for a demonstration of the passage to a perfect civil constitution.

There is a key to a new praxis: can we detect the solution to the riddle of civil 'evolution'? Indeed we can and the eonic effect (in earlier versions with its 'discrete freedom sequence') shows just this. So, instead of a succession of systems in deterministic directionality we have the prospect of moving toward replacing capitalist democracy with renewed progress toward a perfect civil constitution. The current madness is hardly perfection! This is the task of free agents nor mechanical systems or economic structures.

The status of theories: physics versus economics

May 21st, 2018 ·

Economic theory and public jargon/ideology....
October 29th, 2015 ·

Our project to critique neo-classical economics proceeds apace...I keep getting distracted but it is enough to undermine economic theories at the root: a physical theory applies to an exact context. The match is exact. But in economics, if we examine the work, we see differential equations used on situations involving human agency: an instant fallacy. As a result differential equations cease to apply. And yet the theories continue...in fact, as approximations they seem to work often enough to induce their use. But as 2008 shows the theories weren't there when you needed them...

We have a right to protest against policies of exploitation based on bogus theories.

It might help to swear off Marxist theories, except in passing mention. We tend to critique capitalist theories to propose Marxist ones. Best skip it. There is no simple way to produce an economic theory. Marx's insights are acute, but he had as hard a time getting theory straight as anyone else (his critics by the turn of the twentieth century already had most of them nailed, Marxists need to be alert to all the critiques).

Listening to conservatives on cable news channels brings the point home (although liberal/left discussion is often itself fallacious where based on neo-classicism...): it is obvious they don't understand economics and have become vulnerable to lunacies (like Ayn Rand, libertarians, etc...) nobody knows what they are talking about. Noone.

A new approach is needed. Popper's old idea of piecemeal social engineering, despite its dreadful aspects, points to the reality: all we can do is try basic strategies based not on theories but constructs that resemble them but don't delude us with exact mathematical delusions.

A revolutionary left has to have a program that has a good chance of working and it has to be more than planning in an office, and it must self-feedback to get it right. We need to create a whole new set of assumptions...

For example...we assume entrepreneurs must be motivated by profit...but there is every possibility of new economic structures created by the 'will of the entrepreneur'...We don't meditate for profit, we just do it. The fictions of capitalist mentality need to be challenged...etc, etc...We may or may not wish to have entrepreneurs in a communist system. But the point is clear. The assumptions of capitalism can be challenged at every point.

Proposing bogus economic theories should be considered a crime, because they fake science and cause the death of large numbers of people...

Empty rhetoric of democracy without a Commons

May 21st, 2018 ·

The idea of communism has been so discredited that we forget that in some form it is the only solution to the problem of fairness, and thence of democracy: our current system promotes the theme of democracy in order to covertly promote forms of inequality, and domination by the economics of capital.

This are fairly old ideas! But there cogency is becoming obvious all over again as we begin to grasp in intuitively terms the way the demand for democracy has produced its opposite. The problem arises with the equation of democracy with 'electoral democracy', an equation that was never established until fairly late in the game.

Unless we can establish a commons as the basis for a fundamental equality of resources our talk of democracy is mostly empty rhetoric...

archive: market (neo-)communism in the transition through the coming crisis...
April 2nd, 2016 ·

In the context of the climate crisis we are moving beyond populist politics on inequality: we will be lucky if we can prevent the elites from simply deleting the working and other classes from any share of the pie as they create elite survival pods.

In that context we must think in terms of the whole, i.e. some form of neo-communism, free of the clichés and dead hand of the older brands.

We might do what we did with socialism: consider market socialism, here market communism, as a gedanken experiment. A communist revolution might seem unrealistic, but if we approach the end point in stages we can begin to consider at least something: market communism considers a system of a planetary federation of communist republics, with control of all large scale industry under governmental and UN control, but leaving some or multiple aspects of industrial civilization strictly regulated, delivered beyond private property to the Commons, but still functioning in a de facto semi-independent manner. To this we have a strict new form of democracy where the control of process by capitalism is made impossible. The latter if accomplished, could rapidly transform the paralysis of government we see. There is a host of possible scenarios here, including full communism from the start in a situation of such crisis that the forms of economy and government collapse.

But there are a number of way stations reachable via electoral processes, or revolutionary situations at the margins. We should have a set of options in multiple varieties. What we must do is ask how a legacy marxism could prove viable, or remain worthy of a second chance. Surely we must recast that classic for a new situation, in a form that people will actually buy into. If we can get Bolshevik lunacy out of our minds and memories we will see that the original idea of communism was transparent, robust, republican/democratic, and economically intelligent, with covert agency lunatics, secret polices, etc... We can see how this could prove impossible to achieve: the boondocks of the American system under constitutional license is armed to the teeth and in denial about anything but further environmental exploitation, but the tipping point of shocked realization may actually exist: the competition of bad alternatives will sooner or later take effect.

Stages of history versus relative transformations and transitions

May 21st, 2018 ·

December 11th, 2015 ·

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marx's_theory_of_history

The classic stages of history in marxism are
primitive communism

slave society
 feudalism
 capitalism
 socialism
 communism

But will this analysis really work?

slave society is to follow primitive communism, but slavery is not clearly a very early stage of society. It is more like a pathology of civilizations and a primitive form of a later stage, capitalism, and the extreme form of system with a pathological labor theory of value.

feudalism is hard to define but its 'medieval' source as a term was more a stage of the decline from the state in the dark ages. It was a stage after the world of organized Rome...

capitalism isn't really a stage because it is present from the dawn of the Neolithic or before (the paleolithic trade in obsidian), shows up in essence in all forms of commercial interaction, and is clearly present in periods that are well-documented, e.g. ancient Greece, where the forms of finance are already coming to the fore. And this is merely a better documented case: the forms seen in early Greece must have seen many permutations throughout antiquity.

Trade relations over large distances with bullock carts, for example....

The perspective of the 'macro effect' in WHEE works better because it is more fluid and refers to transitions, not to stages. These transitions refer to something more like shoveling coal into a furnace (cycles of a locomotive) appear to be an aspect of a dynamic of cyclical action. The cycles of the locomotive have no correlation with the outer terrain through which it travels. Whatever the case, it is actually more useful to clock stages in terms of transitions rather than social definitions.

The core of civilization begins in the Neolithic: family, tribe/aggregates, villages, town, cities, states...But this is another stages list: transitions act on whatever they find in place and produce relative transformations of what it finds to a greater complexification, e.g. with appearance of agriculture we see villages, then towns, then cities states. These depictions are not intrinsic but descriptive and contain the real advance factors: innovations in the realm of ideas, from technical inventions to religions in the crucible developing culture...

The macro effect can only find three phases of transitions, but suspect six or seven starting in the Neolithic.

We start in the phase of the first states: Egypt, Sumer, around 3000BCE, then the Axial phase, around 600BCE, then the modern period around 1800 AD. These dates cap a period of transition of several centuries, and show a remarkable correlation of seminal innovations. The nice thing about relative transformations is that we can begin anywhere, and can proceed even if we don't have a complete early history.

So instead of phases we have a purely abstract definitionless set of transitions which show definite advances in civilization but not in the sequence of stages as above.

One problem with feudalism is that its medieval form shows decline from a higher phase or 'stage' in the period of the great flowering of the Axial Age. It can thus hardly be a stage. Feudalism precedes modern capitalism only via the empirical facts of the case of European history.

The modern transition seems to be the stage of capitalism coming to pass, but a closer look shows that its development, although severely characteristic of the early modern, was peripheral to the much more complicated broader innovations of general culture in science, philosophy, religion, art, literature, and much else. We can't ascribe these to economic determination or to a stage of history. They are relative transformations of genres that existed all along.

We do seem to see 'a' birth of capitalism at the end of the modern transition around the time of the industrial revolution, and this may be part of that transition, but it is not a new stage of history to be called capitalist. Capitalism immediately in synchronous initiation spawns its counterpoint socialism/communism as projects for a new future. Thus modernity is not the stage of capitalism, and socialism/communism as ideas appear at the same time as capitalism. Socialism/communism can't really be stages because they begin to influence capitalism immediately and we see socialist tendencies and a Russian revolution in tandem with capitalism.

Still, the issue of communism makes its point: a terminal end state of communism in an era of postcapitalism would constitute a pretty good version of some sort of stage, after never seeing any up to that time, only transitions of relative transformations. But the achievement of communism might itself be a start subject to new transformations...

We see that the outcome of modernity is a transformation of the early modern transition and capitalism comes to the fore very late at the end of the modern transition. The sudden appearance of socialism/communism thus are entirely appropriate terms for new 'relative transformations to be applied to modernity in context of (or kidnapped by) capitalism. democracy, socialism, communism and 'revolution' itself are thus clear typical innovations of the early modern. They may have existed before, and would thus be relative transformations.

(Roots of a tree show absolute beginnings: tree rings show (annual) relative beginnings or transformations.)

'It's the market economy, stupid'

May 21st, 2018 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=R48G+revolution>

The question of revolution has been so distracted by its self-generated confusions that we are no longer able to put activist questions in right perspective. But we can at least make

the point that current programs are not adequate to the situation in place and the crisis that is in progress. We can only consider some of the issues, from our perspective here:

the prime candidate here should be in the marxist legacy, but that legacy is unable to meet the challenge any more: we have suggested a new and more streamlined framework that can create a new consensus around a hybrid of socialism and democracy, but cast in a new way that is free of the onerous burden of marxist theory. We have suggested ditching historical materialism for a more flexible and broader historical perspective. The communist legacy has been ‘discredited’ but it shouldn’t be that way. Two linked stories today (scroll down), on the bluefin tuna, and the destruction of Borneo, suggest, as do a thousand related facts/stories, the need for both a national and transnational solution to the crisis of capitalism. The question of capitalism has gone critical although by and large the Fukuyama ‘end of history’ propaganda still reigns. The original vision of the second international and its immediate succession established more or less clearly the basis for a global/local resolution of issues.

Now we are floundering in a field of mysterious incompetence ruled by anarchists, gandhians, one issue activists, and the plaintive re-analysis of well-discussed issues. The revolutionary option is virtually silent beyond the repetitive ‘Leninist’ encomnia that miss the point that a new platform is needed.

We have gone back and forth between evolutionary/revolutionary pleadings but at this point we need without being dogmatic to call out the center of gravity on the left as without at least a potential revolutionary option. Perhaps it is as with the Sanders meme of ‘Our Revolution’ whose meaning is really phony socialism as social democratic posturing. The latter could also be taken as a rebirth of revolutionary thinking in a limited conception...

Again, all we can do is to point to a set of situations that counsel the logical inevitability of a revolutionary solution. At the same we must note that every time this issue is addressed the dead hand of Marxist analysis takes over and we end up in Marxist boilerplate.

Let us consider variant approaches: the american revolution as a model, unfortunately, of ‘bourgeois revolution’, remorphed as a new hybrid that emphasizes the true form of a democratic revolution as one that is socialist/communist, being careful to send marxists packing (even as we review their core legacy) if they their funny monopoly here.

The key here is however to not compromise with basics: our ‘democratic market capitalism’ performs this exercise by creating a basic democratic framework that can also embrace a version of postcapitalism: the issue of markets, in the context of a Commons, i.e. a communist expropriation of capital. The point is to start with a tactic to bring communism to liberalism (and liberalism to communism) in a path that evades utopian abstractions and deals with remorphable solutions of known historical constructs. That actually wouldn’t be so hard! The whole nightmare of Leninism/Stalinism is confusing and distracting us. Time to press the reset button. And none too soon: between the

expanding capitalist totalitarian system emerging and the feckless idiocy of marxists the revolutionary option is slipping away, which means the whole game is shot...

What five first steps (or ten...) could proceed along a revolutionary path?

we should invoke the option, first, the evolutionary path as a failsafe...

we need to create a virtual revolutionary option in waiting for the maturing opportunity, or the onset of chaos...

creating streamlined postmarxist formulation of history, economics, and postcapitalism, one that can appeal to multiple perspectives...

...

creating a revolutionary party

staging public demonstrations (without violence, but without a fetish of non-violence)

loud, legal, and open proclamations of a new revolutionary inevitability

moving from there to underground faction initiatives...

the and only then, or then and asap..

considering the options of various 'guerrilla' tactics...etc... (first step is sending black bloc idiots packing, or else drafting them to three finger salute left discipline...)

Keep in mind that while the descendants of marxism failed, the american rebs succeeded: we need to stop being talked out of doing what is needed by the army of stupidoes currently ruled the leftist roost...

Marx/engels foresaw their inability to foresee what a future socialism would be like...

May 21st, 2018

One of the ironies of the history of marxism is the elusive way marx/engels anticipated the problems with their own theories/platforms. In fact, this was the basis for a kind of silence about what a future communism would be. But the emergence of Stalinism was connected to this void: what we need now is a set of blueprints for a real postcapitalism and this in our view will move beyond capitalism but still possibly maintain a system of markets...markets as processors of 'clearing' or information processing, etc... A revolutionary/evolutionary transition must be specific about what it is going to do and be able to disengage if caudillo Stalinism tries to coopt the outcome: an abort mode. In our formulation 'state capitalism' never appears because the 'state' won't control the economy: the state will protect the Commons but the latter is not a state run enterprise of enterprises: running the economy will be done by a new type of economist connected to a set of ecological courts, planning bodies/courts, labor organizations and parliamentary bodies completely insulated from the kind of farce present in the current 'wall street constitution'...It would also have a new kind of entrepreneur able to marshal 'capital that

is no longer capital in the archaic sense' (resources licensed from the Commons) to create social corporations run under the demands of efficiency, and, yes, profitable ledger
Plus...

R48G: beyond the marxist straight jacket to a new strategy of 'constructivist neo-communism'

August 17th, 2017 ·

The core ideas of marxism are actually viable extracted from their brittle theory wrapper: class struggle, capitalist critique, etc...But the issue of 'stages of production' has created a dubious theory of history which critics can use to challenge any concept of a postcapitalist futurism.

The whole thing can be redone in a way that frees Marxists from their own straight jacket and allow a new strategy of 'constructivist neo-communism' in the sense of free agents in history applying a critique to social capitalism and thence freely creating a successor. And this will roust passive leftism from its doldrums of teleological fantasies of theory about their circumstance.

<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>

Need for a neo-marxist upgrade

May 23rd, 2018 ·

Beyond the Marxist monopoly of the communist idea...

October 22nd, 2017 ·

<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>

The left has tied its head knots with theory, theory that doesn't really work, but which has turned into a kind of dogma. The whole question of socialism has been frozen in place in terms of a legacy that was too complicated, confusing, and poorly defined.

It shouldn't be all that hard to create a viable socialist system if we get out of the straight jacket of Marx's misdefinition of the problem. Marx posited that a set of stages of history would bring communism to capitalism even as the latter replaced feudalism, etc...This theory isn't really successful and has confused the issue. A more cogent formulation might simply ask for a communist foundation, as a set of axioms creating a Commons: resources from the commons would become a social entity (and not the same as state capitalism) mediated as economic process not unlike the market version save that the question of private property is superceded. The issue of the working class has also confused discussion. In fact, the idea of a 'universal class' is really the same as the working class but focuses on the real working class which is much larger than the traditional cliché of workers in factories. The tradition of working class focus is a great one, and is easily adaptable to our larger conception but at this point the problems of

social reconstruction are far more complex than the question of industrial labor. We may even be leaving the era of factories and workers. And we confront climate change and its call for a radical revolution beyond the factors of production: an ecological framework that just might lead to a world of no-growth economics...

The idea of communism as a fixed stage beyond capitalism failed to specify what was to be done, and Stalinism filled that void. We need to consider capitalism, or liberalism, and communism as constructivist projects in tandem rather than in opposition. We can even have a system of markets in the context of a Commons. The whole nexus of concepts was misdefined from the start in order to create an effective propaganda about the inevitability of communism succeeding capitalism. In fact, the illusion that capitalism was a stage of history has if anything made the problem worse as we allowed a flawed format to be 'normal' as a phase. In reality, the task was to do the job right and create from the start a democratic socialism with elements of both planned and market factors. The market factors proceed without the confusions of private property by reclaiming the entities of 'primitive accumulation': it is simply a species of plunder that animates the whole capitalist scheme. Constructing a real socialist communism ought to be as transparent as anything produced in the capitalist legacy: the two are remorphable versions of each other, but with the profound difference of a Commons...

Design arguments and atheism

May 23rd, 2018

Help wanted: atheist design arguments...
February 8th, 2018 ·

We have discussed many times the question of 'design' in history even as we expose the mythology of theistic historicism in the Old Testament. The ID group has confused their whole critique of Darwinism with their failure to deal with the issues of biblical criticism...

design versus 'intelligent' design...//5.1.3 Art, Evolution and The Tragic Genre

September 15th, 2017

The ID group speaks of design, and more intelligent design, but the critique here has always balked at the term 'intelligent' because it is abused as crypto-creationist. But we confront the mysterious 'net equivalent' to 'intelligence' in the way the eonic effect correlates with so much great art and literature. (Enigma of the Axial Age pursues the question beyond WHEE somewhat: we can propose a new kind of intelligent designer). In the age of neural nets, AI, I feel my hesitation here is justified because such subject

while proving nothing as such suggest that a planetary mystery is in action here with ‘mechanisms’ that can mimic intelligence. But we confront as historical design systems that can process aesthetic objects, more, induce hominids to be creative in specific ways...

Source: 5.1.3 Art, Evolution and The Tragic Genre

archive: Denton needs to repudiate the Old Testament ‘intelligent design’ junk religion to discuss design in biology
July 13th, 2017 ·

Denton needs to repudiate the Old Testament ‘intelligent design’ junk religion to discuss design in biology
February 24th, 2016 ·
<http://www.uncommondescent.com/intelligent-design/denton-vs-moran-on-structuralism/>

Denton is the author of the classic *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, a book whose success depended on its neutrality on the issue of design (the last chapter comes close), in fact appearing before the Discovery Institute even existed. The term ‘Intelligent Design’, if I recall hardly existed (until Behe in 1996), and that made Denton’s book a far more useful text.

Now his new book seems to be associated closely with the Discovery Institute and Intelligent Design. It becomes problematical for those who question Christian design mythology.

It might help if Denton publicly disavowed the Old Testament with its theistic ‘Intelligent Design’ mythology. We cannot mix science and Old Testament theistic historicism. The question has turned the evolution question, with a lot of help from Darwinists into a quagmire.

This does not forbid the use of design arguments in biology. Design in nature is clear from the evidence, but its explanation remains difficult although there is every possibility of naturalistic design.

This does not exclude ‘Intelligent Design’, if its meaning is clarified, and if proof can be given of a particular form or agent of such ‘intelligence’. But the term ‘intelligent’ is abused to be a double entendre: there should be a distinction of ‘directed design as machine construction in biological systems’ and ‘intelligent’ design by a designer agent. Critics often forget this point: you can propose design by a designer but you must prove your case (the design inference is suggestive but not conclusive). It is then essential to point out that while Intelligent Design via a designing agent is perfectly good science if that is the way it happened the reality is that such a case crosses the boundary of metaphysics and is virtually impossible to prove (scientists often make the case that ID is by definition beyond science. Not so, only probably not the case. It is probably beyond

proof, and infantile in most versions. But if someone can prove a designer fielded a design, then that would be the scientific explanation. Not likely)

So it is important to make clear to Discovery Institute biologists that the Old Testament is NOT a usable documentation of historical design. Confusing 'design' arguments in religion and biology has confused everyone, including biologists who overreact and propose false theories like natural selection.

But we cannot exclude the possibility of designers in evolution. The evolution of man is in any case so far beyond explanation at this point that Darwinism is far more offensive than religious explanation.

Reformation and 'secularism'

May 24th, 2018

Trick question: was the Reformation religious or secular?

November 29th, 2017 ·

<https://jacobinmag.com/2017/10/martin-luther-reformation-religion>

Our question (previous post), why does the left always lose?, is reflected in this interesting bit on the Reformation. We have commented already on the elusive character of the Reformation:

It includes not only Luther but Thomas Munzer. It is apt to consider this dialectic at the beginning: a bourgeois (Luther a bourgeois?) and a communist revolutionary theme emerged at the start of what we call the 'modern transition'. And they did so as it were in tandem. We have one answer in terms of our eonic model: the Reformation was a success because it was part of a larger movement of history and had a macro determination. What on earth does that mean? (by eonic hypothesis).

That the Reformation was connected to the rise of the modern left should be obvious from the case of the English Civil War. The French Revolution and the era of Feuerbach are a later stage, completely understandable in their 'secular' emphasis but likely to make one forget the earlier phase (Engels was quite aware of it). But the 'macro' aspect of the Reformation is confusing: it doesn't actually have a religious basis!!!! What? The same forces, by eonic hypothesis, that produced the Reformation produced all the other aspects of the modern transition. Thus the Reformation is only ambiguously religious and the final stage of the Reformation clearly leads beyond Christianity, Feuerbach again.

But this is too confusing. Let us simply note that revolution in the early modern has eonic correlation, thus a slingshot effect. This effect wanes and the various lefts are stuck with

the question, what is a revolution with the unstated question, can anyone produce a revolution at will? Clearly not! The macro factor is completed and free agency is left to itself.

Again, this is too complicated but the point is clear that revolutionary action is subject to ambiguities that obviously haunt the left now, leaving it to endless equivocations and analysis with no easy plan of action.

But we have to consider this: our idea of a floating fourth turning point was another question: can a revolution of free agents mimic a macro phase? can we construct a new society beyond economy in terms of the general categories of culture from philosophy to art to religion and science? The question is ominous and we can see in bolshevism an anemic 'floating fourth turning point', or 'eonic pseudo-transition'. We can ask another related question for example: can a revolutionary movement produce great art as did the early modern? It is useful to invoke the 'impossible' and then consider that revolutionaries are learning and that such impossible tasks will resolve themselves in a next epoch of transformation.

This is too complex to easily analyze but we have a hint that a macro transformation starts with a religious transformation but isn't really about religion, in the end, at least...

The left has actually conformed to this principle and we can see that the era of socialism then Marx is really the final phase of the Reformation, in a sense.

This is at least a reminder that the question of religion is VERY tricky. Historical materialism by its extreme reductionism was not up to the task of culture creation...

Again, this is too complex: we should start over with the simple idea that a leftist theme must be secular but able to invoke the net equivalent of religion, and in general the broader aspects of culture.

Capitalism: beginning of the end...

May 25th, 2018 ·

The end of capitalism has begun

December 21st, 2017 ·

Re: [Marxism] Fwd: The end of capitalism has begun | Books | The Guardian

<http://www.marxmail.org/msg132083.html>

Paul Mason writes a long, interesting but wrongheaded article embracing the ideas of John Holloway without mentioning him.

<http://www.theguardian.com/books/2015/jul/17/postcapitalism-end-of-capitalism-begun>

<http://www.theguardian.com/books/2015/jul/17/postcapitalism-end-of-capitalism-begun>
As with the end of feudalism 500 years ago, capitalism's replacement by postcapitalism will be accelerated by external shocks and shaped by the emergence of a new kind of human being. And it has started.

Postcapitalism is possible because of three major changes information technology has brought about in the past 25 years. First, it has reduced the need for work, blurred the edges between work and free time and loosened the relationship between work and wages. The coming wave of automation, currently stalled because our social infrastructure cannot bear the consequences, will hugely diminish the amount of work needed – not just to subsist but to provide a decent life for all.

Second, information is corroding the market's ability to form prices correctly. That is because markets are based on scarcity while information is abundant. The system's defense mechanism is to form monopolies – the giant tech companies – on a scale not seen in the past 200 years, yet they cannot last. By building business models and share valuations based on the capture and privatization of all socially produced information, such firms are constructing a fragile corporate edifice at odds with the most basic need of humanity, which is to use ideas freely.

British capitalism is broken. Here's how to fix it
Read more

Third, we're seeing the spontaneous rise of collaborative production: goods, services and organizations are appearing that no longer respond to the dictates of the market and the managerial hierarchy. The biggest information product in the world – Wikipedia – is made by volunteers for free, abolishing the encyclopedia business and depriving the advertising industry of an estimated \$3bn a year in revenue.

Almost unnoticed, in the niches and hollows of the market system, whole swaths of economic life are beginning to move to a different rhythm. Parallel currencies, time banks, cooperatives and self-managed spaces have proliferated, barely noticed by the economics profession, and often as a direct result of the shattering of the old structures in the post-2008 crisis.

We can express hope in citing this speculative analysis, but what real grounds do we have for thinking this is the dynamic that will play out?

I think that it is possible a technological development can bring us 'closer to the other shore', but the landing requires our freely created initiative to 'revolutionize fundamentals'.

Socialism/social democracy

May 26th, 2018

R48G: socialisms doomed to social democratic finale
January 16th, 2018 ·

socialism is not social democratic malarkey...//The Socialism America Needs Now | New Republic

August 25th, 2017 ·

It is debatable whether it is worth reading an article in the New Republic about socialism. As I started reading I wondered how many paragraphs would pass before we were treated to social democratic blah blah. It didn't take long. We get the whole package of malarkey, including Bernstein no less.

These views might well be a 'way to go' but they aren't socialism. Neither was the perspective of Sanders who mostly managed to confuse the term all over again, talked a good game, and accomplished nothing whatever along the lines of socialism. The term is almost not worth using anymore and we have specified communism to roust nonsense. I will not rule out the avenue of 'leveraged socialist metaphors' that leap out of their skin at the key moment and mean what they say. But that hope with Sanders seems to have been illusory.

The problem as we have noted is that marxism never properly defined its terms, its strategies or its theory. We have insisted on starting over and instead of social democratic blah blah packaged as socialism trying to construct a specific system that is communist, or neo-communist in our sense, roughly the classic sense, going back to even before Marx. This system might well focus on the working class but it doesn't have to. We have talked of the 'universal class' both realized and potential into which all classes would merge. It would consist of efforts to construct an economy on communist foundations and of course that would seem to involve 'state capitalism'. We have a solution for that in a system of the separation of powers that is triadic: property belongs to a Commons and the 'state' does not as such have any control over it. That control would devolve to a three way triadic system of agencies that mediate the economy in planned, market and autonomous sectors. Since bourgeois capital would not exist the issue of markets would be transformed, but they would be markets in a new sense. And they would coexist with a planned sector that would never be under the control of the state, as such, being mediated by legal and democratic mechanisms of various kinds. Most of all this new communism must deal with the arrival of the catastrophe of climate change and begin to consider economies that lead the way into a sane foundation: the issue of no-growth economies is tabled, as far as we can say (there are a number of possibilities), and this is difficult: no more gravy train socialism to attract the working class: we must create a system of equality, more or less, that can feed, house and employ a totality.

It is hard to see how this could happen short of revolution, but if that seems hopeless it is equally true that socialist posturing has accomplished absolutely nothing. The system we see is going to break: we should be ready for the de facto revolution that is almost sure to

happen as the elite idiots now in control (and with Trump getting worse) actually dismantle the EPA, a low in political stupidity that will bring the revolution sooner or later.

There is no reason why the proposals of Judis et al can't be a parallel evolutionary path, but let's call it something else and make the term 'socialism' stand for political refoundation, evolutionary or revolutionary.

We surely win the argument here: read to the end. Apple is to be brought under worker control. Only a revolution could do that, and any other idea is fantasy...

Let us reiterate our semantic protest: that's not a rejection of these proposals for working in the system. But let's not use the term 'socialism'. But, since it is already coopted let's talk about communism.

Source: The Socialism America Needs Now | New Republic

The shambles of judeo-xtianity: sooner or later the secular age will move beyond these religions, ...soon!

May 26th, 2018 ·

darwiniana.com/?s=xtianity+eonic+effect

The history of xtianity (or judeo-xtianity) is surely a shambles, a real humdinger of muddle stretched over centuries/millennia.

But it doesn't follow that we can resolve its confusions in the standard vein of scientism.

The reason can be seen in the way the emergence of monotheism correlates with the eonic effect (and/or the more limited version as the 'axial age'), which shows the way monotheism as xtianity emerges in the wake of the Israelite transition, a very complex phenomenon which produces a truly awesome set of confusions that have persisted to this day and become the truly cancerated ideology of Zionism.

Xtians always claimed that Judaism and xtianity should have been one religion but no such luck, a kind of demonic confusion invaded the whole subject. Talk about a shambles...

To understand monotheism then we need the eonic model (which distinguishes in its stream and sequence distinction the absolute onset of a 'one god' belief, cf. Abraham or the akhnatism movement or earlier versions), and the relative transformation of the axial period, in Israel and Persia. The model warns us that the 'Greek enlightenment' or emergent Buddhism are correlated effects. We cannot claim 'god' produced an atheist religion. Clearly the eonic process is seeking variety and diverse effects in possible opposition. And the modern secular process is again related (and that can't be equated with atheism, in the quite different movement beyond axial religion).

The Israelites detected the eonic effect and thought is evidence of 'god in history', in the end a disastrous mistake.

The failure of the Israelites to see the larger picture of the axial interval created a confusion that has never gone away. We see that the issue is not religion as such, or

anything to do with ‘god’.

But the eonic model distinguishes the larger system action and ‘free action’, a warning that as history experiments with monotheism the actual outcome if the results of free agents, and the Israelites must have been the worst choice for such a task. Monotheism is almost braindead from the start. But it doesn’t follow that the whole trend is completely wrong.

There is a mysterious ‘spiritual’ force behind the onset of xtianity and this ends up in the hands of the early xtians who were hardly any better at religion creation than the Israelites...

The modern age is moving to liberate xtians/Jews from their ancient confusions, but the tenacity of the whole shambles points tragically to more centuries of ...a complete shambles...

The eonic model says nothing about ‘god in history’: the effect is something else.

The text ‘Enigma of the Axial Age’ goes into dangerous terrain and tries to sort out some of the confusions.

The new atheists have simply compounded the confusion...

History as causal mechanics or simple story?

May 27th, 2018 ·

This influence is crystallized most clearly in Smucker’s argument that the “historical task” of progressive movements “has more to do with ‘telling a good story’ than it does with ‘speaking the truth,’” and that the central front in the battle for power is “essentially a contest over popular meanings and common sense.”

Storytelling is all the rage in today’s professional organizing milieu, and a number of NGOs have emerged to offer their services in developing “narrative strategies”: Working Narratives, the Center for Story-Based Strategy, #AllofUs, and Smucker’s own Beyond the Choir, among others. The fundamental assumption here is that politics is ultimately a clash of discourses and cultural norms, and that the key to winning power is winning the “Battle of the Story.”

Prior citation: <https://jacobinmag.com/2017/11/hegemony-how-to-gramsci-organizing>

If you wanted a good story none could beat the eonic effect as a macro narrative of world history and probably extendable to human evolution in general. But it is too complicated perhaps for easy use and we should bear in mind that an earlier ‘story’ based on the eonic effect got it muddled: the Old Testament tale is basically an ‘eonic story’, one that generated a series of religions, and confused the issue of history by ascribing ‘eonic

effects' to 'god', viz. Yahweh. It was a Reformation, however, and a revolution against pagan polytheism. And revolutionary Christianity effected its own transformation, but it was not in the mainline of the eonic sequence, hence its partial success/failures...

In modern times our epochal transition has spawned the stories, and historical facts, as to 'revolution' and this can easily resolve to a muddle because the dynamics of revolution are not easily understood. Deja Vu all over again.

At least we can be confident of the way a larger history supports revolutionary action. We can predict with some confidence based on the early modern that just as the Axial interval generated the passing of polytheism in the Occident the modern transition will equivocate democracy and communism to produce some attempt at what Kant pointed to, the 'perfect civil constitution'.

So, whatever our confusions, we sense a certain confidence about historical momentum, wary however that as with the botched Christianity Judaism, our 'revolutions' can misfire. We are however beset with the compulsion to 'try again'....!

Pseudo-democracy and the 'end of history'

May 27th, 2018 ·

R48G: the irony that the 'end of history' argument undermines the status of American pseudo-democracy: it is collapsing on the way to the real endgame
May 4th, 2017 ·

One of the great ironies of the 'end of history' debate is that if we take its thesis seriously the directionality of history so proclaimed by Fukuyama will move beyond the pseudo-democracy of liberal capitalism to 'real democracy'. We see not one but two failures in this directional framework: the failure of bolshevism and now the apparent failure of the kind of fake democracy we see in the US. And the system under these terms will move inexorably to try and create a new and higher freedom as democracy.

The issue is related to the reciprocity of rights and liberties and the gross fallacy of sacrificing the freedom of the many for the 'freedom of capital', free markets. The point is so obvious, and has been from the onset of early socialism, that it is hard to see how we are still mesmerized by the claims of democracy in the current system. But there is no absolute given of such a transformation: the system can simply decay into a degenerate morass and that is what we starting to see in the American system. And there is a peculiar and seemingly organized cabal of rightist reaction that is trying to promote dictatorship against the trend of democracy and this has finally reached the American realm with Trump. The question of a directionality of freedom is far better analyzed in the study of the eonic effect given the obscurity of both Hegel and his so-called interpreters.

The 'end of history' should refer to the remarkable way that the 'evolution of freedom' in various modes emerges in both the evolution of man and the emergence of higher civilization. But the data of history warns us that the macro action behind emergent freedom operates over a very large scale and can be degraded in the short term as the

system moves beyond its acceleration intervals. We can say that ancient democracy shows a correlation with a macro effect (our discrete freedom sequence) but the action is a one shot deal over a huge range of centuries. Man can completely wreck the result! That seems to be what we are seeing now as democracy seems to fade away. But we say this before in the rise of fascism and the system did withstand the process to recover. The point is that the ‘end of history’ meme is misleading. Democracy is not a given entity by definition but a dynamic semantics and one that was the object of an attempted correction by a socialist critique, the most obvious kind of critical pointing to the limit on freedom created by the bourgeoisie. This critique somehow fell into its own nemesis as the anti-liberal tide produced the monstrosity of bolshevism. The claim on ‘communism’ seems in retrospect to be completely wrong. A democracy on a communist foundation remains a brilliant conception that hasn’t been tried. We see the failed alternatives of social democracy and pseudo-communist dictatorship turn in circle around each other as logical complements. We need to recompute the whole possibility and we need to do this as free agents in history. And this ironically fulfills the ‘end of history’ argument far better in the creation of a new level of freedom in social relations.

Fukuyama oblivious to ‘totalitarian democracy’
January 22nd, 2015 ·

[http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/januaryfebruary_2015/
on_political_books/the_rise_and_fall_of_the_us_go053474.php?page=all](http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/januaryfebruary_2015/on_political_books/the_rise_and_fall_of_the_us_go053474.php?page=all)

Now, in the second installment of this two-volume treatise, *Political Order and Political Decay*, Fukuyama picks up where the French Revolution left off and proceeds to the present. While he stresses that liberal democracy is not “humanly universal,” he still believes that there is “a clear directionality to the process of political development” that favors liberal democracy. But, in stark contrast to *The End of History* and his concern over hypothetical last men and their possible discontents, in his latest book he is worried about liberal democracies not sustaining themselves and not reliably delivering peace, prosperity, and personal security to their peoples. As he writes, if “there has been a single problem facing contemporary democracies, whether aspiring or well established, it has been centered in their failure to provide the substance of what people want from government: personal security, shared economic growth, and quality of basic public services like education, health, and infrastructure that are needed to achieve individual opportunity.”

Fukuyama keeps talking about democracy but fails to see that we are living in a concealed totalitarian system. That’s suddenly obvious to me: I write a book challenging Fukuyama’s ‘end of history’ thesis with a very cogent argument resolving the problems, but the concealed censorship and mind control of this political culture of ‘democracy’ can’t allow any public review, reference or discussion of this work. Zero. Fukuyama is aware of this book but can’t refer to it in public.

So we are in a worse situation than democracy under strain. We are already in a system that can create a totalitarian mind control system behind the appearance of democracy. As the author of *Last and First Men* the point is completely obvious, granting the added

problem of academic credentialing. A book with no major publisher from the underground is by definition banned from discourse. But it would be almost impossible for the argument stated to find a venue in academic publishing circles (due to its discussion of Darwinism, for starters).

The issue is clearer perhaps in the ‘debate’ over evolution: here the mind control system has been spectacularly successful, with a critique from the religious right: this political culture is in a sorry state, and not even the radical left has much clarity on the subject. Fukuyama’s classic was a powerful constellation of ideas, and the adroit use of Hegel allowed him to escape momentarily from the Darwinian dogma that strangles historical sociology. His later books return to dismal Darwinian dumbkopfhood, a condition unworthy of the Hegelian legerdemain of his outrageous End of History piece, dealing Hegelian mysticism from the bottom of the deck.

Confusions of the working class/revolution model

May 29th, 2018 ·

Our new distinction of the universal and working class might seem a thorough heresy: the Marxist influence has made the invocation of the working class almost a dogma. Have we upset a classic thematic with a dangerous deviation from right thinking? Hardly: the idea of the universal class is a useful tool to analyze the questions of class and class struggle with a reminder that in the end a working class focus just might be more intelligible in the context of the idea of a ‘universal class’.

Once we create this distinction we should turn around and invoke a working class platform but with a finer sense of the dangers of an abstraction called the ‘working class’: there are any number of these and there are a lot of confusions here. Anyone who does wage labor is part of the working class, and this includes a whole range of people who don’t necessarily have jobs in factories. The universal class even includes the bourgeoisie who we can expect like Engels to work toward the resolution of capitalist tragedy to work for a new solution to the economic question. We must in the final analysis attempt to deal with democratic majorities, centers of gravity that overlap with but are not the same as the ‘working’ class. It would be good to do it several ways in a kind of multitasking. We deal with the bourgeoisie, the lumpenproletariat, the petit bourgeois shopkeeper, the agrarian, etc, along with the working class. We must deal with larger categories and have strategies for all of them.

Our formulation of democratic market socialism is an attempt to do this with a triadic fix on the complexities of multiple subsets of the universal class and in an era when the ‘working class’ confronts automation, next to a host of new challenges in a post-factory era, we must look to new and effective combinations of basic ideas.

The trap of historical theories...

May 29th, 2018 ·

R48G: beyond historical theories, the eonic effect, and a new kind of history of capitalism//outline of a new blogbook
September 21st, 2017 ·

Actually (see archived post below), we need only a very general outline of world history with a series of questions and a set of hypotheses: the beauty of the eonic model is that we don't have to adopt a hard theory. The model's manner of distinguishing a system and its action and the action of free agents plus the fact that the system acts intermittently and possibly has completed its action over ten thousand years shows that we have entered free agency mode looking backward. We don't have to believe anything but can use periodization with a set of hypotheses to act in the present (almost always with the innovations appearing in the eonic transformation, no doubt), but with a fine sense that the eonic effect is a warning we are likely to get religious and scientific historicism wrong.

If we renounce a theory of the eonic effect, however, we still confront the endless and futile efforts of others to produce other theories of history. The Big History is one of the most recent, a delusion that won't go away. And the evolution question enters here also. We should use the eonic model to debrief these.

Our generalized approach allows us to simply look at the facts of a non-random pattern. Consider the Greek archaic: the stunning rush of innovations followed by a slow falling off is something we can simply take as a given, whatever our interpretation. We can assemble the data on the set of such patternings and use them neat with minimal interpretation, mindful of a larger model in the background, perhaps.

This approach is far superior to both the flat histories of scientism, and/or the religious mythologies of theological historicism. Ironically, one of our hotspots in stunning synchrony with archaic Greece is the core period of the Israelite Axial Age in tandem with a whole spectrum of sudden change: this material seen in a larger context both affirms the relevance and debriefs the theistic historicism which it generated. It is also a warning that we can misinterpret the eonic effect and fall into treacherous confusions. Making a religion out of the eonic effect was the classic confusion of Israelite monotheism. Time to move on. We have moved on beyond that and we can see roughly what was really happening during that period (which doesn't include the mostly mythological history from Abraham to Moses to Solomon) recorded in the era from ca. 900 BCE to the Exile. We confront a mystery far more surprising that the now sterile tale of Yahweh, etc, and a secularized version of this (in parallel with Greek/roman, indict, person, Chinese synchronies) would better serve Christians and Jews struggling with issues of religious legitimacy, now increasingly hopeless.

For the left this approach could serve beautifully to update marxism and create a useful historical framework that can easily deal with democratic, communist, and religious

issues, with empirical studies of the history of capitalism, class, and ideology rather than the brittle stages of production theory.

The eonic suggests that 'feudalism' is a specific set of issues of a medieval period, the latter a class eonic effect, or mideonic effect! It is not a stage of history since feudalisms of one kind or another have frequently appeared. The phase of capitalism is an illusion: the rising of markets must surely go back to the Neolithic or before and the real question is the balance of state economies and external/internal markets. Capitalism was always gestating throughout and it is false to declare it a specific stage. We must distinguish historical capitalist 'social archaeology' (from the trains of bullock carts moving across the Middle East in the wake of Sumer to the near Greek or earlier invention of capitalist finance, etc...) from the surprising eruption of fully crystallized version that came with the Industrial revolution. This became associated with a libertarian interpretation and was also a revolt against statist economic systems, more or less. This was an important insight into the question of markets but at no point did the capitalists win the argument since almost instantly this new 'modern capitalism' became problematical and generated at once a dialectical complement in the flux of socialism/communism. The libertarian capitalism has resurfaced in the neoliberal age (the term is distorted) and is so extreme it may induce the downfall of the whole system. The question of state and economy persists as it must. The most sensible resolution is a democratic communism in which equality demands an equal stake by all in the field of property rendered to a Commons.

We cannot expect communism to automatically succeed capitalism: we must act a free agents with a better resolution to social organization and economy to wrest social existence from the barbarous effects of libertarian pseudo-economies. As the effects of globalization mature and the effect of capitalism is increasingly destructive and dangerous the pendulum will swing back and we must be ready to refund the issue of state and economy, hopefully in a democratic/communist format.

We should retitle our netbook below to suggest our lightweight version of the eonic effect.

archive: R48G: time for a full eonic model for postmarxism...

September 8th, 2017 ·

Time for a new blog book along with another archive of posts from this blog.... We have been dancing around the question of the 'eonic model' and the left, but maybe it is time to suggest an entirely new set of perspectives for a neo-communist platform (but with some public domain historical materials form marxism as a sideline)....

It would be nice to get some feedback here, but it can't be hoped for. Marxists are so self-enclosed they live in a fantasy world (as to theory, much of its empirical analysis of politics remains cogent).

But it is time for the left to wake up: a marxism-led theory is not going to produce anything at this point... The marxists can't even figure out the ideological issue of 9/11.,

Flawed historical models using concept of ‘civilization’

May 29th, 2018

R48G: the illusion of ‘western civilization’...the modern transition, globalization, and the breakdown of the bourgeois revolutions...

September 19th, 2017 ·

<https://www.lrb.co.uk/v39/n18/pankaj-mishra/what-is-great-about-ourselves> The term ‘the West’ is really a fiction: we have discussed this many times in order to get past Eurocentric confusions including those in the critics of Eurocentricism. In terms of the eonic effect we can see that there is no ‘western civilization’ apart from simple descriptive geographical reference. The so-called West is the result of a new branch of the macrosequence jumping to the west of Eurasia in spectacular ‘frontier effect’. Its status is that of an entity already a part of a global system and the macro action was always the creation of a global oikoumene. The latter is already in existence but needs a new framework for its final consolidation.

The problem is that the ‘liberal’ idea was close to fake from the start and a study of the early modern shows clearly how ‘revolution manqué’ in the English case gave birth to the kind of bourgeois pseudo-democracy that characterizes modern so-called democracies. The latter (more directly in the wake of the French revolution) were carefully critiqued by the early socialists whose ideas were taken up by Marx/Engels who attempted to critique exactly the kind of mess of pottage Pankaj Mishra broods over in his review. This critique comes home to roost in our own time as the socialist framework (manqué) carries the obvious solution: a new set of national socialist democracies and an international to bind them together and fulfill the completion of the oikoumene created by the globalizing modern (eonic) transition. All very obvious, but if so why is the ‘solution’ beyond the comprehension of the ‘failed liberals’ who have completed whatever was the case with their usurpation of the modern project?

The study of occidental antiquity shows how the failure of this project’s analog in the roman case consisted of a republican system losing its integrity, turning into an empire and completing an oikoumene on false foundations and this to last ad infinitum in a phony ‘end of history’.

Deja vu all over again.

So we see two possibilities with chaos as a third: the creation of a true global community as an international (almost certainly with democratic communism as a foundation) or the consolidation of the global system as an american empire shedding its democracy and becoming a monolithic imperialism based more or less on plunder, militarism, and capitalist totalitarianism. The latter has been well underway for some time! In the latter case the fate of England is irrelevant: a small and vanishing colony of the Colossus, hallucinating its PBS costume dramas upstairs/downstairs redux. It is entirely possible that the imperial baton could pass to China but this seems unlikely. A dual system stalled in place for a century or so is also possible: after all the Roman Empire was occidental....

The notion of the ‘end of history’ pace Fukuyama is a hopeless piece of junk, but one that seems to have confused everyone. The end of history as things stand now will be American domination as empire and the passing away of democracy as such. The original version of the idea, let us recall the obvious, was leftist one. As little as we trust this meme, we should at least get the football across the finish line with the reminder that the ‘end of history’ was something like an upgrade and completion of the liberal age as socialism/communism and an international.

...economic determinists denying they are economic determinists...

May 29th, 2018

The Marxist left has a great core product, but its materialist/theoretical wrapper has produced its own ‘Iron Cage’ and the result is no longer able to communicate with the larger public.

As with the new atheists who have defined secularism as atheist, Marxists tend to produce hard boundaries where a more dialectical approach would enlarge their audience. I actually have no problem as such with an atheist left, but a more flexible perspective, perhaps a critique of monotheistic exploitation and one that acknowledges some kind of spiritual dimension at least as an hypothesis, would reopen the door to a new public... In general historical materialism has made the left into economic determinists denying they are economic determinists...

archive: new robust definitions of modernity/secularism

July 24th, 2017 ·

The crisis of so-called ‘secularists’ is to define modernity. It is remarkable that this simple task eludes them. And it leads to endless efforts to press religion into the failures of scientism. And that simply muddles the issues even more. The failure to define modernity is endemic and we see the first failures in the wake of the collapsing Hegelian movement. The rise of positivism colored everything and we have had the failures of historical materialism, Darwinism, and economic theory, and much else. The problem lies in the stupefying complexity of the modern transition from the sixteenth century onward. From Reformation to Revolution suggests the complexity of the modern transition, defining the secular, which includes religion.

Instead now we find a very oversimplified Spinozist pastiche adopted by minds competent in advanced physics, or reductionist biology (Darwinism), and this applied to all forms of knowledge, and the result is a culture with a flat tire. And the distance now from the early modern makes it all the harder to produce a correctly balanced rendition of modernity. And the cadres of narrowly trained devotees of scientism make discussion almost impossible.

But there’s the problem to be solved: new and more faithful renderings of the meaning(s) of modernity and secularism. Scientists are hard of hearing here and often stupidoes

hiding behind science knowhow.

History gives us a good example of the difference: the Darwinists versus the teleomechanists at the dawn of biology. The former is the classic case of scientism replacing the more nuanced complexity of the innovations of the early modern.

XZ

The eonic effect: detecting a hidden historical driver

May 30th, 2018

The eonic effect versus the universal muddle of all historical theories...
February 10th, 2018 ·

The influence of bad science, bad history, and bad education backing them up has made WHEE a book almost impossible to understand, but it is actually a very practical study of the way history follows a basic developmental logic.

Why are scientists unable to deal with this? 1. they can't handle anything that doesn't follow reductionist causality...2. they can't therefore handle the place of free agency in history, which is like studying a zoo with no animals...3. they can't follow the simple logic of discontinuity given the endless confusion created here by religious thinkers... 4. most of all they can't grasp that there is something wrong with darwinism...

The question of historical materialism

May 30th, 2018 ·

February 6th, 2018 ·

http://history-and-evolution.com/whee4th/intro1_1_1.htm
<http://darwiniana.com/toward-a-new-communist-manifesto-minutes-of-the-red-forty-eight-group/>

One of the reasons to suggest the macro model of WHEE to replace historical materialism is that it

1. transcends the economic where HM emphasizes it that allows a larger view of culture and shows a model where the economic is in principle

a subcomponent

the dynamics of civilizations and economies are different

2. it does not select a subset philosophy to explain the whole (although the idea of a model is a partial exception)

instead it embraces all known historical philosophies, and religions and knowledge forms, and not only that, their evolutions over time

3. it embraces the framework of science but stands outside by not applying naive causal explanations

4. yields a structure that shows the action of facts and values together

5. provides an example of how a large scale system evolves (development over time)

6. corrects misperceptions about random evolution

7. has a definite lineage in Lamarck's lesser theory (not his theory of adaptation) and the Kantian teleomechanists, the first theoretical biologists

in this context

8. gives a clear rationale for the massive appearance of revolution in world history during the early modern

9. bypasses the confusing 'end of history' discourse

10. reconciles dynamism and free agency

etc...

What drives history? Economics?

April 29th, 2018 ·

Our discussion of the limits of historical materialism raises the issue of what is driving history, that stolid cliché.

But a study of the eonic effect shows a much broader view is needed because there is clear evidence of an historical driver in a distinct macro effect.

Nothing in WHEE actually states a theoretical finding that the eonic effect is driving history, as such. It is clearly driving an 'evolutionary' or developmental process on a global scale. But the eonic model distinguishes 'stream and sequence' aspects and it could even be claimed that the eonic sequence is superimposed on a set of streams that have great if not greater momentum. If we look at the outcome of the Axial Age in the Occident we might well claim that medievalism overcame the whole effect of the Axial driver. But that's the whole point: the next transition in the macro sequence restores much that had been lost! But even so the basic influences did remain in some form. The analysis must distinguish the Axial Age and Christianity/Islam two subdrivers as it were. The eonic model also points to the 'econostream' and the 'technostream', as economic and technological histories. So the question of what drives history is complicated.

It would be useful to try and consider the question of class struggle in this context. But much of class struggle is implicit until it is made explicit in the ideology of Marxism (well, almost...) We need to reask the question: what is the place of class struggle in history in

the context of the eonic effect? Much of the Marxist data just might fit into the model. A look at the English Civil War makes clear that democracy/communism (along with Quakerism, religion) were part of the 'Blob' of issues moving in and out of conjunction. It's the effect of the Glorious Revolution that made liberal democracy an upper class non-democracy, the bourgeois revolution....)

Let us note that the 'discrete freedom sequence' in the eonic model (the suspected recursive appearance of democracy in the macro effect) suggests an implicit version of class struggle in the question of the definition of democracy: the point was lost that communism with an axiom of equality deriving a Commons is really an aspect of that sequence and that overall the eonic model has a core meme of the 'evolution of freedom'. It is clear that the net equivalents of class analysis and class struggle fit easily into the eonic analysis...

Meanwhile climate catastrophe threatens to be the next kind on the block as a driver of (the end of) history

The fading of the religions of the axial era...

April 29th, 2018 ·

R48G: Toward a new reformation: the exit path from axial era Christianity
 In Last and First Men we discuss the fact that historical materialists confront a world system still with billions of monotheists far outnumbering their ranks. The left however produced in many ways one of the concluding episodes of the Reformation in the post-kantian/post-hegelian Feuerbach. This was however an excessively narrow view with, nonetheless, an important challenge to theistic authoritarianism. The outcome of the Reformation produced a strong revolutionary version of Christianity from the proto-communism of the period of Munzer to the revolutionary seed democracy of the Puritans, to the abolitionism of the Quakers. In many ways the form of modern revolution and democracy emerged from radical Christian perspectives in the reformation. Then the system rapidly moved beyond the religious mode in the French Revolution as the Reformation found a concluding phase in the realm of Kant, Hegel and Schopenhauer, with Spinoza echoed from the start and a Feuerbachian refoundation in the wake of this set of transformations. The persistence of reformation churches (and Catholicism is really the outcome of its own reformation, a far cry from the traditional church of the era of Luther).

The implications are clear: Christianity got one tank of gas for a brief renewal in the early modern and then began to move again toward a post-religious secularism. That latter however was confused by its secular humanist and atheist emphasis to become a reductionist view based on scientism and positivism. The system had challenged metaphysics with Kant, reinvented god with Hegel, and produced a master outlook in the deep insights post-theistic Schopenhauer. Throwing this away for the Marxist

reductionist positivism seems now like a strategic error. The solution is simple: adopt the whole spectrum in a dialectical feast of reason. This factor of scientism actually fueled a reactionary religious reaction set on a postmodern/antimodern restoration of religious traditionalism. The complexity of modernity is such that its own exemplars cannot understand it.

But the tide of modernity is inexorable. The left is pressured to compromise on the issue of religion and in fact it should do so: it can welcome religious viewpoints to a nonetheless Feuerbachian challenge to authoritarian godism by simple tolerance and a new project of religion with outcomes more in tune with the future. The legacy of Christian theology is so flawed this would not be hard to do. A simple solution is that of tolerance, and yet to project a project of study, critique, kantian debriefing, and twin aspects of the study of man's consciousness and the cosmic questions of source universes and their antinomial aspects. A kantian challenge to metaphysics can help to move beyond the misleading and collapsing 'faith' religions to a new consideration of 'faith' in a new and more robust mode. These three are not a new religious dogma but, as Hegel noted, a signpost as religious dogma graduates to the modern of philosophy.

In *Last and First Men*, we discussed the 'virtual church of the Holy Brick', an ironic or humorous version of a set of religious constructs in motion. We can adopt such a perspective to create a radical post-christian version of the reformation that is a far better produce than the traditional impoverished christian theology whose reign is coming to its 'running on empty' point. This can create a flexible set of transitional churches under the flag of radical social action. Whatever traditional legacies the individual brings to radicalizing left deserve close tolerance and an equal challenge to the study of new forms of post-belief.

In a strange sense Kant, Hegel and Schopenhauer are the conclusion to the reformation, next to the radicalism of the Puritans and the abolitionism of the Quakers. This can, next to Munzerian Christianity, provide a path beyond the rapid conservatizing of the mainstream protestant movements with their Calvinist capitalism and antimodern mindsets.

The theology of Christianity is actually a hopeless hodgepodge. Done right it could be vehicle into the future of religion in a secular context.

Some issues: the question of god is not an issue of faith but of antinomial metaphysics. That same is true of questions of soul and free will.

We can easily envisage an 'atheist' Christianity (the quotation marks are important!) that challenges the primitive pop theism that came to replace the original visions of an unknown IHVH of the Hebrew prophets. The whole idolatry of theistic superstition was never a successful religious mode at all and can be transcended in a new perspective of the issues of cosmic source, now informed mostly by science, however limited the latter's reductionist canon.

Despite its historical limitations the legacy of Christianity is easy to upgrade to a radical social vision, and the left while remaining more or less neutral could assist in the

generation of a new reformation, one that might also move to inform the transition of Islam to a modernist version...

Capitalism not a stage of economic history?

April 30th, 2018 ·

R48G: capitalism is not a stage of (economic) history: marxist production theory is misleading and making the problem worse...did Marx/Engels fumble the ball?

April 5th, 2017 ·

was capitalism a mistake...? we are probably dead by capitalism so the answer is clear...

The whole emphasis of marxism is confused: the way that capitalism was turned into a stage of history as a stage of production ended up giving it a status it didn't deserve and is one aspect of its persistence in the sense of Marx's concealed bourgeois tendencies assuming this stage of production must exhaust its potential before moving beyond itself, a disastrous gift to the fanatics of capitalist futurism. The potential of this set of fake systems could never be exhausted and the truer circumstance is that this fake stage of history will terminate a planet.

The emergence of 'capitalism' is relative: in a fairly general definition, it goes back to the Neolithic or beyond and is present in all phases of civilization. The equivocation here over capitalism as a modern phenomenon is simply another case of its 'relative' transformations, and the onset of the industrial revolution along with the ideology of such as Adam Smith and the invention of new kinds of financial instruments created the illusion that a new capitalist era had somehow replaced feudalism as a new stage of history.

The study of the eonic effect demonstrates a more complicated picture in which economic systems in various stages and formats are embedded in a larger social context. Marx and Engels understood all this until they misunderstood it with the creation of 'historical materialism'. A more realistic picture is that capitalism is a set of innovations inside a larger system and that its nefarious character, the object of immediate protest, created the need for an new kind of social system that could control its rogue character. Capitalism was always a rogue process and there was never any reason that the whole of humanity was to be subjected to market forces in the name of the laws of history was a gross fallacy and a decided fumble by Marx/Engels.

Marx/Engels were however pretty clear in the 1848 period of the dangers of the situation and the need to act at once to move to a new type of system.

Bennett and the concept of hyparxis...

April 30th, 2018 ·

R48G: neo-communism and the hyparchic future?

May 2nd, 2017 ·

One of the reasons for my interest in Bennett is due to the way the study of the eonic effect rediscovered his odd framework of space/time.

The remarkable pattern of the eonic series and related parallel sidewinders is strikingly reminiscent of the action of the 'eternity/hyparxis' dimensions.

This analysis can help to understand how a discontinuous series can operate in a temporal context.

And we can see that the issue of postcapitalism (witness the muddled discussions of the end of history) is bound up in this kind of consideration of 'virtual futures' and directionality.

The question of hyparxis, at the risk of a botch of our account, might be considered with an analogy:

a writer has the plan in mind for a book, but this is still potential, and by analog 'timeless/spaceless'. As he moves to compose the book the realization is an interaction of the potential idea with a temporal actualization and a series of parallel and/or sequential drafts, in a discontinuous series and or discontinuous set of alternates. The interaction of time and eternity is via the hyparchic dimension as just this discontinuous series as the book takes shape in a directional and willed action of creative writing. Early drafts suffer issues of quality and the cyclical hyparxis interaction with the potential generates an uphill qualitative transformation.

This writer's World History and the Eonic Effect most probably gives us an example of this triple aspect of the temporal: the temporal stream of history shows an embedded discontinuous series in both successive and parallel (spatially discontinuous) and this is associated with the action to 'climb Mt. Improbable'. The so-called macro sequence is just this kind of discontinuous realization of potential as the stream of history upgrades with eras of creative action. This phenomenon of the eonic effect in the Axial Age also shows clear cases of the parallel effect as the temporal stream actually (and most remarkably) shows a splitting of synchronous lines in the remarkable 'transition zones' of the Axial Age.

From the concept of ‘civilizations’ to global differential transitions

April 30th, 2018 ·

R48G: the illusion of ‘western civilization’...the modern transition, globalization, and the breakdown of the bourgeois revolutions...

September 19th, 2017 ·

<https://www.lrb.co.uk/v39/n18/pankaj-mishra/what-is-great-about-ourselves> The term ‘the West’ is really a fiction: we have discussed this many times in order to get past Eurocentric confusions including those in the critics of Eurocentricism. In terms of the eonic effect we can see that there is no ‘western civilization’ apart from simple descriptive geographical reference. The so-called West is the result of a new branch of the macrosequence jumping to the west of Eurasia in spectacular ‘frontier effect’. Its status is that of an entity already a part of a global system and the macro action was always the creation of a global oikoumene. The latter is already in existence but needs a new framework for its final consolidation.

The problem is that the ‘liberal’ idea was close to fake from the start and a study of the early modern shows clearly how ‘revolution manqué’ in the English case gave birth to the kind of bourgeois pseudo-democracy that characterizes modern so-called democracies. The latter (more directly in the wake of the French revolution) were carefully critiqued by the early socialists whose ideas were taken up by Marx/Engels who attempted to critique exactly the kind of mess of pottage Pankaj Mishra broods over in his review. This critique comes home to roost in our own time as the socialist framework (manqué) carries the obvious solution: a new set of national socialist democracies and an international to bind them together and fulfill the completion of the oikoumene created by the globalizing modern (eonic) transition. All very obvious, but if so why is the ‘solution’ beyond the comprehension of the ‘failed liberals’ who have completed whatever was the case with their usurpation of the modern project?

The study of occidental antiquity shows how the failure of this project’s analog in the roman case consisted of a republican system losing its integrity, turning into an empire and completing an oikoumene on false foundations and this to last ad infinitum in a phony ‘end of history’.

Deja vu all over again.

So we see two possibilities with chaos as a third: the creation of a true global community as an international (almost certainly with democratic communism as a foundation) or the consolidation of the global system as an american empire shedding its democracy and becoming a monolithic imperialism based more or less on plunder, militarism, and capitalist totalitarianism. The latter has been well underway for some time! In the latter case the fate of England is irrelevant: a small and vanishing colony of the Colossus,

hallucinating its PBS costume dramas upstairs/downstairs redux. It is entirely possible that the imperial baton could pass to China but this seems unlikely. A dual system stalled in place for a century or so is also possible: after all the Roman empire was occidental....

The notion of the 'end of history' pace Fukuyama is a hopeless piece of junk, but one that seems to have confused everyone. The end of history as things stand now will be american domination as empire and the passing away of democracy as such. The original version of the idea, let us recall the obvious, was leftist one. As little as we trust this meme, we should at least get the football across the finish line with the reminder that the 'end of history' was something like an upgrade and completion of the liberal age as socialism/communism and an international.

Capitalism generating postcapitalism

April 30th, 2018

It is very hard for some, especially after so much Fukuyama propaganda, to snap out of the fixation on the inevitability of capitalism, but all at once the inevitability of postcapitalism comes into view.

The American system is in a dialectical tail spin as the monumental idiocy of rightist action seeds revolutionary futurism.

R48G: from virtual revolution to (virtual) open insurrection: ask yourself, is it your duty to stop the current american crime against humanity at a time of climate crisis?
May 8th, 2017

Our discussions of virtual revolution appear to be either a song and dance routine, or else the actual revolution can be discussed as virtual in either a bluff or else a consideration of the dangers prior to action, especially in the context of the overwhelming power of the current regime. The point: our revolutionary consideration is maturing but is still a thumbtiddler while we examine the situation we find ourselves in. In any case we must whatever we think be ready with a new platform and a new consensus, of a kind, as an open tent, with a critique of marxism, but a definite rewrite or upgrade of that 'has been ism'. We have no other choice than to pursue this upgrade since the classics here have clogged the arteries of activists of all colors.

We can bluntly ask the question, how would activists on the left pursue regime change if needed at a time when the planet is about to be trashed by a uniquely vulgar phony president whose legitimacy is itself in question? There is more to this in that the issue also revolves around rescuing democracy from a strange global cabal of authoritarian

government on the right. There's the catch: marxists fell out of sync with democratic initiatives. We have attempted to recast the issues as both the transition to postcapitalism and the completion of the democratic revolution in a mix that as it were brings communism to liberalism and thus liberalism to communism. This approach can free the whole question of revolutionary ideology from its degeneration into Stalinism syndrome by simply saying goodbye to classic Marxism-Leninism and starting over with the obvious insight that a constitutional approach to a form of neo-communism can appeal to activists where now the demands for democracy in cliché mode automatically downshift all discussions into triviality and issue activism.

Still in virtual mode: this is still an exercise in free speech, and entirely legal, an important issue for the chattering teeth set that is wringing their hands over efforts to raise the minimum wage and get political idiots of multiple stripes to march on weekends.

So we must produce a comprehensive platform, propose it as revolutionary and yet proceed quite possibly with a kind of Third Party approach that move at first toward an electoral/evolutionary resolution, with a clear definition in that case of what we mean by the expropriation of the bourgeoisie, how we can proceed legally to the legal control of capital, first in a national context, thence to an international one, most hopefully. While we grant entirely the classic theme of the International we must consider the real issue: bringing the american juggernaut to a postcapitalist potential. It would be possible short of re-constitutional re-foundation to create a legal framework for the control of capital short of full expropriation.

We have devised a useful transitional version or versions that is called Democratic Market Neo-communism, based on the idea that new forms of economic in a mix of markets and planning can provide a bridge to a full postcapitalism.

[https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?](https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Democratic_Market_Neo_Communism_ver_2.pdf)

[preview=Democratic_Market_Neo_Communism_ver_2.pdf](https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Democratic_Market_Neo_Communism_ver_2.pdf)

This is perhaps too much for most and we confront the probably baseless versions like the Berniac 'Our Revolution' which seems to mean very little at this point. We should consider however that this can be one watered down compromise (or cop out) in relation to our larger framework that is NOT a project of social democratic reformism, but either a reformist or revolutionary path to a strong socialism in some form.

The reality is that we confront an ominous criminal rogue state and the only real option, no option at all it seems, is a revolutionary transformation that can:

take over the capitalist national security state

reconstitutionalize a socialist foundation

expropriate large-scale capital formation intro-boundary, with strong constraints extra-boundary

reform politics to free democracy from capital domination

introduce an ecological legal structure to mediate economic issues in the context of climate catastrophe

abolish the hidden government and expose the criminalities of imperialism, capitalist militarism, and out of control covert agencies.

this must include liberation from the Israeli conspiracy dominating current politics
 this new system can function as an independent state socialism and/or a plug in
 component of an international....

this approach moves beyond the working class to the 'universal class' but the focal point
 of the latter might well be the transitional working class

The question of evolution/revolution is thus an integrated consideration that is open-
 ended. We have so far only pleaded to consider a virtual abstraction, but with a warning
 that its intent is serious social change...

Impossible? a million people marching on Washington could induce collapse.

Quo Vadis? The Athenian tragedy, and the american...?

March 30th, 2018

The question of American democracy is approaching crisis, not the least a crisis of
 definition. The founding fathers were clear that a revolutionary starting point was the first
 axiom of first democracy and clear again that re-foundation would be its inevitable
 future. But the tragedy of Athens seems to predict the tragedy of the modern american
 recursion and the question arises, quo vadis? in the hopes of salvation from emergent
 fascist sins.

We have suggested a new redefinition, and a finesse of evolution/revolution. Your move/
 Our move...let it mutate via tragicomedy to ...

Beyond the evolutionary/revolutionary divide...

February 22nd, 2018 ·

Below is an archived post from last year.

Let's restate the point in a new way: our distinctions of evolutionary/revolutionary have
 (deliberately) created a division in thought bridged by our idea of 'virtual revolution'. But
 at this point one suspects that if an evolutionary path is taken up it will sooner or later
 confront the coming collapse of this form of civilization and hopefully be ready for its
 revolutionary moment.

The point is to challenge the marxist monopoly here (much of it remains useful) and not
 let it confuse the issue the way it did in the Bolshevik era wasting an immense
 opportunity.

This is not a point of compromise or a social democracy cop out but a genuine
 constitutional re-foundation with a more sensible approach to socialist/communist
 economies that can embrace elements of planning, markets in a Commons, and a dash of
 anarchism...

archive: Red Forty-eight Group: need for a new brand of revolutionary movement
 July 16th, 2017 ·

Update: this post from yesterday (deleted and reposted below) made a controversial/dubious statement: a kind of vanguardist overemphasis. What happened to the 'working class'. Actually the statement was deliberate and simply focuses on the double action, populist and vanguardist. The citation of Ellis' book *The Quartet* is perhaps misleading: read the book. This was a serious dialectical exercise to consider vanguardism versus the working class...

The point here is simple: we can energize the working class, but then a vanguard will come to the fore, and at that point we must have very carefully defined how it is to act, i.e. communist, democratic (if temporarily with strong authority), with rights and liberties next to the power to control large scale industry (with a good deal of autonomy). That vanguard in our formulation will not be a one-party state, control 'property' of the Commons, control the economy...all this requires a new form of the separation of powers. My point about the Founding Fathers was simply a warning that an elite can just as well create a democracy as not and be self-preprogrammed to give certain guarantees, etc...

A vanguard that defines its own limits, makes pledges to act according to principles of democracy, equality, and so on, has a good chance of success.

Let us note that American democracy (or a republic) was created by an elite, cf. *The Quartet* by Joseph Ellis, against popular opinion. A vanguard and a populist movement are the 'yo-yo' that is hard to compute and is the non-linear two-headed beast behind a successful transition.

Red Forty-eight Group: need for a new brand of revolutionary movement

The marxist left hasn't produced any activist movements of late, why is that? It is a frustrating question, because the marxist legacy holds the keys to a genuine crisis movement of the type we need now. But its legacy is frozen in its own crud and vitiated by excessive theories that don't really hold up, like historical materialism.

But a streamlined and lightweight version of the marx legacy that at the same time creates a radical break with its own past could take off and generate a response to the current crisis.

All that is needed is an historical account of the nineteenth century left, a history of the communist idea, a general take on the question of economic theories, ideology, class and class struggle, and a post-Feuerbachian secularism that isn't going to waste time on theism/atheism debates. It is also my sense, despite its strong position, unfair, that darwinism needs to go. It is a liability that has undermined the integrity of science and fueled the antiscience of much of the right, especially on climate change. Beyond that it distorts social understanding. All that is needed is to stand back and consider that evolution is visible in deep time, but its mechanism remains unknown. And the suspicion lurks that teleology is involved.

The left needs to get past the 'end of history' debate: the real such 'end of history' is approximated closely enough in an obvious way a hybrid that can reconcile democracy and postcapitalist socialism/communism.

What did the idea come from? You could probably find it in Hegel, but I prefer my version in WHEE of the 'discrete freedom sequence'. There actually is a directionality behind democracy in world history, a point requiring careful demonstration. But after the larger system gives that a boost the rest is up to man, with a serious chance of 'fuck up'. We have seen two fuck ups so far, bolshevism and climate era capitalism and its destruction of democracy. That is not a promising record for homo sapiens.

The marxist left has to mutate into something classic yet novel and try to lead a revolutionary (plus evolutionary/electoral) movement. It has to free itself of cultic idiocy, drop the 'personality' cult of 'Marx' by dropping the term 'marxism', focus on the Communist Manifesto, consigning the incomplete train wreck Das Capital, so beloved of Marx critics, to the library, graduate from classical economics to a critique of neo-classical economics (mastering the math to do so and expose mathematics in economics), resolve the planning problem (but market neo-communism might be a good transitional vehicle), create a hybrid of the Enlightenment and Romantic movement thereby creating an ecological communism/socialism. In general the period of Marx and the post-Hegelians is too limited and needs a larger perspective on modernity. This left might well continue the legacy of Feuerbach, modified, but it must also communicate with the classic religions. We have pulled a rabbit out of a hat here: The Church of Munzer and a church of historical memory: the left has to lead the way to a new secularism but it must also get knowledgeable about consciousness and be able to challenge buddhism, Islam, xtianity, not with polemics so much as a real understanding, a difficult task. We may be out of time there.

What is needed is a populist movement with a postcapitalist platform, such as the market neo-communism proposed here, and with a new stance on class warfare: a focus on the Universal Class rather than the working class. There is not real contradiction, but the Universal Class is a larger superset that will energize a broader spectrum of the range of class combinations.

It needs to happen this year, stat. Shuffle the Marx papers and throw the junk out. Divorce from 'isms', divorce from Leninism (but study the guy), make clear the divorce from Stalinism is total, and that a movement has a right to revolt against fake democracy to create the real thing. The fallacies of electoral/direct democracy compete with their virtues, and a democratic revolution can be fought by an elite vanguard as well if not better than a populist revolt IF they do the job right and act according to principle and don't screw up the whole game at the start with power formations. It can't just reflex into the tired mental diseases that result in government by psychopaths and the CIA's. A vanguard and a populist movement are the tricky duo that operate hopefully in tandem.

A vanguard that defines its own limits, makes pledges to act according to principles of democracy, equality, and so one, has a good chance of success.

Let us note that American democracy (or a republic) was created by an elite, cf. The Quartet by Joseph Ellis, against popular opinion. A vanguard and a populist movement

are the ‘yoyo’ that is hard to compute and is the non-linear two-headed beast behind a successful transition.

We have to at least try this. All the other progressivist efforts have been realized and then dismantled. Can you try again, and again...? A change in the system is needed.

Viking economics, incurable capitalist stupidity of US retards...

March 30th, 2018

Time for some ‘insults’: my fellow Americans, you are a pack of idiots...

Haven’t read yet, but the title will google to a lot of reviews/discussions. Our R48G initiatives pick this angle with alacrity as a default but still too limited version of threshold socialism.

The american idiots succumbing to Ayn Rand need to ask themselves if they haven’t been rendered stupid and consider if they really have the intelligence by comparison with the mysterious smarts of the Nordic sector to do anything but capitalism crude, a low level of ‘video game’ style ‘big hard on’ economics...

Viking Economics: How the Scandinavians Got It Right-and How We Can, Too – Kindle edition by George Lakey. Download it once and read it on your Kindle device, PC, phones or tablets. Use features like bookmarks, note taking and highlighting while reading Viking Economics: How the Scandinavians Got It Right-and How We Can, Too.

Source: Viking Economics: How the Scandinavians Got It Right-and How We Can, Too – Kindle edition by George Lakey. Politics & Social Sciences Kindle eBooks @ Amazon.com.

History and delusion

March 30th, 2018

I strongly recommend anyone stuck in the ‘end of history’ morass to get beyond historical materialism and Hegel and adopt my far superior method based on Kant’s original essay on history, or Kant’s Challenge. This can bypass the end of history confusion by looking at the question from another angle. The online netbook is perhaps too simple, but it contains the basic issue in systems analysis form. Hegel ‘Spirit’ in history is too mystical. The basic issue is stated more directly using the ‘macro model’. We see ‘freedom emergence’ in history in that context.

Historical materialism has mis-stated the issue here also. It is a hopeless muddle that has confused every generation of marxists and made them a closed cult defending the muddle ad infinitum. Time to drop it and try a new perspective.

Last and First Men also states the issues clearly: last-and-first-men.com

It is almost impossible to decipher the ‘end of history’ meme. The model in WHEE is more useful and never really deals with the ‘end of history’.

Instead it answers the questions asked by Kant in his short essay. The model of the eonic effect gives an elegant and highly suggestive solution to the questions asked by Kant. The solution given in the eonic or macro model is so simple and elegant that it simply sails by the complexity of Hegel to Kojeve to Fukuyama. None of that really clarifies Kant’s basic challenge. It might suggest one of the meanings sometimes given, as the entry to a new epoch. I don’t know. Or it might instead be taken as a discourse related to another: the timeless aspect of a teleological system. The macro system ‘touches’ the directionality of world history in terms of the intermittent action of its basic driver, the ‘end’ in a pun on ‘ends’ as ‘goals’. But that is a bit speculative. The whole muddle of the ‘end of history’ is too opaque to determine much of anything.

The eonic model answers directly to each of the main issues of Kant’s essay, ignoring the rest (it is not a commentary on that essay). Part of Hegel’s problem was that, as Kant warned, the issue of his challenge was premature. The world would have to wait for more data. And that is correct: we live now in the first generation to have enough data to see the solution to what Kant wondered about.

The basic solution to the question of a progress to a civil constitution is implicit in the model in its ‘discrete freedom sequence’. But the simple point is that the stunning emergence of democratic revolutions in the early modern is confusing us a little. I have criticized marxists but they alone analyzed this and came up with the charge of bourgeois revolution. And everyone forgets that the first ‘democratic’ (power to the people) revolutions in the early modern was Munzer’s Peasant Revolt with its ‘communist theme’: communism came BEFORE what we call democracy. In fact democracy, pace Locke, rapidly downshifted in the worst case of the ‘democratic’ revolution, the decidedly bourgeois revolution of the Americans, who compromised on slavery! We don’t often realize this outcome was close to a fraud, even as it created a large-scale mockup of a democratic something. But a closer look shows not only Munzer (and the ambiguous bourgeois Luther) but the English Civil War with its near-Cambrian profusion of potential in the many ‘queer’ profound experimental movements, Levelers, Diggers, ... Let us recall the ambiguity of Locke as a counter-revolutionary.

The analysis of such as Marx and Engels here is appropriate, and they saw that ‘democracy’ in this outcome was problematical, as it had been in Athens.

What is the solution in terms of the ‘eonic model’? There is none: the macro system spawns on one level a kind of ideal abstraction and the first glimpse of this is communist!! The whole nexus devolves into realization as a crude form of democratic yet elitist Frankenstein that ended up in the Civil War, and which was always vulnerable to usurpation by the capitalist class.....etc..

The action of the ‘end of history’ is really an abstraction we look back on from our present. We shouldn’t use the term in this model. The eonic model is very clear: after the phase of system action generating the modern transition the system defaults back to free agency, which means we are on our own. A first costly experiment to fix ‘bourgeois democracy’ as ‘real communist democracy’ was a train wreck, and is Strike One,

bolshevism, in the new era in realization. In antiquity, after the axial age the whole system simply declined from its height, and never recovered. Will that happen again? Looking at the fiasco of current american 'democracy' is not grounds for optimism. We need to ready for a base hit and not Strike Two at a moment of crisis when the capitalist usurpation as 'bourgeois democracy' from 'bourgeois revolution' has now produced a calamity of a system of markets that cannot respond to climate change. The ideas of capitalism as the 'end of history' in this sense is a semantic calamity, and a social apocalypse in the making. But the problem is ours to solve. It is a practical question of a revolution, a new economic system, a postliberal system of freedom and rights, and a possibly transitional system of hard authority to lay the foundations of a system received from the 'expropriation of the bourgeoisie'. We need to get cracking with a practical set of blueprints. It is not longer 'revolution first'. 'Revolution first' has already failed. We need a sense of a global/national federation of socialist republics, this time with something better than the fiasco called out as Strike One. But willy nilly events will prove Marx right in a way: we must respond to the situation that arises, which could be chaos globally at four degrees of temperature rise. The bourgeoisie failing action will soon be castled in air-conditioned bunkers ruling over mass genocide.

Use my model, it is much simpler and the verdict is simpler: the moment to construct a new postcapitalist system is at hand. Nothing in Hegel, Kojeve, or Fukuyama says anything against this. There is no end of history. Look at classical antiquity in the Occident. It went into decline that slowly but surely ended in a medieval period. Then the macro system jumpstarted a new beginning, right on schedule in the fifteenth century (often confused with the Renaissance, which was something else). That action is long since over, and we are on our own. The American system is pretty much as Marx predicted. With the invention of the CIA the system has mutated into an enigma of crime, empire, covert ops, and political lunatics. Such a fast decay over a mere two centuries is another puzzle.

A generalized dynamic of progress more complex than Pinker's oversimplification

March 29th, 2018

We have had many posts on Pinker's new book but overall he has failed to see the dilemma of modernity: an exclusive emphasis on capitalism as the first born of the enlightenment fails to do justice to the subject. Progress is a complex dynamic far more elusive than mere rationality and futurism: we need to deal with a generalized idea of progress across world history. There is something deeper that we can miss completely. We call it the eonic effect: cf. history-and-evolution.com

World history: a mysterious and terrifying enigma...Pinker's failure to see the failure of capitalist 'progress'
February 20th, 2018 ·

One more bit on pinker: one could do worse than promote a thesis of progress. But our larger point here is that Pinker's thinking is based on a false or absent theory of history. First, the focus on the enlightenment is too limited: it is the early modern as a whole (a transition) from 1500 to 1800 that is the generator of modernity and that is much more than science and reason, and the result is a misleading idea what progress is and what is anything it generating.

How do we know this? It is almost terrifying to think that a hidden dynamic is driving history in the large and that we can barely observe it and can find no thinkers as yet who can bring themselves to take it into account.

We need a larger perspective than that of the enlightenment which generates, yes, but which is generated in a larger sphere.

Pinker will also fail in the way classical liberalism and thus capitalism are going to be taken the engines of progress: whence the trend toward a compassionate society? Enlightenment reason? Did enlightenment reason generate the Quaker abolitionists? Wasn't capitalist liberalism a tad cruel, eh? The key here is to follow the emergence of democracy and to see that via classical liberalism it is a work in progress. A step backward from the eighteenth century will show the crucial dilemmas of the English Civil War at a point when monarchy, democracy, and primitive communism were fighting for the definition of democracy. The exclusion of socialist strains from the liberalism of the England of the restoration is the truer picture and a reminder that classical liberalism is a regression that never really solved its core problem, as the men of the French revolution rediscovered well enough, generating the hopes to complete the 'revolution' toward 'real democracy' that we see in marx, whose work however didn't fully resolve the overall question. But we should be clear to remind the pincers that progress has been mixed and that the capitalist era is failing tragically as it engulfs a planet in ecological disaster...

The point here is to see that technology and economics do not really drive progress, as such..

Kant's challenge and the riddle of history

March 27th, 2018 ·

This was: <http://darwiniana.com/2016/05/11/beyond-the-end-of-history-meme/>
It is essential to get past the 'end of history' morass and move beyond historical materialism and Hegel: A far superior method based on Kant's original essay on history, or Kant's Challenge, can transform awareness. This can bypass the end of history confusion by looking at the question from another angle. The online netbook is perhaps too simple, but it contains the basic issue in systems analysis form. Hegel 'Spirit' in history is too mystical. The basic issue is stated more directly using the 'macro model'. We see 'freedom emergence' in history in that context.

Historical materialism has mis-stated the issue here also. It is a hopeless muddle that has confused every generation of marxists and made them a closed cult defending the muddle ad infinitum. Time to drop it and try a new perspective.

Last and First Men also states the issues clearly: last-and-first-men.com

It is almost impossible to decipher the ‘end of history’ meme. The model in WHEE is more useful and never really deals with the ‘end of history’.

Instead it answers the questions asked by Kant in his short essay. The model of the eonic effect gives an elegant and highly suggestive solution to the questions asked by Kant. The solution given in the eonic or macro model is so simple and elegant that it simply sails by the complexity of Hegel to Kojeve to Fukuyama. None of that really clarifies Kant’s basic challenge. It might suggest one of the meanings sometimes given, as the entry to a new epoch. I don’t know. Or it might instead be taken as a discourse related to another: the timeless aspect of a teleological system. The macro system ‘touches’ the directionality of world history in terms of the intermittent action of its basic driver, the ‘end’ in a pun on ‘ends’ as ‘goals’. But that is a bit speculative. The whole muddle of the ‘end of history’ is too opaque to determine much of anything.

The eonic model answers directly to each of the main issues of Kant’s essay, ignoring the rest (it is not a commentary on that essay). Part of Hegel’s problem was that, as Kant warned, the issue of his challenge was premature. The world would have to wait for more data. And that is correct: we live now in the first generation to have enough data to see the solution to what Kant wondered about.

The basic solution to the question of a progress to a civil constitution is implicit in the model in its ‘discrete freedom sequence’. But the simple point is that the stunning emergence of democratic revolutions in the early modern is confusing us a little. I have criticized marxists but they alone analyzed this and came up with the charge of bourgeois revolution. And everyone forgets that the first ‘democratic’ (power to the people) revolutions in the early modern was Munzer’s Peasant Revolt with its ‘communist theme’: communism came BEFORE what we call democracy. In fact democracy, pace Locke, rapidly downshifted in the worst case of the ‘democratic’ revolution, the decidedly bourgeois revolution of the Americans, who compromised on slavery! We don’t often realize this outcome was close to a fraud, even as it created a large-scale mockup of a democratic something. But a closer look shows not only Munzer (and the ambiguous bourgeois Luther) but the English Civil War with its near-Cambrian profusion of potential in the many ‘queer’ profound experimental movements, Levelers, Diggers, ... Let us recall the ambiguity of Locke as a counter-revolutionary.

The analysis of such as Marx and Engels here is appropriate, and they saw that ‘democracy’ in this outcome was problematical, as it had been in Athens.

What is the solution in terms of the ‘eonic model’? There is none: the macro system spawns on one level a kind of ideal abstraction and the first glimpse of this is communist!! The whole nexus devolves into realization as a crude form of democratic yet elitist Frankenstein that ended up in the Civil War, and which was always vulnerable to usurpation by the capitalist class.....etc..

The action of the ‘end of history’ is really an abstraction we look back on from our present. We shouldn’t use the term in this model. The eonic model is very clear: after the phase of system action generating the modern transition the system defaults back to free agency, which means we are on our own. A first costly experiment to fix ‘bourgeois democracy’ as ‘real communist democracy’ was a train wreck, and is Strike One,

bolshevism, in the new era in realization. In antiquity, after the axial age the whole system simply declined from its height, and never recovered. Will that happen again? Looking at the fiasco of current american 'democracy' is not grounds for optimism. We need to ready for a base hit and not Strike Two at a moment of crisis when the capitalist usurpation as 'bourgeois democracy' from 'bourgeois revolution' has now produced a calamity of a system of markets that cannot respond to climate change. The ideas of capitalism as the 'end of history' in this sense is a semantic calamity, and a social apocalypse in the making. But the problem is ours to solve. It is a practical question of a revolution, a new economic system, a postliberal system of freedom and rights, and a possibly transitional system of hard authority to lay the foundations of a system received from the 'expropriation of the bourgeoisie'. We need to get cracking with a practical set of blueprints. It is not longer 'revolution first'. 'Revolution first' has already failed. We need a sense of a global/national federation of socialist republics, this time with something better than the fiasco called out as Strike One. But willy nilly events will prove Marx right in a way: we must respond to the situation that arises, which could be chaos globally at four degrees of temperature rise. The bourgeoisie failing action will soon be castled in air-conditioned bunkers ruling over mass genocide.

Use my model, it is much simpler and the verdict is simpler: the moment to construct a new postcapitalist system is at hand. Nothing in Hegel, Kojeve, or Fukuyama says anything against this. There is no end of history. Look at classical antiquity in the Occident. It went into decline that slowly but surely ended in a medieval period. Then the macro system jumpstarted a new beginning, right on schedule in the fifteenth century (often confused with the Renaissance, which was something else). That action is long since over, and we are on our own. The american system is pretty much as Marx predicted. With the invention of the CIA the system has mutated into an enigma of crime, empire, covert ops, and political lunatics. Such a fast decay over a mere two centuries is another puzzle.

Communism has never been tried...

March 26th, 2018

The Bolshevik era is a test case of the failure of marxist theory, yet we often fail to see why. The problem can be seen in the muddle over whether Russia had to first pass through a stage of capitalism and variants of this confusion are visible in all factions, until Lenin broke the logjam, but with an equally flawed formula.

We should recast the whole subject to a new formulation which can adopt a communist foundation from the start, but redefined to allow a developmental mix that can still include markets. Lenin almost got it right until he got it wrong, followed by Stalin's monumental lunacy which was never communism at all.

The point is that democracy and communism must emerge together in a match that can possible allow market economics to coexist in a complex mixture that is beyond the illusions of private property, the predatory fictions of ecological plunder of the

Commons...

The Bolshevik fallacies are really inherited from Marx's flawed analysis...

In general, there is no reason why development in the context of communism can't be the basic starting point.

Marxist confusions

March 21st, 2017 ·

Two Manifestos

We have tried to suggest a way out of the stalled left, stalled by marxist dogma among other factors.

I seriously doubt that in the US at least that the marxist legacy will work anymore either as theory or as praxis. It is however very difficult to even communicate with these idiots. Let us recall how Marx struggled with theory and then seems to have given up as the task was completed ad hoc by Engels. The whole initiative was far better served at the start in the period of the 1840's when Marx Engels reckoned in a simplified and very effective manner with the elements of capitalist critique. In a way the appearance of The German Ideology however began to token the onset of Big Theory in the reaction to Hegelianism. The struggle for theory clearly exhausted marx who began to obsess over the completion of his work. We need to free ourselves of the dogmatic confusion that came into existence and that led the second international astray.

Anyway we have produced a path to a new approach: you can start this today without theories, in a set of simple issues about history, economic systems, and the constitutional definition of a society that can function as a form of neo-communism. It doesn't even require the abolition of markets, and the whole task can be on of a transitional democratic experiment.

But we are out of time on the issue of climate and it is hard to see how the marxist world can be evaded in the creation of a new left. I can only recommend all this to just such marxists, given a sober warning they are in the way at this point.

We have proposed elements so simple they can be adopted without chronic perplexities (despite the near extravagance of the eonic model, which can be used in a simplified fragment) that plague marxists who are so confused they can't function. But despite all our criticisms, marxists are the only group with a commitment to postcapitalism. We can suggest leaping out of one's skin and remorphing to a new left. The eonic model is useful as a form of shock treatment:

Our suggestion is that we need a communist foundation in the Commons, with a hybrid system of planned economy and market economy with a lower sector in a semi-anarchist autonomous mode. Such an approach failsafe's against the monstrosity created by bolshevism which was never really in the legacy at all, as many noted: we live in a fully developed capitalism in the so-called democratic context. We can move to something new with far greater effect and intelligence than the mass idiocy of the Bolshevik derailment which in any case was hijacked by Stalin. We have nothing to do with that, or with the monstrosities we see in the case of china (and even Russia, still, in its putinesque degeneration from degenerate pseudo-communism).

So much of the struggle over marxism is pointless sophistry. We need to open the window for some fresh air. While the issue of the eonic effect it perhaps too exotic for a practical movement it nonetheless answers to a classic query of the philosopher Kant and can be taken as what we suspect is the case with a simple foundation in secular modernism as a new epoch in world history. The sudden appearance of modern capitalism (in reality it was invented ages ago) was immediately met with its dialectical complement, socialism/communism. This contrast is entirely apt as the system begins to explore a new a superior form of democracy/economy. As the planet starts into climate calamity the facile idiocies of capitalist obsession seem both out of date and grossly primitive.

...revolutionary communism as a variant of the democratic revolutions of the early modern...

March 22nd, 2018

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=virtual+revolution>

Our seemingly consistent critique of ‘reformist leftism’ is, of course, misleading because we have also made ‘compromise’ a studied angle with our idea of ‘virtual revolution’ which embraces the whole contradiction. That in addition to hybrid of markets and communism. This is not really compromise but quiet desperation.

The issue is not so much the superiority of either pole but the increased control by a totalitarian capitalism that seems to preclude revolutionary actions. That is misleading and partly the result of too much wrong thinking but the issue remains to find a vehicle, any vehicle, that can lead to some kind of change. But the issue of revolution, however unrealistic at first, won’t go away because the current regime is actually closing in on reformism, as with the anti-union successes, and everyone will discover too late that real options no longer exist. Actually, the problem lies in the way the problem has been analyzed and the confusing interpolation of Leninism Stalinism into definitions of communism, with analog confusions from Mensheviks.

We have suggested seeing revolutionary communism as, in part, a variant of the democratic revolutions of the early modern and adapting economic thinking to that kind of foundation, save that we derive the nature of democracy from axioms of fairness and equality: the logical requirement of communism of some kind in the creation of a Commons. To bring capital under control need not imply the total absence of markets. The two ideas are logically separate, perhaps...

Classic marxism confused the issue, we suspect, in the way it posits a stage of communism to follow a stage of capitalism, in turn after a stage of feudalism. Such an analysis simply doesn’t correspond to the way world history unfolds and enforced a rigid antithesis of communism and capitalism. But as noted, after the expropriation of capital into a neo-communist Commons, it is still possible to have markets, no doubt in a balance of planned sectors. In addition we have propose an autonomous sector below a certain threshold given a touch of anarchism to a highly complex overstructure that must break new ground economically but which has the potential to both recast communism as democracy and economically as a viable experiment that can evolve and provide the net

equivalent of capitalism in a truer form under the aegis of 'democratic communism'. This is not a social democratic compromise but could mimic that in early phases, e.g. moving toward an electoral constitutional convention, say, that could found communist axioms. In fact, a revolutionary situation is emerging but the old marxist left is not ready. Get ready!

So, the social democratic band music is now stealth revolutionism, not so stealthy, more or less in the open. The eerie background music is, no, revolution is the first necessity. But this formulation can move into new ground in a threatened future to a reformist slingshot to a revolutionary situation likely to emerge in the coming chaos of climate catastrophe.

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Democratic_Market_Neo_Communism_ver_5.pdf

World history, freedom in the state and freedom from the state

February 28th, 2018

The legacy of Marxism contains a rich load of potential tools but is marred by the confusions of theory that beset Marx (and Engels) and rendered their work overall a contradictory package in practice. Instead of historical materialism and/or dialectical materialism we have suggested a simple historical outline with modernity a sort of epochal transition (starting in the early modern) as the crucial focus. The progression of economic epochs in Marx is simply not correct as a long range perspective will clearly show: capitalism is gestating from the Neolithic and feudalism in many forms is recurrent. The middle ages isn't really feudal, as such. So the whole scheme is a puzzle until we recast the whole problem.

We can inject our eonic model, but that might be controversial so we can simply map out a set of epochal intervals obvious to the naked eye.

(the preface of the paleo/neolithic)

the phase of onset of the State, Sumer, Egypt and era from ca. 3000 BCE onwards
the so-called Axial Age and its succession as an epoch, and this enforces a discipline of balanced study from Greece/Rome across Eurasia to China
the rise of the modern world from fifteenth to the eighteenth century...

We can try to interpret this pattern, or we can just take it empirically as a kind of punctuated series, wary of theories save as a descriptive category of development or civilizational evolution (wary of the term evolution, it just means what it means in conversational lingo).

In this context we can analyze class, economy, and technology empirically as histories or chronicles. Note that we add technological history as separate category: the onset of capitalism is often confused with the industrial (technological) revolution of the eighteenth century.

We can certainly focus on a working class analysis of these various eras and/or look at the whole in terms of multiple classes and posit the motion toward a universal class. But let us note that a working class dynamic is going to be incomplete: there is a double motion, the onset of the State as one kind of freedom and then almost dialectically a motion against the state as the birth of democracy. We note the resemblance of the democratic and the working class strain.

We should note that 'feudalism' is really an ideological version of the idea of caste that so dominates India: the Aryan cast logic is simply a variant in the occidental middle ages. We can see then that overall the sudden amplification of capitalism in the industrial revolution period looks like the onset of a new epoch of economy, but surely to a close look we can see that that is not true.

We can resolve the question by seeing that democracy can't be fully realized or the State truly fulfilled until we unite the working class, or better the gestating universal class into a common realization, viz. with a communist democracy...

We have both availed ourselves of a theme of proletarian ideology, Marxism, and escaped its rigid formulation which can obstruct clarity.

Let us note then that capitalism is developing at all stages of history even if it suddenly becomes a dominant factor in modernity. We can see that capitalism as economy and technology almost because an independent factor in history, but that's not the same as saying it is a stage of history.

Let us recommend a closer look at the eonic model but without having to take it in full as another theory. But, all in all, we can see that an empirical approach can free us from the confusions that haunt marxist ideas about inexorable stages of economic history.

The working class formulation is so classic and to the point we can work with that, but the idea of a 'universal class', which is really a variant of the individuality of all men given by the great religions, can be an equally valuable approach. We can easily change gears between the two concepts, also mindful that the class interests of the working class can't be made an absolute: the nature of the state and its evolution into democracy and two separate issues, reaching their conclusion in their unification.

Another issue is the question of slavery: it is increasingly clear, although not certain, that slavery is never any kind of necessary stage in history, because it didn't really exist at the birth of agriculture or the State: it appears to be a disease of civilization that grows progressively worse in the era after the rise of State Sumer/Egypt. Thus, it appears that the Pyramids, at first, were constructed by free labor as a sort of military draft.

The dread disease of slavery is really related to emerging capitalism in an obvious sense, and overtakes the State in the later phase of our first epoch???

Whatever the case we cannot ascribe any necessary status to slavery: if the great pyramids were initiated by free labor the arguments for the inevitability of slavery as a stage (suspiciously lurking in marx) collapse at once.

archive: The question of modernity

December 11th, 2017 ·

The need for a larger perspective....of modernity

January 8th, 2015 ·

The neo-communist left has to have a far larger universe than that created by historical materialism: it needs a global anthropology that can talk to a generalized modernity/secularism. But what is that? The nineteenth century created a reduced subset to all that in the forms of positivism, scientism, secular humanism, marxism...

Marxism needs to be rescued from this situation: the situation is not hard to solve: we use the 'macro model' (or you can skip that) to look at what we call the 'modern transition' from 1500 to 1800 (approx/) at which point the new era of modernity begins. The early modern clearly shows at once what happened: Marxism jumped on a yippee surfboard in the Feuerbachian reaction to Hegel and downshifted into a very limited perspective. The overall idea was brilliant, however, and can easily be recast to include 1. a larger whole than Hegel and his critics 2. the 'dialectic' of the modern transitional with counterpoints in the Reformation/Rise of Science, revolutions from Munzer to the French Revolution. 3 the rise of liberalism, ideas of freedom, philosophies of freedom, 4. German Classical Philosophy....

In general the Marxist perspective can't even handle the Enlightenment very well. The so-called 'dialectic of the Enlightenment' started chasing a good idea for a critique and ended up in the hopeless muddle of the postmodern critique of modernity.

In the larger view the issue of communism is 1. A response to the need for a post-transitional 'revolution' against capitalism, 2. the need to reconstruct modernity in this new context, requiring versions of the Reformation, Scientific Revolution, rise of liberalism/communism (socialism), industrialization and its technologies and globalization, 3.some reckoning with the complex chords generated: e.g. the Romantic Reaction, the export of buddhism and figures like Schopenhauer, etc...

You can see that the current tactic of trying to use marxism to challenge all other aspects of modernity is ill-conceived and the route to sterility and scientism made worse.

Last and First Men creates an historical context for not only the larger perspective of modernity, but a still larger context of world history. This approach requires looking at a whole complex(dialectic) of counterpoints, contraries and pairs of opposites.

In specific terms, the new left here needs to study the reality of global religion, from Xtianity/Islam to buddhism, and Confucianism Taoism, etc.. It needs to have a larger philosophy that can work with materialism and idealism in a larger context than simple collision. Etc...

This problem of selecting a small subset of modernity to define secularism haunts the science world whose cadre of poorly educated scientism troopers has created, like marxism, an extremely narrow subset of modernity that beggars the whole transition to a new era.

It would be nice to ditch the old Marxism and create a larger version that is tuned to the greater whole of modernity, and thence antiquity.

How can the left reach a new historical vision?

February 28th, 2018

In many ways the dated ‘ideology’ of Marxism is itself an obstacle on the way to a newly receptive public, poised at the threshold of a new era of socialism, maybe. Our Last and First Men tries to braid various heroic strains of the Marx saga as historical epic without embracing the theory, as such, trying to come into existence in Capital. In fact, the latter book should be retired and join the saga as historical imagery. For all other purposes the Marxist realm needs to self-dissolve into a new version of the communist initiative that stalks the capitalist period, mistakenly taken as some kind of ‘epoch’. In reality the reign of capitalism shows if anything the failure of the modern epoch (in a more accurate delineation of epochs since the era of Egypt/Sumer) to realize its democratic project as the domination of capital distorts the whole unfolding of a technological era of production. The latter is taken as the determining factor in historical analysis but in fact it is, or should be, secondary and brought into harmony with the parallel democratic emergentism that is so characteristic of the modern period.

archive: R48G: the eonic effect: as a tool to ‘debrief’ historical theories...
August 11th, 2017 ·

The eonic model comes off as wild speculation but the reality is that it is, or should be, an objective tool to expose standard historical mythologies, including those of science and most conventional historians. It can be taken on its own terms or used as a set of questions that will challenge other forms of theory:

first, it challenges deconstructs the mythology of flat history
 next, it shows how values must be taken into account, rendering a causal dynamic antinomial
 from there it proceeds to expose ‘unflat’ histories, e.g. biblical old testament stories of Israel
 it implicitly exposes theistic historicism, e.g. Judeo-Christian Islamic ‘god in history’ myths (that depends definitions of ‘god’, to be sure)...
 it exposes histories that disallow free agency and keeps open the ‘free will’ debate (free agency allows the introduction of complex hybrids, e.g. self-consciousness to mediate freedom, causality)
 it transcends the useless ‘materialism/idealism’ debate and the model can be taken both ways, i.e. is independent of the distinction, and it can provide a vehicle for the model of ‘transcendental idealism’, i.e. as noumenal/phenomenal perspective...
 it exposes (to a considerable likelihood) the myth of darwinism (natural selection) as random evolution by showing an example of non-random process
 it returns the term ‘evolution’ to its correct meaning, as ‘development’
 it isolated the ‘antinomy of teleological judgment’ by showing how both teleological and non-teleological interpretations can fail (with a new definition of teleology as a discrete-continuous model)
 it shows how the ‘evolution of freedom’ needs to be a practical historical/evolutionary concept
 it show how ‘evolution’ is likely to be a global process
 it offers a warning that a great deal of innovation in history is macro induced

that's a reasonable, but short, list: the point here is that we can retreat from hard claims and use these propositions as a set of questions...conventional historiography can't survive such a difficult challenge, but as with darwinism it will simply try to control opinion behind academic mind control.

Design in history...histomat versus the eonic perspective...

February 28th, 2018

R48G: quick costume change for Marxist historicism

December 8th, 2017 ·

our previous post on the issue of design in history suggests that the Marxist 'design' argument is too limited, and fallacious.

We have recommended a version of the eonic model as a replacement.

This can be a minimalist version that is simply a chronicle of world history, but one that points to the definite if ambiguous evidence of rapid transitions.

This view simply catalogs the epochs visible: transitions and their in betweens or medieval periods: three visible since Egypt/Sumer

This can be taken empirically, with modernity as the hypothesized onset of a new epoch by whatever dynamic, a no-brainer actually.

In this context the study of economic history (next to technological history) makes better sense than the rigid framework of feudalism, capitalism, and communism.

One aspect of historical design is the emergence of democracy, and the modern version is especially compelling. But the early socialists and then Marx/Engels pointed to the cooptation of democracy by capitalism and suggested democracy required both political and economic equality, another no-brainer after all this debate over 'isms'.

The eonic version of Marxist historicism is thus a simple, practical empirical model that can stage the issue of communism as an aspect of democratic realization and ecological economics.

The current brand of Marxism claims that communism will inexorably succeed capitalism. But that won't happen unless free agents decide to create a communist future. They can do this based on axioms of fairness, equality, and economic sanity, rather than with a clumsy and incorrect version of economic epochs.

But this then requires the assumption that men make themselves and can create a communist future.

Our models and manifestos suggest a social democratic blueprint done right: the equivocation over social democracy and/or 'Stalinist' planning wrecked the old international. A much simpler approach using our eonic model can, stripped of jargon, provides a 'clear water' brand of non-theory and strong praxis...

Our previous post on the issue of design in history suggests that the marxist 'design' argument is too limited, and fallacious.

We have recommended a version of the eonic model as a replacement.

This can be a minimalist version that is simply a chronicle of world history, but one that points to the definite if ambiguous evidence of rapid transitions.

This view simply catalogs the epochs visible: transitions and their in betweens or medieval periods: three visible since Egypt/Sumer

This can be taken empirically, with modernity as the hypothesized onset of a new epoch by whatever dynamic, a no-brainer actually.

In this context the study of economic history (next to technological history) makes better sense than the rigid framework of feudalism, capitalism, communism.

One aspect of historical design is the emergence of democracy, and the modern version is especially compelling. But the early socialists and then Marx/Engels pointed to the cooptation of democracy by capitalism and suggested democracy required both political and economic equality, another no-brainer after all this debate over 'isms'.

The eonic version of Marxist historicism is thus a simple, practical empirical model that can stage the issue of communism as an aspect of democratic realization and ecological economics.

The current brand of Marxism claims that communism will inexorably succeed capitalism. But that won't happen unless free agents decide to create a communist future. They can do this based on axioms of fairness, equality, and economic sanity, rather than with a clumsy and incorrect version of economic epochs.

But this then requires the assumption that men make themselves and can create a communist future.

Our models and manifestos suggest a social democratic blueprint done right: the equivocation over social democracy and/or 'Stalinist' planning wrecked the old international. A much simpler approach using our eonic model can, stripped of jargon, provide a 'clear water' brand of non-theory and strong praxis...

Fake democracy

February 27th, 2018

As we suggested strongly yesterday (and before) the provocations of the american political system in general and the emerging additional confusion created by Trump is a mysterious 'green light' for 'revolution', especially given the context of climate change calamity underway.

The problem is of course the extent of monopoly power by the US state, and the international aspect of the basic 'problem' requiring both a nationalistic and/or international action. Is the american system a democracy? No, it is a system controlled by gangsters...

If we are powerless we must at least produce a statement of what must be done and a blueprint for an alternative system. Clarity can produce action, and as a new consensus emerges then the question of evolution/revolution is resolved by the spontaneous

emergence of ‘change’. We must at least be considering a true revolutionary option, and this will force the hard thinking needed to correct the dysfunctional politics of capitalism and democracy. Consensus is constantly frustrated by the confused semantics of democracy as a process, concept, ideal, and platform. Leftists have analyzed this problem ad infinitum but mostly have failed to communicate the dilemma (maybe that wasn’t true in the earlier period of the second international with its global cadres) and the result is the constant demand for democracy without nuance: the problem is we already have a ‘democracy’, in quotation marks, so nothing needs to be done. Or if we do anything the result must be what it already is, democracy, in quotation marks.

A similar problem stalks the terms of economic reasoning, and here the ‘end of history’ argument has prevailed over the need for common sense applied to capitalism in action. It is patently false that ‘capitalism’ is the last word in economic systems. How did such nonsense ever become dominant? Actually, the idea was challenged before it even became explicit, viz. in the period of Adam Smith. The era of Thomas Munzer and the English Civil War shows that the problem was clear from the start.

Even Adam Smith is not so much of a problem. We could have applied his thinking and spared a lot of trouble. But more generally the obvious point lost in the clever forms of propaganda (which started with Adam Smith, of course) is that capitalism is simply a set of processes. They have no inherent legitimation. An economic system of any kind, but especially capitalism, must be subject to a higher authority, control process and ethical court of reason. And that is true irregardless of any shibboleths about regulation and the nature of free markets. If we allow fanaticism to overrule this principle or allow complete idiots like Ayn Rand to pour dysethical gasoline on a fire the result in short order is, a system controlled by gangsters. There is no reason why a control system can’t also mediate issues of regulatory over-control. What else is new?

In a way the great insights of the Marx/Engels era didn’t succeed in producing quite the right mix. And we have to wonder if the progression to a Russian context didn’t subtly confound the original socialist formulas. Certainly the Stalinist distortion should have been seen at once as a deviation from plan, so to speak, not communism at all.

In this context, Americans have an opportunity to perform a world historical service by performing a true first: a transition revolutionary/evolutionary to an economic system done right, most probably along socialist/communist axiomatic lines.

The basic starting point is the lesson from experience that capitalism has corrupted an experiment in republics/‘democracy’ and produced a ‘fake democracy’ controlled by capitalist gangsters. Can we estimate the chances of orderly reform? We can fritter away our chances in facile reformist measures. We could as easily fritter them away in phantom revolutionary projects. The way forward is not clear. And that is the reason perhaps that most revolutions have slipped into themselves almost serendipitously: witness the French and Russian cases.

But we are now in a unique and deadly situation: to the tyranny of capitalist gangsters we must add the related corruption of government by covert agencies, a deep state, and a

criminal mafia dosing wars, controlling drug rackets, and making militarism a capitalist politics of imperial false destinies (american exceptionalism, ye gods). On top of this we have an emerging climate catastrophe, with a gangster elite that has captured public action on the problem. This situation might demand kamikazis.

We must fight our way out of this somehow or watch the system pass into global oligarchic domination, the status of the american reign up in the air as its 'empire' evaporates.

The most likely outcome, or so it seems at the moment, is climate catastrophe in a system where the left has failed to really produce a revolutionary ecological option. But the latter is not so hard to arrive at: it needs a clear statement, however hard this is for conventional leftists.

We have said enough for the moment: it is a simple issue: democracy promoted favors the capitalists. democracy critiqued promotes the Stalinists. We must start over with a nuanced hybrid that can resolve a set of contradictions. (We have pulled one such rabbit out of a host: democratic market neo-communism).

So we have a peculiar situation: democracy is a corrupted term. Communism is corrupted term (given its history). Markets are systematically misanalyzed, corrupt terminology again. Electoral reform is probably impossible, revolutionary change possible but unlikely, and fraught with peril.

The solution/resolution of all this seems to be: disappear in chaos as the planet becomes toast.

We can change this system if we can restate a set of classic principles, extricate them from false democratic and false socialist thinking and generate a revolutionary change that can reset the system from scratch. If enough people can achieve clarity of thought it will happen almost spontaneously. But we can see that activist groups have lost clarity. The terminal nature of the crisis will likely remedy that in a hurry.

In any case, there are no active groups that one can see that can address the full spectrum of issues. We must start with that task, and the actual framework isn't that hard to arrive at.

Postcapitalism in the age of climate catastrophe

February 27th, 2018

The current political climate is shifting from its traditional focus to the crisis of climate but many of the activist groups current are still falling short of the correct stance on the issue. And this imbalance will continue as the climate movement suffers and goes into stall, maybe, or maybe not.

We must leave that aside but attempt the same analysis with the traditional working class emphasis of the left. We need a larger and more general focus on the issue of culture, politics, ecology, and the economics of neoliberal globalization and this in the context of a robust platform of climate action in the context of a post-capitalist economic system. In a way the Marxist approach, if it can graduate from its narrow focus, is potentially able to do this, but it must drop 'marxism' and take up the net equivalent yet better in a new form. And as with feminism the focus on the working class must become something more general with respect to the whole issue of modernity, economic systems, and democracy. Issues of race, feminism, LGBT, etc, can easily ride piggyback here, but not the other way around.

The key issue is the nature of an economic transformation that can resolve the crisis of climate, assuming there is still time. We have to try but we need to consider a revolutionary movement, and this could even be a virtual bluff that can start to act immediately with at the least the non-violent equivalent of 'guerilla warfare'. We confront the reality that corporate America discovered the crisis a generation ago and scofflaw its way to destroying climate consciousness in government. Under the circumstances we are given near demand to challenge the current order, corporate and political. So the virtual revolution has the right to dismantle carbon economy, with some definable standard of ruthless action, a question mark to be sure.

If you empower a president who will destroy climate action you have the right and a duty to more drastic remedies that can, well, remedy the situation. Radicalize for the \$15 minimum wage all you want, but a postcapitalist economy is needed more urgently, and postcarbon economy at the top of the list, no question. Guerilla warfare in quotation marks or not can join 'virtual' revolution as a thought experiment to flush out the issues and deprogram the problems here.

I think the working class is going to show up with a vengeance in the wake of the Trump era, and this can work fine with our formulation as to the universal class, save only that all these rust belt communities are just that, communities, and need a comprehensive solutions. All those jobs aren't coming back, and we confront the need for wholly new economic perspective.

Man cannot evolve under capitalist social darwinism...

February 26th, 2018

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=The+Crisis+of+Modernity_ver4.pdf

This version of the eonic model stages a far better version of both an hegelian freedom metaphysics and the demonstration of emergent democracy:

The model actually produces what Hegel guessed about and Fukuyama actually eliminated: the so-called discrete freedom sequence and the way that historical emergence prompts man toward increased political freedom, which might well suggest 'democracy'. But the catch here is that macro history can prompt man to freedom but

man must make himself and must take the steps toward freedom further to the completion of the task. Big History simply induces a dialectical potential: man must make himself by solving the problem of freedom. Clearly gyration between liberal democracy, capitalism and some form of postcapitalism is the likely near term outcome. The whole point, cogently noted by the early socialists, was that the field of liberalism was flawed by the domination of capital and that ‘true democracy’ must be redefined. And the obvious point missed by Fukuyama is seen in the contrast between the birth of democracy in the English civil war and its erosion in the restoration and its cynical ‘liberal’ settlement.

In the eonic model we reach, not the ‘end of history’ but the probable end of the ‘eonic sequence’: the point at which man must take control of his own history. That cannot be the same as subjecting man irrevocably to forces of the market, something we can now begin to see is going to be a disastrous outcome. Man’s true freedom can’t emerge under domination by the market...

First and last international

February 25th, 2018

The passing of the 2nd international was long ago, and yet the marxist framework (that might have led to its failure) still persists. A new upgrade is needed for a ‘last international’. Part of the problem was the expectation that the working class would be revolutionary but the onset of the first world war demonstrated the limits of that hope, although we might well blame the politicians rather than the working class. We have created a kind of ‘dialectic’ of the universal and the working class with a critique of the narrow limits of the working class focus: the working class on a global scale remains a key component but in the US something strange has happened. Social engineering from the right has crated a monstrosity as we see in the issue of Trump’s ‘base’. That is not the same as the working class, no doubt...But we should reconsider the whole range of issues and ask why the working class should be given preference over everyone else: it has led to a confusion on the left and has stalled activism. The working class isn’t revolutionary. But it might be, with the renewed discourse that is relevant to our current situation.

Resource: The rise and fall of the Second International | SocialistWorker.org

The core heroic saga...

February 24th, 2018

I think the communist left is stalled and the inability of leftist parties to expand at a moment of such global crisis is ominous.

To me the problem is not hard to analyze in principle, whatever the solution in practice: social historical forces ‘freeze’ after a prolonged period of stasis or stability in the mechanization of habit, and conditioned action. This can befall even successful organizations. But the spectre of Stalinism in one’s historical account makes the problem almost impossible.

Part of the problem is the ‘shattered nerves’ of those who review the legacy of bolshevism: they are hep to invent anything but. The Occupy movement was really ‘anything but’. Chomsky and many others, as ‘anarchists’, are strongly ‘anything but’. We need to move to a realistic ‘anything but’ the capitalist endgame of a burnt out planet. But the tide is turning. The case for market domination is beginning to lag even in the minds of ordinary TV consumers of ideology.

And yet the moment for a new left is likely to stall again, ...and again. What is needed is a clear rethink of fundamentals, a complete restatement that eliminates all clichés, boilerplate and all the stale arguments about Marx’s theories, etc...

Last and First Men tries to invent some solutions here:

Treat the saga of Marx and Engels up to 1848 as the ‘Core Heroic Saga’, but attempt to create a superset of the classic canon using new language, jargon free, and moving swiftly to the issue of modern neo-classical economics and its expose as a pseudo-science. The dated theories of Marx waste all the energies of leftists forced to defend them in the studied and instant counterattacks of trained anti-marxists. Who cares? Start with fresh analyses of the modern economy as it is, and focus on the vulnerable marginalist fiction scenarios at their Achilles’ Heels.

Downplay historical materialism and try to create a new world history that is not based on the crude logic of nineteenth century scientism. LFM tries to create an historical framework based on an analysis of the Axial Age, the modern transition, and the larger evolutionary account of man, freed from darwinism.

The left’s stance on religion, the evolution of religion, and the Feuerbachian critique is largely a failure at this point. The US now has far more buddhists than marxists. These people won’t even look at a marxist analysis of anything at this point.

The modern transition produced one of the most fantastic sequences of original philosophic geniuses, from Spinoza to Hegel and yet now all of that is thrown away for the crudest of reductionist thought systems. How did that happen? A leftist can’t even discuss Kant without a fierce reaction of scorn. A strange mindset for those whose efforts must found a living culture. Looking at the Stalinist litanies of dialectical materialism we must protest the goal of repeated imposition of Bolshevik ‘crud’.

The issue of Darwinism haunts the whole radical left coming out of the Second Internationale. Who really won the Scopes Trial? It looks like a victory for Darwinist science. Eighty years later we see the right’s thinktanks with an expose of darwinism far superior to the academic ideology of evolution.

Last and First Men shows a way to escape from darwinism within the context of a non-religious historical analysis. The left is completely addicted to Darwin, but the reality is that darwinism is killing the left.

There are a lot of ways to expand this analysis but the key issue is that the old left is a mechanized terminal thought system. The cure for that doesn’t even have to be leaving it behind. Simple refreshing can be enough. Lettuce is lettuce, but the week old lettuce is instantly recognizable.

And this leaves the tricky questions of Leninism. I think that here we can try it both ways. The historical sequence leading to Lenin was unique and won’t recur. Or is that wrong? A crisis is coming that will demand those who are ready to seize the initiative. That’s the real ‘lenis’: being ready to lead the movement into a new postcapitalist era.

That seems so unlikely we do nothing. But we should act as if the neo-communist moment is to come. And it must be 'neo', because the forces of reaction will be instant in their counterattack at senile 'paleo-communism'.

It is, btw, time to drop the term 'marxist' given the strange cult of personality that now freezes the real legacy of Marx.

And the new atheism is a demonstration of the way the older secular humanism got stuck in reductionist thinking. The issue of 'god' hamstring the current left, because they have already lived through the failure of the 'new atheist' movement in an older incarnation, secular humanism of the era of Feuerbach. IN a world of several billion theists, atheism is the wrong strategy. For myself I have no opinion on the 'god' question. After the revolution you can ask me again. Til then the issue is Kantian indecidability. In that context a radical leftist should be ready to discourse courteously with theists, atheists, and the many 'in between'. If we examine the historical framework of Last and First Men we see that the modern transition has the same foundation as the Hellenic and Judaic transitions, one on top of the other. So we need not gaze backward for an 'age of revelation', that misnomer nonetheless worth flashing once before the eyes of religious conservatives. The modern transition makes the Judaic 'transition' with its age of Revelation look like a kiddie ride at Disneyland. And we should definitely not try to make a god religion out of the modern instance. That said, the materialist interpretation has gotten too hard. The great yogis of antiquity were also 'materialists' in the canon of Samkhya. So the brief moment of hard materialism which served to stun the rightist religious reaction may have served its purpose. A religion of atheism isn't needed for a new communism. After the revolution, ask me again.

Free agents and postcapitalist transition

February 24th, 2018

We are caught in the downspiral of what constitutes the 'endgame of capitalism'.

But for some reason the left, under the influence of marxism, seems unready for the challenge. Part of the reason is the simple inability to attract an audience at this point. In the period of the early internationals the canon of Marx/Engels rapidly spread and created a global audience. Now it appears unable to do so, for reasons that are in a way obvious: the factor of bolshevism is a fatal blight on the legacy. These points are actually obvious, almost clichés, but the solution seems to elude the left, which is mostly a remnant as the majority has moved on. But unfortunately activist groups end up floundering in eclecticism without an organizing framework. And the canon is itself flawed and needs to be recast, a very difficult task that is more likely to produce a confused rendering. We have suggested a new approach: move beyond historical materialism to broader view of history, eject from 'stages of production' theory to a view of capitalism that is ad hoc, not systematic. There is no stage of history that is capitalist and capitalism was not the prime destroyer of feudalism. Capitalism was simply a striking amplification of the capitalism that had existed since the Neolithic in primitive stages. The point was/is to create a social system that can buffer the new economic processes in an intelligent way. In many ways it is a question creating a real democracy, a system of equality in the context of market economies moving beyond that to a higher synthesis.

A new formulation is needed that doesn't require the constant dogmatic reiteration of blanket marxism, which doesn't mean that legacy can't be cited. But the left is saddled with endless futile attempts to defend their mistakes. In a way the obsessive celebration of the centennial of the Bolshevik Revolution is a distraction. We need to act as if socialism/communism were being considered for the first time, and to be able to simply shrug when critics point to mistakes/flaws/failures of the older left: the stance should be, not of our doing, and our principles won't lead to a repetition there because our formulation is a new one.

Our formulation here is based on the idea that free agency is a key factor in historical realization. That economic systems don't determine history as such, despite their huge momentum, and that instead of waiting on the 'next epoch' of communism men have to act as free agents to conceive and realize a system that is not letting capitalism to run amok. Calling capitalism a stage of history was a monumental blunder from the start. Rather we should consider that a communist foundation is needed to create democratic equality. We must as free agents design a system that can match those axioms. It is a fallacy to think the system of capitalism is evolving to communism: we must instead assume we are free agents and act to create a sane future.

Macro/micro

February 20th, 2018

Update: that economic system lack a macro factor in the sense of 'evolution' is possibly false but in any case I forgot to point out part of my argument, that economic systems have aggregate properties and dynamical 'motions', e.g. economic cycles, therefore our distinction of 'system action' and 'free action' would apply. But it is not clear that there is any process over the course of world history that directs economic systems...

We have explored the macro/micro distinction in several contexts in the process creating an 'evolution' category.

And then we noticed the obvious fact that economics has a similar distinction. But we warned that the economic context is somewhat different because it is not an evolutionary category. As far as we know, based on the evidence of history where economic systems are processes insider larger civilizations. (The idea of economic evolution can and has been proposed, again in a different sense). Ironically marx produced an evolutionary theory of economics in the way he distinguished a series of economic epochs. Such a system requires a kind of macro factor, but is there one?

We proposed an emergency solution to this failure of theory by suggesting that communism is about more than economics and that it can be a goal of free agents in history trying to produce 'real democracy'. In that form it doesn't require a fictitious macro factor.

So, we have:

Macro/micro in evolutionary biology (speciation, adaptation?)

Macro/micro in history (the eonic effect, a sequence of transitions, versus free agency, or

system action/free action)

Macro/micro in economics...But the case is different: economies are processes and not evolutionary in our sense. Note however the interesting way in which microeconomics is about 'free agency' in our sense, while macroeconomics still lacks an historical macro effect. Macroeconomics is really a special case of microeconomics in which free agents try to modify large scale economic systems.

Floating fourth turning points?

February 20th, 2018

We have suggested an idea of a 'floating fourth turning point' as a human creation of its own eonic effects, a truly stupendous task requiring operating on a scale of tens of millennia. It would be useful to at least think about it and to try to estimate what is really behind the eonic effect because we have a system of stupendous potential. Leftists might use the idea to see how primitive is the idea, so far, of socialist transformation in marxism.

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=floating+fourth+turning+points>

R48G: transitions versus civilizations...floating fourth turning points...

October 10th, 2017 ·

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=The+Crisis+of+Modernity_ver6.pdf

We have suggested that we have to upgrade 'revolution' to something more general and comprehensive that includes the fundamentals of the whole of modernity. We can see how the Russian revolution ended up collapsing the categories of social construction into the brittle ideology of the second international, ultimately the result of the contraction of marxism around nineteenth century positivism. That was an attractive set of tenets for the time but it is not believable to many now, even given the reality of religious reaction attempting to restore itself as socially dominant.

The idea of the 'floating fourth turning point' is a 'curious notion' attempting to generalize the idea of a revolutionary social transformation and is both practical and preposterous, food for thought...

A lot of good reasons to scrap historical materialism for a simplified historical model based on the 'eonic effect'

February 18th, 2018

Despite the apparent opacity of the 'eonic model' the reality is that it points to a structure easy to verify empirically that confounds our standard approaches to historical study. The model demands that we acknowledge the place of values in the emergence of factual histories and resolves the misleading distinctions of religion, civilization, and culture by showing everything in terms of a set of 'relative transformations' that drive a larger whole. For example at the core of the model in the specified time periods we see the synchrony of emergent Israelite monotheism and Greek classical transformations: we are

given the suggestion of something far more abstract than anything in theistic or reductionist historicism.

The natural interpretation is that of some kind of macroevolution paired with a related microevolution. These terms are simply labels in a formalism of descriptive 'evolutionism' (or developmental progression) but leave the question open: is there any connection to the evolution of organisms and life in deep time? We can leave that secondary question to the text of World History and the Eonic Effect. There is also a connection of the similar distinction in economics: micro and macro.

Presented as a chronicle of epochs in an empirical framework the construct is probably beyond any easy falsification short of a theory even as its interpretations might well vary in their conclusions. But overall the construct is a robust set of insights that can develop an almost stunningly rich content that synthesizes physical, aesthetic, ethical, and religious/secular spheres. The ultimate account is in some ways a descendant of the kind of theistic historicism of the Old Testament but in a completely generalized form that exposes the myths of historical theism and adopts a stance of secular humanism in a new mode.

The question of religion thus finds a richer version of itself in a secular format that is free of the 'pagan'(sic) mythologies of the monotheistic legacy, the lonely pantheon of the 'one god', yet does better justice to their histories and practices...

The beauty of this approach is that, in a streamlined form free of the murkiness of the text of WHEE, the model can form a superb successor to historical materialism and economic historicism of the marxist brand. And it can reconcile 'end of history' debates over democracy and historical directionality next to an equal clarification of the emergent communism as a challenge to the capitalist era.

In fact, in a great irony the eonic model points to a potential science of history (making no claims to a finished theory) even as it allows injections of ideological interpretation, albeit in a dialectical spectrum.

Nothing in world history makes sense without an understanding of the macro effect...

September 18th, 2015 ·

http://history-and-evolution.com/whee4th/chap4_1.htm

The influence of bad science, bad history, and bad education backing them up has made WHEE book almost impossible to understand, but it is actually a very practical study of the way history follows a basic developmental logic.

Why are scientists unable to deal with this? 1. they can't handle anything that doesn't follow reductionist causality...2. they can't therefore handle the place of free agency in history, which is like studying a zoo with no animals...3. they can't follow the simple logic of discontinuity given the endless confusion created here by religious thinkers... 4. most of all they can't grasp that there is something wrong with darwinism...

A 'dialectic' of revolution/virtual revolution

February 13th, 2018

<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>

We have almost deliberately indulged a kind of 'dialectic' of revolution/virtual revolution, the latter a way station as we confront the immensely dangerous and conflicted theme of revolutionary action. In fact we are confronted by a situation that is almost demanding a revolutionary response and yet the prospect of that seems remote, as yet, despite an increasing falling away from the possibilities of social salvation given the ominous climate catastrophe developing. The answer is that we must failsafe both approaches. But the prospect of electoral resolution of the crisis emerging is increasingly remote even as the trump era is almost borderline insanity and a near demand for radical electoral challenges.

The revolutionary potential allows us think in real terms of a comprehensive solution to the 'social contract', as such, not just a few issues of activist promotion. And it invokes the idea of an international, an alliance of radical revolutionary action groups that can challenge imperialism, and address a transnational working class and climate politics. All obvious clichés stalled at the starting gate. A core problem is the inadequacy of legacy marxist ideologies and their association with ancient failures. They are stubbornly frozen in place as the reign of Marx Engels, the second international, and the Bolshevik lunacies haunt all efforts. Leave all that behind and recast the whole subject, asap. We have suggested via two manifestos a comprehensive jumpstart of revolutionary/evolutionary action with a new perspective on history and a new set of issues.

Marxist jargon almost immediately shuts down potential assent to leftist projects because it animates mindsets wary of its earlier history and subject to the seeming cogency of the 'end of history' propaganda. Remarkably, most activists are reluctant to even discuss postcapitalist axioms and consider the question of private property as beyond any challenge. But the domination of capital is going to prevent any serious change: have we seen anything of any significance since the fall of Bolshevik Russia? Hardly, and that is a warning we are turning in circles. The climate question is especially indicative: an immense amount of effort, a whole generation, has achieved very little and the US confronts a regressive madman intent on destroying the EPA.

So the dog chasing its tail comes around to the need to think in terms of revolutionary change, a new postmarxist platform, and an international that can start to think in transnational terms of globalization as postcapitalist...

from last month:

The virtual revolution as a minimal challenge to both fake democracy and trump fascist conspiracy

February 14th, 2017 ·

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Democratic_Market_Neo_Communist_ver_5.pdf

Given the fear of Stalinism it is almost impossible to even discuss communism any more, but in our version we are explicitly discussing a form of democracy and the critique goes in both directions. The whole discussion has to move beyond legacy Marxism-Leninism, obviously, but by the same token we must be wary of those who defend what we have now as democracy. If nothing else a communist virtual revolution will be ready to meet the crypto-Leninist fascism of the Trump/Bannon set as a debriefing tactic, warning, and if the circumstance forces the issue a revolutionary movement to produce a postcapitalist democracy...

In the context of climate calamity the stakes have risen and we are threatened with less than caution... We need a failsafed revolutionary left...

Falling between two stools: religious and secular confusion over history

February 11th, 2018

Marxists often don't get it: you can't propose an incorrect theory of history and expect people to listen.

Using the eonic model we can show just how hard it is to grapple with a real theory of history. From there we can stand back and distance ourselves from the syndrome of false certainties and we can also reconcile, or at least defang, the collision of secular and religious historicisms...

Archive: R48G: the eonic effect: as a tool to 'debrief' historical theories...

August 11th, 2017 ·

The eonic model comes off as wild speculation but the reality is that it is, or should be, an objective tool to expose standard historical mythologies, including those of science and most conventional historians. It can be taken on its own terms or used as a set of questions that will challenge other forms of theory:

first, it challenges deconstructs the mythology of flat history

next, it shows how values must be taken into account, rendering a causal dynamic antinomial

from there it proceeds to expose 'unflat' histories, e.g. biblical old testament stories of Israel

it implicitly exposes theistic historicism, e.g. judeo-christian/islamic 'god in history' myths (that depends definitions of 'god', to be sure)...

it exposes histories that disallow free agency and keeps open the 'free will' debate (free agency allows the introduction of complex hybrids, e.g self-consciousness to mediate freedom, causality)

it transcends the useless 'materialism/idealism' debate and the model can be taken both ways, i.e. is independent of the distinction, and it can provide a vehicle for the model of

‘transcendental idealism’, i.e. as noumenal/phenomenal perspective...
 it exposes (to a considerable likelihood) the myth of darwinism (natural selection) as
 random evolution by showing an example of non-random process
 it returns the term ‘evolution’ to its correct meaning, as ‘development’
 it isolated the ‘antinomy of teleological judgment’ by showing how both teleological and
 non-teleological interpretations can fail (with a new definition of teleology as a discrete-
 continuous model)
 it shows how the ‘evolution of freedom’ needs to be a practical historical/evolutionary
 concept
 it show how ‘evolution’ is likely to be a global process
 it offers a warning that a great deal of innovation in history is macro induced

that’s a reasonable, but short, list: the point here is that we can retreat from hard claims
 and use these propositions as a set of questions...conventional historiography can’t
 survive such a difficult challenge, but as with darwinism it will simply try to control
 opinion behind academic mind control.

Beyond pseudo-democracy...at the ‘end of history’

February 10th, 2018

One of the great ironies of the ‘end of history’ debate is that if we take its thesis seriously
 the directionality of history so proclaimed by Fukuyama will move beyond the pseudo-
 democracy of liberal capitalism to ‘real democracy’. We see not one but two failures in
 this directional framework: the failure of bolshevism and now the apparent failure of the
 kind of fake democracy we see in the US. And the system under these terms will move
 inexorably to try and create a new and higher freedom as democracy.

The issue is related to the reciprocity of rights and liberties and the gross fallacy of
 sacrificing the freedom of the many for the ‘freedom of capital’, free markets. The point
 is so obvious, and has been from the onset of early socialism, that it is hard to see how we
 are still mesmerized by the claims of democracy in the current system. But there is no
 absolute given of such a transformation: the system can simply decay into a degenerate
 morass and that is what we starting to see in the american system. And there is a peculiar
 and seemingly organized cabal of rightist reaction that is trying to promote dictatorship
 against the trend of democracy and this has finally reached the american realm with
 Trump. The question of a directionality of freedom is far better analyzed in the study of
 the eonic effect given the obscurity of both Hegel and his so-called interpreters.
 The ‘end of history’ should refer to the remarkable way that the ‘evolution of freedom’ in
 various modes emerges in both the evolution of man and the emergence of higher
 civilization. But the data of history warns us that the macro action behind emergent
 freedom operates over a very large scale and can be degraded in the short term as the
 system moves beyond its acceleration intervals. We can say that ancient democracy
 shows a correlation with a macro effect (our discrete freedom sequence) but the action is
 a one shot deal over a huge range of centuries. Man can completely wreck the result!
 That seems to be what we are seeing now as democracy seems to fade away. But we say
 this before in the rise of fascism and the system did withstand the process to recover.

The point is that the ‘end of history’ meme is misleading. Democracy is not a given entity by definition but a dynamic semantics and one that was the object of an attempted correction by a socialist critique, the most obvious kind of critical pointing to the limit on freedom created by the bourgeoisie. This critique somehow fell into its own nemesis as the anti-liberal tide produced the monstrosity of bolshevism. The claim on ‘communism’ seems in retrospect to be completely wrong. A democracy on a communist foundation remains a brilliant conception that hasn’t been tried. We see the failed alternatives of social democracy and pseudo-communist dictatorship turn in circle around each other as logical complements. We need to recompute the whole possibility and we need to do this as free agents in history. And this ironically fulfills the ‘end of history’ argument far better in the creation of a new level of freedom in social relations.

Fukuyama oblivious to ‘totalitarian democracy’
January 22nd, 2015 ·

[http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/januaryfebruary_2015/
on_political_books/the_rise_and_fall_of_the_us_go053474.php?page=all](http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/januaryfebruary_2015/on_political_books/the_rise_and_fall_of_the_us_go053474.php?page=all)

Now, in the second installment of this two-volume treatise, Political Order and Political Decay, Fukuyama picks up where the French Revolution left off and proceeds to the present. While he stresses that liberal democracy is not “humanly universal,” he still believes that there is “a clear directionality to the process of political development” that favors liberal democracy. But, in stark contrast to The End of History and his concern over hypothetical last men and their possible discontents, in his latest book he is worried about liberal democracies not sustaining themselves and not reliably delivering peace, prosperity, and personal security to their peoples. As he writes, if “there has been a single problem facing contemporary democracies, whether aspiring or well established, it has been centered in their failure to provide the substance of what people want from government: personal security, shared economic growth, and quality of basic public services like education, health, and infrastructure that are needed to achieve individual opportunity.”

Fukuyama keeps talking about democracy but fails to see that we are living in a concealed totalitarian system. That’s suddenly obvious to me: I write a book challenging Fukuyama’s ‘end of history’ thesis with a very cogent argument resolving the problems, but the concealed censorship and mind control of this political culture of ‘democracy’ can’t allow any public review, reference or discussion of this work. Zero. Fukuyama is aware of this book but can’t refer to it in public.

So we are in a worse situation than democracy under strain. We are already in a system that can create a totalitarian mind control system behind the appearance of democracy. As the author of Last and First Men the point is completely obvious, granting the added problem of academic credentialing. A book with no major publisher from the underground is by definition banned from discourse. But it would be almost impossible for the argument stated to find a venue in academic publishing circles (due to its discussion of darwinism, for starters).

The issue is clearer perhaps in the ‘debate’ over evolution: here the mind control system

has been spectacularly successful, with a critique from the religious right: this political culture is in a sorry state, and not even the radical left has much clarity on the subject. Fukuyama's classic was a powerful constellation of ideas, and the adroit use of Hegel allowed him to escape momentarily from the darwinian dogma that strangles historical sociology. His later books return to dismal darwinian dumbkopfhoo, a condition unworthy of the Hegelian legerdemain of his outrageous End of History piece, dealing Hegelian mysticism from the bottom of the deck.

Once and future modernity

February 3rd, 2018

<http://history-and-evolution.com>

We have reposted material from yesterday below the cutoff. At a time of leftist discombobulation it is important to get one's bearings with a simple and practical version of historical dynamism that can animate a postmarxist generation. Our eonic model can do that but it is perhaps too strange at first to be taken seriously.

We have already dealt with that in our various manifestos, along with Crisis of Modernity and Out of Revolution.

We can avail ourselves of the material if it is simplified to the point of being not a fixed theory but a set of questions and a range of answers. In the meantime the darwinian paradigm is starting to collapse and we are ready there. But unfortunately the older marxist left is too far gone in its dogmatic system to either appeal to a new generation or produce a movement that can accomplish anything. The DSA has surged in membership, great, 10,000 members? Hardly enough. I think Sanders should have led a real socialist movement, even a revolutionary one. Instead we are stuck with situation that has become grotesque. In part the problem was the ambiguity of 'our revolution', Bernie's?

The planet is about to self-destruct: we are ready here with a program, a virtual revolution, or else the real thing, and this can translate immediately into some kind of action. I fear however that as with Sanders' 'Our Revolution' we will fall short of the revolution needed in the frittering away of revolutionary jargon as 'New Deal' 'play it again, sam' attempted repeats of FDR. Why would we expect to succeed if the previous success was systematically analyzed and dismantled?

We are getting a lot of visitors to this site, and it correlates with our R48G series, so maybe we are onto something.

Our strategy here, however, is to operate with what many might consider an unrealistic strategy. Why challenge darwinism at a time like this? But our strategy is based on a sense that while we not equipped to either found a movement or operate celebrity style leadership we can do something related but different: do everything the hard way as the

right way, not cater to public opinion to the exclusion of principles and to avoid issue activism fragmentation... Too old to found some new movement we can nonetheless not try to hedge on activism with partial platforms:

we have produced two manifestos
 two world histories with several more in the background
 an emergency emphasis on the issue of climate change...
 an analysis and critique of marxism
 an analysis of economic theories
 a strategy on the calculation debate
 an analysis of secularism and world religion
 with an exit strategy for christians, along with similar possibilities with respect to Islam and indict/buddhist religion...
 a critique of darwinism with an indication for a substitute
 a critique of dialectical materialism and, in the wings, a samkhya substitute
 a two-edged sword: evolutionary/revolutionary projects
 there is more... that is a lot of controversies and any 'sensible' activist would concentrate on single themes...
 we have also picked up to carry parallel activist issues of feminism, LBBT, BLM, and related issues,
 with a cowcatcher for cousin issues such as Basic Income, automation, etc, ...
 in short we have a basics for a blueprint for a new form of civilization...
 we have deliberately not simplified or eliminated anything which may or may not mean we will ignored completely...

and to this we add a warning that the left is mostly floundering in confusion...

_____ from yesterday...

We have proposed a new view of history and evolution based on this material and while this generates resistance and is a hard sell the fact remains that conventional marxist historical theory is no longer adequate. We have proposed a version of 'eonic effect lite' as a simple periodization of world history based a simple outline. In that context we produce a version of historical materialism and production theory as interpretations of world history without rigid theories.

The 'eonic effect' is more than a theory, not theory at all, because it shows why no theories of history in the conventional sense are going to work. In our framework then marxist theories are themselves a subset, a subevent with its own dynamism and we can deal with it on that basis as an entity to which we could apply a dialectic of some kind: affirmation, critique and reformulation. It is essential to recast the whole legacy while at the same maintaining its essential thrust: the economic aspect of historical evolution, but without is absolute character such as we tend to see in marxist discussions. Economies are not easily characterized: they should be taken as empirical constructs and the progression of capitalism to communism not as a form of teleological inevitability but as a (possibly logically inevitable) means adopted by free agents to freely create a

postcapitalist economic civilization. The subtle difference is important because we need a broad humanist psychology that can mediate determination in a scientific sense and free agency/free will in a kind of Kantian mix. In fact, Kant, with Schopenhauer and Hegel as variant interpretations of a classic ‘moment’ in philosophy, was the only philosopher able to produce the correction to scientism needed to make history safe for free agents, whatever the status of their free will. Kantian ethical socialists tried to gate crash conventional Marxism at the end of the nineteenth century and their perspective remains as an untried variant of the socialist mental universe. We have produced several rabbits out of a hat along these lines and it could make a big difference to a second time at bat for a new socialism. Let’s face the reality: traditional monotheistic religion succeeded, if it succeeded at all, because it respected the freedom of man, his free agency and the drama of the human will. To replace that with an economic theory with a thesis of determination was always misguided. It was part of the tide of positivism that arose in the wake of the era of Hegel. But a true humanism needs to have learned enough about the success of religion to see that from the time of Zarathustra onward the free agency of man was a core humanist value. Kant brilliantly realized a truly robust version of such thinking for the age of science.

Virtually all of the marxist corpus can be restated very simply in terms of the ‘eonic model’ of world history, and the latter can be streamlined down to the point where it is a perspectivist option for simplifying the study of world history as a set of questions. And there is no reason why that corpus can’t be reused as a rough guide, the more so since an entire cadre already speaks that language. But marxist theories have been ‘refuted’ so many times and in so many ways that it is unwise to promote them dogmatically, to say the least.

A new generation has to be able to deal with neo-classical economics (easy, it is most theory junk), figure out how to plan markets, unplan markets, create some form of postcapitalist market/planned economic under communist axioms, etc... Marx the prophet is a tonic but a bit too set in granite for flexible action. The labors of Marx/Engels in the 1840’s is such a classic that as a saga it is enough as a foundation for a complete recasting of the legacy.

I fear the legacy cadre is too stuck in its ideology to adapt to anything new. I think that will change however if a new generation, already in existence, after the watershed of 1989, tries to grapple with the capitalist catastrophe now in evidence. The prophetic irony that it is a question of going beyond capitalism, not just of doing FDR song and dance. Such a transition is tricky and fraught with peril, but the alternative we see now is truly fatal. So much for the capitalist end of history. Meanwhile the eonic effect like alka seltzer will dissolve in water and can be taken as useful introit as a metanarrative that fades into the background as a dogcatcher for artificial theorizing, the bane of marxist orthodoxy. The eonic effect can thus be taken as the simple assertion that history shows a non-random process operating in the background and that history has a hidden dynamics, maybe. This cannot change the necessity of free agency dealing with the content given by that probably real by barely visible hidden dynamic. Man makes himself, after history has produced the scenery and topics, and that is the bottom line in the end. The questions of economics are thus both fundamental, and yet, strangely, secondary and it is for man to create a first true economy that serves man in a system of ecological sanity

R48G: from universal class back to the working class...

February 3rd, 2018

<http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/features/how-democratic-socialists-are-building-on-bernie-momentum-w465452> : Democratic Socialists for America.

The DSA is grist for our mill, and yet we should also from a distance attempt to ply our slightly different version of socialist platforming: we have two manifestos, a comprehensive social plan for a neo-communism, a clear multitasking of revolutionary/evolutionary paths, and an emphasis of the current crisis of climate change with a slightly different version of the working class issue. The DSA shows a flexibility often absent in dogmatic socialist groups so we should try to inject our thinking into their mix in an open and intelligently dialectical fashion. The question of the working class confronts the stark future of automation, universal basic income hopes, and economies that no longer need a working class.

Let's note one start fact: the working class concept is probably dead, in the US, and with Trumps' gang of rustbelt idiots and the UAW in stealth Trump mode (slander?) the concept needs a reworking. First, what is more important: wages for the working class, or the fate of the planet? or of the working classes of the exterior global economy? The rust belt is in crisis but not starving, while the larger working class is work or starve, they need jobs therefore, perhaps american jobs. But that perspective is over. Perhaps a new economic nationalism is temporarily relevant...whatever... We need to step out of the fixation of working class emphases to consider that a no-growth economy is coming down the pike and that we must find some new approach to the questions of economy and employment. We don't need to get fixated on appeasing some fictitious working class, which actually includes all those not owners of capital, the 99%. Our stance on the universal class (which can in a moment change gears back to a working class emphasis) centers on the needs of a multiplicity of 'classes and subsets' and must of course provide a robust economic package for working class sectors. But in a comprehensive vision we are in a crisis of economics whereby the nature of growth is itself in question. We need a socialist/communist comprehensive social plan that mediates many contradictions and can create a new form of society and politics. And the large 'red forty-eight group' needs to be able to critique and educate (and be educated by) the 'working class' sectors. And that in the context of an international set of still larger confusions. A degree of economic nationalism is the just resolution of rust belt unemployment, but the global nature of jobs/infrastructure is essential. The older world of the internationales had solutions to these issues that we have lost.

In any case, it is time for a new kind of multitasking: we won't soon produce a working class revolutionary movement, but we can have a revolutionary movement of members from all classes with a failsafe plan for employment for the various 'working classes' and this in the context of renewable energy, economic shutdown in the context of climate change. And the left needs the right to shout back at the 'working class' and stop being its mouthpiece, this group has been turned into a right wing interest group using Madison Ave brainwashing: we need to shout at the working class to make it wake up: the issue of communism, revolution, and climate action is the task of the universal class and this requires more than gravy train socialist fixation on working class potluck. That said, any serious movement must solve the problem all the other groups seem incapable of dealing with, look at Clinton. Solving the working class problem is not so hard. But it must be done in a larger context now.

A revolutionary group is needed that can act either alone as a vanguard or in concert with a parallel populist tide. The two are distinct processes often out of sync. But the point is that what is needed is a comprehensive package of balanced issues stretching between political, constitutional, ecological, economic and climatological packages of proposed action. This approach might make the 'working class' wake up from Trumpian pipe dreams (if there was any truth to the right's seizure of the rust belt) and become a force on the left. But those who were dumb enough to follow Trump are of no use to anyone and I suspect the real working class is far vaster in extent and submerged and ready and waiting for a pitch that is something better than the Clintonian establishment democrats on offer.

In any case, the R48G needs to change gears routinely between initiatives from the universal class and for the working class, awaiting the mythical arousal of that group to its revolutionary potential. The point here is only that the working class is an abstraction and not a person. A real movement must operate with a membership from the universal class and its multiple sectors and this is always a question of real people, individuals, not of abstract class groups with fictitious properties. Real people are needed to lead real movements, and as members of the universal class we can expect a huge participation by multiple working classes if not the imaginary 'Working Class', that abstraction now stolen by the right and populist demagogues.

In any case the DSA has come a long way from the now past world of the older socialisms. Let us suggest our new and different set of perspectives as a vehicle to animate a far larger audience than the current stillborn post-bolshevik realm of reshuffled socialism. Our reshuffled versions make a clean break even as it reanimates the true core to the original vision of postcapitalism...

We need to produce a robust new form of working class populism, but in the context of a new social politics and economy....next to an international component...

Need for a new brand of revolutionary movement

February 3rd, 2018

The point here is simple: we can energize the working class, but then a vanguard will come to the fore, and at that point we must have very carefully defined how it is to act, i.e. communist, democratic (if temporarily with strong authority), with rights and liberties next to the power to control large scale industry (with a good deal of autonomy). That vanguard in our formulation will not be a one-party state, control 'property' of the Commons, control the economy...all this requires a new form of the separation of powers. My point about the Founding Fathers was simply a warning that a elite can just as well create a democracy as not and be self-preprogrammed to give certain guarantees, etc...

A vanguard that defines its own limits, makes pledges to act according to principles of democracy, equality, and so one, has a good chance of success.

Let us note that American democracy (or a republic) was created by an elite, cf. The Quartet by Joseph Ellis, against popular opinion. A vanguard and a populist movement are the 'yoyo' that is hard to compute and is the non-linear two-headed beast behind a successful transition.

Red Forty-eight Group: need for a new brand of revolutionary movement

The marxist left hasn't produced any activist movements of late, why is that? It is a frustrating question, because the marxist legacy holds the keys to a genuine crisis movement of the type we need now. But its legacy is frozen in its own crud and vitiated by excessive theories that don't really hold up, like historical materialism.

But a streamlined and lightweight version of the Marx legacy that at the same time creates a radical break with its own past could take off and generate a response to the current crisis.

All that is needed is an historical account of the nineteenth century left, a history of the communist idea, a general take on the question of economic theories, ideology, class and class struggle, and a post-Feuerbachian secularism that isn't going to waste time on theism/atheism debates. It is also my sense, despite its strong position, unfair, that Darwinism needs to go. It is a liability that has undermined the integrity of science and fueled the antiscience of much of the right, especially on climate change. Beyond that it distorts social understanding. All that is needed is to stand back and consider that evolution is visible in deep time, but its mechanism remains unknown. And the suspicion lurks that teleology is involved.

The left needs to get past the 'end of history' debate: the real such 'end of history' is approximated closely enough in an obvious way a hybrid that can reconcile democracy and postcapitalist socialism/communism.

What did the idea come from? You could probably find it in Hegel, but I prefer my version in WHEE of the 'discrete freedom sequence'. There actually is a directionality behind democracy in world history, a point requiring careful demonstration. But after the larger system gives that a boost the rest is up to man, with a serious chance of 'fuck up'. We have seen two fuck ups so far, bolshevism and climate era capitalism and its destruction of democracy. That is not a promising record for homo sapiens.

The marxist left has to mutate into something classic yet novel and try to lead a revolutionary (plus evolutionary/electoral) movement. It has to free itself of cultic idiocy, drop the 'personality' cult of 'Marx' by dropping the term 'marxism', focus on the Communist Manifesto, consigning the incomplete train wreck Das Capital, so beloved of Marx critics, to the library, graduate from classical economics to a critique of neo-classical economics (mastering the math to do so and expose mathematics in economics), resolve the planning problem (but market neo-communism might be a good transitional vehicle), create a hybrid of the Enlightenment and Romantic movement thereby creating an ecological communism/socialism. In general the period of Marx and the post-Hegelians is too limited and needs a larger perspective on modernity. This left might well continue the legacy of Feuerbach, modified, but it must also communicate with the classic religions. We have pulled a rabbit out of a hat here: The Church of Munzer and a church of historical memory: the left has to lead the way to a new secularism but it must also get knowledgeable about consciousness and be able to challenge buddhism, Islam, xtianity, not with polemics so much as a real understanding, a difficult task. We may be out of time there.

What is needed is a populist movement with a postcapitalist platform, such as the market neo-communism proposed here, and with a new stance on class warfare: a focus on the Universal Class rather than the working class. There is not real contradiction, but the Universal Class is a larger superset that will energize a broader spectrum of the range of class combinations.

It needs to happen this year, stat. Shuffle the Marx papers and throw the junk out. Divorce from 'isms', divorce from Leninism (but study the guy), make clear the divorce from Stalinism is total, and that a movement has a right to revolt against fake democracy to create the real thing. The fallacies of electoral/direct democracy compete with their virtues, and a democratic revolution can be fought by an elite vanguard as well if not better than a populist revolt IF they do the job right and act according to principle and don't screw up the whole game at the start with power formations. It can't just reflex into the tired mental diseases that result in government by psychopaths and the CIA's. A vanguard and a populist movement are the tricky duo that operate hopefully in tandem.

A vanguard that defines its own limits, makes pledges to act according to principles of democracy, equality, and so one, has a good chance of success.

Let us note that American democracy (or a republic) was created by an elite, cf. The Quartet by Joseph Ellis, against popular opinion. A vanguard and a populist movement are the 'yoyo' that is hard to compute and is the non-linear two-headed beast behind a successful transition.

We have to at least try this. All the other progressivist efforts have been realized and then dismantled. Can you try again, and again...? A change in the system is needed.

'Democracy' without 'communism' is a fraud

February 3rd, 2018

The idea of communism has been so discredited that we forget that in some form it is the only solution to the problem of fairness, and thence of democracy: our current system promotes the theme of democracy in order to covertly promote forms of inequality, and domination by the economics of capital. This are fairly old ideas! But there cogency is becoming obvious all over again as we begin to grasp in intuitively terms the way the demand for democracy has produced its opposite. The problem arises with the equation of democracy with 'electoral democracy', an equation that was never established until fairly late in the game.

Unless we can establish a commons as the basis for a fundamental equality of resources our talk of democracy is mostly empty rhetoric...

archive: market (neo-)communism in the transition through the coming crisis...
April 2nd, 2016 ·

In the context of the climate crisis we are moving beyond populist politics on inequality: we will be lucky if we can prevent the elites from simply deleting the working and other classes from any share of the pie as they create elite survival pods.

In that context we must think in terms of the whole, i.e. some form of neo-communism, free of the clichés and dead hand of the older brands.

We might do what we did with socialism: consider market socialism, here market communism, as a gedanken experiment. A communist revolution might seem unrealistic, but if we approach the end point in stages we can begin to consider at least something: market communism considers a system of a planetary federation of communist republics, with control of all large scale industry under governmental and UN control, but leaving some or multiple aspects of industrial civilization strictly regulated, delivered beyond private property to the Commons, but still functioning in a de facto semi-independent manner. To this we have a strict new form of democracy where the control of process by capitalism is made impossible. The latter if accomplished, could rapidly transform the paralysis of government we see. There is a host of possible scenarios here, including full communism from the start in a situation of such crisis that the forms of economy and government collapse.

But there are a number of way stations reachable via electoral processes, or revolutionary situations at the margins. We should have a set of options in multiple varieties. What we must do is ask how a legacy marxism could prove viable, or remain worthy of a second

chance. Surely we must recast that classic for a new situation, in a form that people will actually buy into. If we can get bolshevik lunacy out of our minds and memories we will see that the original idea of communism was transparent, robust, republican/democratic, and economically intelligent, with covert agency lunatics, secret polices, etc... We can see how this could prove impossible to achieve: the boondocks of the American system under constitutional license is armed to the teeth and in denial about anything but further environmental exploitation, but the tipping point of shocked realization may actually exist: the competition of bad alternatives will sooner or later take effect.

Marx and design arguments...

February 2nd, 2018

Design in history...? Marx's historical materialism contains the 'design' argument of 'stages of production' theory...

The charge of design thinking only makes sense for hard core Darwinists. In fact the evidence for 'design' in history is overwhelming, but the term 'intelligent design' is wrong because the term 'intelligent' tends to be crypto-theistic and implies a 'mind'.

Who knows? Maybe Hegel was right...

Or Schopenhauer, with this 'Will in Nature'?

Now it may be that I have underinterpreted the eonic effect which is a purely phenomenological model. And the evidence of 'design' is very strong indeed. But the term 'hyper-intelligent' (or hypo-intelligent) design might be better: 'hyper-intelligent' would mean some natural process that is a de facto equivalent to something/who that is 'intelligent'.

An AI learning machine seems to be intelligent would be thus 'hyper-intelligent', ???

The evidence of design in history is given by the bare description of the 'eonic effect': some kind of hyper-intelligent process stands behind historical emergence in the development of civilization. The evidence for saying this is very strong. We see some kind of hyper-machine that can regulate teleological functions over history, but in a way that 'evolves freedom' rather than producing determined outcomes.

Massively complex 'machines' perform this operating with directionality over tens of thousands of years and able to induce the stub beginnings of whole civilizations...etc...

World History and The Eonic Effect, fifth edition, Kindle/free PDF

The logic of (r)evolution...

February 2nd, 2018

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=R48G+revolution>

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=The+Crisis+of+Modernity_ver6.pdf:
<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>

We have made a number of dialectical feints back and forth between evolutionary and revolutionary perspectives but overall our task here seems to be advocating from the sidelines the discipline of truly revolutionary activism. The sidelines is not really OK, but it is still something. It could be cowardly, but maybe not.

As the Trump era approaches we are going to see intimidation in action and the result may be ambiguous jargon on the issues of activist projects. In fact we have seen that already with the Sanders theme, 'Our Revolution', about which we have performed rain dances and other semantic 'propaedeutic'.

We leave open the option of solidarity with these potentially coopted perspectives, potentially the only really practical avenue.

We are stuck with a strange situation: a true neo-communist perspective must consider more than the economics of the local working class. What about all those jobs that went to an international working class?

We should proceed as before with at least the idea of virtual revolution as a gedanken experiment with the possibility open at each point of activation of this potential.

(The women's march to come is an interesting development indeed (one might have wished a more comprehensive protest, but the platform is excellent). One might note in passing that a women's march was one of the key triggers of the Russian Revolution!)

The point here is that we can be theoretical and potentially practical at the same time. In the first case the perspective of revolution is a way to remind ourselves that real change is very difficult in the system that we have, and that this system is in fact regressing to the right.

One of the key issues is that evolutionary politics can be stuck in a nationalistic focus on the economic gains of one sector of the system, e.g. the working class. But the working class is an international entity and the problems in any case are far larger and complex than the economic. We need at least in principle a comprehensive platform of the kind the older Marxism had. We can't we use that? We can certainly use it as a backdrop but we have a more complicated situation now, and in any case the american case, being that of a fully developed capitalist system, demands what in many ways would be a first: a post-marxist set of core principles that reflect the legacy but which speak to the reality of postcapitalism. The context here is more than economic, it is an ecological crisis, and the solution is going to conflict with economic issues.

In any case the crisis we face we should be daring enough to challenge conventional activism with the almost insuperable yet somehow more logical demands of a revolutionary platform. This barely exists and strangely the marxist left has very little to say here. Perhaps like poker players they are biding their time.

I fear that strategically it is proving counterproductive to have challenged the Marxist canon. Actually we have embraced it, but with a demand that it refresh itself for a new

era. Look at Leninism: it simply doesn't apply to our situation, although in a desperate moment some of its aspects might replicate themselves. Overall we must move on from a failed legacy. (The first step to moving on is to read about ten bios of Lenin, if you have the time...he is a compelling figure).

But in general it would be of great interest to think in a wholly new way, and in this case with respect to the American system...

The point here is simply that capitalism is self-destructing, more than anything else due to climate crisis, and we confront the need for a whole new system:

a new economic system

a new political system, a new form of democracy

a new foundation beyond private property

new approaches to growth/no growth sustainable economies

a nationalistic platform in an international context

exposes of the reality of the American system: the imperialistic context, the military-industrial complex, wars manufactured for profit, the covert agencies and the deep state, the corruption of politics by capital, the reckoning of criminal conspiracies and getting it straight on 9/11 and the false flag ops we can only suspect are at the core of the corrupt and criminal system of politics current, and this includes, stunningly, complicity in the international drug trade.

This is a fairly stunning set of required elements but we should at least construct the full list, create a party and a platform that can deal with them, and an aspiration to a group in motion that is a party of the main party, etc...

So there it is: a virtual solution to the above from a not yet senile old timer: a platform, two manifestos, a proto-party: the Red Forty-eight Group, a first born succession if not successor of the classic Marxist Old Testament with its 1848 focus: the once and future revolution and/or a working class evolutionary party as a focus of social democratic bluffing one's way to a revolution.

The Red Forty-eight Group needs a huge set of study projects, among them the secular future (and equivalent) of religion, the nature of economic theories, practical training systems and bootcamps, a set of communes and cooperatives, etc...

The Red Forty-eight Group is a template and a basically neo-communist conception. At the start of Last and First Men, Nemo declared that every kid on his block was Captain Nemo, thus *nemini*...this new left could *Nemini* in motion, and/or a question like the Who Am I? of the Advaitists. *Nemini* x factors...plus three finger salutes, a cult, an army, a party, a commune, smorgasbord...

Eonic effects, revolutionary outcomes

February 1st, 2018

<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>

It seems that a reluctance to promote the 'eonic model of world history' confronted with the marxist legacy is misguided and that a more forceful presentation of that is indicated. We can always up to a point have our cake and eat it too and place the components of the marxist legacy inside our model.

The advantages of this larger model are considerable but the tide of public opinion doesn't really favor such things, and the frozen character of marxist thinking is another contraindication. But that is perhaps misleading. The shift in public views on evolution, the sense that marxism is now dated, the multiple critiques of marxist thought, all indicate the need for a new way to look at history. And historical materialism was always a very 'risky' theory, open at many points to refutation. We can absorb its basic insight into our model willy-nilly without the theoretical baggage.

It is a longshot to proceed this way but it is better to at least try rather than trying to create a misleading hybrid of the old and the new (we would do that anyway in a fashion that is not misleading hodgepodge). The question of virtual revolution is simply an examination of the place of revolution in the modern transition and the way that it remains an aspect of modern potential.

The advantages of this model are many:

the model is open to ideological interpretations without being propaganda: that is because the 'idea of freedom' and a 'dynamic of freedom' coexist inside historical description, an invaluable characteristic

the model resolves a 'kantian' paradox of the teleological: it is/is not teleological. We win either way... That's because a discrete continuous model 'stops/starts', 'aims at'/changes direction, has goals, but one open to free agents in the... the 'telos' is a freedom effect that might transcend the teleological implication...

the model is ultimately theoretical but stopped from theory by the incomplete nature of the evidence, a useful combination

the result is therefore empirically based with a clear hypothesis as to theory, another invaluable property

Use of the model does not require a proven theory and is more like the terrain survey by scouts on a battlefield: the challenge is to observe complex historical sequences

the model distinguishes free agency and system dynamics and this allows bypassing the hopeless confusion here of most attempts at a science of history

economic events are constructs of free agents which perhaps generate economic dynamics but in the end free agents are able to control the future of the system, at least in principle...

the model shows a clear solution to the 'end of history' muddle with a definite freedom dynamic, a plus in the direction of democratic emergence, revolutionary action, and an injection of a communist counterpoint

the emergence of capitalism is not a stage of history but a complex of economic and technological effects that creates a de facto but not inevitable stage of history: we can abrogate that phase as needed.

economic fundamentalism has no ultimate place in a construct/theory of history. The

claims for free markets as the final stage of history is a gross distortion of facts and evidence. The phase of free markets was an anomaly from the start as many protested at once and within two centuries we can see that free markets are dangerous. Nothing in our model endorses or negates free markets. They are imposters in history and operate like gasoline to fuel an explosive fire...their dangers are suddenly evident at a time of climate catastrophe...Free markets are said to be more efficient than planning. The issue is so apparent on one level to its many converts that it is almost impossible to point out the fallacies. But we need adopt no ultimate stance on markets (our DMNC still allows some market effects). A system that has failed to resolve poverty, corrupted government, enriched an elite and threatens a whole planet cannot be called efficient.

in general economic systems are subsystems in a larger dynamic...much of the marxist legacy, apart from its brittle theories, is easy to restate inside our framework: the questions of class, theory and ideology transport easily into this framework...

There is more, but that it enough...

World history: a complex enigma

January 31st, 2018

Confronting the riddle of world history

January 13th, 2018 ·

After all the debate and discussion from the left the stark reality remains that marxist views of history suffer from a flawed foundation in economic fundamentalism. A far broader view is needed that can handle the places of values, the question of free will (or free agency), questions of art, religion, and philosophy. The original perspectives were too narrow and too reductionist after the style of emerging scientism/positivism. We don't really need a 'science' of history, an invitation to fallacy, so much as a simple map or chronicle done empirically as a backdrop for a value-based account of a futurist project (of socialism/communism).

The eonic effect is somehow very tricky but exposes the false attachment to darwinism that pervades marxism with fallacious axioms, but in the end it points to a set of historical subtleties that make mincemeat of most attempts to subject history to social control as ideological fixation on Machiavellian politics, economics, and technology.

The complicated enigma disguising a hidden teleology demands a far more complex view of the historical than can be provided by current assumptions, mostly based on premature dogmas of how to do science. The fact remains that both evolution and history elude a scientific foundation and part of the reason is the issue facts and values confounds all attempts at a solution to the riddle.

There is a reasonably simple way out, which is to follow the contours of the so-called 'eonic effect' as an outline which itself solves the problem historical dynamics.

In any case the future of socialism requires moving beyond the failed strategies of marxism and the confusion it created over stages of history.

Communism: beyond the marxist monopoly

January 29th, 2018

<https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>

The left has tied its head knots with theory, theory that doesn't really work, but which has turned into a kind of dogma. The whole question of socialism has been frozen in place in terms of a legacy that was too complicated, confusing, and poorly defined.

It shouldn't be all that hard to create a viable socialist system if we get out of the straight jacket of Marx's misdefinition of the problem. Marx posited that a set of stages of history would bring communism to capitalism even as the latter replaced feudalism, etc... This theory isn't really successful and has confused the issue. A more cogent formulation might simply ask for a communist foundation, as a set of axioms creating a Commons: resources from the commons would become a social entity (and not the same as state capitalism) mediated as economic process not unlike the market version save that the question of private property is superceded. The issue of the working class has also confused discussion. In fact, the idea of a 'universal class' is really the same as the working class but focuses on the real working class which is much larger than the traditional cliché of workers in factories. The tradition of working class focus is a great one, and is easily adaptable to our larger conception but at this point the problems of social reconstruction are far more complex than the question of industrial labor. We may even be leaving the era of factories and workers. And we confront climate change and its call for a radical revolution beyond the factors of production: an ecological framework that just might lead to a world of no-growth economics...

The idea of communism as a fixed stage beyond capitalism failed to specify what was to be done, and Stalinism filled that void. We need to consider capitalism, or liberalism, and communism as constructivist projects in tandem rather than in opposition. We can even have a system of markets in the context of a Commons. The whole nexus of concepts was misdefined from the start in order to create an effective propaganda about the inevitability of communism succeeding capitalism. In fact, the illusion that capitalism was a stage of history has if anything made the problem worse as we allowed a flawed format to be 'normal' as a phase. In reality, the task was to do the job right and create from the start a democratic socialism with elements of both planned and market factors. The market factors proceed without the confusions of private property by reclaiming the entities of 'primitive accumulation': it is simply a species of plunder that animates the whole capitalist scheme. Constructing a real socialist communism ought to be as transparent as anything produced in the capitalist legacy: the two are remorphable versions of each other, but with the profound difference of a Commons...

Embedding mode of production theory in eonic model?

January 26th, 2018

Criticizing historical materialism, or mode of production theory, can be counterproductive and I suggested a way to see how a mode of production discourse could be embedded in the macro model. Although I am reluctant to create hybrids with such things, there is something to the idea.

The reason is that the macro model is not a universal determinism but shows a discrete operation applied to a continuous one and as the discrete process finishes over a given interval the system can be subject to any number of different determinations, and the economic is certainly one candidate. We can see the mysterious logic of the macro system that seems to spawn a transition to capitalism and a set of challengers, in parallel. Is this chance? Hardly. From the start the logic of capitalism invokes its antithesis in the coming of postcapitalism, either communism by definition or some more or less the equivalent. In this perspective the logic of mode of production sequences or directionality has a valid logic of its own, even if we don't ascribe the total direction of history to economic processes. In a considerable irony, the logic of capitalism has made the constant suggestion of postcapitalism by multiple independent authors, at the point of climate change, almost a chorus of dissent issuing in the transition from the old mode of production.

So we can adapt a partial version of historical materialism to the macro model under the rubric of the so-called 'econostream'.

The critique of utopianism by Engels especially in his classic *Socialism, Utopian or Scientific*, is also problematical: his point is too important to fritter away with the usual moral arguments, but the fact remains that history does in fact process moral values, as the macro effect clearly demonstrates, in fact, a triad of causal, moral and aesthetic factors. Whatever we think about utopian thinking, the fact remains that we are not forbidden by assumptions about causal history from applying values, or from saying that revolutions can't apply a set of values to social transformations. Valuation applied to history is not 'utopian'.

In general the dangers of utopianism have been addressed here by placing beside the model of a communist revolution the example of the American revolution, as a democratic/bourgeois revolution that is ambiguous and certainly a carrier of the capitalist process. But the inherent skeleton of the American case allows us to remorph its sequencing into an equivalent communist version: the result shows logically that we have not indulged in the utopian because we see an example in history.

The analogy is elemental, and elementary: we see a two phase process of revolution, and anti-imperialist revolt, that leads to a phase free from the control of the 'ancien regime', followed by a second phase of constitutional foundationalism. The American case is ambiguous because it is a top down and bottom up process with an elite creating a republic and a populist strain that inspires an experiment in democracy.

Any (communist) revolution will follow this format (as did the Russian, with a catch), and it is not utopian. The question of a communist democracy nonetheless raises questions that are far more complex than the simpler case of the American revolution, quite obviously.

So we see that a communist revolution would follow a classic format, and that it is not utopian for such a revolution to consider the place of values in a world of fact.

Another interpretation of the macro model suggests that the 'macrosequence' has come to an end and has been replaced with free agency. That is a boon, and a danger: nothing like the stunning large-scale actions seen in that sequence is possible as yet for man. But the birth of modern revolutionism is a start. That is, the conscious intentional social transformation process passes from historical systematics to human agency. At the end of the macrosequence then the whole game is open to free agency and a crisis immediately arises the best example of which is capitalism itself which subjects the whole system to economic factors, a disastrous outcome in the long run. It is thus entirely appropriate that with the birth of capitalism postcapitalist revolutionaries should appear to chase the economic juggernaut to its endgame. Given the climate fiasco we see now that is none too soon.

Historical theories versus the eonic effect

January 26th, 2018 ·

Archaic Greece and class struggle versus the eonic effect...//De Ste. Croix and The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World

January 11th, 2018 ·

To see our point about the dangers of historical theories it is worth looking at the classic marxist study of De Ste. Croix, a remarkable book, but does it really make the point that class struggle drives history?

The book is of interest because it starts with the Archaic Period of Greece and this is the exact point where we see something else at work: the macro effect of the Greek transition, ca. 900 to 600/400. (The extra two centuries is outside the transition as such... an early take off and flowering).

We see clear evidence of class struggle in early Greece, but the dynamic behind the era is something far more complex. http://history-and-evolution.com/whee4th/chap5_2_1.htm
Archaic Greece, The Clue

Bennett and the question of 'materialism'....

January 25th, 2018 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=j+G+Bennett>

The issue of marxism and spirituality has already been solved and we can see in the work of J.G.Bennett (stick to his *The Dramatic Universe*, the rest of his books are new age propaganda) what might have been a way to go. We have noted many times here the confusions of dialectic and 'triadics' which Bennett claims to have solved. I fear that is not the case, but the work of that captive of sufi occultists (Gurdjieff, among others) shows how 'materialists' can stage a comeback from nineteenth century scientism in a model that is really a grafting of classical samkhya onto Schopenhauer, in a strangely 'realist' (Whitehead) version.

One of the ironies here is that if you reduce this work critically to rubble it actually provides its lesson as a set of 'maybe's'. The point is that religion and scientism grafted together doesn't work, but taken as an experimental exploration points to a solution to many of the confusions of secularism. The next era of postreligion has a curious option of research in this direction...