



The Anthropocene And the Coming of Postcapitalism

John Landon

Copyright 2017

Image: Wikimedia commons, public domain;

file:Barrikadenkampf Alexanderplatz 1848.jpg

Table of Contents

Preface	2
Introduction	3
1. Civilization in Crisis.....	4
1.1 On the Threshold of Climate Catastrophe	6
1.2 Capitalism and Empire	6
1.3 The Deep State.....	7
1.4 9/11, Covert agencies, and Drug Mafias.....	7
1.5 The Coming of Postcapitalism.....	7
2. History and Evolution.....	8
2.1 The Politics of Evolution, the Falsification of Darwinism.....	9
2.2 A New Model of History.....	9
2.3 Epochs in Transition, Modernity, Divides	11
2.4 Secularism and Religion in World History.....	11
2.5 The End of History, Evolution of Freedom, Free Agents.....	12
3. Out of Revolution.....	12
3.1 1848	13
3.2 TNCM: Toward a New Communist Manifesto	13
3.3 Economic Theory, Market Socialisms	15
3.4 DMNC: Democratic Market Neo-communism.....	19
3.5 Last and First Men.....	21
Appendix 1: R48G: posts from Darwiniana.....	23

Preface

This is an ongoing pdf (soon Kindle) version of a short blogbook composed at the blog Darwiniana. It is a short blogbook with a series of posts from the blog on issues of leftist activism as a core set of topics. The blog has a tremendous amount of material on the 'Red Forty-eight Group', a kind of virtual neo-

communist movement or party. This short book is thus an introduction to the archiving of the legacy of posts there. The blog is accompanied by two websites, history-and-evolution.com, and lastandfirstmen.com. The 'eonic trilogy', three texts dealing with history, evolution, and the left are listed at those sites.

This short book is accompanied by two manifestos, available at dropbox and/or Amazon in Kindle format: *Toward a New Communist Manifesto*, and *Democratic Market Neo-communism*.

We will upgrade this booklet to book form as soon as possible. But the introductory 'blogbook' will expand independently into a longer version without the archiving of posts from Darwiniana.

Introduction

The contemporary left is a dysfunctional array of issue activisms unable to coordinate a project of social change whether revolutionary or evolutionary. There are signs that this situation is changing. But it is important therefore to review the classic legacies, among them the marxist, to try and 'debug' the older traditions which are too obviously stuck in a kind of dogmatic freeze. There is no mystery here: the immense corpus of marxist literature is stalled in a kind of limbo given the legacy of failed revolutions, stalinist innuendo, anarchist oppositions, and failed or challenged theories of economics and history. The result is a phenomenon analogous to the mechanization of thought that has bedeviled the history of religion. In addition of cult of Marx has made every word he has uttered a kind of holy writ, further stalling thought. It might be time to simply bypass the legacy with a new and streamlined platform that is not obliged to defend a frozen canon.

The current moment has spawned the term 'anthropocene' and this not inappropriate neologism points us to the disastrous brand of eco-degraded climate 'terraforming' that has emerged from the industrial revolution and its capitalist false epitome. The 'other' legacy of the industrial/capitalist 'revolution' has been the smoke stacks of satanic mills of the 'great take off'. The result, onset of disastrous climate change, has created a crisis for the politics of globalization, setting a challenge to its political and economic axiomatic legacy. This has found insult added to injury in current insanity phase induced by the election of Trump. We confront a system now bent on dismantling its EPA and its climate treaty at the point of no return in the benchmark 2C global warming. The delusive character of capitalist ideology has shown itself to be more threatening than the original critics of the bourgeoisie could have imagined. Strangely, this is a revolutionary situation demanding a full cohort of activist resistance over and above the rising tide of environmental activism that has appeared within the last generation. This situation tokens a stage of near social psychosis and presents the left with the contradictory demands of revolutionary intervention and/or evolutionary political continuity. A system leviathan is in place that stands as the guardian of a pseudo-democracy of capital, very much as classic socialists such as Marx and Engels predicted. Given the shift of the millennial generation toward the left it is important for many of the legacy 'lefts' to examine their platforms and self-debrief the histories of the marxist style bolshevik revolution(s) in order to move on into a reformulation of the basic perspective of socialism/communism of the period of 1848.

This is called for due to the obsolescing character of much marxist thought, its clinging to historical and economic theories that have been repeatedly challenged, and with the problem of theory itself, this raising the question of the status of the social sciences in the context of scientism. This evokes the enigma of scientific theories and the failed efforts to mimic the hard sciences in sociological terms. And this set of ambiguities includes the classic darwinian theory of evolution, now under siege, next to such theoretical constructs as historical materialism and its 'stages of production' framework. We can thus reset the discussion almost back at the point of the onset of the industrial and French revolutions with the sudden crystallization of capitalist ideology followed in turn by the immediate challenge of the socialists/communists in the period of Marx/Engels. We can adopt this moment as a saga and prophecy of the future of the world system in the wake of the modern epoch and acknowledge the basic rightness of the challengers. This contextual history can be examined with a new analysis of world history, one that can provide a new perspective on history and evolution, in the process throwing some light on the question of economic theories in both their classical and neo-classical context.

The prospect of revolution is troubling for many who can see the handwriting on the wall but cannot evade the clear signals of failure in the case of the Russian fiasco of bolshevism. We have discussed the question in a 'virtual revolution' mode to allow the basic review of the whole question to break out of the dogmas of past generations on the left. But the stakes

have been raised by the developing emergency of climate matched with the 'blind men walking' as if in a zombie trance, the spectacle of global politicians unable to extricate themselves from the capitalist octopus. We have tried to press the reset button on the whole range of questions with a practical set of manifestos that both echo and break out of the marxist/leninist mould.

Our mini-book, which follows the logic of our two manifestos, is in three sections dealing with the basic crisis, a new view of history, and a possible solution called democratic market neo-communism... <https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Two+Manifestos+version+2.pdf>

We will outline a set of discussions of this 'virtual' book in order to get a bird's eye view of the basic discussion on the way to a new formulation.

1. Civilization in Crisis

The era of capitalist globalization has signaled that its world historical phase is approaching an end. This is no longer an 'end of history' debate, although that sophisticated legacy remains to haunt the discussion, next to a confrontation with environmental apocalypse. If before we had thought markets the inevitable outcome of history we can now see that the 'end of history' could assume an altogether more ominous literal meaning. Unrestricted markets have been put on a pedestal and turned into both an intellectual and a political/economic tyranny, with a patron saint in Ayn Rand the Nietzschean neo-liberal superman, in full cartoon comic. Discussion of such an 'end' tends to deal in absolutes of capitalism/communism but the issue is almost more a change of assumptions in our own minds about how the phenomenon of capitalism is to be taken. The false dilemma of absolute freedom for markets or their total abolition in a debatable version of communism has made the discussion a stalemate. The debate over the end of

history was misleading: we can have a postcapitalist system of markets under communism assumptions and constitutional foundations: we can define a whole spectrum of so-called de facto postcapitalist systems. But we cannot any longer evade our responsibility to a planet with some realization of the dangers of unrestricted capitalism. The result has been a series of dangerous absurdities, notably among the dread list the decimation of the Amazon to produce beef for the American Hamburger mania. It seems that Veganism should join communism as a firebrand issue. A communist system can be founded in the idea of the Commons, and this can coexist with several related or overlapping modes that can failsafe the outcome as experimental and open to modification. We can define a transitional hybrid that can serve to free the discourse, and its discourse from absolute definitions. Despite this flexibility this is not an exercise as such in 'social democratic' or 'New-Dealist' programs, even if this are likely to lurk in the back ground of unrealizable projects falsely labeled 'utopian'. We need to consider the issue of evolutionary and revolutionary paths directly and to consider these in the context of an advanced transnational array of nation state economies.

In all of the discussions of the end of history we have often unconsciously succumbed to capitalist assumptions given the way the outcome of bolshevism as stalinism silences all discussion, and in the process failed to foresee just how dead wrong that fixation is and that we could be left with no choice but to move beyond the era of capitalist markets. It is a desperate situation: the free play of markets is consuming us on the level of an entire planet. The point of the original socialist/communist challenge was that such a phenomenon must be switched off globally. Such a conclusion need hardly be absolute, but it must envision the possibility of higher level control of market proliferation. Given the reality of climate change a system of unrestricted free markets will destroy a whole planet and could even produce the extinction of life as we know it on earth.. We have dawdled in capitalist complacency as this calamity has crept up on us. And there is hardly a more severe condemnation of the capitalist mental framework than the way in which it has bewitched its ideologues to the point of ostrich denial of a transparent crisis in action. Therefore question of climate change alone forces the issue: whatever the nature and future of 'markets' the stark reality confronts us that completely 'free' markets are a malevolent anti-ecological force. We need to define an exit strategy from the obsessive generation of ecological and economic chaos generated by the ideology of such free markets.

But the question of postcapitalism can be overdefined in absolutes: as noted, we should propose a hybrid transitional system in which neo-communist foundations shepard a dialectic of opposites in a balance of powers...

More generally the whole foundation of secular modernity is threatened by the cult of capitalism and yet the two are quite different cultural givens. What do we mean by modernity and the secular? It is helpful to consider a larger view of history than the current marxist versions of economic historicism. We can avail ourselves of a classic legacy but at the same time create a kind of generalization of its premises with a new view of historical dynamics and evolutionary emergence. We live at a time when the classic darwinian theory of evolution has fallen into a range of falsifications. The use of that theory for ideological legitimation is notorious. Let us be clear: darwinism and evolutionism are not the same thing. The former is a rigid dogma about natural selection as the core dynamic of evolution. That thesis was open to objections from the start yet has persisted unreasonably due to its ideological hold on biologists, and the general public. We must suspect that this is still another aspect of the capitalist world

view, especially given the evidence of social darwinist distortions of culture that have used darwinism for ideological culture control. The thesis of the 'survival of the fittest' lurks in a economic bastard form and this needs to be deprived of its spurious claims to science.

1.1 On the Threshold of Climate Catastrophe

As noted, the system of capitalist economy has defaulted to a runaway ecological nemesis controlled by a monopolist class mesmerized by ideological economics built on mathematical fraud and now poised to drive the system over a cliff. The American system is currently on the brink of dismantling its outstanding climate regulations. That sends the message that the political class is asleep and in the hands of lunatics. But in many ways this situation has been predicted from the start, so we have a larger fall back position as a matter of historical fact. The prescient warnings of the prophetic early socialists have never been more relevant: this system will create its own doomsday scenario. Tragically the onset of the neo-liberal era in the 1970's was synchronous with the first realization of the threat of climate change. But the so-called 'neo-liberal' is really but an echo of the whole capitalist historical tragicomedy. The first warnings were sounded in the early stages of that economic counterrevolution, and yet an entire generation has been lost as the warnings have fallen on deaf ears. A series of limited measures have nonetheless been enacted, and a series of technical innovations have begun to show the way to a post-carbon era, but the capitalist capture of governmental action has produced a situation in the critical red zone: the ominous question emerges. Is it too late? We can see that without a revolutionary action to take control of the capitalist psychosis. We could be too late. The system is set to pass the projected limit of 2C temperature increase and yet even at this point the capitalist mindset is not only unyielding but intransigent.

The tenets of self-regulating markets have been in effect falsified by the reality that the global market system cannot respond to an existential crisis. Setting them on automatic has generated a system beyond control.

1.2 Capitalism and Empire

The history of capitalism has seen a series of imperialistic economic phases, from as early as the Spanish empire of the sixteenth century. Imperialism should be distinguish from empire given the frequent core republicanism and imperialistic economism of the periphery. The distinction might fall on deaf ears among many who foresee the downfall of those republics to the decadence of the Roman Empire. But a notable fact has been the cascade of imperialisms, Spanish, Dutch, English, French and German, finally that of the American colossus with its 'empire indeed' of militaristic capitalism. The global system is now beset with and American monstrosity of wars engineered for capitalist profit: a combined capitalist and imperialistic system transfixed by a military industrial complex that has become malevolent. This situation echoes the fate of the Second World War as it demonstrated the efficacy of military spending on the resolution of the Great Depression. This experience has colored all subsequent thinking. The famous complex of Eisenhower has graduated to the status of a new and elusively covert tyranny, open that has feed its appetite on the discovery of atomic weaponry and its maintenance. Although in some ways the attempt to control the factor of atomic weaponry induced a justification for a kind of American

exceptionalism the fact remains that the realities of atomic war have fed all the worst tendencies of the global imperialists.

1.3 The Deep State

Some consider that it was the onset of the Manhattan project that produced this government in the shadows. This evidence shows that the American system has been taken over by a mysterious entity or entities often described as the 'Deep State', but in different senses, from Peter Dale Scott's version to that of Lofgren in his analysis in a book called *The Deep State*. The period of the second world war and after indicates the threshold of the process of capture and control, although the course of American history from its beginning shows the process gestating from the start, with an early version of the disease in the Gilded Age. The questions of slavery were not resolved at the start of the American system and the result has forever cursed the outcome, next to the disastrous genocidal history of the American West.

The period of the creation of the first atomic bomb shows more, the onset of the stranglehold of covert action, secrecy, national security and techno-capitalist collusion. The Manhattan project sowed the seeds of what was to come, but the CIA took the whole system to a new dimension of Machiavellian politics.

The American system is crypto-tyrannical cabal of arbitrary and hidden powers with no public accountability. And in the context of Madison Avenue psychological techniques applied to social communication it has become a de facto psychological tyranny of brainwashing and mind control, with intimations of the 1984 saga.

1.4 9/11, Covert agencies, and Drug Mafias

This period of the second world war and the Manhattan project produced the first versions of covert action agencies, which soon were transformed into the CIA, and a host of other intelligence agencies. The rogue character of the CIA has been documented from the start with such egregious actions as the destruction of Iranian democracy and the many coups and interventions globally by an out of control agency whose legal foundations were botched from the start.

The later stages of the disease are grotesque. The evidence of a 9/11 conspiracy, shockingly missed by the general left, the history of the CIA and the 'national security state' and an almost inconceivable corruption of government in the connection with the drug mafias. It is a significant indictment of the system as is that we cannot properly diagnose let alone deal with the corruption of the American government by the war on drugs taken as a cover for its actual pursuit by government agents.

1.5 The Coming of Postcapitalism

Almost from the start of the industrial revolution in the eighteenth century when the era of capitalism in its current sense began the destructive and exploitative character of its action was seen as a prediction of its eventual end. The early movements of the socialists and communists produced the first abortive challenge, one that was almost terminated by the distraction of the Bolshevik fiasco. The failure of that

movement was a tragic delay in the formation of a genuine movement able to become the successor to the original process.

The question was never resolved by the Russian era of revolution and has resurfaced as the question of the future of a planet. The question of markets is however too often confused with absolutes. We need not fully renounce the market order to move beyond capitalism as a reigning dogma: the issue is that men have a right to live in a cultural mix where they are not subject to the 'alienation' of markets as a fiat of capitalists. We may consider the question of market and planned economies in many ways but a fundamental axiom of fairness and economic rights must override the obsession with the fallacies of universal market dominance. We can consider the question of 'communism' (or neo-communism in a fresh definition) as the return of the expropriation of natural resources to a Commons, a jointly held set of ecological and economic resources freed from the 'primitive accumulation' of rogue capitalist powers.

The coming of postcapitalism is ironically prefigured in the 'end of history' moment of 1989: the Russian system collapsed on the way to a truer end of history! The era of postcapitalism is being rendered inexorable given the emerging catastrophe of planetary destruction...The term is ambiguous and requires a definition before, rather than after a revolutionary or other transition. The legacy of ad hoc 'as you go' constructs of the first aborted challenge to capitalism proved the undoing of the earlier internationales...The question of the 'end of history' has been a notable boon for propagandists: a spurious Hegelian mystification has been foisted on a public confronting the real failures of supposed communism in the history of bolshevism.

2. History and Evolution

The issue of revolutionary communism needs a new historical framework, one that has created a superset to the classic marxist legacy which can remain as a resource. We can suggest a new lightweight version of the 'eonic model' which can be a useful guide to historical and evolutionary thinking.

The tactic is one of stark simplicity the scores a spectacular success but one that remains somewhat ambiguous in its conclusions. We need not create a new dogma or theory to take the warning given by a closer look at history that where the 'science of history' fails, a slightly more complex variant can elicit the basics of a remarkable riddle.

The basic idea is very simple: will history respond to a systems analysis, with or without the search for causal laws.

Once we frame the question, does historical data exhibit a frequency hypothesis, we converge almost at once on the answer: the evidence suggests a clear case to which we can apply a discrete/continuous model of a simple and classic type. We need not make any explicit use of the full model to be able to stage a chronicle of empirical history with definable/visible structure which we can use for simple clarification, without theoretical entanglements. This is a far more general approach than the analysis of economic systems in a teleological sequence.

The marxist legacy suffers from a set of theoretical confusions and has been challenged many times. The question of historical theory is intractable and the model of historical materialism with its attendant 'stages of production' theory is too reductionist even as it proposes a crypto-teleology. A general critique might challenge the economic interpretation of history on the grounds that history is far more than economic functionality: religion, art, science, literature, philosophy and politics, and much else show independent interrelated histories not reducible to questions of economic system that are dominant at any given point. Furthermore, marxism has become entangled with darwinism, despite marx's cautionary remarks, and this theory has proven a liability to the left even as the foundations of natural selection theory are found wanting.

In a further critique the hegelian legacy of the dialectic has subjected marxism to a kind of mysticism in the midst of its attempt at science. And the general world view of dialectical materialism has proven to be set of pseudo-scientific propositions that can't replace conventional science. The issue of logical systems in relation to ideas of the dialectic can remain as a research project but the mainline of proposal and platform should be wary of both non-standard logics and of hegelian subtleties. The dialectic has not been shown to produce a dynamic of history. The nature of dialectical itself requires careful examination.

2.1 The Politics of Evolution, the Falsification of Darwinism

The question of evolution has been controversial from the start, but became institutionalized around standard darwinism, to the dissent of many. The critique has been expropriated by the right which has expanded the challenge to darwinism with a version of the classic design argument, even as it adopts a social darwinist ideology. The suspicious abuse of 'survival of the fittest' theory as an ideology of business competition and class struggle has subjected the left to the vagaries of a pseudo-science. The issue of the mechanism of evolution remains unsolved by the falsified claims of random evolution. Modern biology has lost the original suggestions for a theory of evolution from the enlightenment period. It has produced a mindset fixed in institutional dogma as a form of social conditioning and an aggressive secular humanism that has created the darwin propaganda machine. Marx himself was one of the original critics of darwinism. But we need a view of evolution and history that is open to a broader set of hypotheses than those provided by scientism.

Our strategy with evolution is to be partially agnostic about theories of such: we can see evolution in deep time as a matter of fact but remain uncertain of its mechanics.

2.2 A New Model of History

How do we resolve the confusion over evolution? Biology is slowly undergoing a transformation of its internal theory but there is another way to get a rough glimpse of dynamics of evolution by looking at history. If random evolution is a fallacious perspective then an example of non-random evolution is necessary to re-orient thinking stuck in false theories. Here remarkably world history can suggest the answer: it shows an elusive yet definite structural/developmental logic that can give us the example of non-random 'evolution' needed. This may not fully answer to the question of evolution in deep time but it can force the stock of darwinism to plummet. The arbitrary assumptions of random evolution are seen to be grossly fallacious. Beyond that we need a view of history that is not beset by the false claims of

historical laws and which can deal with questions of free agency, economic determination versus evolutionary developmentalism, and the issue of teleological directionality. In the process it should examine the place of values in a realm of facts and the issues of religion and reformation, and the place of Christianity in the birth of modern communism, beside its versioning as a concealed capitalist ideology.

This new model of history is based on the evidence of world history and its dramatic non-random aspects, which can be roughly systematized in a version of historical directionality. We can approach this starting with the dramatic evidence of the so-called axial age which shows a global process of synchronous parallelism and non-local causal effects. Attempts to understand this discovery of modern historiography lead to a related analysis of a sequential logic of discontinuity in a system operating in a frequency pattern. A stunning development. And one that is likely to remain controversial. But we don't have to adopt a belief system about this, instead merely adopting a set of suspicions given a set of hypotheses. We see a non-random directional process in our past but we are still in this model subject to our own free agency and are not bound in a mechanical system. We do not therefore require a full theory of history to proceed, but our new suspicions make us less dogmatic about issues of evolution, teleology, and historical dynamics, even as we find renewed grounds for 'history according to free agents'. We may take this approach to its logical limits without creating a false claim of scientific theory. We do this with a minimalist chronology of epochs 'visible to the naked' with a set of warnings about the relation of free agency to system dynamics. It is also open to a set of 'deductions' that lend plausibility to its perspective, and this shows a strong resemblance to the model of punctuated equilibrium. But we need only the barest outline of a new model of history, one that can also piggyback the rough outlines of the marxist system whose assumptions however suffer a kind of metal fatigue next to a great deal of dialectical challenge.

A look at the perspective of Kantian ethical socialism can buttress this approach and consider the form of Kantian historicism that asks for a solution to the riddle of history in a larger framework than reductionist science. Kant's famous essay on historicism speaks of the progress to the perfect civil constitution and we can adapt this to the claim that democracy, then economic democracy, shows this very progression. We act as free agents to amend our constitutions to, viz. a postcapitalist communism, as an issue of revolutionary re-foundation. This is very different from saying that feudalism yields to capitalism thence to communism, a difficult speculative theory.

But we should adopt only the most general assumptions, and not pretend to a science of history in conventional form, instead remaining within an empirical confine.

This approach suggests the efficacy of a plan vanilla 'discrete/continuous' systems analysis which can show the teleological character behind historical chaos and in the process force us to take seriously ideas of the 'evolution of freedom', a useful end run around the usual 'end of history' propaganda...This can be interpreted as a progression of epochs. And this in turn can help to clarify what we mean by modernity and secularism. This is another borderline theory of Big History, but we can simply leave it in the background to an empirical outline of history using the given visible blocks of evidence taken for what they clearly suggest.

2.3 Epochs in Transition, Modernity, Divides

Our model can be reduced to the simplicity of a rough outline of world epochs with the transition to modernity in the most recent transformation of civilization. The transition concept suddenly explains the obvious issue of the explosion of the early modern from 1500 to 1800 or so, at which point a divide era emerges as the onset of the new epoch. It is significant that capitalism and communism emerge almost simultaneously at this point and the 'dialectic' of a new era attempting realization comes into being. Note the way this model does not produce determinate outcomes, only semi-determinate initializations. This analysis distinguishes the early modern, as a transition, and the new era itself which begins in the early nineteenth century in the wake of the immense transformation from the sixteenth century onward. This model considers then the 'divide' point at the end of the transitional period: it leaves a question, why was the period just before and after 1800 so massively gifted with innovations? Our model suggests an answer. And it suggests the tandem emergence of a capitalist framework and a challenger, the socialist/communist movements whose prophetic action constitutes a chase plane action in the chaotic phases of free markets and their ideology...

This system is simply a reminder that a revolutionary process must distinguish teleological and the effects of free agency: the relationship changes as time goes on. A far larger process of social transformation is required than the usual version of revolutionary economism.

2.4 Secularism and Religion in World History

Our model gives us a clear rendition of the issues of religion, the Axial Age, reformations and the emergence of the secular framework. The left is the inheritor of the void left by the waning of Axial Age religion but its early Feuerbachian versions suggest the need for a larger framework. These issues were actually well analyzed by such as Kant, Schopenhauer and Hegel who brought the reformation to a close and set the religious legacies into a new evolutionary phasing still underway in our present.

The evidence of the Axial Age shows something far more complex than what the views of historical materialism would suggest, and furthermore this is beyond the duality of sacred and secular. The Axial Age shows a global almost 'gaian level' process operating across long intervals of time and non-local zones of planetary space. The suggestion of the overall dynamic is that of a directed 'evolutionary' process that can operate on whole cultural subsets, a spectacular finding. This process was detected by but misunderstood by the Israelites who created a myth of the action of 'god' in history. But the larger context shows us a mysterious design driven by a mysterious 'macroevolutionary' injection that resembles an analog structure of punctuated equilibrium.

One of the distinctive features of this new model is the way it must reflect the non-linear interaction of historical system and free agents. It does this by operating in a discrete/continuous series in which the degree of freedom is a variable: our system shows an active phase at the start of each interval or epoch and then the degree of freedom of the free agents takes off in the wake of the characteristic transition. This form of analysis suddenly clarifies many confusions of historical study and enables a discussion of the 'history of freedom' of the types considered by Kant and then Hegel. Marxism was regressive in this respect and tried to reduce history to economic interpretations.

2.5 The End of History, Evolution of Freedom, Free Agents

Our model gives us another version of an 'end of history' argument in its examination of the rising effects of free agency in a system of macro action. The term is sophisticated and we see that the 'end of history' means better 'historical directionality'. And that direction setting occurs before the new era begins, not at its end which is created by free agents and may deviate from initial conditions. The association of democracy and capitalism is seen to be arbitrary and the domination of free markets and its ideology, exposed as a planetary threat, falsifies the simple equation. From the beginning of the socialist movements the obvious counterargument has suggested a socialist foundation for real democracy.

The term 'end of history' is an ambiguous one and can refer either to some 'terminal point of history', not what was meant, or the 'end' in the sense of some goal or directionality. The idea via Hegel was pegged with the idea of the emergence of freedom and here the model of the eonic effect more successfully shows a direct set of examples of the directionality of 'freedom'.

The macro system as it is called has a high degree of determination at the start but progressively releases its agents to increased levels of freedom. We must suspect that the issue is really the 'end of macrohistory' as free agents emerge from the eonic sequence to assume their own history.

Here the issue is really about the emergence of democracy but this must be subject to analyses of the meaning of that term and here the critiques of Marx and others very clearly distinguished between legal and economic democracy.

The emergence of free agents in the wake of the hypercomplexity of the 'macro effect' is a warning that revolutionary processes are subject to very difficult tasks of 'culture creation' and this requires a far larger study than simple economic refoundation.

Thus, the 'end of macrohistory' leaves man with a set of potential realizations in dialectical tension: the first attempts at democracy are critiqued to suggest a socialist rewrite of the early democratic crypto-oligarchic systems dominated by capitalism. The critique is transparent, the correction very difficult.

3. Out of Revolution

Our model gives us a better insight into revolution in the association of revolutionary action with the early modern period. Revolutions are clearly associated with the onset of the transition of the early modern, an elegant solution to an historical riddle. But there is a warning that revolutions induced by a system effect will lapse to free agency for their completion. This might explain why the Bolshevik revolution was so swiftly derailed by events. We must carefully think through the implications of early modern (democratic) revolution as freedom in one sense and the conscious later replication and realization subject to the action of free agents. Our proposal for action is to remorph cases that succeed, more or less, such as the American revolution, given the marxist analysis of its bourgeois character.

3.1 1848

The symbolic year 1848 shows the spooky timing of the emergence of communism in the ambiguous revolutions of 1848, just after the 'divide' period of our transition. This is hardly coincidence and shows the reification of a prophetic action in pursuit of the runaway capitalist frenzy...

3.2 TNCM: Toward a New Communist Manifesto

We can conclude by invoking our two manifestos, noting that the appearance of the original is a classic moment now highlighted by our new historical model.

That the year 1848 issued the classic manifesto of Marx and Engels is strangely 'right timing' at the precise point of the onset of a new era. The manifesto issued the de facto judgment that the capitalist system was flawed and could not be final. We can both echo and update/virtualize a new manifesto that attempts to realize a set of 'hyparchic futures', a term to be explored in another text...

A selection from TNCM:

The Crisis of Capitalist Globalization

At a time of social crisis, the classic Manifesto of Marx and Engels in the era of the 1848 revolutions resonates with an eerie relevance for the age of neoliberalism and dangerous climate change. The clever fiction of the end of history is exposed as an artifice of philosophic legerdemain, Hegel from the bottom of the deck. The original tour de force would be a hard act to follow, but in reality our 'new' manifesto is a studied echo of the old brought to its real future, via the prophetic desperation of two revolutionaries before their time. The era of the 1848 upheavals, in the last tremors of the mighty French Revolution, has been called a turning point in world history, but one which failed to turn. It is an ironic aspect of our current era that this 'revolution manqué' is an apt metaphor for our own predicament. It threw down the gage to the future of the whole of indusreality. That remarkable period of revolt was a shot over the bows of the capitalist revolution unfolding toward its long march to globalization, with the problematical outcome of its success beset once again with the haunting realization the failure to turn is a world of markets going mad. A rational limit or else overthrow of the new capitalist affair might have spared the planetary community much suffering, but now the issue goes into the critical zone, as the crisis reaches a point of no return. And that moment has a symbolic significance in terms of a larger view of world history.

The status of late capitalism is desperate:

As the planet nears the point of no-return at the threshold of climate criticality, the conservative sector of the American congress threatens to veto the US treaty obligation with respect to the recent Paris climate conference: this example typifies the extreme terminal ideological seizure of consciousness by capitalist ideology and tokens a recompute of the American system of government...

The crisis of capitalism is the crisis of planetary destruction in the onset of catastrophic climate change. And this is becoming a crisis of modernity itself. The inability of the powers of government to mediate the capitalist process condemns both and asks for a program of (new) communism to bring sanity to a body politic mesmerized by the ideology of economic

illusion. The tenets of free market economics have been exposed to stark falsification in the inability of the system to respond to the disaster of climate change. This extreme example leads to a second look at much of the rest of the ideology of random economic activity. Self-regulating markets are shown to be a myth. The effect of ideology blinding agents to their situation is clearly prophesied by the earliest observers of capitalism.

Marx/Engels correctly saw the crisis of globalization and deserve to speak for our present in the rough outline of their remarkable Manifesto. We must try to 'throughpass' their classic while creating a more flexible superset of that classic as a venue to practical realization. We will concretize the result with a gesture to define 'market neo-communism' as one realization of the original proclamations. We must emphasize the prefix 'neo' and move to a discussion of a New Communism as if encountering the idea for the first time.

Marxist shibboleths It is a spectacular effect to see the period of the passing of the Hegelian school proceed to the era of Feuerbach and the many associated figures of that period, including Marx and Engels who spawn the new vision of economic history just at the point of the failed revolutions of 1848. Those revolutions failed, but they prophesied the future of a 'last revolution' that would set the true fate of modernity. Clearly they were premature, as Marx/Engels sensed...Those two went on to create a remarkable canon to codify a new view of society, economics, and revolution, one that would nearly overtake the twentieth century, despite what we see now is still another version of the failed revolutions of 1848, and the roll back after 1989. Marxism produces a powerful basic corpus, but, as noted, it has elements of distortion, or so we suspect.... We should note that it was beset with the difficulty of analyzing economic systems, the debates over the labor theory of value, as one example, and the sudden onset of marginalist economics in one of the spookiest of capitalism dead bed survivals. Beyond this we see also the appearance of Kantian ethical socialism in an attempt to critique the reductionist positivism of the marxists. Beyond this the proliferation of social democratic substitutes for the full transition beyond capitalism.

Leninist interlude The first aftershock of the 1848 'failed revolutions' was the great Russian Revolution, which was both a standard democratic revolution of the classic type attempting to overthrow the medieval Tsarist phantom, and a first attempt to bring about the final revolution against capitalism. The question of Leninism arises in this context as a hard to evaluate circumstance that carries a flawed ideological complex but which probably prophesies the future of 'chase plane' communism to come.... Lenin is not a transparent figure who belongs to his followers, but a mysterious agent of revolution in a prefiguration of the coming of postcapitalism. The core issues are the ethical perspectives of the agent of change, and the need for an economic solution to the operation of markets. We can and should argue the 'dialectic' of these two questions, and see the way an ethical nihilism, foreseen by the Kantian socialists, can enter like bilge water into the good ship Communism, and the way that the cunning capitalists with tricks of phantom calculus outplayed Marxist rendering of Adam Smith, and how figures like the market evangelist Mises, etc., performed the feat of turning the idea of freedom into a libertarian finesse, along with a valid challenge to socialist planning on the grounds of the dynamic of markets.

Last Men and their Smartphones The passing of the Leninist Interlude has given the appearance of final sanction to the capitalist future, but already by the end of the twentieth century the reality would seem that a flawed socialism was abandoned to search for the real thing, even as the so-called neoliberal age began a rapid conquest of globalization, economy, and government. The fall of the original Leninist interlude begins even to seem a mistake, despite its massively flawed outcomes.

The basic development of communism is and remains nonetheless a world historical outcome to the modern transition, in ambiguous relation to democracy, and will spawn sooner or later a new version in the wake of the failure of bolshevism... At the moment of climate crisis, we sense the desperation of the euphoria over the capitalist miracle with its final gesture of planetary destruction. The debate over the last man, which started with Nietzsche takes an ominous leftist form as the ideological rigor mortis of capitalist ideological in its final symptoms produces a social nexus completely bemused to the point of blindness to the destruction of environment, and the final carbon destiny of the capitalist industrial revolution. Nietzsche was a distortion of the early modern, but had a point about the 'last man': the participants in the modern experiment are moving toward the completion of the 'great transition' or the evolution of man, and this requires that 'free agency' come to an understanding and self-replication of the macrosequence.... But the downside is the commodity fetishism so visible in the smartphone mania outbreak at the point of atmospheric breakdown.

Last Phase of Capitalism We can conclude by pointing to the eerie downfall of the capitalist Faust in the pact with the logic of derivatives and catastrophic margin calls. We refer the reader to the Hollywood movie.... the profits in downfall. The last phases of capitalism show the capitalist axioms proceeding toward the destruction of the world system in an orgy of financialization... The period 2008 made plain a new form of capitalist finance: the bet against the system, an omen of the self-destructive character of the capitalist lunacy syndrome...

3.3 Economic Theory, Market Socialisms

We need to upgrade classic marxist legacies with a close analysis of the neo-classical economic farce and its 'theories' as ideologies. We have a strong clue to the failures of economic science in the abuse of calculus to explicate something very different from systems analyzed by physics. The element of free agents as economic atoms nullifies the deterministic solutions of formal science. So we reduce such theories to a dead letter on the spot. We can also profit from study of the critics and proponents of market socialism and its brouhaha over the so-called calculation debate. This debate was won then lost by the left but was then won again in various considerations of computational economics...A clear and effective strategy as to 'market calculation' is needed on the left. In the age of computers, AI, and increasing insight into economic action the solution is at hand in various experimental post-Keynesian/socialist strategies...Since the capitalists have no serious theory of economic systems we are under no obligation to submit to critiques of socialism based on the sophistries of the calculation debate.

We include a short selection from *World History and the Eonic Effect*: it is important to understand why deterministic calculus theories can never apply correctly to economic models of free agents in economic contexts.

System Action, Free Action:

Determinism vs (Creative) Free Agency

Related to the issue of Kant's Challenge is the issue of creative history, and we need to set a distinction, before embarking in the next chapter on a study of world history. The data of history is confusing unless we distinguish a causal factor from free agency, AND be sure to keep the two together, in tandem. We have evoked Kant's Challenge, and we must distinguish historical dynamics from free will, since both are operating, and we can call this the distinction of a system and the free agents inside it. Think of a ship and its passengers: the action of the system, the ship, and the action of the passengers on board is a hybrid system of mechanics and free will. It is important to see that history is not determined: it shows many hybrid situations where behavior is partly determined and partly free in the creative action of individuals. This distinction of system and agents might seem confusing, but we already know all this: the simplest example of the many we encounter every day might be the 'system action' of a car, and the 'free action' of the driver. The point is that 'history' has a mind of its own, so to speak, and we are inside it operating with our agendas. But the two intersect. We need a looser version of the duality of causality and freedom: system action and free action. Free agency is not always 'free will'. You can be a free agent in an earthquake, but not free to do much of anything while it happens!

Some analogs The simplest example here is that of a driver in a vehicle. The situation shows the tandem action of a causal machine and a free agent, with our without free will, in control of that machine. Another example is that of an ocean liner and its passengers. Still another is a computer with a mouse, a clear tandem situation of 'system' (computer) and 'free agent', user with mouse.

The question of market socialism has been controversial since the era of Mises near the start of the Bolshevik revolution: it is important to study this debate and it is also important to be able to survive capitalist sophistry here. Our DMNC in a way creates a hybrid that makes the debate irrelevant, and in the age of supercomputers and Artificial Intelligence the idea of planned economies takes root all over again.

The text of *Toward a New Socialism* contains a useful discussion:

http://ricardo.ecn.wfu.edu/~cottrell/socialism_book/new_socialism.pdf

A whole series of books on the 'calculation debate' have been reviewed at Amazon.

Our formulation undermines the whole of neo-classical economics, in principle, as noted in distinction of free action, system action. The calculation debate is tricky and needs study but in the end if economists have no real theory, the debate is also sidelined. The left needs in any case to study this issue without getting entangled in sophistries from capitalists...

A useful summary:

From Marx to Mises: Post Capitalist Society and the Challenge of Economic Calculation

Miscalculations and botched economies

Critiques of Marxism are too often biased and useless misunderstandings of the substance and history of its philosophy and theories, but this book points to a partial exception that is more than ideological clichés, the socialist calculation debate, and contains a thorough history of this theoretical wrangle and its arcana, exposing the core weakness of the so-called Communist economies in action. Since conservatives make a fetish of this argument, I will recommend it instead to ostrich students on the left since few seem to be even aware of domain of discourse, or else they are not telling. G. Hodgson's *Economics and Utopia* also contains a corrective discussion of this issue, with a summary of "Towards a New Socialism", with its provocative and amusing attempt to resolve the intractable pricing nexus with computers! This after all is partly a technical, not a philosophic, issue, in the long run. Pricing twelve million commodities was a nightmare for Stalinist bureaucracies, but a few seconds computer time these days doing an input-output matrix! Hayek the dragon slayer may find himself trumped by Moore's Law, one day. That will be the day. Ha!

Important and useful book.

Against the Market: Political Economy, Market Socialism and the Marxist Critique

Against the Market: Political Economy, Market Socialism and the Marxist Critique

by David McNally

This is a useful critique of market socialism with a lot of good ..., September 24, 2016

This review is from: *Against the Market: Political Economy, Market Socialism and the Marxist Critique* (Paperback)

This is a useful critique of market socialism with a lot of good history of the subject, tracing it back as far as Adam Smith, no less. But the larger question remains of what economic system is to be provided for a socialist or communist successor to the market. We cannot rule out the entire universe of possible systems, among them systems of communism that expropriate the bourgeoisie but leave open the economy to match. There is completely satisfying argument thus against all forms of market socialism. But this is a useful history and set of challenges to those who consider the complexities, not fully resolved by marxists, of any form of postcapitalism. The reader might consider the issues of 'democratic market neo-communism' explored at darwiniana.com and in the reviewer's *Last and First Men* (Amazon).

Market in a Socialist Economy

by Włodzimierz Brus

A somewhat 'ancient' but still very useful discussion of the place of the market in a ..., September 16, 2016

A somewhat 'ancient' but still very useful discussion of the place of the market in a socialist economy with a consideration of the questions of decentralization. The work is useful (and includes a short take on Oscar Lange and the calculation problem) in coming before the flood of neoliberal propaganda for the free market system that was soon to overtake the field. Our contemporary crisis of economy and climate crisis forces us to search the history of the many discussions now virtually banished from public discourse.

Introduction to Equilibrium Analysis: Variations on Themes by Edgeworth and Walras

Introduction to Equilibrium Analysis: Variations on Themes by Edgeworth and Walras

by Werner Hildenbrand

The neoclassical realm of economic theory, August 26, 2016

In the context of the so-called economic calculation debate and its controversies it is important to get on the trail of the theories involved: consider a work such as Marx to Mises by David Steele, and Economic Calculation in the Socialist Commonwealth by Mises. The debates here have seesawed over the years with the perception that that the capitalists have won the debate. But the reality is that neoclassical economics is a flawed theoretical framework and offers no proof of anything. It is useful to try and extricate oneself from the confusion of complex theories that are likely pseudoscience. In a system that uses mathematical complexity for some outrageous deceptions, the task is not easy and keeps getting passed to 'experts'. The issue of equilibrium comes to the fore and it is hard at first to find the relevant books (in the era of the Amazon search box the books can be found in an hour or less). This book is a good simple text on the basic economic model. The appearance of rigor and the use of modern (mathematical) 'analysis' (advanced/modernized calculus) is misleading or in any case a transient portrait of the elegance of theory that is perhaps misleading economists. The issue of marginalism, from Jevons to Walras enters directly and we are left to wonder as to the status of economic theories. We can proceed to another round of the calculation debate armed with the 'culprits' of theory involved in the general confusion.

Finding Equilibrium: Arrow, Debreu, McKenzie and the Problem of Scientific Credit

Science or sophistry?, August 22, 2016

I am skeptical of the neo-classical paradigm in economics and went in search of some expose of the way the work of Arrow/Debreu is used to give the equilibrium mystique a mathematical footing. Instead I found this book which has high charm value and considerable (your time at bat)acumen in its own closed world of calculus applied to economic systems. So the critics lose one inning here and retreat to the dugout to 'figure'. Actually the mystique is not hard to explain. Work such as that of Arrow/Debreu's demonstration is not surprising given the initial assumption for a subject created by the original mathematical economics; But we can find hopeless flaws there leaving us to wonder why it works. This subject of neoclassical economics was levitated from physics bastardization with a use of differentials breathtaking in its sophisticated impudence. The trick to Arrow/Debreu springs from the fact that if you

scrawl figures on a wall of geometric form, you may derive the a priori properties from such scrawls, but if you call the result a science of economics the umpire should call you out and send you to the dugout.

But this book is fascinating in any case, and is a minor classic in the realm of neo-classical mathematical economics, aka economic dark arts.

It is a useful history of one of the more obscure areas of economic reasoning by which we are, well, in Keynesian 'all dead'. Now I will have to study this subject in greater detail.

Socialism After Communism: The New Market Socialism

by Christopher Pierson

This is a highly useful set of challenges to the idea of 'market socialism', but written too soon in the wake of 1989. It is hard to follow sometimes the intimidated muddle that came in the wake of bolshevism, but now that we have had over a generation of neo-liberalism we can see from experience that something is as wrong with capitalist dogmatism as with pseudo-socialist fantasy. The implications of the end of history argument (fantasy) are that we should let markets, without modification, proceed to destroy a whole planet. Clearly the whole capitalist mindset has produced an ideological blindness to the facts of the case. The fallacies here revolve around the failure to really explore an immense number of possible solutions to the question of a planned, socialist or communist society. The examples of bolshevism are not really examples of anything at all. And the question of planning has been the object of far too much ideological thinking from defenders of capitalism. The adoption of planning at the start of the second world war should have made it obvious that debunking planning in your enemies is a bit facile. When it comes to planning your own home terrain, suddenly it is easy and the planned economy in the US at the start of the war came into existence in a matter of weeks. So the dogmas of the right are mostly just that. In *Toward a New Communist Manifesto: The Crisis of Modernity Postcapitalism in the Era of Climate Calamity* Kindle Edition we see a new set of possibilities are explored and that evade the standard objections. In any case, the history of the question itself shows the weak assumptions of all parties at the start. Research has produced many insights into possibilities for the future. We are in a new situation: we must constrain the wild destruction of free markets before it is too late. The older literature here seems out of date and almost lunatic on both sides.

3.4 DMNC: Democratic Market Neo-communism

We begin to consider a practical version of a system that can mediate capitalism and communism, taken as 'democratic market neo-communism', a transitional system that can provide a resolution of the crisis point...We have a system that can mediate both markets and planned economies, next to a third autonomous sector with a degree of anarchist free for all. The combination of strong regulation, strong communist authority and a reflected set of opposites in balance, with an especial focus on the creation of a Commons of shared resources beyond capital as private property and an ecological legal system that can assist the passage beyond the crisis of climate...

Selection from DMNC:

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 attempt 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 will 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.

3.5 Last and First Men

Man is proceeding as a species in transformation with the emergence of civilization seen as a new phase of human evolution. The almost inconceivable complexity of human evolution presents a challenge for a new civilization in the era of postcapitalism. Our challenge to darwinism was at least appropriate to the task of evading oversimplifications. Man is emerging from an embryonic phase of so-called civilization to a new form of society that can resolve both economy and democracy in social commune vested in the

Commons. The question of evolution has become an endless debate over religion and science, with neither side able to resolve the question. Even as empirical research proceeds with increasing force the overall character of history and evolution remains obscured by theistic confusions and the narrow vision of scientism. A future beyond the Reformation will attempt to find a dimension beyond spiritual myth and beyond scientism a new science that recognizes the place of value in the realm of fact. Modernity has been confused by premature Nietzschean efforts to foreclose on religion with a degenerate view of higher man. Perhaps a movement cast in a new left can lead man to a completion of human speciation in a synthesis of perspectives that does justice to the real evolution of man.

From Last and First Men:

848: Last and First Men

As we examine world history with its suggestion from the brief interval for which records in real time are available of a cascade of successive epochs, the significance of the modern age becomes clear, as enter into a new stage of civilization, and yet one, as the early socialists saw, that had at its beginning not yet achieved its conclusive final state, in the creation of a potential leading to a possible endstate. As the consequences of the capitalist revolution close on themselves two centuries downfield from the conclusion of the modern transition, the better conclusion in the form of a meta-economic understanding confronts the reckless abandon with which modernity was equated with economic free for all, and this in turn with an extravagant fantasy of evolving economic agents.

It was the science fiction writer Olaf Stapleton who coined the phrase 'last and first men', and in the wake of our evolutionary discussion, it would seem appropriate to wonder if the chronicle of the first and last men is not reflected in the stages of what we suppose is the macroevolution of the species 'homo sapiens'. We tend to think, as noted, in terms of 'evolution' stopping, for history to begin, but we should rather suspect a braided set of evolutionary histories, between transitional phases, such as history indeed shows, to be the real 'evolutionary saga', as yet incomplete, between the first and the last men. That this phrase echoes a quite different notion to the philosopher Nietzsche is an additional irony, for we can see that the 'last man' of that philosopher's tirades against modernity is in reality a parody of Darwinian pseudo-evolution, and, absurdly, the false victor of the economic game, unfit to survive due to the blunting of his humanity in the phases of alienation.

The year 1848 is a symbolic token of this state of affairs, prophesied by the witnesses to the French (and American) revolutions who saw a future and final revolution to come, yet one, as in the tales of Scheherazade, forever delayed to a new episode of the old. We should rather consider the scale of our larger chronicle, to see that events have proceeded faster than we might have thought, and that the urgency of the early challengers to capitalist domination seemed to sense that the endgame would not be a distant future, but a nearly imminent crisis in the system at hand. And so, two centuries from their urgency, we can indeed see that an unadulterated system of markets can in short order destabilize an entire ecological system, and in the name of free markets produce a kind of social madness in the octaves of Social Darwinist utopianism.

The revolutions of the year 1848 are thus an apt reference, more so than those of the classic early modern, to our current realities, since precisely the constellation of market liberalism triumphant and liberalism reborn in the resolution of its contradictions in the new banner of socialist democracy was at work, and powerfully recorded in the writings of the scions of the 180's, that seminal decade that saw the first phase of the modern world compromised at the start by the legacies of scientism, Darwinism, and economic ideology. That moment of high potential remains to find its realization in the last, and first new age of man's true speciation as man, the stage of homo sapiens as yet unachieved. Sooner or later, and, as it now seems, sooner, we will be forced to conclude the revolutions of 1848, as a global movement toward postcapitalism, environmental sanity, and in the context of an epochal transition in the macroevolutionary legacy of man.

Appendix 1: R48G: posts from Darwiniana...

AYG/archive of posts at Darwiniana

AYG

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

April 2nd, 2017

The question will induce howls of protest in some quarters but if a process generates a runaway train and threatens to destroy a planet even as it induces delusion in the social sphere then the answer to the question is fairly clear....Let's repeat the point: a process that threatens to destroy a planet as its executives are deluded is a mistake.

Where did we go wrong. Marx/Engels understood this point but retreated to calling capitalism a stage of history. But was it? Capitalism arose as a set of technical and financial innovations that fueled processes of economic growth but which were seen immediately to be problematic. How could this have been the onset of a new stage in history? All the basics of capitalism had existed for centuries, machine production, proletariat issues, factories, financial investment processes, the only difference was the scale and the onset of the industrial revolution. The ideology that came into existence at that point was an egregious distortion of the realities of world history, as Marx and Engels well understood. But instead of giving license to capitalism as a stage of world history it would have been better to have denied it any status at all save as a set of technical and economic innovations, and ones that needed integration into a larger system of social culture. Thinking of capitalism as some inevitable stage of history was nonsense: a rational system should have been the first prerequisite. Instead a false process was unleashed that has proceeded beyond control to the stage of ecological insanity, a sign the original conception was bogus or flawed.

R48G: remorphing liberal democracy one to one with DMNC shows the 'end of history' argument can apply to both systems...

May 9th, 2017 ·

Let us reiterate our argument in the last post (quoted below): Read our depiction of DMNC and note that the system is essentially the same as a liberal market system and yet different in the way it remorphs one to one the basic elements into a neo-communism of the Commons. But the whole liberal apparatus is still there in another form.

The point should have been obvious given the lesser version of the New Deal, for example. Does Fukuyama's argument forbid that? His neo-con confreres surely thought so and Fukuyama made the problem worse because it has led to the cancer of privatization taken to extremes.

Does Fukuyama not see that the Commons in our formulation already exists in free market capitalism, albeit in an incomplete form. At what point does moving capital to the Commons violate one and the same 'end of history' argument?

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Democratic_Market_Neo_Communism_ver_5.pdf

R48G: the absurdity of Fukuyama's argument...

May 9th, 2017 ·

We have two clear lines of objection to Fukuyama's argument: we don't need Hegel, historical materialism, as the 'motor of historical synthesis': our study of the eonic effect shows something else driving history. One can object to that but the material is clearly able to expose techno-economic thinking as an inadequate explanation.

The second, if you don't like the eonic effect, is that it is unreasonable to reject any challenge to unrestricted capitalism. This is the claim that any modifications to free markets is against the 'end of history' argument (which has no basis either in Hegel or anything else, put poppycock).

If you look at our Democratic Market Neo-Communism you can see that liberal market capitalism has been remorphed one to one with alternations that work just as well as those of straight market capitalism. In effect, Fukuyama is arguing that the injustices of free markets can't be altered, a gross and nauseating propaganda. The argument only worked for about five minutes after 1989. The whole 'end of history' is neo-con propaganda, although we might realize that historical materialism doesn't work either.

R48G: the dialectic of revolution

March 30th, 2017 ·

Red Forty-eight Group: back to the grind: revolutionary harangues...

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=The+Crisis+of+Modernity_ver6.pdf:

Toward a New Communist Manifesto

Democratic Market Neo-Communism

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

I hope it is more than someone getting older indulging in revolutionary exclamations, but if nothing else that is a function appropriate in a personal sense...And it is merely useful to remind those who will instinctively move in a more 'practical' vein that they could easily end up wasting their time. In the Trump era, watch what you say in public, we are 'nemo' here, ditto for nemini...

I don't think they will waste a drone on me, so as the headmaster quoth in Animal House, 'Out with it'...

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, smorgasboard... March 30th, 2017 · No Comments

Red Forty-eight Group: back to the grind: revolutionary harangues...

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=The+Crisis+of+Modernity_ver6.pdf:

Toward a New Communist Manifesto

Democratic Market Neo-Communism

I hope it is more than someone getting older indulging in revolutionary exclamations, but if nothing else that is a function appropriate in a personal sense...And it is merely useful to remind those who will instinctively move in a more 'practical' vein that they could easily end up wasting their time. in the Trump era, watch what you say in public, we are 'nemo' here, ditto for nemini...

I don't think they will waste a drone on me, so as the headmaster quoth in Animal House, 'Out with it'...

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, smorgasboard...

R48G: the inevitable revolution beyond industrial capitalism? //Humans are creating a new geological layer of technofossils.

March 30th, 2017

Another indication of the historical limits of the capitalist/anthropocene era...

Source: Humans are creating a new geological layer of technofossils.

R48G: end of history or end of eonic sequence? man's true freedom can't emerge under domination man's true freedom can't emerge under domination by the market...

March 29th, 2017

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...

Using fukuyama's argument against liberal democracy itself: history can't end with liberalism...//Was Francis Fukuyama the first man to see Trump coming? | Aeon Essays

March 29th, 2017 ·

We discussed fukuyama's argument yesterday and here is the core of the fallacious argument. He has missed the point of hegel but even if we accepted his hegelian metaphysics it would not necessarily follow that liberal democracy represents any endpoint.

The whole idea originally was surely pace kojeve at al, indeed marx, that very simply liberal democracy was too imperfect to be this 'end of history' and that a form of communism could achieve the correction to produce real democracy. Here the bolshevik example totally confused the issue, it must be admitted.

Our discussion of 'kant's challenge' and the idea of progress toward a perfect civil constitution is a better formulation: we can see that beyond liberal democracy lie any number of systems that could improve on the confusion created by so-called liberal democracy as a cover for capitalism.

Why use hegel at all? It is a mystification of metaphysics where our eonic model shows clearly the directionality of a freedom effect in world history.

Source: Was Francis Fukuyama the first man to see Trump coming? | Aeon Essays

R48G: the eonic effect and a perspective on the hypercomplexity of human evolution

March 28th, 2017

<https://singularityhub.com/2017/03/26/the-rise-of-a-new-species-of-human-being/>

There is no inherent objection to a new and future evolution of man, but its meaning in the context of darwinism, and reductionist scientism is likely to be abortive.

It is for this reason we have discussed the 'meme' 'last and first men' (originally the title of a scifi classic) and rendered that into a book on the left: the question of a future human evolution is so desperate that we must challenge what is coming: the capitalist expropriation of 'human-hood' for industrial/capitalist enterprises, the new robotic slaveries...

By the same token, and mindful of the worse confusions of the stalinist humanzee projections, little known, conceived in secret but never carried out, we can equally fear a pseudo-leftist totalitarian resolution of this question.

One thing is clear, we must get it straight and that requires a whole new order of intelligent thought. Let us consider what 'evolution' means in terms of the 'eonic effect' and its model: a teleological process of mysterious design operating over tens of thousands of years able to remorph whole cultures in a series and able to operate globally, able to interact on physical, ethical, and aesthetic levels, and guide the emergentism realization of a given species.

This is the level of mastery required to use the term 'evolution' and any future 'evolution' of man. By this standard homo sapiens is a primitive species still with barely an inkling of his real evolution. The scale of the 'eonic effect' is stupendous. I can barely conceive of it and it is clear that figures like Stephen Hawking and the students of the Singularity Hub are not very far along either.

The left (and I would say certain classic religious legacies) must be prepared to stand guard over the coming botch of a project with a larger view of secular humanism and its evolution that what is current now in the reductionist Iron Cage realm of social darwinist/capitalist science...

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=9780984702930-LFM_text.pdf

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 thumbtwiddler 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.

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?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 into-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 openended. We have so far only pleaded to consider a virtual abstraction, but with a warning that its intent is serious social change...

<http://darwiniana.com/2017/05/06/r48g-revolutionary-musingsabstractions-and-a-kantian-perspective/>

<http://darwiniana.com/2017/05/06/archive-an-evolutionary-path-to-some-version-of-democratic-market-neo-communism/>

<http://darwiniana.com/2017/05/06/archive-r48g-the-revolutionary-impulse-and-modernityantimodernity/>

<http://darwiniana.com/2017/05/06/archive-r48g-modernity-revolution-and-postcapitalism/>

R48G: what stance on religion from the left?

May 7th, 2017 ·

We have launched two salvos against Judeo-Christianity today (two older posts from earlier this year) and this leaves the whole question in the void of the chaotic range of definitions of the secular. It is true that the secular era of modernity initiated a trend against archaic religion (especially those of the Axial succession) but it did not as such reject those religions. We see a series of 'reformations' and then an increasing and progressive disintegration of the Judeo-Christian legacies.

The persistence of the confusion in a 'secular' Israel is a complication and seeming exception. But the Reformation is a contradiction with respect to its classic tradition and with respect to the rapid conservatizing of the remains of the 'religion', witness the disgrace of the right-wing Bible Belt. As to the question of Israel: the secularization of Judaism by all rights should critique the 'membership' criteria that have proven so destructive over the centuries: secularization ought to suggest (voluntary) assimilation beyond the cultural identity politics of Jewish religious membership. We see instead a (transient, no doubt) play on two sides of a fence in a geopolitical innovation created by Zionists who tend to have no religious tenets in the classic sense. The extraordinary outcome of the Holocaust demands however a careful treatment of the questions raised by persistent, but disintegrating, Judaism.

A hopeless mess but the best solution if to liberate Christians from their legacy at which point the Judaic will accelerate its dissipation.

But if we challenge Christianity the question remains, what was the meaning of its history, what was the nature of its theology, what is the reality of 'salvation' as a spiritual 'path', and is its 'faith' emphasis really the right approach given the gross character of what is demanded as belief?

The problem here is that the 'secular' has been captured by a mélange of confusions that drive many backwards to a religious perspective. In the nonce the whole cultural sphere of modernity is under assault by so-called New Age restorations of gnostic, mystical, yogi/Buddhist traditions and these to a first view seem destined to replace monotheism with a new set of beliefs. It is true that these traditions

have something to say to the impoverished content of monotheism, but the appearance is deceiving as these 'oriental' contributions begin to founder in their own 'reformations'.

We can't resolve all these issue very easily. For example, can a committed secularist really claim that 'salvation' is a myth. It is not so easy to dismiss this idea. But the irony is that Christianity could never properly define 'salvation' as a cult of passive membership while the onset of secular modernity suggests both a vigorous debriefing of the concept, and most remarkably, a better set of definitions of its meaning.

The point is merely that the secular humanists have no properly critique either monotheism or religion in general, while the New Age attempts to supercede the tradition are themselves victims of their own traditions.

A leftist take on all of this requires a vigorous critique but not necessarily a dogmatic scientism as a substitute. The questions here were addressed by the philosopher Kant who warned that the critique of metaphysics could work both ways and that question of religion and reason was no so easily resolved by the legacy of physics fundamentalism.

The left needs to create a very large tent, operate with a dash of Feuerbach but more generally an historical-research perspective that is truly dialectical and properly equipped to really deal with religion in a fashion better than the sterile views of secularism with a dash of Nietzsche. The secular humanists have produced an aborted outcome to the passing of Axial Age religions and the system will be driven over and over to try and reinvent religion. The left can't really resolve the issue of religion without a larger perspective than marxist idiocy on the history of religion. A warning to conduct some better research and to avoid trying to manufacture baseball-cap true believers in a reduced view of scientism turned into its own religion.

In some ways, the left might simply stand by and let the post-reformation take its course: these religions have a huge outstanding momentum but slow but surely their fate is sealed.

+++++

two earlier posts today:

Israel and Jewish supremacist chauvinism and covenantal historicism as racist propaganda...Jews have no right to some special homeland and must become a population among many...

February 16th, 2017 ·

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public/XML_DARW_GC_Axial?preview=9780984702947_txt_Enigma_of_the_Axial_Age.pdf

Figuring out the history of ancient Israel requires a new perspective on world history: here the 'eonic model' of the axial age can help. The myth of divine intervention in ancient Israel is so primitive it is almost barbaric. It is unfair to the world's poor exploited by religion to be still promoting Jewish spiritual superiority with its crypto-supremacist tactics up to and including control of the American government.

It is not true, false, that Jews have a special relationship with god. It was an illusion foisted on Jews by the axial age effect which included a far vast set of focal groups. The axial age was not a form of divine revelation.

Challenging religious exploitation in the israeli religious abortion //Dismantling the judeo-christian religions...israel as rogue state...judaism's fraudulent history

May 7th, 2017

The judeo-xtian titanic is foundering in its own contradictions. We have a right and a duty to expose the abuse of theology, christian and judaic that is using biblical myth/propaganda to promote/exploit Israel in the name of religious belief concerning the Old Testament. The account of Israelite history in the classic Bible can no longer stand the test of modern rational/historical enquiry.

These believers have lost the right to such fictions which are used to such destructive purposes.

Source: Dismantling the judeo-christian religions...israel as rogue state...judaism's fraudulent history

R48G: revolutionary musings/abstractions? and a Kantian perspective....

May 6th, 2017 ·

We have cited an older post from this spring on the subject of views of history and 'Kant's challenge' to find the logic or pattern of history.

The question of revolution lurks in the background of all our discussions irregardless of our stance as to its efficacy beyond abstraction.

Let us note that in a situation where many activists cannot endorse revolutionary action, not surprising perhaps, our idea of 'virtual revolution' is a useful reminder that whatever the practicality or realistic hope for revolutionary change the fragmented issue activism of too many distracts from attempting to integrate a full platform of issues, projects, and aspirations in the fields of economy, politics, and

culture. Prominent here must be the issue of climate and ecology and the ongoing disaster of global warming.

This virtual revolution can help us to confront the system as is in a realistic manner, however seemingly unrealistic the prospects for 'over the barricades' civil tumult. The point here is that dealing in abstractions of comprehensive social change isn't totally fruitless: ideas proclaimed can and will induce change, if only to induce chattering teeth in elites who in fact know only too well how corrupt the current american system really is. So, at the least, abstractions can be the first budge toward moving the giant rock.

And it is necessary to reinvent political activism, as we have suggested here many times. We might reiterate our postmarxist perspective by citing the figure of Kant and his idea of history proceeding toward a 'perfect civil constitution'. The rise of modern politics are it suddenly remorphed into democratic, then socialist, revolution, reflects this obvious question that has degenerated into the post-hegelian nonsense about the 'end of history'. Modernity shows a kantian progression toward a 'perfect civil constitution', but obviously the result is far short of perfection! So we have made progress but the process is still underway. This is a far more intuitive version of the question that isn't muddled by the sophistry of the trick play called the 'end of history'.

The kantian perspective can be useful to think in practical terms about the need to not get stalled in the realization of constitutional evolution. And we learn the lessons given by the early socilaists and then marxists that the democracy breakthrough was challenged from the start by the ambiguity over the idea of freedom and its early libertarian/capitalist corruptions. In a way Kant is one of the sources here despite his stolid early liberalism and his work spawned a parallel version of socialism based on a core notion of the 'republic of ends', a system that respected the rights of all men taken equally in a system of politics.

Capitalism assisted in one way and denied in another the trend toward equality and now we see a system out of control as a neo-totalitarian capitalist/oligarchic pseudo-democracy controlled by capital. The grounds for a new transformation/progression toward an improved 'civil constitution' is screamingly obvious. But here the bolshevik corruptions of such tenets has alienated the general public from what otherwise is its insistence now on democracy. That insistence must inform the degenerated version of marxism we see in the Russian revolution. We need to recast the whole subject and this requires deriving a new politics based on equality, or equalization, and ideas of freedom that cannot be sacrificed to economic mythology such as the fictions of free markets.

We rapidly produce a recursion of the early logic of the socialists who deduced the clear logic of 'communism' from the principle of fairness, as the status of social production reverts to a commons. This need not forgo the question of market which might thrive as will under the aegis of the Commons.

The point here is that the Kantian perspective is a constitutional praxis, an completely intuitive, where the marxist canon has too ambitiously attempt to create a science of economic developmental systems. Such theories are an obstacle now because they have been repeatedly challenged, and produce obstinate opposition in a majority of the public.

an older post:

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.

R48G: modernity, revolution and postcapitalism...

March 13th, 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 reinvolve 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.

R48G: the revolutionary impulse and modernity/antimodernity

March 13th, 2017

One of the ironies of the analysis of the antimodernists and their calls for some kind of 'new age' epoch (the aquarian age meme was one such piece of nonsense) is that modern revolutionary dynamism itself is both modern and antimodern at the same time:

the revolutionary impulse (nothing like the modern 'revolution' really existed in earlier eras) has tended to promote the 'modern' against the 'medieval' but it soon enough became clear that a set of secondary 'revolutions' would be needed to complete modernity. (A related example is the chaotic legacy of, say, the english reformation between henry/8, the english civil war and its restoration, a spectacle of not being able to get it right). The classic case is the nineteenth century left with its canonical codification by marx/engels: the idea of the 'last revolution' has the implication that a postcapitalist era will emerge in reaction to the contraction of modernity in the downshifted version of capitalist economic organization.

We have suggested a more generalized version of such a revolution as a 'floating fourth turning point' (referring to the 'eonic effect'). i.e. some kind of economic revolution balanced with a full platform of cultural aspects that can forestall revolutionary oversimplification. The 'revolution' of modernity was itself such a transformation, a warning of the complexity of the task of postcapitalist social reorganization.

It is worth studying the case of the greek enlightenment in the axial age and its related roman degenerations. By analog to attempts to castigate modernity we might charge greece with roman sins: obviously that doesn't work. The obvious point was for rome to have realized the greek enlightenment. In the same fashion we must be wary of blaming the early modern for the deviations and degenerations of those who come later. The whole point is to realize modernity not to abolish it. But that is not an easy task given the tremendous complexity of the early modern.

R48G: the prosperity illusion

May 5th, 2017

The activist is often prone to use bad economic conditions, e.g. the crisis of 2008, to make a case, but we live in a strange time: the evidence of relative prosperity is as good a field of protest as any. This morning we hear of relatively good employment stats, for example, and low unemployment, but we must in fact redouble our efforts at critique because we no longer live in the context of economic optimism (and its hidden discontents) based on growth, prosperity, jobs, and technological euphorias.

The grim fact is that in the situation we find ourselves in the reality of growth is part of the problem. And that situation is the reality of developing climate catastrophe. So must if anything redouble our critique precisely when the system appears to right itself. In fact the prosperity illusion needs especial expose because it blinds us to the self-destructive endgame underway that probably spells the endgame of pure unrestricted capitalism...

R48G: an extended minimalist approach...a maximalist approach...

May 5th, 2017 ·

Having produced a solid result with a minimalist approach we are soon on the spoor of an more systematic examination, with a maximalist approach in the background.

The latter can undermine the value of what we are doing and implies a closed theory with a causal structure that impinges on science. As we proceed we discover that is unrealistic and find an extended minimalist approach is better. we can pursue this tomorrow, to let the minimalist idea sink in. But as we examine our discovery we rapidly see the larger implications of our non-random pattern. The pieces of a puzzle start to fit, even if the total puzzle remains unsolved. The analogy is apt: we can solve locally some parts of a puzzle without completing the whole thing. In history this is related to the fact that we discover our non-random pattern only since the invention of writing and the existence of an historical record, an indication the only reason we can't proceed is lack of data, mouthwatering. In any case detecting a non-random pattern makes us examine the data very closely indeed and we rapidly discover many more pieces to the puzzle and we are soon able to make some partial conclusions based on the meaning of what we are seeing. Consider: if the partial puzzle shows a 'face' or a 'house' we can conclude that the puzzle has meanings and isn't a random abstract pattern, this even without the whole pattern. We will conclude this discussion later, but we can point to some tentative conclusions:

contra Popper, history has meaning

we suspect that random evolution arguments are bogus: development is non-random (the point should be screamingly obvious if we examine biological organs and their directed functions)

history appears to show a developmental sequence

we can close in on the particulars very easily in proximate antiquity, ditto but to a lesser extent for earlier antiquity.

this analysis trips the warning light: speculative...but the balance of evidence makes randomness look crackpot...

economic explanation is too reductive: the economic interpretation of history isn't going to work

history shows meaning and thus shows the action of values in the realm of fact, a very simple, minimalist, yet overwhelming conclusion in the context of attempts at 'science'

we cannot close on a causal theory and must remain with our 'extended minimalist' approach that can depict history in the context of the non-random without false efforts at theory...

we can easily update a postmarxism here to create a more useful view of history as a platform for the left...(Liberals are quite free to use it also, but as we shall see the conservative reactionary views of history are in some ways falsified...as we will see)

The eonic effect: an absolutely minimalist approach...a warning: conventional historiography darwinism, scientism have (probably) gotten history wrong...

May 5th, 2017 ·

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

The study of history can be greatly clarified by the study of the so-called 'eonic effect' but the treatment tends to be too complex for many, to start. More than that this approach violates the canons of historiographical dogma that enforces a very peculiar perception of history. Here the reign of darwinism has completely corrupted all attempts to correct limited perceptions. And the charge of 'speculative' history also enforces a kind of dusty flat history that cannot allow any consideration of historical dynamism. And the marxist canon is very dogmatic on the issues of historical materialism.

The question of the eonic effect is beyond the pale and is suppressed from any consideration or discussion. It is also a highly complex perspective that given its sins against darwinism seems to be a speculative piece. So we might suggest a different approach: the simple and minimalist use of systems analysis to find a model that might fit better than the usual 'flat history' muddle.

How do we do that? Simple: does world history show evidence of a non-random pattern? This can be decisive. If you see a rustling in the bushes in the distance, that is non-random, it could be wind, or some active entity. But it draws our attention as derandomizing. The prime assumption of the era of darwin is the randomness of history, the lack of any structure, meaning, dynamic, or long range directionality. Such a perspective is almost absolute in its dogmatic force. But at the core of the enlightenment we should note the great philosopher Kant asked a question, or a set of questions about these issues, and essentially asked if history shows a non-random pattern. Causal processes can generate non-random processes, to be sure (e.g waves on the ocean) so we must evaluate different forms of this. But, basically, a non-random pattern in our sense is any evidence of a dynamic, direction, meaningful macro

effects on any level. Kant is useful because he derives issues of 'freedom' in the context of his era of Newtonian science.

Once we ask this question, with Kant as a discipline in the background, the answer arrives fairly quickly. To answer we can use simple inspection or we can apply a simple systems analysis, e.g. is there any kind of 'frequency pattern', or more simply any kind of 'non-random' pattern? As to inspection we see that modern historiography has stumbled on a stunning pattern of synchronous action in the evidence of the Axial Age. It is interesting that Kant said that his question was premature and that the answer to it would have to come in the future. Sure enough the nineteenth century with its explosion of research began to show the effect called the Axial Age, one of the smoking guns indeed. As to the frequency approach the evidence of the Axial Age itself suggests it is a phase in something larger. But the systems analysis approach starts with frequency intervals: one, two, ...ten, twenty, fifty...centuries,etc...The ancients did this for us and were obsessed with historical cycles and ended up in a muddle over cycles of the Great Year, which doesn't work but its wavelength of ca. 22 centuries is suggestive but it misses the real pattern. To be fair the ancients could apply at most two points on a line and were confined thus to a one cycle system, hopeless, with the cosmological speculation in fact irrelevant, but they suspected remarkably a cyclical system on the order of two millennia. We have more data now, and can produce at least three points on a line, with two intervals and the onset of a third, not hopeless, if still limited.. But if we lay out a grid and test variants of this from about 18 to 26 centuries we discover at once, and given our greater modern data, that 24 centuries stumbles at once on a limited but remarkable frequency pattern and, more, this immediately includes the extra side evidence of the Axial Age: so our answer is tentatively answered: history shows a very suggestive non-random pattern, and this induces collapse in the stock of those claiming such things don't exist. Thus there is an unmistakable non-random pattern stretching from ca. 3000 to 600 BCE, to around 1800 AD, with leadup periods just before these dates. Three beats is not much, enough to be confident something non-random is at play, but not enough to fully close on some kind of theory. We can do better than this, but the minimalist approach can be helpful in dealing with skeptics, not really skeptical and dogmatic about random history/evolution.

This is unnerving: almost all views of history are wrong, and ditto for the claims that 'evolution' is purely random: non-random patterns aren't supposed to exist. That's a darwinian dogma and in fact since we have discovered a non-random pattern, so the assumption is probably false.

We can leave it there, as a warning: conventional historiography probably gets history wrong, as do darwinian assumptions, the enforcers of randomness.

This minimalist approach can leave it at that: we have a first intimation of the solution to Kant' question and a warning that conventional analysis has gotten the whole question wrong. We can't be sure but we must frankly suspect that the assumptions of random historical emergence are wrong.

We can perform also a kind maximal approach attempting to create a definite model but for the moment we can simply warn skeptics in the field of history and evolution that history shows non-random pattering, and that flat history approaches are probably wrong.

Toward a new leftist perspective on history

April 30th, 2016 ·

WHEE abridged for another Kindle edition, cheap

The first iteration this morning is flawed and the correction will come online this weekend, but the basic point (you can also use the full online edition) is to offer marxists something better than historical materialism as an historical theory. A lot of people are hoping this book will disappear, but with Kindle a book is probably in existence for good, famous last words...

Marxists are confused about history and hopelessly stubborn here, but the issue is simple. As a theory histomat fails, despite its rough cogency. That means that if you pitch historical materialism as a critique of capitalism, the critique is false, as even second rate sociologists can quite easily point out. How did marxism get stuck here? Again, rough cogency would have been enough. But the purpose of theory was to attempt, in nineteenth century naivete, to force the issue with skeptics: this is science, so you have no choice, etc...

It isn't true because base and superstructure don't connect in the way claimed. A much simpler and more practical view is much more useful: societies are complex wholes and economies are only one aspect of their function.

Let me repeat that: if you propose marxist core thinking, capitalist critics will simply say the theory is false. Period. Ditch the theory and focus on the empirical descriptive approach of exposing class, ideology, and economic theoretical illusion. Leave the burden of false theories on the capitalists, and they are vulnerable.

We cannot solve the problem of theoretical history so easily, and WHEE shows why, and offers a simpler approach, although the book is a bit daunting and tackles darwinism which will make it out of the question for the secular crowd which has been so brainwashed by darwinism even marxists are crippled here. Five minutes with an ID critic might help to get squared away here, but they are beyond the pale, even if we set aside their 'design' logic. It has nothing to do with religion. Or something like Soren Lovtrup (many selections on this blog) who protested the fraud of darwinism decades ago, along with many others. But we are stuck in a strange situation, where established brainies like physicists either lie or are confused about evolution. Marxists aren't far behind.

Checkmate for marxists: they assume a theory of evolution that is easily shown to be false, and game over.

WHEE offers a way to hedge out of this morass: an empirical study of a system of evidence with many suggestive properties. We don't have to adopt either its full perspective or its incipient 'non theory' to have a rough outline that shows a clear dynamic taken as a rough bird's eye view. It is enough to rewrite

the basic thrust of Marx/Engels without the positivist quicksand they fell into. And you must include free agency in the account. And stay away from dialectic. Dialectic is used to create a theory of revolution. False. Checkmate. Game over.

Here the construct is meta-economic. That means people create economies and people can unmake them. No economic determination is needed as theory.

WHEE is unfortunately too exotic for most in the science field, but their failure is clear here. It cannot be used to 'refute' such a simple approach (which rapidly gets a little complicated with some conjectures in the form of a model. It contains its own definition of 'evolution' with a simple and elegant deduction of a basic model. Because the model is a glove over a data set its value and limitations are apparent.

The value here is not the model necessarily, but a rough outline of world history, a way to point to a possible dynamic without a theory, a place for free agency, a much better approach to economics/revolutions, and a larger humanistic perspective. Marxists have forgotten the earlier attempts by Kantian ethical socialists at the end of the nineteenth century to rescue marxism from its core idiocy. Instead we got a whole crowd of knuckleheads like Plekhanov and the endless muddle of classic marxism with its full complement of dialectical moonshine.

There is a simple way out of this mess, and a rough subset of the too vast WHEE could make a good way to do historical 'theory' without theory. WHEE is a little outlandish, but its basic framework is simply a description, not a causal theory.

As for darwinism, why not just be agnostic? Over and out. We see evolution as a fact in deep time, but we don't really see its mechanisms.

Let me repeat my basic point: marxists come on as, we are profound, and smart, look at this theory called historical materialism, the result of someone very smart working for years.

Make your pitch, and anyone with a freshman level of theory can simply call your main spiel false. Period. And Marx suffered writer's block for fifteen years because he couldn't get the theory to work. He finished grew exhausted and gave up, and left the pile of papers to Engels to sort out.

The earlier era of the 40's and the humanistic Marx/Engels is more useful and a good legacy (although the German Ideology began the confusion of historical materialist theory).

Red Fortyeight Group: now or never...

February 29th, 2016

<http://darwiniana.com/2016/02/28/passing-of-the-social-plutocratsscratch-democrats/>

The world isn't ready for neo-communism, but it wasn't/isn't ready for either social democracy or, gasp, socialism as referenced by Sanders, the reason it forever goes into 'next election' mode. But Sanders has shown that the times have changed: a new public is stirring. But the world has never been ready to confront the nature of economic dysfunction and the real and intrinsic failure of capitalism in a crisis of increasingly desperate climate change. So the point is to prompt the original idea of 'what to do' inherited from the successors to the French Revolution who saw that a theory of economy and class was needed: presto, Marx. But the idea of communism predates Marx who is therefore in principle what we must be, inheritors of the original idea.

The legacy of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, is so scrambled together and fixed in dread that it becomes a question: should we re-inherit the original 'communist' idea bypassing Marx? Marx confronted a situation with so many confused projects and crackpots that without him, next to Engels, the idea might have died on the vine. But can we reiterate the original brilliant thesis as is? Probably not. Thus we displace Marx into Old Testament mode as we re-create a New Testament synthesis that doesn't end up forever nervous-nellied by the dread specter of Stalin. The point is that all the indications for a passage to postcapitalism are present, but not if they follow the groove of mechanizing thought that overtook the left with the Second Internationale. A true neo-communism will be something completely different from yet faithful to the old, and not derail in the 'same old rut' that has effectively silenced the marxist left. The issue is a sensible project that inherits democracy even as it moves to recreate it in a postcapitalist form. The issue is the 'bourgeoisie and Big Capital': the point about the proletariat was that they should simply take over this minority nexus of false power. There Marx's brilliant idea about proletariats may have confused the issue. As it turned out the proletariat wasn't necessarily very revolutionary, and increasingly less as social democratic sugars took hold of barricade emotion. In a pinch, we can finesse Marx's brilliant innovation with an idea of the 'Universal Class' as the enzyme of proletarian revolution, which is equivalent to majority revolution able in principle to easily overcome, it is supposed, the small cabal of the bourgeoisie.

Done right the communist idea should have prevailed more easily, without the ideological baggage that ended by defeating the first attempt. Marxism should have eschewed 'historical materialist' reductionism and done what the Kantian socialists in some alarm rushed in to do, to correct: the lack of a robust secular humanism, with a critique of reason, a canon of the human will or free agent, like the old religions who always knew this the core of their own revolutions, even despite the 'tyranny of god', an ethical perspective, and the original understanding of the dialectic. These may be recycled religious cliches, but they are recycled and without them your movement is a league of frankensteins. The world of Marx was confused by the sudden onset of scientism, darwinism, positivism, in the wake of the great Hegelian phantasm. A new and very simple recasting of the otherwise significant 'historical materialist' view of history as a narrative of free agents can save a radical movement going into shutdown as did the bolshevik as its axioms turned rancid in the mechanization of the already flawed Second Internationale. This larger approach leaves revolutionaries with the freedom to 'revolt against economic determinations' which aren't determinism.

This is but one of the aspects that can be easily modified to create a more robust package that those, e.g. climate activists turning in circles, can use without fear of inflicting dictatorship, secret police, and

cement block economics on projects already difficult enough: the point is to face the reality of the facade of democracy and move in the name of neo-communism to create a real democracy, in the context of the many side issues like climate change. A revolution, if that occurs, must be a passage to a new democracy, but it doesn't follow that it is a democracy already. That is why revolutions are chancy. But they don't have to be that way. A clear statement of particulars can make the whole process something that puts the Russian revolutionary nightmare into ancient history.

There are a whole series of intermediate possibilities, short of what must be the final target, as we remain clearly aware of the dangers of compromises: one is the reduction of private Capital to State control and mediation. We could solve the climate crisis in a week in such a system. Such a system could even leave markets in place, up to a point, and simply regulate any and all industrial projects. What other alternative is there? The world has known, along with Exxon Mobil capital gang, since the 1980's that a crisis was approaching, yet now thirty-five years later we have an election where none of the candidates can discuss climate change or simple New Deal projects, like health care, without an dose of the increasing reconditioned public force-fed supercharged greed via Ayn Rand.

So a new platform can echo Marx but should raise a single cavil from those who smell Stalinism in the Post Office.

Post-marxist neo-communist activism now! from the Old Testament of Marx/Engels to the New Testament of ...get your 'admit one' ticket to the Red Fortyeight Group

November 29th, 2015 ·

Last and First Men suggests a way to create a stylized post-marxist left leaving its core intact. It is not clear why, but the 'communist' legacy in its various (american) groups is defunct, and where a socialist gambit via Sanders took off like a rocket, perhaps cresting even now, the further left is still in the starting chewing cud of regurgitated oats.

It would help to break the mechanical connection with the past in the process finding how that actually connects to the past. The post-marxist left needs to decree Marx/Engels to be the Old Testament and get started on the New Testament of neo-communist activism, electoral and revolutionary. The marxist legacy is sterile now, and not in tune with the times, or, for that matter its critics. There is too much cultic dogmatism and it is paralyzing thought.

A few strategies can help: step out of the historical materialist world view and replace it with a stylized take on the economic in history. Broaden 'materialism' to a more general dialectic of modernity that can allow neo-comunists to communicate with monotheists, buddhist, confucians, and to a large community of modern perspectives, idealism, materialist, or whatever. Place materialism in the larger context of physics, and also move to include the whole of german classical philosophy in a dialectic of oppositions.

Devise a language of consciousness, a post-darwinian evolutionism, and a world view that is less pretentious and more 'nine-to-five' subway talk...derivations of something better usually result in more pretentious jargon. Maybe forget it, and get into something practical.

The revolutionaries of the American Republic tolerated no theories of what they were doing, and stayed with conversational descriptions. That's all the left needs. Historical materialism is a complex theory of history and it is impossible to prove and probably wrong. Dump it.

The ancient samkhya made spirituality materialistic, and the conclusion is that leftist materialism is fine but needs some pizzazz. Even that rightwing svengali gurdjieff knew the trick and talked about weighing god...the reactionaries have stolen the material framework of samkhya from the ancient left. This situation is idiotic.

The right has created a materialist view that can trip up the innocent leftist stuck on early nineteenth century materialism...

There's another way to go: stop thinking about and be ready to relate with newcomers who haven't learned the jargon.

In fact, all these questions are a waste of time at this point. Leave the old timers alone, but don't impose dogma on the newcomers...

The current climate demonstrations are the neo-communists starting point, and their 'universal class' to be a superset of the proletariat.

Thus nothing much needs to be done to revise neo-communism thinking: it is ordinary public language given a focus on the revolutionary transformation of capitalism. The Sanders gambit is probably going to fizzle out. The neo-communist left isn't ready and is going to twiddle its thumbs once again as the energy dissipates.

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.

Marxist views of religion are inadequate // The Marxist Critique of Religion: Dialectical Materialist Views – 2015

May 3rd, 2017 ·

The marxist take on religion (despite Engels' reasonable attempts to update the earlier materialism with an evolutionary view) is almost completely out of date. The origin of religion is actually an unknown, but the evidence of the eonic effect and in that context the Axial Age shows that conventional explanations secular or marxist are off the mark. The question of the material and the spiritual confuses all discussions. We don't have to reject 'materialism' as such to consider the 'spiritual' aspect of religion. A consistent world view is lacking on all sides and the muddle created by religionists is even worse than that of reductionist sociology. The issue won't go away and the nineteenth century views of Engels with the resulting dialectical materialism are no longer viable views for the left. Marxists fall into the trap of negating the 'soul' and cannot see that 'magic' is not some primitive superstition but an aspect of a species/man with a latent will. The religious mythologies of figures like Jesus have corrupted the original traditions here.

The Marxist Analysis of the Origins of Religion Marxism accepts the dictum of the earlier materialists, derived from Epicurus, that religion originated from the savage's awe and fear in the face of an inexplicable nature. However, making use of subsequent comparative mythology and its own

sociological insight, it has elaborated and expanded upon this observation. 'All religion... is nothing but the fantastic reflection in men's minds of those external forces which control their daily life,' says Engels (On Religion, p.147), 'a reflection in which the terrestrial forces assume the form of supernatural forces. In the beginnings of history it was the forces of nature which were first so reflected and which in the course of further evolution underwent the most manifold and varied personifications among various peoples.'

Source: The Marxist Critique of Religion: Dialectical Materialist Views – The Greenville Post

The left out in left field...Is Chomsky giving cover for Israel on 9/11 //Solving 9-11: The Deception That Changed the World: Christopher Lee Bollyn

May 3rd, 2017 ·

It is essential for the left to free itself from suppression of consideration of the 9/11 conspiracy. Denouncing all this as 'conspiracy theory' is a disservice to everyone else on the left who end up being ostracized by celebrity leftists who monopolize the 'bullshit front'. One can certainly take up a critique of the strong challenge/expose of Israel in this book but at this point the overall evidence taken minimally points to a covert operation involving the US, the Israelis with a role on the part of the Saudi covert agencies, we must suspect.

We must suspect in fact that attempts to give Israel cover have behind the scenes played a strong role here.

Source: Solving 9-11: The Deception That Changed the World: Christopher Lee Bollyn: 9780985322588: Amazon.com: Books

R48G: the hold of capitalist hypnosis and the failure of a science of either history or economics

May 1st, 2017

<http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/40376-it-is-profitable-to-let-the-world-go-to-hell-will-capitalism-doom-the-planet>

The absurdity of the current ideological fix on all publics with respect to the virtues of capitalism is beginning to crumble but the question of moving beyond capitalism has yet to gel as an actual social project of projects, notwithstanding the apparent commitment of the older left to just this. In fact, the ideological assault of fake theory has proven successful and the models of neo-classical economics have a hold on thinking that even physicists seem to buy into. It is remarkable the foundation of core economic theories is simply bogus and therefore that the prejudice unexamined of the efficacy of markets has been a hard sell. In the age of climate catastrophe and the inability of the 'capitalist public' to even grasp the danger is a late alert to the malevolent effects of and false assumptions about capitalist economies. Here the 'end of history' argument (like the Misesian counterattack on planned economics) have proven truly effective propagandas with hardly anyone grasping their pernicious fallacies in motion.

R48G: another potshot at Soros, clopen (closed/open) societies, and the DMNC approach to a true open society

May 1st, 2017 ·

We took a potshot at Popperian George Soros yesterday as the Svengali financier of the Climate March, and it is worth considering both the limits of Karl Popper's instant conservatism in the idea of the 'open society'. In the era of Stalin, the former socialist Popper was, like the early post-Trotskyite neocons, a convert to a flawed version of his own idea. In the neo-liberal era, the idea that capitalist domination is evidence of a true open society suffers skeptical collapse. Such societies have a corrupted freedom, a definite induced hypnosis including ideological fixation, and an increasing set of crypto-totalitarian tendencies/agencies/covert control mechanisms that beggar the idea of an open society. It is thus more than obvious that the whole question is on a reciprocal sliding scale with the freedom of markets inducing a loss of freedom in a majority with the need to equalize the question of 'capital formations' to redress the totalitarian aspect of capital domination. The simplest solution is claim that equality in an opens society requires equal access to and/or equal ownership of the means of production, typically in a Commons that is a de fact 'communism'. Touché to the neo/paleocon Popperians...

R48G: we are out of time to revise marxism but must do so in any case: the eonic model in the background can replace the failed historical materialism.

April 11th, 2017 ·

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

R48G: we are out of time to revise marxism but must do so in any case: the eonic model in the background can replace the failed historical materialism.

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 vitiating 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...

R48G: the eonic model as a tool

April 11th, 2017

Our post on the supposed 'african model' of history shows the inherent confusion arising from the imbalance of the macro effect. The result is a kind of 'me too' consideration that is often misguided.

Our model explains why so much great literature appears in the transition zones of the early modern, with spectacular effect, and then suddenly wanes in the wake of the transitional interval. This puts everyone in a strange position. After a while Shakespeare as a world-historical poet of the globalizing 'pidgin english' begins to pall and people begin to look at their own traditions. But we can also get wise to what is going on and see that the effect is to create a world culture to which all belong. And in any case the process of modernity globalization, despite the cavil of the reactionary gurus and postmodernists has been a spectacular success and has created already a global oikoumene of shared modernism. So we might be wary of kicking a gift horse in the mouth even as we move to critique the outcome of this prodigious show of the eonic effect. The same confusion arose in antiquity with the Israelites who unfortunately thought themselves bound in a special relationship with god, to the unending confusion of later religion. The Israelites were certainly in the right place at the right time and spawned (along with the Persians, we forget) the lineage of monotheism. But we must in the modern case move to prevent any suggestion of Eurocentric superiority, the result would destroy the whole era. Let us note the parallel and eerily synchronous buddhism appearing in almost direct concert with Israelite monotheism, soon to spawn Mahayana and Christianity.

We can see the need for something like the eonic model as a successor to historical materialism and this can be adopted in a streamlined form as a model, that is as a tool. The issue is not a new belief system but a tool that is useful and can be adopted on provision. It points to a complicated reality but even on the surface it produces a handy way to resolve the confusions of historical development.

We can adopt a simple version of the eonic model, as a tool for historical inspection and a set of suspicions about the emergence of civilization:

civilization emerges in a complex set of transitions in a macrosequence

these transitions initiate new epochs and monopolize almost all ultra complex core cultural innovations at their starting points

technology Innovation) and economic development are not the same and show continuous histories...

Eras after the divide realize the implications of the transitional periods but may suffer decline in their 'middle' period (medieval?)

the Axial Age was a clear exemplar of the macro sequence which shows potential sequential and parallel aspects

this parallel/sequential aspect can be seen as a minimax of some kind to maximize teleological directionality and lateral integration as one process.

Modernity resumes the sequential logic after the lateral synchrony of the Axial Age, the reason is transparent: the endstate of globalization needs unique focus...

The transitions never repeat themselves and always restart at a frontier area, the so-called frontier or acorn effect: e.g. Israel at the frontiers of ancient Egypt, Persia at the frontier of 'Sumer', Greece at the frontier of the Middle East. India and China in this period are obvious related cases of frontier effects. Note thus that the modern transition occurs in one of the last areas of the Eurasian sphere...

This model can be used as a tool and then replaced with a simple chronology of epochs, and we see two such very clearly (probably seven in all starting 8000BCE Or even 10000), from 3000 to 600, then 600 to 1800, followed by a new epoch, the modern after 1500/1800 (our marker points are relative to 300 year transitions) showing the start of a new epoch in this series. We can see that we are already using this model! An example is our instinctive sense of the 'middle ages', clearly a sense of the middle section of the epoch emerging from the Axial Age (better called the Axial interval).

This model we should note is a generalization of the Israelite sense of the Axial period and thought it evidence of 'god' in history. This effect is NOT the result of theistic action, which would be cosmic (or to an atheist nonexistent), however and the point is obvious from the way it generates religion, secularism, in one and the same pattern. But this data does leave the question of 'where the blazes' does all this come from? We should adopt a provisional agnostic stance here, the value of our model which merely shows what is going on, not how. We have attempted a number of discussions of this in WHEE and Enigma of the Axial Age, but in the final analysis we don't understand our own process of evolution, in deep time and in history, but we do receive many indications of how to proceed and here is the crucial point: we don't have to produce a theory of this to proceed: the macro action as we perceive it is always in the past in a transient interval and we are left with a series of 'to do' potentials that we must realize as our own free action. We thus don't actually require the model but we would do well to at least hold it in reserve as tool. We will otherwise make all sorts of mistakes, e.g. history is random and shows not teleological. Using this model as a tool we get a strong red light warning that that is false.

This model is tailor made for postmarxist historiography but conventional science, historiography, evolutionism, and marxism will do everything they can to suppress this model. But perhaps not for long. As the reign of darwinism and scientism collapse people will begin to ask where they went wrong.

R48G: Eurocentrism, the eonic model and the left

April 11th, 2017 ·

The eonic model is too controversial for many but it explains very easily many of the questions that tend to vitiate real understanding such as the Eurocentric focus of accounts that peddle the idea of 'Western civilization' or the Christian West. The actual facts of the rise of the modern are so strikingly similar to those of Axial/Classical Greece in antiquity that we get a clue to something more complex. That modernity is as aspect of macro induction is too much for most, but the evidence suggests it, starting with the eerie timing of the whole complex of transition areas depicted in the model of the eonic effect

The problem with this developmental process is the ambiguity of macro and micro processes: the overall effect is benign while the larger sphere of influence falls into the hands of ambiguous exploiters, e.g. imperialists, exploiters...At least, in all cases, the phases of imperialism in the transition zones were short lived. The American case (which is not a transition zone for the early modern, although at the end it became a staging area for democratic emergence) with its late imperialism is now beginning to fall apart, we suspect.

The point here was well understood by Marx/Engels who saw clearly the transient effect of the rise of modernity in the transition zone in Europe and the crisis this provokes in the process of globalization. That the fate of modernity fell into the ambiguities of the capitalist globalization is a misfortune although in principle the process was projected as a benign potential. The modern transition is unique in the way it spawns a leftist challenge to the degeneration of modernity/globalization's imperialism and exploitation. It is important to see that the modern transition is not inherently a capitalist process and here the marxist left has tended to its own oversimplification. But the point is clear that our macrosequence, so pure in its spectacular initializations is at risk from the unmodified field of streaming history not directly effected by the larger process. The point is that the macro effect doesn't come with a police force and simply injects its transitional zone with creative influences, the outcome be what it may. Here the modernist transition needed desperately a counterpoint to its 'benign'/'malign' capitalist innovations and this was almost immediate in the almost providential appearance of figures such as Marx/Engels. Even with this the challenge to the capitalist tidal wave has been weak, and the Russian revolution has most unfortunately discredited the attempted correction. But the general point is clear: undiluted capitalism is not the same as the rise of modernity and requires desperately a corrective.

We can thus both strong endorse the marxist classic (with other parallel socialist and related movements) and yet caution at its limitations.

It would not be hard to correct the correction and it is important to consider that if the emergence of capitalism was grossly flawed the emergence of its challenger could itself shows its limits.

The value of the eonic model is that it demonstrates the logic of modernity in the context of larger world history and suggests a broder set of 'modern innovations' beyond the economic as a field of culture, soon to be warped by capitalist emergence. As noted the ambivalence of marxists/socialists is a crucial

aspect of this macro transition and yet these movements have not so far succeeded in their task of bringing capitalism into harmony with the emerging culture of modernity.

The question of Eurocentrism is solved at a glance by the eonic model: modernity (not the same as the Italian, etc, Renaissance) arises in exact timing 2400 years after the onset of the Axial Age in one of the last frontier zones (Europe) of the Eurasian field of emergence civilizations driven by the macrosequence. The modern transition from 1500 to 1800 produces a spectacular set of innovation in religion, science, politics, philosophy, literature, art, technology and economics. But the latter two categories are really independent social processes influenced by the macro effect to be sure, but not the same. Technological and economic streams and innovations can occur continuously in all eras and are not discontinuous injections. Some cases to be sure are borderline, capitalism itself perhaps, but the interaction of these processes is very complex. However, the sudden appearance of complex art, etc, on schedule, rapidly waning out of the timing interval, is almost impossible to explain by any other model. Why is it so much literature and art suddenly appear in our transition zones, Germany, England, France, etc, in the transition interval and then wane almost immediately after the divide. How explain a similar effect for modern music? We are totally outclassed by the eonic effect and barely know what hit us. We should put both the American and Russian cases as not really a part of the modern transition, but are sidewinders that become direct candidates for diffusion from the core zone.

This is at first a preposterous model of history but no other model can explain so many strange aspects of world history.

The dubious claims for Islamic/African sources of the modern//How African Muslims Civilized Spain

April 11th, 2017 ·

We commented on this yesterday: <http://darwiniana.com/2017/04/10/an-islamic-pipedreamheres-how-black-muslims-lifted-europe-out-of-the-dark-ages-news-telesur-english/>

I am glad Counterpunch reprinted this perspective which we commented on yesterday at another publication site.

The argument for the African origin of civilization and here a related argument as to Muslim Spain and modernity is a puzzling argument, and one that won't stand up to the evidence.

Overall the evidence suggests higher civilization emerges from the Neolithic in the Sumerian and parallel Egyptian transitions (well clarified by our eonic model) after gestation in the the Natufian/early neolithic and pre-Sumerian phases of the Levant, Anatolia, and northern Mesopotamia. Other parallel starting points are not ruled out, as such, and our 'eonic model' is a warning about the complexity of the evidence of parallel/independent emergence: we don't have the full evidence of the Neolithic but it would seem that the onset of that era occurred later in all regions adjacent to the Near Eastern source of later civilization, and that evidence suggests that the Neolithic is much later in Europe, India/China

and Africa. The Neolithic is not the same as the discovery of agriculture, as such, and the latter's possible multiple independent emergence in different areas is more than possible. But the Neolithic is a complex civilizational whole as a stage of historical development, witness the complex emergence of state religions in the temple complexes of northern Neolithic pre-Sumer. The influence of Egypt on Greece is clear from the record but this is much later, and quite in the wake of the onset of the 'first' phase of higher civilization (the real onset of near higher civilization might better be considered northern Sumer ca. 5500 BCE), e.g. well after 3000 BCE (Mycenean/Minoan phases), along with 'Mesopotamian'/Near Eastern diffusion in the same era. But from the perspective of the eonic model the sudden take off of Greece in the Axial Age, parallel to those of the Israel/Persian and Indic/Chinese zones (in the wake of Sumerian diffusion of the previous era) is part of our strange macro sequence. If that is too controversial it nonetheless is clear that Greece in its flowering in the Axial Age was part of the diffusion of the original phase of higher civilization, and there is no evidence that this is 'African' unless, of course, we mean Dynastic Egypt from which a strong field of diffusion into Africa occurred. By the time of the Greek Axial Age the African subcontinent was just beginning to enter its Neolithic and this era was probably prior to, for example, Bantu diffusion, meaning that much of the southern sector zones of Africa were still in the range of Paleolithic (e.g. San peoples). It was actually the contribution of western African peoples migrating to the full African sphere in the spread of its Neolithic that brought Africa to the first phase of (Neolithic) civilization. That Africa was a very difficult environment to master suggests the importance of this achievement (modern Europeans initially died in droves on entry into this complicated and dangerous environmental field).

These claims for African influences on Greece, or Islam/Spain are highly dubious and certainly don't account for the rise of modernity (a similar set of claims are often proposed for Islam without any African connection).

It is important to see that higher civilization came very late to Europe and it is really the diffusion from the Roman Empire that gestates what is to come later.

One can only recommend a careful study of the 'eonic effect' to get a suggestion as to the sudden take off of certain sectors of Europe in the sixteenth century. Modernity is thus no more 'European' than the Axial Age is Greek, or Israelite, Indic, etc... And it is important to see that the modern transition springs from a subset of European cultures, in all cases frontier areas of the old Roman imperium: Spain, France, England, Holland, Germany. The only model that can account for this is the eonic effect interpretation, whatever its problems.

The reason the Eurocentric interpretation prevails springs from the confusions over 'western civilization', christian chauvinism, etc... A closer look shows the connection to a larger developmental sequence and here the 'frontier effect' of the eonic model can help to see how the European transition (what we call modernity) in the period of the 'early modern' is, bafflingly, an aspect of the so-called macrosequence. If that is still controversial the fact remains that Islamic influences in Spain are a poor candidate for explaining the rise of the modern.

Source: How African Muslims Civilized Spain

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://darwiniana.com/2017/04/02/was-capitalism-a-mistake-we-are-probably-dead-by-capitalism-so-the-answer-is-clear/>

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 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.

R48G: will the celebrity driven/soros funded climate march make much difference?

April 30th, 2017 ·

Climate March news... (google link)

At a time of the critical transition of the climate into catastrophe we need more than marches (there could be marches with a more radical perspective, openly promoting a challenges to the current government). The march one must hope had far more effect than one might think but in the end the powers that be are confronting groups they know are in the end harmless, soros funded, gandhians, one day stand whoopers, and feckless marxist radicals who have given up revolutionary aims for conferences on historical materialism...

This is unkind but we need to stop climate calamity within a decade and Trump is trying to steal eight of those years. The whole game needs to be stopped now. The point here is that those who avail of 'marches' have a contribution to make, whatever their limitations, but this focus needs a larger platform, a framework that is comprehensive, and a critique of the whole current social/political system.

You can spot the phonies easily: they will call exposes of the 9/11 conspiracies

It is significant in this regard that most of those in these marches would not dare indulge a challenge to the system or support real socialism beyond the Sanders phony brand and they should yield or move to a new type of march: aggressive but still strictly legal 'evolutionary' protests with comprehensive platforms encompassing virtual revolution, socialist/ecological economics, real populism, ...:

climate change

the coming catastrophe

socialist/ecological populism

challenges to american imperialism, covert agencies

exposes of the 9/11 deep state

exposes of the hidden drug mafia in the covert agencies

the list is considerable ...but the basics of a comprehensive platform is needed with its own kind of march.

Tags: General

R48G: end of history or end of eonic sequence? man's true freedom can't emerge under domination by the market...

March 29th, 2017 ·

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...

Faith in 'god' is bullshit: xtian theology as a disguised atheist samkhya

March 16th, 2017 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=samkhya+xtianity>

We have pointed out many times here that 'pop theism' was always a distortion of the original monotheism (not that the prophets likely got it straight themselves): it leaves behind a clear clue in the glyph IHVH which was inherited from some unknown source and which indicated the problematical aspects of 'god talking'.

The latter xtian theory shows clear evidence of being a garbled version of the atheist samkhya with its cascade of cosmic 'laws', (1) 3 6 12 24 48 96. 'God' is in some fashion prior to the first manifestation of cosmic triads and is simply unknown or unknowable behind the primary manifestation of the first cosmic triad. The solution to the riddle of christian theological insanity is not hard and quite elegant but at this point a correction would prove an uphill battle. The church fathers performed a feat of grafting that is almost grotesquely 'frankensteinerian', the great god frankenstein indeed.

The eonic model as a replacement for historical materialism...time is short, take it and use it for a quickie replacement for marxist theory confusion

March 15th, 2017 ·

<http://history-and-evolution.com/>: we have produced a large number of books this year and all have open source pdf versions as listed at this website.

The books adopt the perspective of the eonic effect which is a strange approach to world history and evolution via a new type of dynamic systems model. I advocate that the world of (marxist) leftists move beyond historical materialism's reductionism and crypto-teleology in its stages of production theory along with its feuerbachianism (which can easily be updated, the left needs a religious critique), and finally its dialectical confusions, to some kind of new and updated set of perspectives. The left needs to get cracking and get this done asap.

Personally I recommend using the so-called eonic model from WHEE: this model has an immense number of advantages but is at first a bit daunting:

the model can be simplified to a frequency hypothesis and then reduced to a chronology of world historical eras or epochs

these epochs resemble a generalized punctuated equilibrium pattern and show a pattern of transitions inside these epochs

the epoch of modernity phases in with the early modern (1500 to 1800) in the frontier zone of a subset of Europe and is the successor to the axial age and its epoch

this transition rapidly generates a global oikoumene which now has a capitalist framework but the modern transition clearly generates a counterpoint socialism and the progression of the world system beyond capitalism was a potential indication from the start

the eonic effect is this set of epochal transitions and probably goes back to the neolithic or before

the model gives expression to an 'evolution framework' in the general category of 'evolution' and can be used to highlight the problems plaguing darwinism

the model shows a meta-teleological system which is both directional and yet open to free agency

in fact the model shows a resemblance to questions raised by the kantian teleomechanists who are the real founders of a theory of evolution

the modern also expresses well the basic idea of lamarck on evolution as a process on two levels

the model makes economic history a subordinate process inside the larger history and this allows free agents to modify such systems: there is no absolute stage of history called capitalism

the world system at the full tide of globalization is predicted to begin a shift beyond capitalism and the prophecy of the early socialists/ marxists remain relevant...

This model is neither material nor spiritual gives ample leeway to discuss religion, adopts the endpoint perspective of modernist secularism, and automatically enforces a complex discipline of counterpoint opposites.

this model is highly flexible and requires no dogmatic conversion or belief: a model is a model, if it helps to clarify the data we use it provisionally to clarify our circumstance. Ordinary views of world history are so far off that the discovery of a non-random process behind world history is a caution to our false views of scientific history.

This model can help to extricate thought from the false 'end of history' delusion about the inevitability of markets. Much of the marxist canon remains of use, e.g. the critiques of ideology, class struggle, etc...

You are already using a simplified version of the eonic effect (why do you use the term 'modern' or 'middle ages', etc...?)

This model is thus useful even under negation: you can try and apply a critique but you rapidly discover its meaning under negation (e.g. the system is teleological, the system is not teleological...). you shoot the model full of holes and it still remains more or less the same because it is based on patterns of data, e.g. the emergent cluster of archaic greece...

This approach can discuss secularism and religion in stride and is a useful account of the Old Testament genesis, the rise of proto-modernity in ancient greece, etc...

From enlightenment values to a generalized secularist modernism

March 15th, 2017

<http://darwiniana.com/2017/03/14/critiques-of-the-enlightenment/>

<http://darwiniana.com/2017/03/14/marxists-critiquing-enlightenment-give-me-heartburn-pen-l-fwd-enlightenment-values-no-thanks-louis-proyect-the-unrepentant-marxist/>

The leftist critique of the enlightenment (The classic Dialectic of the Enlightenment is the most famous case) is both understandable and usually misguided. We have suggested a larger project of founding a leftist movement on a generalized framework of modernity and that includes a full set of complements: religion and reformation, the scientific revolution, the revolutions of the early modern, liberalism, utopian, ideas of freedom, a revolution in philosophy (kant, hegel, schopenhauer...), the enlightenment as such in six versions, german, dutch, english, scottish, french, etc...

And so on. A useful framework is that of the eonic effect and the way it enforces a 'dialectical' spectrum of multiple opposites. A revolutionary left based on positivistic materialism of the nineteenth century is too narrow and has been left behind in the era when even quantum mechanics has challenged crude materialistic viewpoints.

The left had a natural ambivalence to modernity but in the end it must be able to create societies that are robustly modernist without eliminating all the social factors that we see in what we call the 'modern transition':

From Reformation to Revolution

A recent call for the left to adopt enlightenment values is excellent but too narrow: what are enlightenment values?

If we adopt the perspective of the eonic effect we can adopt a true universalism we consider as relevant the entire spectrum of civilizational histories shown in the so-called macrosequence...

The axial age, eonic effects and the 'gaia' meme//It's Time to Take the Gaia Hypothesis Seriously

March 13th, 2017 ·

We linked to an essay on the Gaian hypothesis and we can point to a cautious use of the 'meme' in the text subsequent to WHEE, Enigma of the Axial Age. The latter does something the former refuses to do which is to explore the Gaian idea. There is every possibility of getting this wrong so I have always been reluctant as in WHEE to corrupt the model with 'extras'. But the evidence of the eonic effect shows unmistakable evidence of a global effect in motion...

Source: It's Time to Take the Gaia Hypothesis Seriously

R48G: the revolutionary impulse and modernity/antimodernity

March 13th, 2017 ·

One of the ironies of the analysis of the antimodernists and their calls for some kind of 'new age' epoch (the Aquarian age meme was one such piece of nonsense) is that modern revolutionary dynamism itself is both modern and antimodern at the same time:

the revolutionary impulse (nothing like the modern 'revolution' really existed in earlier eras) has tended to promote the 'modern' against the 'medieval' but it soon enough became clear that a set of secondary 'revolutions' would be needed to complete modernity. (A related example is the chaotic legacy of, say, the English reformation between Henry/8, the English civil war and its restoration, a spectacle of not being able to get it right). The classic case is the nineteenth century left with its canonical codification by Marx/Engels: the idea of the 'last revolution' has the implication that a postcapitalist era will emerge in reaction to the contraction of modernity in the downshifted version of capitalist economic organization.

We have suggested a more generalized version of such a revolution as a 'floating fourth turning point' (referring to the 'eonic effect'). i.e. some kind of economic revolution balanced with a full platform of cultural aspects that can forestall revolutionary oversimplification. The 'revolution' of modernity was itself such a transformation, a warning of the complexity of the task of postcapitalist social reorganization.

It is worth studying the case of the Greek enlightenment in the Axial Age and its related Roman degenerations. By analog to attempts to castigate modernity we might charge Greece with Roman sins: obviously that doesn't work. The obvious point was for Rome to have realized the Greek enlightenment. In the same fashion we must be wary of blaming the early modern for the deviations and degenerations of those who come later. The whole point is to realize modernity not to abolish it. But that is not an easy task given the tremendous complexity of the early modern.

Up from historical materialism

March 9th, 2017 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/2017/03/08/historical-materialism-and-other-marxist-rubbish/>

It is not productive to start thrashing 'historical materialism' unless we are so hard-pressed we can't avoid it. We would do better to produce a better version. Our historical framework of the 'eonic effect' can do that with ease but the result no longer has the prime focus of economic determination or stages of production. But the phases of the eonic effect show any number of economic formation and we have but to study them in their empirical reality to fulfill the task of the analysis by historical materialism.

There, however, the 'stage' of capitalism ceases to be a modern stage of production and becomes a gestating tendency present since the neolithic and interacting very often externally with a core economic system. Its crystallization in modern times is thus both a new stage, perhaps, or else a decisive rendition of the whole historical becoming of so-called capitalism, armed with the financial mystique of 'capital'. But we might wager that 'capitalism' of that type was in reality invented by the sumerians. What we are dealing with is the nature of the state, economies, and political equality as objects of evolving societies where the declaration of communism is a way to reclaim the effects of capitalism for a new social whole. The end state, communism, makes complete sense as the logical outcome of restoration of the entities of primitive accumulation to the Commons, an almost axiomatic derivation of the idea. In any case, the question of slavery is very close in world history to that of capitalism and we have argued that, as far as we can assess the facts of the early sumer/egypt period onward the phenomenon of slavery was a distortion and a social disease, not an inevitable phase of economic society. In the early period of civilization this institution was marginal but slowly but surely became an endemic social misformation, becoming by the time of the Romans a calamity of civilization in the Occident. The slow transformation of society was partially remedied in the coming of christianity before the dread relapse in the modern period as the slave trade intensified and produced social anomaly. It was for this that marx tended to equate capitalism with the modern period but the larger reality is more complex.

A new historical model is needed to account for the social transformation of the christian world, for example. Our eonic model can handle these distinctions with ease and give a warning that spiritual powers must exist in a larger sphere of nature, although it is hard to detect their action. The crisis of rome strongly suggests such a spiritual intervention. Whatever the case as the unknowable, the fact remains that christianity, despite ending up the purveyor of social caste systems, was a revolutionary force at the start for equality and this was more than a question of economics...

In all of this the real core meaning or intent of the concept of historical materialism 'sort of' works and we would be wary of trying to revise a settled canon, unless we must. I fear we must. It need not be divisive. Marx's brilliant thesis, while its theorems suffer failed proofs, more or less got it right. But we must at this point be prepared as free agents in history to propose and carry out the axioms of the commons, communism, as a freely generated social transformation because that is the right thing to do. An ethical assertion in the context of fallacies of economic stages...

Actually, all that is needed is to snap our of concept hypnosis and deal with practical situations.

Jesus Christ Commie...toward a futuristic/revolutionary radical reformation and an 'atheist' theology

March 3rd, 2017 ·

I am not a spiritual prophet but I sometimes wonder if non-prophets couldn't do a better job renewing the subject than those who might make such claims and/or those who adhere to a core doctrine.

A radical reinvention of christianity in a new reformation could lead the religion into a new future for a new era, but only if it can reckon its theological history in a truthful fashion beyond biblical distortions.

It would seem the first step is to play a trick on modern secularism by considering an 'atheist christianity'. Let's put the term 'atheist' in quotation marks and consider that the 'pop theism' that came into existence over time is not the original of the hebrew prophets. In any case a renewed christianity doesn't need god superstitions and can consider a far more intelligent brand, one that is not based on faith or doctrinal dogmatism.

A sufistic or advaita concept of 'god' could completely transform the ancient superstition that turned into a runaway theological idolatry of a crypto-pagan one/god pantheon.

And a future christianity should reinvent itself around the left as a revolutionary social movement that can fulfill the earlier dialectic of the reformation, calvinist capitalism versus munzerian proto-communism...

A leftist christianity could provide a vehicle for a transition beyond the stupidity (and israel propaganda) of the current declining mess of pottage. There are many ways to reinvent the subject and many aspects of a revamped religion that can move through modernity in a way that might actually prove helpful...

A good starting point is the assertion that without the 'resurrection' there is no religion. Nonsense. we can pull the plug on the whole game by exposing the belief system based on the resurrection.

R48G: virtual revolution? Trump's criminal climate policy is grounds for a new politics, and asks for a sacrifice of the present for the future

March 2nd, 2017 ·

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Toward+a+New+Communist+Manifesto_jlandon_kindle_10_11_16_PDF_ver2.pdf

Confronting the reality of what is underway and the potential calamity in the making we tend 'lost consciousness' about the reality as the other aspect of that reality (our ability since we will not live to see the full disaster to shift the disaster onto the next generation) makes us ignore the need for some kind of action.

Americans have given birth to a civilization that is a monstrosity and its remedy requires some kind of revolutionary challenge. We have proceeded from the virtual revolution, to the potential for a non-violent activism to a non-violent revolution, to the steps to an actual revolutionary future. What do we make of all this?

All we can do is to aggressively 'shout in public' about the crime against humanity in progress from the US system, which is a basically criminal operation of global predators...

This system is vulnerable, however, and a determined social movement could bring it to the brink of discontinuity.

An older post: the 'end of history' confusion and its ideology

February 28th, 2017

this was: <http://darwiniana.com/2016/05/11/beyond-the-end-of-history-meme/>

Kant and the philosophy of history/Amazon

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 Kojève 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, Kojève, 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.

Transitions between civilizations: meta-religions, floating fourth turning points, the future of secularism

February 27th, 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 internationale, 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...

R48G: DMNC, working class, universal class//The Prophet: Deutscher's Trotsky

February 25th, 2017 ·

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

This is a compelling summary of both trotsky's bio and the history of the russian revolution. That history raises a large number of questions and invokes a factual history of great complexity. We need to carefully assess that history and yet at the same time we should realize that the ground has shifted under our feet and we live in a situation different from that of the second international onward. We must be wary of getting stuck in the past. The key issue is that we don't really need to compute stages of revolution and/or trotsky's 'permanent revolution'. In the US we have a developed capitalist economy, and most ironically a working class whose status is ambiguous: it is really a middle class phenomenon and thus not dissimilar to the 'petit bourgeoisie' (?). It is thus a disappearing class, for this and other reasons, e.g. globalization, automation, etc... And our particular formulation with three sectors could assist the study of the issue of agriculture by being flexible: can have planed, capitalist, and small scale agricultural enterprise, the latter perhaps in transition to a larger system and technically a part of the Commons but as if privately owned. Or whatever...The point of the 'third sector' is evade the creation of a monstrosity of total state control...

We confront a very different situation, and in many ways the problem has become simplified (although the question of revolution remains very 'unsimple!'): we need a transition to a postcapitalist system that has been designed in advance and whose principles need to be implemented constitutionally. We need a fully thought out and comprehensive solution, which includes solutions to the problems of democratic politics, in the context of a neo-communist system, solutions to the problems of military industrialism, imperialism, covert agencies, the deep state, and importantly the fiasco of israel. Reading this history one gets the sense that marxism made the problem too difficult. We agonize over the working class, mostly in vain. We have suggested a focus on 'the' or 'a' universal class, which really means a complex alliance of classes or subsectors, and this can immediately turn around and evoke the working class subset. But it can just as well focus on sectors of the middle class. The point is that beyond classes lie

individuals and it is individuals who join parties, movements, and who must be a vanguard to lead a revolution. Instead of wondering if classes will remain true to socialism we ask how a vanguard can construct a fair and honest constitutional system that fulfills a platform of neo-communism, economic dynamics, and economic rights and ways and means to create a 'real democracy'.

We have developed economies and don't need, thank god, a five year plan of forced industrialization or a war with a peasantry. We can simply bypass all of that.

And we must design this so the issue of 'socialism in one country' and all its agonizing dilemmas and history become dead letters: we must design a democratic market neo-communist solution for one country and yet this system can still relate to a globalization context that might still be stuck in transition to postcapitalism and still subject to capital. How such a system would replace the internationales and/or comintern, etc..., is up in the air, but soluble. The US would face a real challenge here but could lead the way to a larger system which can 'lego block' its way into a federation of socialist systems, ...

It will be hard for legacy marxists to deal with what seems heresy as to the working class. I would say relax: we don't have to change anything. Instead a change in conceptual terminology creates a superset of the older set of concepts. We can focus on the working class in its older aspect any time we want. But a larger field opens up as we stop struggling to play yoyo with the tricky 'working class' and get about the business of creating social equality in a constitutional system.

There is still a working class, globally. We must be very careful to be able to change gears there and adapt our flexible framework to solidarity on the way to a global system of postcapitalism.

The life of trotsky is a compelling saga and should be a part of our canon, but at the same time we should be wary as with lenin of thinking we have sort out all the issues of the older legacies. Much of it has slipped into history...

"There is now no one except me to carry out the mission of arming a new generation with the revolutionary method..." – Trotsky, Diary in Exile The Old Testament prophets belonged to a religious order...

Source: The Prophet: Deutscher's Trotsky

R48G: revolutions per second... the cycle of revolution is recurrent and is arriving ahead of schedule at the brink of climate calamity...the sufi stop exercise

February 22nd, 2017 · No Comments

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=revolution>

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Toward+a+New+Communist+Manifesto_jlandon_kindle_10_11_16_PDF_ver2.pdf

As with the french and russian revolutions the onset will be unexpected but we need to be ready with the right framework when the moment comes. The current left is spasmodic and too focused on the marxist legacy. That legacy is fine the way it is and yet it is necessary to 'leap out of one's skin' and break old habits in the process recasting the whole question afresh.

Leftists should note the point: a repeat of marxism/leninism will not be acceptable to a new generation and in any case the question of ecological economics needs to be made central. It is not enough to argue that marxism was actually ecological socialism from the start. It wasn't really. At a time of impending climate catastrophe the options begin to narrow and we won't have time to recast the whole marxist legacy so we should do a remake in very rough terms and in a form that is at once faithful to post-capitalist premises and yet free from the mechanization of thought that haunts all fixed legacies.

We have made a slight change to that legacy with a focus on the universal class instead of the working class, and the moment of Trump suggests that is right. It makes no difference, save to our perception of a holistic perspective: the working class emphasis is essential in the proposition of the universal class. But we see that appealing to the working class can backfire and the idea in the US at least is no longer the same handle it was in the earlier era of industrialism.

We must in any case think in terms of that class as a basic focus: it wasn't our intention to do otherwise, save to note that the problem is not solely one of the working class, but the whole system of classes and social sectors. We must have a solution to the whole question of society, economy, and politics, in advance: no more 'on the fly' constructions, an invitation to stalinist ad hockery.

It is not a funny question: the left will disintegrate at the crucial moment of revolutionary open window, if that occurs, because it will be dominated by die-hard dogmatists who will suddenly repent of their repentance of stalinism. It is in that sense that we 'disown' the marxist legacy: the idea of postcapitalist communism was born before Marx/Engels and was codified by them. Once we disown them we can in fact turn around and make us of their basic research.

The idea is to create a discontinuity in a process of mechanization to allow behavioral habit to reach a new state of creativity. One thinks of the sufi stop exercise, a much hyped esoteric idea, but the point is simple: breaking old habits...

R48G: the american political system is a fake democracy controlled by political/capitalist gangsters...can it be reformed before climate calamity terminates the game?

February 20th, 2017

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.

secular/leftist/atheist/devangelic/theistic design arguments//History and Evolution

February 20th, 2017 ·

We have consistently cited material from the two main ID blogs, but not because we support 'intelligent design' as such, at least the full blown Discovery Institute versions...We have however introduced a whole new perspective on design in relation to history (and evolution) in terms of a new kind of model, with associated issues of secular humanism, leftist issues, teleological questions, and with a core examination of Kant's classic essay on history (which was actually a challenge to find design in history, including a footnote to the intelligent design aspect with a reference to a suspicion of a demiurge in nature). We have claimed to show the first steps to the solution of that 'challenge' set by the seminal philosopher who generated the era of the much neglected 'teleomechanists'. A look at Descent of Man Revisted can clarify this stance which is very critical of biblical textualism...We have consistently shifted gears dialectically between atheist design arguments, and a version of Bennett's demiurgic powers shifted in a new conceptual framework, with an ersatz term 'devangelic domains'. By and large however the eonic model is entirely stripped of design arguments with its neutral model which however shows a stunning complexity resulting in a 'design inference'.

Kant and the Philosophy of History

Source: History and Evolution

A dot.gov that would abolish its EPA in the midst of a climate catastrophe?

February 19th, 2017

It is surpasses belief that a country that put a man on the moon could end by censoring its space agency's climate research and threatening to close it Environmental Protection Agency at a time of escalating climate calamity.

In the face of such stupidity you get one last warning after which the rebs open fire and don't quit until you are overthrown...

Deep state? who were the 9/11 perps? //What Is the Deep State? | The Nation

February 19th, 2017 ·

This analysis is useful enough but misses the desperate point that a 'deep state' (more in the sense of Peter Dale Scott) is suspected but unknown to us. The current liberal and/or radical left cannot seem to get its act together over issues of the JFK assassination and/or the 9/11 conspiracy. Until we can

understand such histories the issue of the 'deep state' remains an unknown but to some extent palpable concept.

It is no use blathering about the 'deep state' if we can't figure out who was behind the 9/11 conspiracy. Most of the so-called left is still floundering in a muddle on the question. And in the age of Trump we must be wary of getting shafted one more time by a false flag op from the 'deep state', a cover term 'x' for an unknown...

We can't equate that with the outer action of George Bush, as far as we know, and that leaves the question of the 'deep state' very real indeed.

In the nonce we can see that many on Wall Street made a bunch off the 9/11 game plan, whatever it was, and we detect the twitchings of a deep state directly from that.

Source: What Is the Deep State? | The Nation

R48G: history, evolution, revolution and the once and future modernity

February 16th, 2017 ·

<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 indic/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 its 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 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

The Eonic Effect

February 13th, 2017

The idea of an historical dynamic, what to say of a critique of darwinism, is very controversial with historians, but I think you should defy conventional thinking here and consider the macro model. And there are several forms of 'deduction' that can strongly suggest this approach. The first is the evolution to history deduction: history must emerge from evolution, but it can't emerge all at once but must show a transition between the two. But the same is true of each such transition and the result is a series of such transitions. Presto world history shows that effect. Another deduction is based on the idea of free agency: a system evolving freedom can't overdetermine agency since it would block all freedom, but that system can't underdetermine free agency because it would not evolve freedom. Presto the evidence of history in our model clearly shows an alternation of different degrees of freedom of 'free agency'. A third deduction is a kind of 'kantian antinomuy' of teleological judgment: world history shows/does not show a teleological effect. The result might/must correspond to the antinomy and show both possibilities: presto, once again our data shows the effect: an intermittent model shows a balance of directionality and free agency....

Standard thinking simply assumes history can show no structure or dynamic. But the question can go either way: even a short survey or world history can show how the dilemma avalanches toward diretionality. Our deduction says this will be an intermittent effect. Presto, the evidence is there...

Consider, why do we speak of the 'middle ages', or 'modernity' or, etc...We already sense the 'eonic' or intermittent effect in our general view of history...

The model and its match to the evidence can and should be open to challenge, but the match to many secondary properties (and the three above are only a few) greatly increase the odds that the model and its dynamic are onto something...

The term 'deduction' is like the Kantian usage (maybe), not a logical proof but close to that as a justification for a certain line of reasoning...(in Kant the term 'deduction' is a legal term or metaphor).

R48G: from universal class back to the working class...

February 9th, 2017 ·

<http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/features/how-democratic-socialists-are-building-on-bernies-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 makes 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...

Waldman and the usual darwinian bullshit //DeVos' Code Words for Creationism Offshoot Raise Concerns About 'Junk Science' – ProPublica

February 9th, 2017

With the onset of someone like DeVos the left needs to get smart about evolutionism/darwinism. I have no idea what agenda the dread DeVos has in mind, and the question of creationism in the schools is understandably of concern to the non-religious but the question of 'evolution' is not the same as 'darwinism'. And the design argument is not the same as the creationist argument: the latter is so primitive theologically as to be datedly infantile at this point. The 'ID' groups have a more nuanced and updated 'design' argument which may or may not be 'stealth creationism' but which is intelligible on its own terms. It is a species of reductionist lunacy to hold down the fort on darwinism, i.e. taken as the same as the theory of evolution, after so much exposure of the theory's flaws. So if scientists want to keep creationism/ID out of the schools they should stop provoking religionists who know perfectly well that natural selection is a deception and discuss the issue of 'design' in scientific terms. In the process it is cogent to critique the biblical design argument and to demand a critique of the false equation of biblical design historicism and evolutionary design arguments, what to say of the distinction of 'design' and 'intelligent design', the latter closing the gap between the intelligibly coherent design argument and the crypto-theistic (or not!) case for some kind of 'intelligence' in nature. The issue is not the incorrectness of design but their complexity and near obscurity in the suggestion of teleological issues still at the threshold of science.

Scientists/secularists need to toss in the towel on design arguments and, for those who are obsessed with the Dawkins fundamentalist abuse of natural selection to debunk theology, adopt an 'atheist design' argument, a discourse long overdue in evolutionary/cosmological circles. We have suggested here many ways to do that, and have also warned the question may be so far insoluble, in Kantian terms, the reason WHEE has so much material on the issue of the 'critique of metaphysics'. It is one thing to critique religious viewpoints, it is another to promote the sterile and provocative views of scientism on man. Religionists understandably gag on this and wish the subject to be more intelligently taught in schools.

In the Trump era, it has become critically important to stop deceiving the public about the nature of science with respect to evolution. It is a strategy to hand the right victory on a platter. It is hard to think of a subject as best categorized as 'junk science' as darwinism.

Source: DeVos' Code Words for Creationism Offshoot Raise Concerns About 'Junk Science' – ProPublica

Red Forty-eight Group: revolutionary communism as a demiurgic projection?

February 7th, 2017

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=bennett+revolution+demiurgic+powers>

Last year we had a series of posts on the mystery of materialist revolutionism seen as a projection of demiurgic action in the sense of Bennett (we have proposed a constant reworking of the terms, e.g. devangelic, as a reminder to not crystallize unknowns): the larger domain of spiritual action foresaw at once the dangers inherent in the industrial revolution and moved to generate a crisis vehicle of leftist revolutionism as soon as possible While this interpretation is speculative (it appears in another form in Bennett) it is a reminder that the confusing materialism of the marxist left conceals a larger 'spiritual' context that is the legacy of the period just after the modern transition. Readers of Enigma of the Axial

Age will recall the distinction of the process generating the eonic effect and the way that independent demiurgic powers can intervene in the post divide period.

We cannot deduce a scientific understanding here, but our point, as reminder to both the left and its exterior religious critics, is that the movement of communism has as much spiritual basis as anything in religion as such.

The mysterious realm of demiurgic power foresaw the danger of planetary destruction via capitalism and rushed to generate a rescue vehicle, which now needs rescue itself. These powers can generate starting points, but the executive action is man's. This thesis could be the basis, not for a new leftist myth, but a reminder to religious conservatives that the left has taken up the task of redemptive action, with religious nonsense filtered out from the start as a distraction from the needs of action in a terminal crisis.

Here is the original post:

Demiurgic manifold, and the mystery of revolutionary communism

March 17th, 2016 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/2016/03/16/is-it-really-possible-demiurgic-powers-induced-the-early-communist-futurism-of-the-early-nineteenth-century/>

This might well strike leftists as a strange set of statements. In fact it was indirectly asserted in Last and First Men, in the Preface. It seems like an outlandish distraction, but I think it is a useful construct for the rescue of proto-marxism, and core marxism at a time when historical materialists appear to have been routed by the Bible Belt, New Age buddhists, etc,...

The point is very simple: the sacred/secular distinction has no fundamental status, and the onset of revolutionary thought was confusingly anti-religious for the same reason the ancient Israelites, and Xtians were anti-religious (?! if that religion was archaic polytheism, etc...): it liberated future thought from the categories of the Axial Age. A healthy dose of Feuerbach and 'materialism' served that purpose.

But what if there were 'spiritual' powers behind the onset of the explosion of the revolutionary left in the early nineteenth century, post-French Revolution, with figures like Marx/Engels entering this field of movements?

We don't need to proceed in that vein, but I for one have always thought so and in any case picked up the view of J.G.Bennett who suddenly realized his reactionary sufi friends were confused about modernity, and also began to sense, he thought, the realm of super-spiritual (really material) powers he called 'demiurgic powers'. He sensed a new era arising in world history in this period, even pointing to the year 1848 and noting the birth of communism. He must have shocked his sufi honchos but this idea has come to seem highly relevant to me over the years (Bennett actually thought such powers had intervened in the Cold War to prevent disaster), but I think he may have misunderstood his own idea which shows a compromised definition in terms of the whole nexus of Gurdjieff 'cannibal occultism' and other horrors.

The powers indicated require careful redefinition, and we can't assume they are 'mental beings' who are looking over daily history, the same old same old 'theistic' interactionism that the Feuerbachian era did well to scotch, even though the last word has not been said here, and given the direct interaction of Xtian early modern religion in the gestation of the modern left, from Munzer and communism, to the Quakers with the English Civil War, and abolitionism.

They operate over long range eras of millions of years, and could only intervene at key starting points.

We can make some sense of Bennett's useful idea, and his sense, taken up in Last and First Men, that something mysterious happened around 1848 (i.e. the period from 1800 to 1850, as a watershed of the modern explosion, the take off after the early modern period from the sixteenth century. But Bennett's model of modernity is not adequate, and the model in WHEE is much better. In any case, the transformations of history in WHEE are super-mechanical mysteries, and, well, too mechanical for theistic interpretations, but that does not rule out the action of super-subtle 'material/spiritual' beings indirectly connected to human history. Here's the point that the model in WHEE suddenly uncovers: the macro effect of transitions may be supermechanical but this doesn't prevent higher agencies from suddenly intervening in their wake to amplify strains. This is what I suspect about the sudden explosion of the left: the strain of democratic revolution so strangely mutated to confront almost instantaneously the way that capitalism appearing so rapidly at the conclusion of the early modern (with many prior intimations to be sure) had kidnapped the whole modern experiment. As if the Enlightenment meant nothing, now Smithian greed became the winner take all of the modern transformation, a short range plus for economy, no doubt, but a long range calamity. We can see all too clearly that the calamity is upon us, and a further mutation of Smithian to Ayn Randian mental derangement threatens a whole planet.

I will say it outright, leaving Feuerbachians everywhere shocked and outraged, a spiritual influence grafted leftist communism onto the modernist outcome as of the French Revolution. The point in any case was obvious to those Revolutionaries who saw the need to bring economic issues and class analysis to the revolution. So our extra view is egregious, but it might help to see that while the materialist cast of modern leftism/marxism is an extreme secular humanism, behind that lied a hidden spiritual helper process.

This might help to see that the sequence from 1848 to the Russian revolution to 1989 was a lot more subtle than we might think and that its genesis represents a 'long shot' intervention from a mysterious spiritual domain trying to seed some kind of cultural recovery vehicle for the coming 'triumph of the capitalist idiots', the threatened demise of a whole planet.

We don't have to believe a word of this, save to see that the era of 1848 to the end of bolshevism wasn't an aberration, but an experiment that proceeded with majestic but deviating precision until it derailed or remorphed, and one that needs to be 'debugged' and re-jumpstarted.

This is not the first time this has happened. The majestic Axial Age period (consider the early Greek case) was so chock full of innovations that it was almost incandescent and yet within six centuries we see a Roman dominated era at the level of death spectacles in the Roman arena. The appearance of a rescue vehicle with unknown spiritual sourcing (it's a small world) using monotheistic cover is one of the best ways to make some sense out of the almost incomprehensible birth of Christianity, which eventually overtook the Roman Empire, success or failure we can 'leave it to you to decide'.

In the modern version all the switches were flipped from spiritual to material categories. A wise move, but at this point it might help to let the cat out of the bag. Historical materialism in the period of Feuerbach onward made a tremendous impression on the whole of modernist thought, but the categories of thought have shifted slightly. The original canon needs a fix of some kind.

So the 'conclusion' here is that we cannot bring preposterous spiritual categories into this mix, and yet it might help to consider the point to make 'materialists' realize that 'spirituality' and 'materialism' are finally the same category.

These 'demiurgic powers' must be completely frustrated to see the outcome of their attempt at assistance. The only thing we can do is try again, and at a point where we are running out of time. These entities have done their work and aren't the objects of prayers or wish fulfilments...

The question of 'demiurgic powers' suffers from Bennett's confusions. Who isn't confused here? It might help to start over with the idea at the starting point: Plato, then Kant's, idea of the 'demiurge'. This could be confused with god, but the concepts are not the same.

We might well, with Bennett, seek the plural of demiurge with a question: are these beings atman or brahman? This trick shows Bennett was on the right track to think of a plurality.

I am producing some material on this, but to summarize quickly the point is that 'god' is metaphysical and unknown, and 'he' comes in three or more brands: Lawrence Krauss has one brand: something from nothing, buddhists have another, something from the Void, and monotheists have still another, corrupted by pop theism, the nameless X or IHVH, whose 'creation' comes from nothing. A 'Hey wait a minute' is heard here: these are the same product in three brands or packages. Why argue over theology, a waste of time. Take your pick.

We have the basis for a unified theology. Great! Next case.

That's the 'metaphysical part', and refers to 'god, nothing, or void' beyond existence. God is beyond existence because universes emerge into existence, and the whole spiel is under Kantian suspicion.

The idea of a demiurge, or a manifold demiurge (as veils of atman/brahman many-one), or demiurgic manifold is about some possible entity within existence, not 'god', but not organismic or 'alive' in the biological realms. Here's the remarkable issue: the demiurgic manifold can show 'will' and

'consciousness' beyond life. Every generation of man had a version of this: man has a 'soul', a something he couldn't understand: it was something beyond the lower material that persisted beyond the organism...Sounds familiar in this context.

Demmiurgic powers are starting to make sense.

We associate 'consciousness' with life, but it would seem the two are distinct. A close look at Advaita would warn us 'consciousness' and 'brahman' really refer to the same thing, as it were. So we begin to get a sense of entities within material existence, but at a higher level of being beyond life, that have vehicles of 'will' and 'consciousness' but no bodies of the 'animal/evolutionary' type. The idea that 'will' and 'consciousness' are beyond yet penetrate life is a bit much, but with study the issue solves a host of confusions. We don't have to buy any of this to proceed. It might help to consider the classic yet distinct issue of 'buddhist enlightenment'. Buddhas always claimed to be beyond even the 'gods'. Makes sense: they beyond consciousness, will, and soul to a 'something' that is none of the above, which is? Consciousness, in the larger brahman sense. Buddhas seem to disappear and are a mystery. The demiurgic manifold is somewhat different as we can see.

If this is strange the fact is that garbled versions of this are multiply historical (angelology is one by now brain dead remnant).

Since this is all about entities within the 'material' or the 'existent' it is not a spiritual challenge to materialism. It is one and the same subject with hat tipped to brands one two three of hyper-humongous 'god/nothing/void'. Whatever the case, we need to return to a chastened Feuerbachian perspective to try to rescue our rescue vehicle at a moment of almost terminal crisis. This account can help revolutionaries stop being suckerpunched by religious hoitytoities: their subject is as sacred as anything else. It could use a couple of upgrades as a humanism, but the issue is not to figure outlandish demiurgic materialism, but to see that a rescue vehicle inherited from the nineteenth century is all we've got to challenge capitalism at its end game.

Hyponomic, autonomic, and hypernomic...

February 7th, 2017 ·

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=The%2B_Dramatic_Universe_commentary2a_JL.pdf

We have often cited the work of J.G.Bennett here: he was the carrier of a sufi attempt to sow seeds of materialist samkhya in the modern world under the aegis of a very smart englishman trained in modern science. The result is a trainwreck but has many of the elements that could lead to a way station for the denizens of the iron cage of scientism. We have already used this as a critique/commentary on 'dialectical materialism' and the overall suggestion is that the mysterious samkhya contains some unknown legacy of spiritual understanding that goes back very far indeed. Bennett's rendering depends on a set of assumptions that may prove untenable but he does show how the decayed version of samkhya we find historically can be rendered coherent, if not scientific, for an age of science. The crucial

point, to buttress our previous post on the spiritual 'deep background' to christianity, is that we need a material interpretation of the spiritual in the sense of Bennett's hyponomic, autonomic, and hypernomic realms, roughly the material, biological and spiritual (now material) realms. That man is immersed in a larger materiality he calls 'spiritual' is the first step to unraveling the confusion he endures on the issues of religion. We can dismantle Bennett's construct on the spot and yet get a sense of how our immersion in scientism is misleading. That dialectical materialism is a wild card version of this, almost an incoherent parody, suggests a way for the left to carry the remnants of religious antiquity into a new future as, at the least, a spiritual archaeological project. Bennett's reconstruction suggests that some ancient canon now lost was present in India millennia ago, and this must have had a larger provenance. We hardly know but we can see that we have a lot of work to do to understand the religions of antiquity and our own consciousness in the present.

R48G: virtual revolution and confronting overwhelming power

February 6th, 2017

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

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=revolution+R48G>

We would have to be very careful about mixing revolutionary and religious ideas and one use of our idea of virtual revolution is to consider two aspects to the question, in effect generating two components of our 'virtual' group, the R48 formation. In fact this happened with the bolshevik/menshevik split and we can also see the historical example of islam as a case or 'revolutionary religion' open to violent military conversions, judge that as we may. The inner tension inside islam testifies to the issue and we should be wary of facile combinations of ideas. That said, the original program of the marxists via proletarian revolution opened itself to this problematic.

The answer is not some facile form of non-violence as a philosophy. But it is not an easy question, to ask how to generate cultural change while also attempting to stage some kind of religious reformation.

The question can be answered easily in theory, but in practice there is going to be confusion. In the end the whole question of political ethics comes to the fore and this cautions and complicates revolutionary aspiration. One has to wonder if the strange de-ethicized marxism wasn't a strange tactic to render revolutionaries de-sensitized to ethical questions on the way to a ruthless praxis. If so, the stratgy failed and we are stuck at best with the 'nice guy' revolutionism of the Kantian ethical socialists. Part of the crisis of capitalism and pseudo-democracy of the american type is the de facto erection of the psychopath to the political norm. Something has to change there and it won't be amenable to a Leninst solution...

In the nonce a virtual revolution can gestate the future as a potential to influence action, whatever the likelihood of 'real' revolution. The history of christianity wasn't so far off from that: a sideshow slowing becoming its own revolution (with not very elegant constantinian results). The modern secular sphere can do a lot better with that, but while there is no inherent objection of a revolutionary religion (witness the islamic case) the modern future must do something far more complex and not inflict violent episodes on a general public. Let us not that Munzer and Luther did just that, so we are actually open to

doing the job right here, not with a gandian fundamentalism, but a careful political/ethical and other consideration of the nature of change.

Again these issues are not insoluble, but they do require a recompute of legacy revolutionism. Just as well. The past informs us but is water over the dam. The Kantian 'republic of ends' invokes a categorical imperative: what is the status of revolutionism in that canon?

The issues might seem idle: confronting the overwhelming power of, say, the american state as a criminal mafia, we have another translation of 'virtual revolution' in the classic history of catacombs of dissenting christian 'virtual revolutionaries'.

Secular humanism versus the christian mystery and a leftist exit vehicle

February 6th, 2017

<http://darwiniana.com/2017/02/05/r48g-toward-a-new-reformation-the-exit-path-from-axial-era-christianity-toward-a-revolutionary-munzerian-christian-communism/>

The question of christianity and the left has no simple solution. And christianity is starting an accelerated collapse, at least in the West. As desirable as a form of radical christianity might be the fact remains that this religion has in the US been captured by a repulsive and phony brand of calvinist/capitalist 'wealth brand' evangelical cultism. And its association with the injustice of Israel further condemns any attempt to compromise with the legacy. The old testament has turned against itself and enabled a completely stupid and religiously moronic territorial apartheid. We must move to dismantle the illusion of religion in this 'christian' distortion (which of course equally condemns branded judaism).

Nonetheless a highly stylized exit path is possible and useful for those who are going to suffer the fading away of a vehicle that has a core that secularism so far cannot replace.

As a religious legacy christianity has a genuine spiritual component, although we don't understand what that is: some mysterious post-Israelite spiritual power or powers took up the old testament corpus and generated a world religion.

We don't even know if the figure Jesus even existed, but that issue was rendered moot in the way the hidden spiritual process encapsulated a set of instant myths that were animated by some kind of soon unknown empirical history. The tale of Jesus suggests some historical component but the remarkable fact remains that this historical component was instantly mythologized

we are at a loss to grasp, for example, the doctrine of the resurrection and are left baffled, as modernists, by the success of what so many saw at once couldn't be right. And yet the myth instantly propagated and took over the whole emerging canon. A strange puzzle, but also, in the end, the undoing of the whole affair. Even as this belief system generated a belief cult its faith basis in the end, our time, will prove its undoing. We can no longer propose the permanent of faith based religion because faith is eroding and almost seems like a con. (there is an ultra simple explanation of the 'resurrection' as a psychological/occult visionary process, but the facts are unknown, a clever aspect of the whole strategy of the hidden spiritual power)...

We have proposed for this hopeless confusion not a further perpetuation of illusion but a generalized historical enquiry into the mystery of the background spiritual process. (For example, in Enigma of the Axial Age we have explored the nature of what we call 'devangelic powers' in nature, Bennett's demiurgic powers are another example). The next era will see the graduates exiting christian cultism with a deep query as to the nature of the experience of christianity. We can apply secular humanist critique but does that get straight what happened and the effect the operation had as rescue vehicle for a degenerate cultural occident. We can apply doubt to religion but we must be wary of negating the 'path to salvation'. The blanket rejection of religion in too many in the new atheist cult forgets the almost miraculous effect over the long term of christian action. There was a genuine spiritual operation there, and yet we can barely understand what it was.

So we are left with the question: what is the real meaning of 'salvation'? What is its relation to the buddhist equivalent, the path to enlightenment (they aren't the same).

The left needs to offer a strategy for religious study—it can barely manage more without entering into the realities/illusions of the complex mix that history has generated, and is leaving behind.

The secular equivalent of religion has yet to be achieved by modernity, stuck so long in what Kant exposed as scientism, and now the many new age movements have arrived to further scramble public coherence. A post-Feuerbachian world view (one that embraces its core, perhaps) is needed by the revolutionary left if it wishes to deprogram economic/social darwinist/nietzschean remnants of pseudo-christianity.

Our study, The Crisis of Modernity, has suggested the way the Axial Age spiritual fixations suffered reversal in modern times and that the revolutionary left of the nineteenth century suddenly filled the void of secular anti-religion with the social equivalent of religion. But this requires a more nuanced and robust version of the whole modernist phasing of politics, culture, and religion. This can phase out the format of christian religion, but it can't forget the hidden spiritual mystery behind that process and its ambiguous yet real success in the cultural transformation of the roman empire.

R48G: Toward a new reformation: the exit path from axial era christianity: toward a revolutionary 'munzerian' christian communism

February 5th, 2017 ·

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...

Red Forty-eight Group: more on the 'virtual' revolution

February 4th, 2017

We have arrived at a dangerous moment. Many who wouldn't ever consider the question of revolution confronting the point of no return we have entered on the issue of climate change are stopped in their tracks by the insult added to injury by Donald Trump. The moment is starting to produce a kamikazi mentality. We should at least consider our strategy of the virtual revolution, that is a stated consideration of the revolutionary option that is subject as it were to a countdown prior to initialization. This has some potential to force the issue without provoking people into crossing the threshold of illegal action or irreversible decisions...Some of the potential in that approach:

it is legal free speech

it can multitask with different strategies as an open bluff, maybe

it can get the work done of thinking through the 'what is to be done'

it can provoke the debate over non-violent strategies and lead beyond gandhian illusion and sentimentality

it can send a message that the rules might be changing

i.e. scare the heck out of the powers that be...

it will force the study of the history of bolshevism, leninism and generate a recompute of the whole marxist legacy

it might energize such marxists to repair their legacy, streamline it, and volunteer for a new 'red forty-eight group', a virtual blueprint of a movement, virtual or realizing...

and this can lead to a reinvention of revolution, one with failsafes against many undesirable outcomes...

those with a buddhist type understanding know they will reincarnate in their own mess: we can warn the indifferent who think they will die scotfree of the terrifying karma they have inherited...

etc...

Please, no more washington marches of the nice rhetoric/go home brand: at least produce the issue of revolution, virtual, out front...

We should have had this already in the climate movement and on the left generally. For some reason the marxist left has become inert. Perhaps just as well: it is a sign that they sense their legacy won't work anymore. We must consider the axioms of socialism and communism, learn from that history, and start from scratch. All we need is a statement of a new politics, a new economy, a new bill of rights, and a revolutionary program declared virtual but sending a message of the strongest 'or else'...

The point is that we are out of time for a huge maybe called the 'next election'. We should be multitasking on that front in any case.

Let us keep in mind that the problem we face is transnational. If you have a smartphone, consider the plight of the coltan miners in the Congo...the behavior of the american system in general is out of control globally. Socialists in power in some mythical electoral victory would confront the establishment and soon be indulging in drone warfare, etc...electoral reform cannot solve the larger problem...

A march on washington with a platform of revolution stated virtually just might generate change as is...

We have probably missed the 2C danger point. We have already passed 400ppm. Time for a million people to descend on washington...

Red forty-eight group...: the revolutionary demand...a system at the onset of nosedive and plane crash...the deep state reformable?

February 3rd, 2017 · No Comments

Review of The Deep State: An indispensable guide and expose of the harsh reality of the corrupted American political system. The author surveys the history, dynamics, and increasing lunacy of a system that has drifted into distortion and dysfunction. The portrait is a sobering indictment of a national decline, and an international menace. I would point to one limit in the analysis: the failure to consider that the 9/11 terror attack had deep sources in another version of the 'deep state', that pointed to in such thinkers as Peter Dale Scott.

But all in all this book from an insider x-rays the core malfunction of a republic/democracy that has become an oligarchic plutocracy.

https://www.amazon.com/review/RKJN0G1U878XJ/ref=cm_cr_rdp_perm

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=revolution>

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=our+revolution>

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=democratic+market+neo-communism>

We are confronting a system that has fooled us completely, and even its correct indictment is problematical. But as the overall picture sets in the fixer we confront the rogue nature of the American sentimental masterpiece and the result is shocking in the extreme. The basic analysis of The Deep State, the expose of the JFK and 9/11 conspiracies, the expose of drug mafias in the pursuit of covert action, the history and legacy of the CIA, the surveillance crisis of the national security state, the military industrial complex and its wars for profit, the neoliberal capture of democratic government, the place of money in politics, the influence of Israel on American foreign policy, the crime against humanity in the destruction of Iraq and the ambiguity of imperialistic predation in Afghanistan. All this but the cap to a prelude of almost two centuries of expansionist and Monroe Doctrine capitalist aggression. It is very difficult to fill out the total picture of statist depravity.

And the ominous question comes to the fore: is there any chance of reforming this system? It seems there is not, and it seems that the endgame is coming in the form of a climate crisis to which the US can't even contribute solutions politically in the psychotic onset of the Trump era. This system now puts a gag order on scientific communication and is set to destroy its EPA. sic!

We must not suffer this overall calamity to destroy a planet. And we must consider that the nature of power in the US is coming to a climax of domination after which activist, radical, and reformist gestures will confront a tyranny that is beyond modification. Is it there already? Some might think that reformist gestures are all we can envision. But the proponents of this are either incompetent or pulling their punches in a state of fear before the Leviathan in question. We cannot abandon them in the name of

some revolutionary aspiration but by the same token we cannot abandon the revolutionary option however remote at first its realization. We confront a generation conditioned to Gandhian thinking and in the wake of bolshevism we recoil from the question of violence in the process of change. We are constantly sermonized as to the successes of non-violent tactics. The reality is that we have lost two generations of tactical activist to this illusion/ The reality is that non-violent action is one tool in a kit of potential methods. And even a revolutionary option should consider its uses. But we are not involved in a path of Jain enlightenment and world indifference. We must change the world however we can manage. The legacy of MLK here has confused people. For some strange reason he outdid even the incompetent Gandhi. Perhaps because of the dynamic of his historical situation. Those who sound off on non-violence need to explain how the abolition of slavery might have occurred via Gandhian peace marches.

We must be clear and honest. Non-violence may be our only option. But that is very different from saying we should as a matter of Jain ethical reasoning espouse non-violence. There is so such reasoning in Christianity despite a number of echoes of themes of non-violence. The Reformation was one of the most violent conflicts in world history, as was the Puritan revolution.

This is not a rationale for some kind of freak out violent conversion. On the contrary. The simple gesture of revolutionary abstraction can by itself induce change. We can see the dangers of indiscriminate violent action and might be wary of recent activities of groups like the Black Block. Tactics require great thought, and first class leadership.

Gandhi's legacy is grossly misleading. His Jain background politicized a spiritual path resembling the buddhist type and moved to renounce the world, not change it. Its extreme non-violence was a path of world renunciation. Gandhi's red herring has had a limited success at best, certainly not in India, and is simply the mirror image illusion of the bolshevik opposite of extreme violence.

We cannot sacrifice the future of human freedom on the altar of a Jain religious tradition that many Jains themselves would reject.

The larger question of war, revolution, and pacifist methods remains in a kind of flux.

We cannot expect to deal with a system so pathological as the one we confront now with peaceful protest marches. The non-violent approaches must nonetheless continue.

The point is not revolution or violence, as such, but the real meaning of revolution: the trigger of regime change and constitutional re-foundation, however arrived at.

We cannot just agitate for a wage increase for a few subsets of the working class in a system as pathological as the one we see.

All those gains, as we can see, will likely be eliminated by the powerful mafia now in control. The coming of Trump shows this to be so: we are likely going to lose the gains of the era of the New Deal and beside that witness the destruction of the Union movement.

So, as to Gandhian sentimentality, we can't evade the reality that history shows us: all the major forms of democracy emerged in revolutionary regime change. A post-capitalist communist could hardly be different.

The truth of the matter is that once we adopt a strong stance on this question we also create the possibility of transcending violence by being clear that we won't be intimidated by the current system whose powers of domination can be exaggerated. The system is actually very vulnerable at many points. For example, behind the facade of politic rhetoric many politicians are aware of the terminal character of the system as it is. Thus a leftist challenge actually has a huge number of hidden supporters, even in the capitalist class.

We can adjourn to our twin manifestos to conclude this post: we have proposed the first fundamental of a postcapitalist system, but we haven't renounced markets altogether as such. This framework can rescue the issues from the ill-conceived brand created by the bolshevik era with a system that can achieve a first step, yet able to evolve to a larger result.

It is possible the crisis could suddenly predispose a majority to revolutionary/constitutional change with or without revolution. We are in an case confronting a revolution from the right that has shown its hand in an instance such as that of Trump who quite stupidly shows the hand of the elite class intent on slow but surely corrupting and then abolishing democracy.

We need to fulfill the prophecies of the end of capitalism and its successor templates with a first step hybrid combination of revolutionary/evolutionary potentials. And we need to act soon because the system is commencing a nosedive leading to plane crash.

Last and First Frankenstein...

February 3rd, 2017 ·

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public/XML_DARW_GC_Axial?preview=LastandFirstMen_2014_hires_21mb.pdf

The future evolution of man can't be left to a system of free markets about to enter a new frankenstein phase of genetic editing....

R48G: stealth neo-Feuerbachian theological sleight of hand? //Advaita Vedanta: Concept of God

February 3rd, 2017 ·

The place of 'god' in Advaita (and its related versions in sufism, thence cryptically in Islam) shows the way in which conventional atheism in the west is often too narrow. At one and the same time it is possible to argue that 'god' the term should be taken out of Advaita as constituting a confusion of its 'atheist' clarity.

The dilemma shows the arbitrary dogmatism of the new atheists: the terminology of God is so confused that strictly speaking 'atheism' is almost as incoherent as religion...

But the 'gnostic' views of god were resisted by xtians, and we have also discussed the reason why: the mysterious embedding of Samkhya in xtianity explains its consistent sense of the cosmic nature of god.

All these confusions could be reduced to forms of study, enquiry and search rather than the dogmatic imposition of belief.

And, ironically, the Samkhya brand has a comic resemblance to 'dialectical materialism', making the realm of marxist atheism ironically suitable for a post-theological xtianity.

What is needed is a vehicle to create a communion of different beliefs in an activist movement on the left...

Source: Advaita Vedanta: Concept of God

<http://vedantastudent.blogspot.com/p/god.html>

The American revolution wasn't a Gandhian movement

February 2nd, 2017 ·

We need non-violent movements, but we must also reinvent revolution: that is, the 'system reset' that recomputes state motion from a new starting point.

The United States has its own rich history – past and present – with effective uses of nonviolent resistance. The technique established alternative institutions like economic cooperatives, alternative courts and an underground constitutional convention in the American colonies resulting in the Declaration of Independence. In 20th century, strategic nonviolent resistance has won voting rights for women and for African Americans living in the Jim Crow South.

Source: How Civil Resistance Can Topple a Dictator | Portside

Declines, the secular equivalent of religion, and the crisis of modern civilization

January 30th, 2017 ·

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=The+Crisis+of+Modernity_ver6.pdf

The degeneration of the American system is often compared to the decline of the Roman Empire. The analog is apt, but incorrect: the obvious comparison is to the brevity of Athenian democracy in the uncanny dissipation in less than two centuries.

The parallel comparison to the decline of the Roman Republic is also relevant, but that process took five/six centuries. Both analogs are useful and revolve the unstated epochal logic clarified by our eonic model which shows the clear correlation of the onset of the American system at the end of the modern transition. That gave the American system a wallop but the result was limited from the start and required the major correction of the horrendous Civil War.

The swift degeneration of the American system is an ominous warning of what the system left to itself will become: worse and worse until the metaphor of the declinists turns correct.

The clear need for a new course correction emerges powerfully in the crisis of capitalism, the failures of globalization, and the calamity of climate change.

It is no accident that religion and empire correlated in the case of ancient Rome. In our case we can use the many potential resources of modernity beyond scientism/materialism (e.g. the course of the Reformation, Spinoza, Kant, Hegel, Schopenhauer, Feuerbach) to create the secular equivalent of religion and what we have called the 'floating fourth turning point': a social transformation to bring restored coherence to a decaying modernity. The legacy religions are too archaic while the fundamentalist marxism was too reductionist to do the job. This is a relatively simple thing to do if we can evade religious obsessions (which doesn't mean being antireligion as such) and the Iron Cage mentality of scientism.

The fate of the American system is sealed at this point. It needs a thorough recompute, even as a lot of radical challenge went nowhere as the system got worse with Trump...

Why is socialism defined in terms of the working class? //Labour Party Marxists — Communist Party of Great Britain

April 24th, 2017

This is an interesting website on the left but it is a softball pitch for the question: why is socialism defined in terms of the working class? Socialism/communism are about postcapitalism and this is not intrinsically connected to the working class. The idea springs from the era of the period of early revolutionary divisions over class and the way in which the bourgeoisie in fighting feudalism was a 'revolutionary' class, with or without the participation of the proletariat of that era. But our situation is different now. The working class is shifting into the middle class, in the US (it is certainly very real on a global level), and as set of questions arise here: why favor any class over another? Why would the class interests of the working class represent the overall needs of a socialism economy? We have suggested that in fact the working class is not the industrial proletariat but the set complement of the bourgeoisie and that includes a whole range of class-combinations. We have advocated thinking in terms of the Universal Class, quite possibly with the working class (or classes) as a spearhead but including the whole spectrum of class formations that make up a social whole. A good example of the difficulty is that the class interests of the working class tend to be indifferent to the issue of climate change and would oppose a no-growth economy that might mediate the issue of climate catastrophe. There is also the strange bias to the lumpenproletariat in Marx, a 'class' no doubt described well by him, up to a point, but in the era we are entering this 'class' is already becoming very extensive, including elements of the working class who are chronically unemployed, displaced by automation, etc...There are all sorts of class combinations that should equally be called 'working class': don't petit bourgeois shopkeepers work? Etc... Strange to say, it would be unfair to define socialism in terms of working class interests. And history has shown that the working class was usurped by the crypto-bourgeoisie of the revolutionary cadre that took power and became a new version of the bourgeoisie.

How do we resolve this? The answer is fairly straightforward: we define socialism, or else our neo-communism, in terms of principles, not classes. We define a political movement in terms of those members of the Universal Class who agree to those principles and work in concert with other class elements in that movement. Instead of equality defined in terms of class, it is defined as a principle constitutional foundationalism, and in terms of both legal and economic rights in the context of a shared economy, and a rough and transitional equalization of external classes entering the Universal Class. Equality is also defined in terms of the communist expropriation of the bourgeoisie in the creation of a Commons in which all participate (and we should include the external environment as a member with 'rights') as common owners. The Bolshevik muddle produced a vanguard of the intelligentsia next to various working class Soviets and ended up created a new bourgeoisie based on state capitalism ruling in the name of the working class who lost all their rights as workers to unionize.

Clearly a wholly different approach is needed. We have suggested that a remorphed version of a democratic revolution could be the model or vehicle to general equality, social ownership, and the transition to post-capitalism. The control of economic resources would be beyond the control of a revolutionary class and default to a range of economic courts adjunct to economic planning bodies, themselves adjunct to a 'market' sector differing from the capitalist in the way it would be run by a formerly 'bourgeois' group of entrepreneurs or managers with relative autonomy, but not ownership. Such enterprises would license resources from the Commons and while they might generate transient inequalities in their action, these would in the final analysis revert to the general pool.

This kind of situation is far from perfect, but it is experimental on the way to incremental improvements, and it could be highly effective where these types of combinations (there are a number of versions) evade the charge of utopianism because they are remorphed versions in finite transformations of systems we know are viable, e.g. the format of modern liberal system. This mix would thus constitute a form of liberalism in a new communist constitutional context. In fact, it is current capitalism that is utopian and this resolution could save modern industrial economy for itself in a system that can still tolerate a system of postcapitalist markets.

Socialism is the rule of the working class over the global economy created by capitalism

Source: Labour Party Marxists — Communist Party of Great Britain

Gradual transition to socialism?

January 25th, 2017 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=revolution> We can explore an idea related to the notion from the previous post of a gradual transition to socialism. The problem is that the current system isn't really evolving: a whole century of leftist progress got wiped out and the system has regressed to the worst form of capitalism. However, that trend could go into another reversal, especially given the grim reality of

climate catastrophe. The problem of course is the foundational issue of a new constitutional framework but such a transformation is by no means impossible as long as the result produces democratic freedom in a form adapted to postcapitalism. We have suggested a formula that should be highly popular and we must reclaim the term 'communism' from its dismal historical record: the legacy of the idea is unusable. In any case, 'socialism' is not 'social democratic' New Deal-ism.

Our set of suggestions:

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Democratic_Market_Neo_Communism_ver_5.pdf

Constitutional and/or labor activist reform/revolution//A Short History of Liberal Myths and Anti-Labor Politics

January 24th, 2017 ·

How does our formulation of the Red Forty-eight Group square with the obvious issues raised in this essay from Counterpunch. Our framework can easily answer to the problems explored and just as easily succumb to the distortion of its axioms in failing to realize its potential.

The point is that given a revolutionary restart an immense number of problems can be solved constitutionally: the capitalist class is expropriated and the Commons becomes a shared resource (transnationally?). With that fundamental transformation many other problems would arise but the basic issue would resolved with or without an actual working class factor, a dangerous assumption that might fail in real time. But the basic format is essential whatever else can happen after that.

The point is that equality is a basic tool to craft a new social formula, with the issue of the Commons and the move beyond private property are deducible as 'communism' from the principle of fairness and the givens of primitive accumulation, the plunder of the Commons, by the former capitalist class.

The issues of the working class in the context of a planned and/or market sector would be solved in principle but in practice might require mediation by working class faction of the representative system, even as the overall matrix guaranteed a set of robust economic rights, again a constitutional/legal solution.

In general marxist formulations despite their cogency overall fail to consider the limits of the working class perspective: we must ask what will happen as revolutionary radicals come into power and predict in advance how we will deal with their transformation into potentially a new class. And we must consider all the subsets of the universal class, including the business class, even as a distinct set of capitalists disappears into a neo-communist system which still however has element of the former market system. etc...

The point is that the core of the set of dilemmas can be solved by a revolutionary 're-constitution' which then must be carefully balanced in order to make its elements function properly.

In any case we must consider in advance the total overall effect of former classes becoming the universal class, and that includes the powerful and instant corruption of a revolutionary 'new class' likely to form in an ill-considered formula of socialism or communism.

Source: A Short History of Liberal Myths and Anti-Labor Politics

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 internationales 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.

Dawkins cult muddling the question of evolution, enlightenment, ...//Psychologists ask: What makes some smart people so skeptical of science? | Richard Dawkins Foundation

January 24th, 2017 ·

The darwinists, and scientists in general, are doing harm to the confusion created on the right, especially in relation to climate change, but mixing separate issues together: evolution, climate change, vaccination, etc...Dissent on evolution is not the same as dissent on darwinism (the theory of natural selection) and the abuse of darwinism to promote an anti-religious agenda has in addition muddled the clarity of atheism, secularism and general humanism which needs a critical view of darwinism, desperately.

The last straw is the attempt to claim the Enlightenment. That's a distortion. The first critics of darwinism arose before Darwin! And the Enlightenment produced a better take on evolution with figures like Lamarck (not his adaptationist theory) and the teleomechanists who arose in the Kantian critique of scientism and the confusion over teleology...

The harm done to both science and historical understanding is immense...

Smart people don't reject science, but they do critique scientism, and if they are smart about biology they see through the natural selection ideology of darwinists...

By Melissa Healy In Washington, D.C., revelers and protesters are marking the ascendance of a new president and the populist movement he says he has mobilized. Some 1,600 miles away in San Antonio,...

Source: Psychologists ask: What makes some smart people so skeptical of science? | Richard Dawkins Foundation

The leftist whisperings from the underground: instead of hurting policemen, guerilla warfare against carbon infrastructure...we don't promote 'terrorism' here, but we can transmit the message

January 23rd, 2017 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/2017/01/23/r48g-need-for-organized-strategic-shock-troops-on-the-left/>

Even as this blog nemo/nemini et al. has discussed 'our revolution' it has received criticism for not being radical enough! The abortive demonstration at the Women's Marx as a demo of male aggression might consider such criticism, and take some of its own. We cannot recommend violent activities here but we

can purvey the underground views gestating the program of guerilla warfare against carbon infrastructure. Why harm policemen? There is a better way.

Why waste valuable activists venting rage against police. An army of some kind of guerillas could send the message that the crisis we are facing won't go unchallenged. We have ten years or so to bring carbon civilization to a halt.

The 'R48G' framework may still be insufficiently radical for what is needed. Our purpose has been theoretical and has never quite proposed anything beyond the virtual. We have been very vague here and used one's free speech without promoting illegality. But the crisis is nothing less than the fate of a planet and a whole species. I merely transmit the gestating underground sentiments brewing to boil...

R48G: need for organized strategic shock troops on the left...

January 23rd, 2017 ·

<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/inauguration-day-protests-felony-rioting-charges-federal-prosecutors-say/>

I won't condemn this sideshow to the Women's March, in such contrast to the lack of incident in the latter, but would suggest the need for an organized strategic perspective that is far more cunning than the enraged tactics of throwing rocks, and projectiles. We could lose two hundred activists to amateurish fist shaking when a set of tactics is needed that can bolshevizize the menshevizized.

I don't think an organized street protest should operate without the leadership needed to prevent hotheads self-destructing. We need to defeat the growing repression and how to do that changes constantly. With the right tactics this system can be brought to its knees.

R48G: utopian versus scientific socialism? //Reply to Black Flag: Marxism or anarchism? – An open letter to thinking anarchists

April 23rd, 2017 ·

These criticisms of anarchism are well taken but does the marxist left really have an edge up here? Let us consider the old distinction of 'utopian versus scientific socialism'.

The naivete of the so-called utopian socialists deserved a critique but the claim that marxism had produced a scientific substitute has subjected the left to a set of brittle claims that are easy targets for capitalist ideologists. The issue is not utopianism or pseudo-sciences of history but a viable program that stands beyond theory as a project to bring about a new form of economy and politics. And this is not utopian because it is a constructivist project of constitutional specifics (neo-communism) remorphing democratic legacies and with a hybrid of market and planning. This system would carry out the expropriation of the bourgeoisie to a Commons. This system is not utopian because it consists of a set of finite legal steps, and is indifferently scientific because it is based on free agents able to act in history, not on a set of 'causal' laws in a science.

The endless confusions of everyone from Bakunin to Proudhon are well answered in this article but the problems with classic marxism are equally intractable. The remarkable thing is that there is a way out of all these confusions, if only the marxist left could break its older mindset and think in fresh concepts.

Source: Reply to Black Flag: Marxism or anarchism? – An open letter to thinking anarchists [Part 1] | Anarchism | History & Theory

R48G: Cut and paste 'science march' for 'women's march'...

April 23rd, 2017 ·

Red Forty-eight Group: a theoretical new left perspective...

January 23rd, 2017 ·

The great success of the Women's March is belied by its lack of a comprehensive program of social change. That wasn't the purpose of the movement so we should not get into a lot of overheating save to note that a splendid degree of organization is lost on the larger left which can't seem to get its act together. What was the formula of success for this March?

The broader left has been rendered spasmodic by its accumulating contradictions and the confusion over evolution/revolution. Sanders' 'Our Revolution' shows the confusion in action: the program refers to one thing, action executes another plan.

It would almost seem as if women should lead a broader left but I fear that the example of the feminist movement will prove misleading.

And it is unfortunate that such a great groundswell of enthusiasm could not have multitasked more, especially in the issue of climate change...

I fear that as with the OWS this could prove a flash in the pan: let me be proved wrong.

Marxists have failed to produce a viable movement. The materials here have suggested the reason, with some suggestions to move on.

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Point_of_No_Return_landon_kindle2.pdf

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=The+Crisis+of+Modernity_ver6.pdf

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public/XML_DARW_GC_Axial?preview=Out+of+Revolution_text_kindle_johnlandon_wbf_pdf.pdf

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

DMNC

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=our+revolution>

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=red+forty-eight+group+fortyeight+R48G>

Red Forty-eight Group: back to the grind: revolutionary harangues...

January 17th, 2017 ·

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=The+Crisis+of+Modernity_ver6.pdf:

Toward a New Communist Manifesto

Democratic Market Neo-Communism

I hope it is more than someone getting older indulging in revolutionary exclamations, but if nothing else that is a function appropriate in a personal sense...And it is merely useful to remind those who will instinctively move in a more 'practical' vein that they could easily end up wasting their time. In the Trump era, watch what you say in public, we are 'nemo' here, ditto for nemini...

I don't think they will waste a drone on me, so as the headmaster quoth in Animal House, 'Out with it'...

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, smorgasboard...

The suspicious connection with transcendental idealism //The Trouble with Quantum Mechanics

January 16th, 2017 ·

One of the developing aspects of the great QM mystery is the suspicious resemblance to the question of Kant's transcendental idealism (with Schopenhauer's in the forefront) and next to that the basic perspective of Advaita's atman/brahman discourse. The New Age aspect has been so close to mystical abuse of physics for so long we might reject any such connection. But however muddled we suspect there must be a connection.

Finally we have discussed the framework of J.G.Bennett here, and one aspect of his work is his (perhaps premature) construct of 'time/eternity/hyparxis' which, however speculative, focuses on the obvious issue with QM and the entanglement problem: something obviously strange about the boundary of space and time in physics: something beyond the spatial/temporal seems intimately involved and this connects at once to Kant and to the Bennett constructs.

Let us hope that physics will be the candidate to resolve this quadruple mystery, but the Kantian distinction of noumenal/phenomenal may be at the heart of difficulties of closing the case in any direction.

Regarding the future of quantum mechanics, I have to echo Viola in Twelfth Night: "O time, thou must untangle this, not I." Steven Weinberg New York Review of Books

Source: The Trouble with Quantum Mechanics | Portside

An evolutionary path to some version of democratic market neo-communism?

January 15th, 2017 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/2017/01/14/after-all-the-labors-of-two-centuries-on-the-left-a-coherent-platform-still-doesnt-exist/>

Democratic Market Neo-communism

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=our+revolution>

<http://www.alternet.org/books/why-bernie-sanders-came-short-and-how-lesson-can-fuel-future-progressive-victories>

The strategy of Bernie Sanders has spawned an ambiguous jargon about 'revolution' and even socialism. This may be a clever indirection that escapes me, and it might help to suffer the ambiguity in a fellow travelers mode. But in the end we might learn from Sanders that he could use the term socialism and get a response from a huge sector of frustrated people who have seen through the charade of current politics.

But why not take up a real socialism, a real project for a new politics and economy taken as both an electoral option, but with a revolutionary potential in the background. The platform of Sanders evoked a strong response: would that persist in a rendering of real socialism? If not we have betrayed the terminology and taken away the option of those who are the real socialists. That changes the discussion in an ugly way and becomes a cooptation of the real thing.

We may just as well misjudge the situation by demanding a coherent platform where a contingent of the desperate are figuring an angle that is clever if not consistent.

It is interesting that while Marx is considered the revolutionary par excellence he and Engels, after 1848 entered a mode of conventional politics. And likewise we can adopt an evolutionary path, but that requires an actual socialist or communist orientation. I fear we are being sidelined then by the Sanders type of language and after an immense come on we are left without the ability to use the term 'revolution'. I predicted that last spring in a cautiously interested take on Sanders.

I don't think the damage done is all that great: all we have to do is point out the issue and at this point anyone who can do anything needs support. But in the end a Sanders victory would not have produced any socialism. Still, I think the time is coming when a Sanders type of campaign will replicate the mirror image of Trump in the revulsion at what has come about: a committed socialist platform might be online in a government that has control of Congress and Senate: what would be possible then?

A lot of confusion would arise at that point: we would end trying to recreate the New Deal in the midst of a now corrupt system that is run from a deep state, is imperialistic, with the drug rackets and covert agencies in the background. How would our Sanders deal with that, or with the spectre of Israel?

We of course lost such a moment with Obama in 2008, but of course he was no socialist.

We need a prefab model dealing with all such issues given a rendering in a complete package and we confront the reality that our political system is not likely to escape the clutches of the vultures of capitalism, the covert agencies, its legacy of imperialism and the persistent murder of many lefts.

As the saying goes, don't let me stop you. But a real socialism in a Sanders-style movement is what those who responded to his message were really hoping for. We don't know what betrayal of circumstance would have, might have, overtaken a Sanders moment.

R48G: revolutionary options, 'Our Revolution': is the american system corrupted beyond repair?

January 3rd, 2017

<http://darwiniana.com/2017/01/02/a-terminal-indictment-of-american-political-realitythe-cia-as-organized-crime/>

We have to face the reality that the american government is far worse than even its harshest critics suspected: our government involved in and controlling the drug trade?

There are limits to our conventional willingness to submit to a form of authority, but a 'drug mafia' embedded in our government sounds the alarm for a wake up call beyond conventional assumptions...

But there is a long list of critical issues:

the issue of 9/11 and the strong evidence some factor in the state/deep-state was behind it

the overall history of the CIA and covert agencies

the record of manufactured wars and imperialistic capitalism

etc...

We confront the question: can such a criminal enterprise as the US dot.gov be reformed?

A terminal indictment of american political reality//The CIA as Organized Crime

January 2nd, 2017 · No Comments

It is hard to think the corruption of the American system could be even worse than we had thought but this book, essential reading, shows an almost apocalyptic level of corruption, crime and dark side malevolence in the rogue operations of the CIA. It is hard to grasp the extent of the downfall and the indictment of the entire american governmental system.

Not the least revelation is that the CIA has essentially controlled the drug trade over the period of its existence...

Source: The CIA as Organized Crime: How Illegal Operations Corrupt America and the World: Douglas Valentine: 9780997287011: Amazon.com: Books

From 2016: R48G: Not getting stuck on Marx

October 5th, 2016 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/2016/10/04/red-forty-eight-group-the-climate-mobilization-movement-and-market-neo-communist-mobilization-party/>

<http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2016/10/10/karl-marx-yesterday-and-today>

Attempts to explicate Marx by asking if he is still relevant become tiresome, and beside the point. We are led through details that don't matter. In broad strokes Marx is overwhelmingly relevant, and that should lead us to try to update, rethink, and recast his legacy. The left is also at fault here in the fetishizing of Marx. It is not a question of Marx, but of a new formulation that may well echo the original set of ideas. But we need very little despite the canonization of the canon, a cultic phenomenon that has rendered marxists immobile, especially in the added legacy of Stalinism. Capital was a project that derailed and historical materialism is too constrained now. But so what? If we can absorb the gist and start over we can create something that can respond to the kind of proposal at the second link: The Climate Mobilization

We have suggested a way out of this stalled tradition in the quest for a new Manifesto.

https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/75650151/XML_DARW_GC_Axial/Toward%20a%20New%20Communist%20Manifesto.pdf. Biographies of Marx are of little moment at this point. The basic achievement of Marx/Engels doesn't need endless commentary and biographical chitchat. Marx/Engels laid down the foundations for a communist challenge to emergent capitalism. Period, over and out. What we need now is a new formulation, a new economic analysis, a new party, a new revolution, and an ecological version poised to resolve the climate crisis.

From 2016: Red Forty-eight Group: the Universal Class as a revolutionary class

October 3rd, 2016 ·

<https://communistleaguetaampa.org/2016/10/01/communist-strategy-today/>

This is a curiously compelling discussion but the format is still in the now date marxist-jargon mode. We have suggested here breaking out of that mold while remaining faithful to the principles of communism.

Let us consider what seems the most heretical reformation: moving from the 'working class' focus to a new approach: the revolutionary Universal Class. The working class analysis is so much a part of the legacy that to question it would seem a hopeless. But actually the take on the Universal Class is a better version of the 'working class' emphasis. The 'working class' formulation belongs to the earliest phase of the industrial revolution with its massive proletarian formations. What we see now is a far more diversified set of classes and class fragments. The idea of the Universal Class is really a synonym for the

'working class' but embraces the whole set of those who are inside a wage economy, outside of the economy, everyone, in fact, even the capitalists who, like Engels, just might enter the stream of postcapitalism.

The idea of the working class created an expectation in leftists, but the result always disappointed them, witness the most recent case of the Trump fans. The working class is not an agent of history, it is an abstraction. And the concept still divides one class against others. The Universal Class is a way to free leftists from trying to manipulate the working class so that they can as a class, and as individuals, act from their own autonomous initiative. The OWS was an example, compromised by other difficulties. The range of figures involved in that movement was actually caviled by some for not being a working class formation! In any case, a movement of any and all persons in all sorts of formations need a category they can enter as they are to work toward a revolutionary postcapitalism. First, it is important to be wary of excessive sectarian divisions in thought. The idea of the Universal Class can serve that purpose and change gears in a flash to the basic orientation of working class activism.

In general, changing terminology is often in itself a useful tactic. It forces a recompute in thought that generates creative energy. The whole left needs a postmarxist re-write that can appeal to the chronic semi-anarchist rejection of classical bolshevism/marxism. There is no other way. But the left is very attached to marxist jargon. Not surprising. This new approach can make use of the classic versions, but points to a core neo-communism as a practical project, etc...

https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/75650151/XML_DARW_GC_Axial/Toward%20a%20New%20Communist%20Manifesto.pdf

From 2016: What is secularism? //How the New Atheist Movement Blew a Big Opportunity...

September 30th, 2016 ·

This is a very good take on the new atheists, and I think a new movement is needed that can produce a broader definition of the secular. Islam is a complicated and tricky question and contains a confusing history and interior that is both almost primitive and highly profound. And it contains the subreligion of Sufism which is very hard to assess, but which attempted to realize a gnostic alternative that was lost in Christianity and thence also in modern secularism, in most forms. And the imperialist war on Terror has hopelessly confused the question. What is the secular given the aborted modernity of the US and other 'exemplars'? I think nonetheless the freedom to critique Islam must be kept clear and open and the right approach might be to set aside the atheism issue and advocate passing beyond Islam (and Christianity) from a larger perspective than that of theistic metaphysics: the large transition to a new epoch of modernity beyond the religions of the Axial Age. The new atheists have failed to see the covert false flag op in 9/11 and this makes their whole critique almost worthless and Islamophobic.

The modern transition is a complex and very rich epochal advance and it contains elements that can realize the net equivalent of religion in a secular form with a far greater sophistication than the legacy traditions themselves. In the nonce, Islam will modernize in its own way, and while exterior critics can and must subject a net religious monstrosity to the demand of postreligion the reality of Islam will defeat anything as simplistic as the new atheism. The irony is that traditions of spiritual psychology in sufism, although captive to reactionary legacies, are potentially the antidote to the scientism of secular

humanism. It is a disservice nonetheless to ignore the fatal bias of the new atheists and equally so to miss the hidden depth in the Islamic legacy.

Source: How the New Atheist Movement Blew a Big Opportunity to Bring Acceptance to Non-Believers | Alternet

Red Forty-eight Group: 'Our Revolution', democratic market neo-communism, and the rapid appearance of totalitarian capitalism

September 30th, 2016 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=red+forty-eight+group+fortyeight>

It is time to consolidate our framework discussed under the key words Red Forty-eight Group (which refers to the birth of postcapitalist revolutionary movements in the wake of the 1848 revolutions. Our project, *Toward a New Communist Manifesto*, was a start, but the task is enormous. The general point is that we are at risk of being completely out played by the forces of capitalist civilization. Their power is immense and growing. But they have shown their weak spot: the legacy of capitalist rationalization has foundered in a remarkable display of stupidity: the rationality turned out to be an ideological hypnosis so severe the perpetrators can't figure out that climate change is even a problem. The automated dynamic of free markets has by its own logic undermined the sanity of conventional economic thinking. Our response to that must be more than new-dealist progressivism, although we should applaud and support the spectrum of such efforts. We must confront the logic of those still in the era of the French Revolution whose inner logic foretold the larger revolution to come that would deal with class, capitalism, and globalization. We must study the Russian instance but we can both study and set aside that episode: we are now in the full autumn of capitalism, where Russia was in its early spring, and we can proceed with a greater efficacy to challenge the capitalist monstrosity. It won't be easy, but the system, especially but not exclusively given the climate crisis, will amplify our efforts if they are rightly directed to a true revolutionary change. That can come via an evolutionary path, but we must change the whole dynamics with a new economic system, a new politics, a new constitutional democratic communism, and a new world view or set of such that can realize the post religious legacies of the Axial Age: the simplest candidate is modernity itself, with the classic secular humanism of the age of Feuerbach being shown to be too limited for the task, although its basic thrust is more than open to a suitable upgrade.

The climate crisis is proving to be so severe that global civilization is going to destabilize. The left needs to be ready. Marxism is a starting point, but in some ways a liability. The key moment of transformation will come suddenly and the left needs to be ready.

The eonic effect, 'form factors' and Bennett's three dimensions of time.

September 30th, 2016 ·

<http://www.csmonitor.com/The-Culture/Verbal-Energy/2016/0929/A-visit-to-Tom-Wolfe-s-Kingdom-of-Speech>

In a way, Wolfe distorts the issue of language evolution with his own suggestion, even as he rightly challenges the Darwin paradigm here. The question of Chomsky, to me, is on the sidelines. It is not a full theory of language, let alone its evolution, but Chomsky, without saying so very clearly, is a non-darwinist. Evidently the academic environment makes it hard to speak out. Bravo for blogs like this! The idea of recursion in Chomsky should be challenged, but it remains somehow a very relevant theory. I think in a general way he is right about a language module, but we have extended that to language as a subprocess in the 'evolution' of mind with correlates in consciousness, ethical reasoning, creativity/aesthetic sense, and much else.

Does language evolution explode the theory of evolution? If you equate 'evolution' with natural selection, then it does. Aren't there other meanings of the term 'evolution'? There are, and we have proposed a slew of different approaches. That, and a reference to J.G. Bennett's approach which is so far ahead (which doesn't make it right) of current thinking that it makes natural selection theory seem ridiculous. Let's illustrate the point in terms of the 'eonic model' discussed here many times, keeping mind that I never create hybrids of my model with speculative outside theories. But we can restate Bennett's point very simply.

In terms of the eonic model we see a process that is directional, which immediately blows the issue out of standard science. How do we discuss a directional (hence teleological) process? Over and over in the eonic model we see a phenomenological dynamic that our model zeroes in on, but what it can't do is really observe, let alone explain, the process behind that remarkable version stated in terms of a finite transition model of discrete transitions. We used Schopenhauer to deal with this: the phenomenology of evolution veils a 'thing-in-itself' aspect: teleology seems to be a noumenal aspect of the outer phenomenology of evolution. That's elegant, but a conjecture beyond the eonic model. But the specific aspects of the phenomenon of transitions induces a sense of shock: what we don't see is an enigma: it looks like a design argument, and yet it looks mechanical at the same time (teleology would induce that feeling). But we are talking about high level culture under transformation. The 'what does this and how' remains a mystery. We can see that there is a hidden form factor and this invokes a demand from physics itself to help out here. Physicists have already proposed a suggestion, fine tuning arguments, which they wish to undo and make disappear. But they are on the record here, whatever the future of research. Let's state the point very simply: something we can't see in the physics is generating a future set of developments, in life, then in the emergence of mind, of man, and then of his civilizations. Getting specific is hard.

Lo and behold, a close look at Bennett gives a few hints. Note that a teleological process is meta-causal. Uh Oh, problem Bennett in his vast system proposes the 'simple' way out, a new geometry of time, in a six dimensional model, three d space and three d time: time, eternity, hyperaxis. Now we have it: the pattern/potential of 'evolution' is carried in the dimension of eternity and interacts via hyperarchic time

with an evolutionary process that realizes a latent future. That's bit wild, but it does produce a model of how a directional process in history can operate. It raises its own questions, to say the least, but it tells us how far off natural selection theory is.

That still doesn't tell us how language evolved, but it is related to the more general question of the evolution of mind, and this is part of the more general teleological development of the evolution of life.

I neither endorse or full reject Bennett's type of analysis, content to point out that a 'paper napkin in a coffee shop' model is in existence to resolve the hopeless difficulties of darwinism, and has a suggestive relative in history.

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/2016/09/26/the-eonic-effect-as-a-long-lost-and-so-far-only-clue-to-the-evolution-of-language/>

<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.

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 hyperaxis, the later being the interaction of time and eternity. 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 an 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.

The eonic effect as a long lost and so far only clue to the evolution of language

September 26th, 2016 ·

The study of the eonic effect (history and evolution.com) can be an arduous trek through an immense amount of complex data but its basic method is sure footed and can create a set of complex gestalts of the 'evolution/development' of various historical entities. This study can give us one set of clues to the evolution of language because we see over and over the sudden emergence of 'very late' linguistic constructs: art/literature in timed emergence intervals, in a complex sequence constituting the rapid appearance of a cultural literature. The most spectacular case is the clearly documented Greek Archaic in the Axial interval, which produces an 'instant literary corpus starting with the Greek epics, moving to an immense field of lyric, concluding (outside the Axial interval) with the stunning Greek tragic phase, after which the effect damps out rapidly. This requires a cautionary study of the 'stream and sequence' effect to make clear that in many cases we see not an absolute innovation but a relative transformation of an entity. That's clear in the case of the Greek epic which has a prior history of bardic culture, but then with a sudden remorphing collation and upgrade into a whole Homeric corpus, notably the Iliad and the Odyssey, with a very large additional corpus (the tale of the Trojan horse never appears in the Iliad).

http://history-and-evolution.com/whee4th/chap5_2_1.htm

This example shows that a high level process we call 'macroevolution' in a special sense can operate over three plus centuries over a cultural region and induce in the common field of members of that culture the creation by such individuals of new and highly advanced aesthetic/linguistic artifacts at the highest level of art/genius. This is a truly stunning discovery right under our noses. We must keep in mind this is by indirect inference of methods of relative periodization and correlation, meaning that we don't see 'what caused what'. Further, in the model given a careful distinction is made between the systematics of the macro process and the free agency of those who execute history (and a macro transformation). The latter can be considered the 'micro' aspect. What does this mean? How does the macro induce the micro? Does the macro create great literature? Clearly not, as far as we can tell: 'man makes himself', in the famous phrase, and yet he clearly gets a lot of help from a mysterious and transient field like effect in a series of discrete transitions. How can we understand this? There is a simple analogy, which can't be the whole story, but which can help up to a point, which is to consider the distinction of a genre from its exemplars. We even see an example: the sudden emergence (at least in Greek literature, there may have been Sumerian tragedies for all we know, just to be non-committal about absolute origins) of the new genre of 'tragedy' (clearly foreseen in the mood of the Iliad, however): the macro generates a high level abstraction and potential and the poet realizes its exemplars. This distinction of system action and free agency all at once clarifies the parallel moment of the stunning synchrony of the Old Testament history of Israel in the Axial interval 900 to 600 BCE (!), a history hopelessly confused by this double action of macro and micro, of a mysterious history of the Axial effect and the Israelites who composed the 'genre' of the Old Testament, etc...We should note the remarkable fact that the Israelites noticed the Axial interval in which they were immersed as it happened and resorted to a cargo cult of a divinity acting in history. That has created great confusion, but it is, taken with the anthropologist fan club cheering on 'primitives', a remarkable insight and discovery.

Let us note in passing that Homer was very clear that he was a mouthpiece for the 'muse' and that he didn't ascribe his poetry to free agency.

This study doesn't clarify the question of genetic correlates of high level cultural evolution. I feel increasingly suspicious there is a genetic component to the emergence of civilization, but we can't close the case here.

This 'macro effect' is something very late that assumes a basic genetic potential of man in an historical context. We can't be sure however just what changes the eonic effect might have induced in man genetically in the last ten thousand years, so we can't directly apply this model to the earlier stage of human evolution of man in general or language in particular.

But we have enough for a judicious guess, if we can assume that what we see in later history applies to the earlier period plus a genetic factor we don't yet understand. First, anything that can operate over ten thousand years to induce coherent effects on a stupendous scale could induce we suspect 'mere changes of various genes'. But we can't speculate without caution.

We have the gist thus of a theory of language evolution, this time applied not on the scale of the Axial Age, but of a more focalized aggregate of hominids, homo erectus most likely, isolated in an African scene, the object of a macrosequence of tens of millennia in a series of transitions that return on their speciating field, inducing holistic transforms of linguistic action, perhaps via primordial art forms, song, saga, and dance.

However, we must stand back to see a far more general transformation.

If we examine the examples above, e.g. the Greek Axial inside the eonic sequence, we see that the transformation is far more than a question of linguistic arts: it is a transformation of a whole culture, the overall rapid 'evolution' visible in Archaic Greece of cultural, political, artistic, philosophical, and other factors.

Thus in our consideration of early emerging homo sapiens we would see a larger complex of cultural/genetic evolution and it may be this way all the way through: a macro transformation that is more than the genetic: an overall transformation of the net 'whole' of hominid, culture, and genetics in a unitary field of an evolving complex.

This model shows just how fast the macro process operates: in three centuries an entire field of culture is transformed, and in ten thousand years plus we see the whole of human civilization emerge, and we strongly suspect this macro effect goes back to the start of Neolithic if not before. (We can't be sure if there were any macro effects in the higher/lower Paleolithic 50kBCE to the Neolithic, unfortunately)

All at once we have a model of how something as sudden as the appearance of homo sapiens might have occurred, with no details, with a general framework for how this can happen, an early variant of the historical case we do see.

No wonder we can't figure it out. We must have rich data sets over very specific short intervals, and that we don't have. We must consider, to repeat, a larger set of transformations, which might revolve around the entry of 'mind into emerging homo sapiens' as an integrated mental/physical transformation that put man in part into spooky physics realms with a sense of spirit, of soul, of art, of ethical action with a will, a new range of consciousness in potential, and a 'creative energy' that in part fueled the creation of language, poetry, song, etc...

That's the best I can do, hope it helps... the study of the eonic effect takes time and requires the study of multiple resources in each period in question over the whole range of world history, a lot of work.

But it is a reminder that we underestimate the sheer stupendous scale of any theory of evolution. We can't speculate about a mechanism in a void. We confront immense data sets, here the entire historical corpus in all possible aspects over a ten thousand year interval. We barely observe this in recent world history. In the case of earlier man, we have almost nothing as yet.

R48G: Our Revolution: confronting the american fascist monstrosity in the climate emergency

September 25th, 2016 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=red+forty-eight+group+fortyeight>

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=market+neo-communism+communism>

The idea of a new political party is nice, cute, but one more just now is superfluous while what is needed is a movement of movements to move as much as possible into the climate emergency situation. But I think that the idea of a virtual neo-communist movement should proceed on the sidelines, ready to move to the forefront, but short of that a constant expose of both established and pseudo-activist movements. The public, once they grasp the situation, will begin to converge away from the current false consensus. Consider 350.org: what else do we have. It is doing a lot a good. But we need to continue from the sidelines to remind such groups they will fail and be ready when the real rage/despair readies a new generation to revolt.

We confront a criminal mafia running the US, predating across a whole planet. There nexus is controlled by a deep state, democracy is an illusion, imperialism is wreaking havoc, the war on terror is a false flag construct, the political system has been essentially taken over by the right, the list is grotesque. We must proceed beside emergency actions NOW to deal with emergency to see how their at best partial success demands a larger comprehensive revolutionary solution.

Mode of production theory and the macro model's intermittent/terminating character.

September 22nd, 2016 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/2016/09/19/red-forty-eight-group-mode-of-production-theory-the-econostream-and-the-macro-sequence/>

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.

R48G: 'Our revolution' and the ambiguity of revolutionary sloganeering...

April 20th, 2017 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=our+revolution> We have addressed Sanders' 'Our revolution' many times here and in the end the phrase, which could be wither a cooptation or a slyly seditious, 'revolutionary', slogan points to impotence of those who see rightly that a revolution is needed even as the undertow of conventional politics leads to what we in fact saw with Sanders: a tide of socialist hurrah turning in circles to become a sucker punch for actually socialists, not the 'new deal/social democratic' reality espoused by the berniacs. That is, cooptation?

There is no inherent reason why a radical platform can't work within the system but at this point we must confront, at least theoretically, the reality of social catastrophe unfolding and only resolvable by near kamikazis prepared to take on the system in a revolutionary sense. We need to do more than implore the working class to revolt under the bargain of a higher minimum wage. Consider the staggering list of issues on which a so-called socialist should work even as these will 'gravitate' as a verb compromise:

climate change which the working class it seems could care less about

degrowth, which makes the question of social democratic gains ambiguous

political corruption, the need for a new type of congress

presidential 'slide': the warmaking presidency

covert action and a 'deep state' of militarist shadow figures

the 9/11 conspiracy and that deep state...

outright drug mafias in place behind government fronts

imperialistic wars

the question of Israel and the Lobby: will these socialist suppress evidence of Israelis behind 9/11?

capitalism and militarism, capitalism/globalization and economic nationalism, the whole spectrum of standard socialist issues

etc...

This list shows the necessity of comprehensive social transformation.

After tremendous struggle socialists might get a congressman or two in place. so what? On which of the above will they compromise?

One thing is clear: we can't compromise on the climate question and we can't wait 4/8 years on the hope that Trump will be defeated...

Obviously the situation is hopeless, yet perhaps not...

We have suggested that a broad radical/revolutionary movement requires more than marxist boilerplate and socialist cliches. We have suggested complete makeover of a version of democratic neo-communism.

This demands that 'marches on Washington' be something more than placard graffiti displays and consider the potential of taking over Washington infrastructure.

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

Should revolutionary DMNC neo-communists be democratic socialists?//Should Democratic Socialists Be Democrats? – In These Times

April 20th, 2017 ·

This is an interesting take from DSA sources which we have puckishly challenged by raising the ante. We have deliberated the basic issue here many times with our formal equivocation over Sanders' 'Our Revolution'. The article speaks for itself, but in the end we must suspect that socialists must be revolutionaries even though they can and should consider the electoral realm.

We have a lot of posts here on related discussions: <http://darwiniana.com/?s=our+revolution>

Source: Should Democratic Socialists Be Democrats? – In These Times

R48G: is the revolutionary option realistic?

April 19th, 2017 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=R48G+revolution>

I think it is quite realistic to consider a 'revolutionary' option to the developing social, ecological and political crisis: willy-nilly the system will default to attempts to seize the future and we see that already underway on the right: so the choice is revolution from the right...or the left. However, the question remains as to whether an evolutionary path is not the correct better alternative. This is the same old debate that arose with Bernstein and the second international, but the terms of that debate have shifted. The claims of Bernstein are not born out: the slow development of socialism isn't happening, quite the contrary, the world system is falling into the hands of the right with a new set of occult reactionaries at work. They must be laughing at the naivete of historical materialists.

But the left can remake itself, inevitably it will, and produce an upgrade of the old canons that will address the overall task of modernity, ecology, economic populism and equality, with a robust socialism—our version is of a form of neo-communism. The left can be confident in one sense: it represents the future better than the right whose confused anti-modernism can only result in decline. The key issue is to not sacrifice democracy in the name of defending democracy corrupted by capitalism. The older left saw through the word game but the result backfired in the antagonism to liberalism and its system of rights, a complete derailment. What is required has to be a postleninist respect for the core liberalism that history spawned against antiquity. That it was corrupted at the start by the capitalist revolution is nearly a cliché, but also a key piece in the puzzle. How could the bolsheviks have lost it.

The point is to be ready as the world system enters an inexorable instability caused by the internal contradictions of the current neo-liberal reaction. In the case of the US a monstrosity has emerged that is a deadly menace to planetary life and civilization. We are confronted by a kind of screaming 'Your move' as the left fumbles through one more march on Washington.

So the logic of revolution seems unrealistic, but the reality is that the right is on the move and will force the issue, if the left can be ready and not regurgitate a stale marxist/2nd international fiasco.

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

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

RG48: countering the global right's attempt to destroy democracy

April 18th, 2017 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=r48g+revolution>

As we noted today there is a global movement to destroy democracy and the left needs to be wary of falling into a version of that trap (I note that Maduro in Venezuela is a fan of Putin, in some connection with Brics thinking perhaps) and it is essential to see that a revolutionary way must be a democratic way even if a transitional passage to a new politics might require a period of strong leadership, whatever that means. In fact we should be clear in advance what that means and create something better than a concoction of one party rule and covert agencies with powers to bypass human rights. The whole Bolshevik experiment was bogus, although it doesn't follow we should embrace some kind of Menshevik 'better alternative'. First, the best option may be the one that seems impossible, an attempt to work within the system along electoral paths to a constitutional regime change. The attempt could also squander opportunity as we have seen in the past generation in fact with a feckless set of projects that guarantee their own failure.

It would seem that the basic pattern is visible looking backwards from the period 1848 forward and the tension of evolutionary/revolutionary ways was explicitly embraced by Marx/Engels (and Bakunin?) but at this point a new formulation is needed, a variant and close relative of the original no doubt, but with a clear discontinuity in thinking and initialization, one that doesn't have to answer to or justify the legacy. Over and over leftists regurgitate marxist thinking, leninist thinking, try to prove that the legacy got it right when it got it wrong, distort the history and accuse bourgeois historians of distorting the record where it is the left dogmatists who are suppressing facts: it is almost impossible to get Lenin correct, for example. So Good Bye to all that....

The solution is a from scratch platform that critiques the capitalist, is ready with an alternative, with an inspirational saga of the onset of socialism/communism in the period of the French Communists whose work we codified by Marx/Engels. The era of the revolutions of 1848 can be a starting point, with a larger framework of modernity as a background more general than positivistic materialism. We have shown how a new model of history can make philosophy irrelevant in the sense of transcending idealism/materialism, with the phase of German classical philosophy being a summation of philosophical counterpoint. The emerging historical materialism of The German Ideology can be taken as the necessity of evaluating the ideological economics and class struggle of capitalist society, taken without the elaborate theory that is clear false.

It would seem that the whole venture has come too late. Between the Stalinists, the Gandhians, Marxist diehards, and feckless OWS screamers unable to produce so much as a platform we may have lost the whole chance and it would seem that a last ditch at revolutionary change carefully envisioned and with some failsafes against past failures (how about a set of revolutionary observers empowered to expose emerging violations of a stated revolutionary procedure? Or an ascetic class of revolutionaries sworn to never own property?). It is a more dignified way to pass through a planetary endgame.

In the nonce we have considered the larger universal class rather than the 'working class'. The working class is not currently a revolutionary force. We must simply produce a general platform of equality and economic populism and economic rights: the working class will rapidly wake up again and respond to a leftist appeal once again.

But the critical issue is a holistic blueprint for a new society, and an ecological postmarxism that can deal with the environmental realization of socialism...

Ayn Rand and techie retards//The Massive Monopolies of Google, Facebook and Amazon, and Their Role in Destroying Privacy, Producing Inequality and Undermining Democracy | Alternet

April 18th, 2017 ·

One of the great ironies of the IQ age is the stupidity of so many in the geek world. Here the attraction of sectors of this realm (in Silicon valley) to Ayn Rand is evidence of the reality of low net intelligence in much of the techno-scientific world. The menace called Ayn Rand can only exist in a basically adolescent culture of 'adults' who are confused about Nietzsche, brainwashed darwinists prone to social darwinism, and victims of neo-classical economic theory, a prime case of surface high intelligence masking idiocy.

Source: The Massive Monopolies of Google, Facebook and Amazon, and Their Role in Destroying Privacy, Producing Inequality and Undermining Democracy | Alternet

The failure of the left//We Are Witnessing the First Global Alliance of Far-Right Parties Since the 1930s | Alternet

April 18th, 2017 ·

I will be perverse and blame marxists for failing to distance themselves from the legacy of Bolshevism: the far right is a phenomenon being engineered from what I would call the 'deep global state', a nexus of related coteries from outright fascists, reactionary sufis and gurus, antimodernists, occult predistigators, and a lot more. We should recall that democracy in Athens between Solon (Cleisthenes) and the end of the Peloponnesian war lasted about two or more centuries, sound familiar?

The left needs to rebirth itself around a hybrid that works of democracy done right, and a postcapitalist socialism with an economic resolution of neo-liberalism via an economics that is functional without being controlled by capitalists.

Source: We Are Witnessing the First Global Alliance of Far-Right Parties Since the 1930s | Alternet

Red Forty-eight Group: beyond the marxist legacy

May 15th, 2016 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/the-crisis-of-modernity/>

The core legacy of marxism, if streamlined, could be a powerful tool at a time when activist groups are floundering in confusion (although climate activism seems to be picking up). The issue of revolution won't go away and it is the electoral non-revolutionaries such as Sanders who have re-energized the term. Step one, drop the term marxism, and be ready to de-sanctify Marx

We have explored a series of issues here:

any serious political movement must tackle the question of 9/11 and the concealed governmental conspiracy here. This stops the legitimacy of America in its tracks

this raises the question of covert agencies and the realm of dark ops seeping into modern government: will the left look the other way and, given revolutionary license adopt the whole game and make it worse, as did the Bolsheviks? Modern government has been almost completely corrupted by psychopaths...Any revolution is likely to be overtaken by these types all over again...

consider our discussion of Carroll's The Big Picture (previous post): the era of positivism produced a brittle materialism, and modern physics as a whole is not producing an accurate view of reality. The sudden posit of materialism against idealism bungled the job of a viable materialism, what to say of idealism. The conflict of the two is a waste of energy at this point

the left has become fixated on darwinism, despite Marx's instant suspicion, later it would seem deception and he stopped his objections...No serious movement is possible with darwinian assumptions...

There are a host of related issues, but the issue of the 9/11 conspiracy is a good acid test of whether the radical left is really serious or competent

Challenge to physicists like Sean Carroll: the eonic effect...scientists can't even discuss the axial age in public

May 15th, 2016 ·

<http://www.preposterousuniverse.com/blog/2015/09/28/the-big-picture/>

We discussed The Big Picture yesterday (by Sean Carroll) and we can refine our basic challenge to the failure of scientists to explain evolution, the failure of that explanation of human evolution and nature, and the failure to answer to the issue of the emergence of values...

As to the latter the eonic effect shows how values are central to the core dynamics of history. We can't reduce history, and therefore probably, evolution to pure fact. Values enter, and probably have a default form even at the level of basic physics

'Reality' doesn't just process causally, but seems to process a unity called 'causality/freedom'

It is very hard, but probably not impossible, to explain human evolution (and that would lead to a generalization for 'animals') in standard evolutionary terms. Human consciousness is a complex instrument far beyond the simple animal awareness from which it springs

The modern period issued a warning against the coming failure of physics with Kant (among others)...Modern science hasn't heeded the warning and enforces a strong Iron Cage mentality

The issue of values is connected with a hidden teleological factor, detectable in history...Science's failure to deal with teleology is a strong objection to its dogmatism

Scientists cannot seem to grasp the way a pseudo-science of economics has been created out of a parody of calculus...

Making America great again has to start with diagnosing the criminal enterprise of its current covert ops legacy, e.g. the 9/11 conspiracy

May 14th, 2016 ·

<http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/36027-hillary-thinks-the-us-great-why-don-t-you>

The issue of America's greatness is a bit grotesque. The reality is that the US has been wrecked beyond repair short of a revolutionary transformation and accounting of its current hidden nightmare, which includes the now strong evidence that this political system is controlled from sources not completely clear but whose action created the 9/11 conspiracy. Reaching greatness again requires diagnosing this history of crime and making it public. That won't happen with either Clinton or Trump: they are part of the calamity.

No more bullshit, please, from any politician double talking on this.

R48G: Trump's crime against humanity and the need to put a stop to it as soon as possible, a desperate situation

April 17th, 2017 ·

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Point_of_No_Return_landon_kindle2.pdf

We have about ten years left to prevent irreversible catastrophe on the climate change front and yet just at this point we are treated to Trump's effort to deprive us of our last chance. It is hard to fathom the depth of wilful ignorance here, and of the capitalist world suffused in false ideology.

We have the right to revolt here, and in fact this has moved into the realm of duty. We can eschew revolution for an evolutionary path, or pursue both, and we can also aggressively point out to a deceiving liar who has flipfopped on all the issues he began with that he can do a flipflop on the issue of climate.

The collapse of Judeo-Christianity: Judeo-Zionism a pernicious terminal end phase of the Judaic tradition

April 17th, 2017

Judaism/Zionism has become a pernicious and almost cancerated version of itself and its outcome in Israel is a monstrosity rendered worse by the support (and exploitation) of (conservative) Christians giving license to the myth of a Jewish state disposed to inequality jewish and gentiles. The tragic flaw of Judaism has come to the fore to create a fake religious frankenstein that has corrupted the American state with a cabal of hidden control.

This outcome, and the critique applies as well to Christians, deserves the fate that will come in the end: abandonment of a false religion that has corrupted the foundation of religion with an Old Testament that is mythological, if not outright mendacious and propagandistic. Equally the Christian legacy is collapsing as the perception becomes obvious that Christianity is equally a form of mythological propaganda and in many ways no religion at all but a cattle car exploiting the pious.

We can and should call for a humanism beyond Christianity (which is neither atheist nor theist) and for the assimilation of jews, more or less, into a post-Judaism that is not a menace to the cultures in which it is embedded, including those in the middle. And the true criminality of the Israeli state is barely understand in the Christian world with its concealed covert actions, including 9/11.

Enough's enough.

Kant's first in the void of ethical doctrines

April 17th, 2017 · No Comments

Kant's ethical system as the first instance in history...

May 13th, 2016 ·

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kantian_ethics

The first, and in many ways the only, real system of ethics was that of Kant. Those who promote Spinoza to Hume for secular reasons should keep that in mind. Unfortunately almost all the accounts of the subject are a turn off. They can't seem to grasp the implications of what he did. And the study of the subject gets sidetracked in attempts to use the Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals as a practical moral text. Maybe, but...

It seems that just as Kant got it right he got it wrong, and realized his deep thinking in a series of almost cardboard exemplars, like duty, etc...But those are perfectly suitable for a general kind of theoretical analysis.

In the end the subject is in reality too complex for simple resolution, but Kant's train wreck is the only real 'ethical system' we have. And then it ends up in the political lying debate as an additional burden of confusion...But he had a point. Modern ethics is influenced by Nietzsche who was confused and, we fail to realize, nihilist politicians who poison the cultural atmosphere...

The issue of ethics analytically is actually ultra complex and so it is not surprising everyone gets it wrong.

Two key points: Kant deduces the form of freedom, as the will, that must be the basis for an ethical system...Here scientists just go off the rails with deterministic axioms...

archive: working class/universal class

April 15th, 2017 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/2017/04/15/r48g-the-working-class-center-focus-in-the-universal-class/>

The working class versus the universal class <http://darwiniana.com/2016/05/07/the-working-class-versus-the-universal-class/>

<http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/35902-elections-and-the-marxist-tradition>

Correctly interpreting the marxist tradition is very difficult, and is beset with the knee jerk defense of Marx at all points. But maybe Marx got it wrong. Or maybe times have changed.

We have tried here to streamline the whole legacy, make it independent of the term 'marxism' and the cult of Marx. We have also challenged the excessive focus on the working class, instead looking at the Universal Class as a superset of the working class. The Universal Class is present at most activist movements while the working class is not always so active. In any case we need to work with the full set of the complement to the bourgeoisie, a much larger set, and very often the real source of radical action.

Consider this book on Lenin:

https://www.amazon.com/Lenin-Revolutionary-Party-Paul-Blanc-ebook/dp/B01912KMW8/ref=sr_1_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1462633151&sr=1-1&keywords=le+blanc+lenin : Lenin and the Revolutionary Party

In most cases there is talk about the working class but when the acid test comes, a vanguard forms and acts in the name of the working class.

The idea of the Universal Class can mediate this easily: it is the same as the working class and/or a superset that can be the flexible placeholder in actual situations. Look at the Sanders movement? How many are working class? Most are my Universal Class, technically working class, but not really bluecollar.

We are not likely to get a revolution by the working class. Let's be honest and attempt a revolution with the Universal Class, and make the outcome a matter of principle, i.e. communist foundations. We must trust that this group or universal class can be trusted to act on principle, given the inevitability of the universal class ending up with a vanguard. These points are all debatable, but the classic marxist jargon isn't producing anything at this point.

We need someone/somwho's with the resolve to create a revolution (or an electoral version, perhaps both in parallel), whoever they are. Such groups can betray principle. But look at the Trump movement. The working class types there aren't exactly radical.

A movement of the Universal Class can actually create a superior form of equality, because it will define that in terms of principles. The marxist approach makes the working class the dominant class, a form of inequality!

It is not a big deal, actually. We stop waiting around for the working class, and just act with a new party of any and all types.

Archive: histomat and the Iron Cage...

April 15th, 2017 ·

We are to archive in our blogbook some posts since last year in addition to 'posts current as you go'...

Red Forty-eight Group: strategy to neutralize Iron Cage scientism/pseudo-science

May 6th, 2016 · <http://darwiniana.com/2016/05/06/red-forty-eight-group-strategy-to-neutralize-iron-cage-scientismpseudo-science/>

We keep harping on historical materialism, but our logic is sound: a deterministic theory (it is denied that it is such, but...) creates a Iron Cage effect in which autonomy has been sacrificed to theory. And this is the case for the overall Iron Cage mentality of science/scientism, neo-classical economics, darwinian evolutionary theory, and marxism itself. This is one reason we have challenged darwinism here: it represents a subtle mechanization of behavior and culture, this playing into the hands of elites via social darwinism, and the result is a brand of the kind of ideology of theory that Marx attempted to challenge. But the result sank further into the quicksand.

It would be a cogent revolutionary tactic to exploit this weak spot in the establishment of 'Big Science' by seeing this fatal weak spot and moving to seize the high ground of real science. Almost the whole cadre of science and economics are fixated in pseudo-science, an easy target.

The result can be an improved social perspective based on the rich spectrum of resources of the early modern.

R48G: our formulation is free of the need to defend legacy marxism/leninism...and a proposal to (american) military sectors... <http://darwiniana.com/2017/04/14/r48g-our-formulation-is-free-of-the-need-to-defend-legacy-marxism-leninism-and-a-proposal-to-american-military-sectors/>

https://www.dropbox.com/home/Public?preview=Democratic_Market_Neo_Communism_ver_5.pdf

We have cited in two days two critiques of marxism. Our stance is, so what? Our task is to arrive at a path to postcapitalism, and we can do this without having to spend any time defending marxism or leninism.

This approach to the question of communism as 'democratic market neo-communism' is completely unburdened from all the implications of marxist fundamentalism, historical materialism, and yet can easily absorb restatements in simple empirical formats of many of the classic themes/memes such as class struggle, the influence of ideology, economics and theoretical illusion. We can even rescue the labor theory of value as long as we don't get into theoretical quagmires with the simple restatement to the effect that labor exploitation is historically as the core of capitalism, etc...

Our DMNC is a compromise that isn't a compromise at all because its foundation is a communist legal foundation and expropriation of private property/the bourgeoisie to the 'Commons'. With that foundation there is no reason why a structured mix of planned economy and modified market economics can't coexist in a complex system of transitional and hybrid neo-communist legal/constitutional communism.

There are a whole set of issues however of the actual character of capitalism as is, especially in our focus on the US: let us take up one issue and quite directly preach a path of a military for a postcapitalist age. In a considerable irony the american military could redeem itself by becoming a global force for postcapitalist DMNC and an equalizer in the ecological transition to a new civilization liberated from capitalist militarism, imperialistic fascism and the economic capture by the military industrial complex. A new conception of the soldier based on the individual rather than the mechanized human robot could liberate the tradition from its class basis and exploitation....We can thus propose without apology a seditious project of a military for DMNC as an exit strategy for the current system of exploited, class based and fascist US army sectors...

R48G: the problem of history and problems with the eonic model: a minimalist version of the eonic effect as a series of questions/hypotheses and warnings

<http://darwiniana.com/2017/04/12/r48g-the-problem-of-history-and-problems-with-the-eonic-model-a-minimalist-version-of-the-eonic-effect-as-a-series-of-questionshypotheses-and-warnings/>

In defense of post-marxism...

May 8th, 2016 ·

<https://www.youtube.com/user/marxistcom>

This site, along with Socialist Appeal has a funny charm, but it is stuck in the past, and is entangled in the 'marxist dogma' syndrome. We need to leave it all behind, recreate the core legacy, drop the term 'marxism', stop the cult of Marx, and from there move on to an honest critique of Leninism, not easy.

Needless to say we need a complete expose of Stalinism, many already exist. We honor Marx better with this approach.

Marxists can apply dialectic to their own materials:

a critique of darwinism

a critique of historical materialism

a foundation in a larger portrait of modernity

a dialectic of idealism/materialism using German Classical philosophy

a debriefing of dialectic and dialectical materialism

an historical saga of Marx/Engels without theory fetishism re; their authoritarian statue

getting neo-classical calculus down cold with an Xray expose

the calculation debate rehashed...

a new approach to history

some elements from Kantian ethical socialism

e.g. Kant on free agency, ethics, his 'dialectic'...

there is more...

Marxists in the recent wake of bolshevism haven't produced a single movement on the scale of Sanders or the OWS. The reasons are becoming clear.

Braving the 'impossible'

May 8th, 2016 ·

Why are we set on the impossible? It is possible the idea of revolutionary new communism is unrealistic, abstract, etc...but the current debates over socialism operate at best on a treadmill and have a half-life in their degeneration into social democratic 'terminal socialist double talk'. It is nothing of the kind. It is the only realistic strategy at this point.

The answer is simple: nothing at present is working or going to work. The OWS, gone. Sanders et al. going, going... And in each case this was predicted at the start by some.

We have a new potential opening: climate chaos added to capitalism chaos is going to do the work of revolution. A neo-communist group needs to be ready at the sidelines the way the bolsheviks were. But a new communism can't use anything much from the old canon.

It must have a revolutionary project, military, rebellion mode, colonial war mode...

a parallel electoral project

an economic plan, in writing

along with a critique of current economic theory

a democratic project inside a communist project

a possible transitional stage of market communism

a philosophy beyond materialism to be able to communicate with the religious majorities

...that should include a new and more robust humanism/secular definition

...one that can critique and yet can at least communicate with religious legacies

...including xtianity, buddhism, islam... (I think a better 'humanism' would be immensely helpful beyond the current Feuerbachian Iron Cagism)

nation/international aspects....

It is sad but the last issue was already in place in the twentieth century, and we lost all of it. Part of the reason is the shoddy character of marxism as a poor foundation...

etc....

The working class versus the universal class <http://darwiniana.com/2016/05/07/the-working-class-versus-the-universal-class/>

<http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/35902-elections-and-the-marxist-tradition>

Correctly interpreting the marxist tradition is very difficult, and is beset with the knee jerk defense of Marx at all points. But maybe Marx got it wrong. Or maybe times have changed.

We have tried here to streamline the whole legacy, make it independent of the term 'marxism' and the cult of Marx. We have also challenged the excessive focus on the working class, instead looking at the Universal Class as a superset of the working class. The Universal Class is present at most activist movements while the working class is not always so active. In any case we need to work with the full set of the complement to the bourgeoisie, a much larger set, and very often the real source of radical action.

Consider this book on Lenin:

https://www.amazon.com/Lenin-Revolutionary-Party-Paul-Blanc-ebook/dp/B01912KMW8/ref=sr_1_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1462633151&sr=1-1&keywords=le+blanc+lenin : Lenin and the Revolutionary Party

In most cases there is talk about the working class but when the acid test comes, a vanguard forms and acts in the name of the working class.

The idea of the Universal Class can mediate this easily: it is the same as the working class and/or a superset that can be the flexible placeholder in actual situations. Look at the Sanders movement? How many are working class? Most are my Universal Class, technically working class, but not really bluecollar.

We are not likely to get a revolution by the working class. Let's be honest and attempt a revolution with the Universal Class, and make the outcome a matter of principle, i.e. communist foundations. We must trust that this group or universal class can be trusted to act on principle, given the inevitability of the universal class ending up with a vanguard. These points are all debatable, but the classic marxist jargon isn't producing anything at this point.

We need someone/somwho's with the resolve to create a revolution (or an electoral version, perhaps both in parallel), whoever they are. Such groups can betray principle. But look at the Trump movement. The working class types there aren't exactly radical.

A movement of the Universal Class can actually create a superior form of equality, because it will define that in terms of principles. The marxist approach makes the working class the dominant class, a form of inequality!

It is not a big deal, actually. We stop waiting around for the working class, and just act with a new party of any and all types.

Red Forty-eight Group: strategy to neutralize Iron Cage scientism/pseudo-science

May 6th, 2016 · <http://darwiniana.com/2016/05/06/red-forty-eight-group-strategy-to-neutralize-iron-cage-scientismpseudo-science/>

We keep harping on historical materialism, but our logic is sound: a deterministic theory (it is denied that it is such, but...) creates a Iron Cage effect in which autonomy has been sacrificed to theory. And this is the case for the overall Iron Cage mentality of science/scientism, neo-classical economics, darwinian evolutionary theory, and marxism itself. This is one reason we have challenged darwinism here: it represents a subtle mechanization of behavior and culture, this playing into the hands of elites

via social darwinism, and the result is a brand of the kind of ideology of theory that Marx attempted to challenge. But the result sank further into the quicksand.

It would be a cogent revolutionary tactic to exploit this weak spot in the establishment of 'Big Science' by seeing this fatal weak spot and moving to seize the high ground of real science. Almost the whole cadre of science and economics are fixated in pseudo-science, an easy target.

The result can be an improved social perspective based on the rich spectrum of resources of the early modern.

Booknotes: Kant and The Philosophy of History (Amazon Kindle)

<http://darwiniana.com/2016/05/05/new-book-kant-and-the-philosophy-of-history-natures-secret-plan-and-the-solution-to-kants-challenge-kindle-edition/>

Manifestos

May 6, 2016: <http://darwiniana.com/2016/05/06/manifestos/>

<http://darwiniana.com/2016/05/05/continued-toward-a-new-communist-manifesto-minutes-of-the-red-fortyeight-group/>

The more I consider the issue of a 'new communism' the more I suspect the old marxist canon is holding 'marxists' back. Thus the suggestion for a radical streamlining based on the single principle of the expropriation of the 'bourgeoisie', the basic core of the now classic Communist Manifesto. In a way that is all that is needed as the legacy is transformed into something new and that doesn't have to answer to the failures of bolshevism/stalinism.

There is a rule of behaviorist action: habit, repetition, and authoritarian dogma produce mechanization, which is in a frozen state, a good depiction of cultic marxism that cannot produce a program of action, or appeal to the general public whose mindset has shifted from that of the era of the Second Internationale.

Marxists need to consider the OWS and Sanders campaigns: fresh approaches to the socialist idea invoke immediate response, in the case of the OWS a global response. If the further left can get itself ready a similar response will be possible with a radical neo-communism. It may have to ditch its marxist canon with its many confusions. The core of that canon can be restated around our minimal take (cf. previous post).

We have lost the insight that a 'new communism' is a complex variant of democracy and that its realization can be achieved as a rational upgrade. Since any such idea would generate very considerable opposition its transitional passage could prove more difficult, putting democracy at risk.

But it is important to see that democracy has already been lost and that a new communism must sell its wares as both an upgrade and a restoration of democracy, to the extent possible in a transitional civil

conflict with immensely powerful and insidious capitalists who control governments and even covert agencies. We need a project to restore/upgrade democracy via a revolutionary transition that may hold democracy as virtual, especially since it doesn't really exist anymore. But the Russian revolution has confused the issue: a starting point of Tsarism resulted in an endpoint of a new tyranny. We need to debrief and then exit that nightmare, and ensure a caesura by simply cutting the link with the whole corpus with its many liabilities, from historical materialism as a theory, to dialectical materialism as a mythology, to economic theory displaced by the neo-classical economic finesse and its immensely successful mystification of the issues of theory, one that has left the classical upholders of the material such as that of Marx's Capital unable to properly respond. It is time for a radical new activist formation (e.g. The Red Forty-eight Group) to take the core of the original idea of communism with a minimal take from classic marxism, e.g. the Manifesto, and to completely re-write the whole stance of neo-communism.

My suggestions are:

a general critique of the issues of capitalist economy...that exists already

ditching theories like historical materialism which are not scientific and which freeze the future potential of freedom in causal determinism

investigative exposure of the 9/11 conspiracies and the legacy of the covert agencies

exposure of the legacy of social darwinist darwinism and a replacement with a new perspective on evolution: the darwinian framework is an invitation to slaughter on both sides...

a criminal indictment of the American government

a strategy for national/international action to create a viable postcapitalism: the expropriation of capital on a global basis, an immensely and seemingly improbable task. But the moment of chaos is coming: it is essential to at least be ready...

...etc...

A revolutionary neo-communism that has a robust economic populism armed with a global strategic plan could prove immensely popular. The moment of crisis is accelerating and if calamities such as the depopulation of the Middle East and North Africa are predicted we can see that just as with the First World War the coming chaos will be the real first stage of revolution.

From WHEE:

http://history-and-evolution.com/whee4th/chap2_1_4.htm: Is there a science of history?

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, 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 anti-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 Munzer 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.

Debate over design arguments//SobervBJPS3.SP.pdf

Earlier today we linked to an ID blog post about the attempts to fend off Eliot Sober.
<https://designdisquisitions.wordpress.com/2017/04/06/critics-corner-elliott-sober/>

I never allowed myself to use Bayesian reasoning, due to its seemingly dubious character, with the result I barely understand its intricacies. <!--more-->

This paper challenging Eliot Sober is thus a bit beyond me, but I don't think you can resolve the design argument in this way (and we should as well work with Sober's paper), but I do think that a la Dembski the ID faction has made its point, save only that the conclusion 'design' requires a 'designer' has not been truly demonstrated. What the ID-ists have done is to show that design is real factor in biology, and a 'design inference' is most probably indicated in many biological and evolutionary contexts (not the same thing). The problem is that the term 'designer' has no simple definition. 'God' doesn't work. The issue begs the question as to whether the 'designer' isn't some kind of 'teleological process' (which provokes the 'designer' question all over again). The important point here is the Pyrrhic victory of the monotheistic designists: the design argument in the Old Testament is clearly false, and it is very dubious to claim that 'god' acted in history or ancient Israel. So what sort of designer could we invoke? Actually, Schopenhauer may have stumbled on the answer, although his metaphysics of the Will is not completely indicated in the Kantian context of critical metaphysics: the factor of 'will' is a clear possibility for an evolutionary (and /or involutory, a term from the same batch of fallacies) 'design x' with an -er at the end. In a Kantian context the whole issue resolves backward and then stops: the issue of 'god' or the source beginning provokes an antinomy and that implies 'transcendental idealism' (please don't get confused over this usage of the Kantian 'transcendental').

We will leave it there and refer the reader to our Enigma of the Axial Age which reviews this question. Our intent here is a set up piece for the next post on the eonic effect, a spectacular case of 'design' in history.

<http://www.utm.utoronto.ca/~weisber3/articles/SobervBJPS3.SP.pdf>

R48G: we are out of time to revise marxism but must do so in any case: the eonic model in the background can replace the failed historical materialism.

<http://darwiniana.com/2017/04/11/r48g-we-are-out-of-time-to-revise-marxism-but-must-do-so-in-any-case-the-eonic-model-in-the-background-can-replace-the-failed-historical-materialism>

<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 vitiating 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...

R48G: the eonic model as a tool

<http://darwiniana.com/2017/04/11/r48g-the-eonic-model-as-a-tool/>

Our post on the supposed 'African model' of history shows the inherent confusion arising from the imbalance of the macro effect. The result is a kind of 'me too' consideration that is often misguided.

Our model explains why so much great literature appears in the transition zones of the early modern, with spectacular effect, and then suddenly wanes in the wake of the transitional interval. This puts everyone in a strange position. After a while Shakespeare as a world-historical poet of the globalizing 'pidgin English' begins to pall and people begin to look at their own traditions. But we can also get wise to what is going on and see that the effect is to create a world culture to which all belong. And in any case the process of modernity globalization, despite the cavil of the reactionary gurus and postmodernists has been a spectacular success and has created already a global oikoumene of shared modernism. So we might be wary of kicking a gift horse in the mouth even as we move to critique the outcome of this prodigious show of the eonic effect. The same confusion arose in antiquity with the Israelites who unfortunately thought themselves bound in a special relationship with god, to the unending confusion of later religion. The Israelites were certainly in the right place at the right time and spawned (along with the Persians, we forget) the lineage of monotheism. But we must in the modern case move to prevent any suggestion of Eurocentric superiority, the result would destroy the whole era. Let us note the parallel and eerily synchronous buddhism appearing in almost direct concert with Israelite monotheism, soon to spawn Mahayana and Christianity.

We can see the need for something like the eonic model as a successor to historical materialism and this can be adopted in a streamlined form as a model, that is as a tool. The issue is not a new belief system but a tool that is useful and can be adopted on provision. It points to a complicated reality but even on the surface it produces a handy way to resolve the confusions of historical development.

We can adopt a simple version of the eonic model, as a tool for historical inspection and a set of suspicions about the emergence of civilization:

civilization emerges in a complex set of transitions in a macrosequence

these transitions initiate new epochs and monopolize almost all ultra-complex core cultural innovations at their starting points

technology Innovation) and economic development are not the same and show continuous histories...

Eras after the divide realize the implications of the transitional periods but may suffer decline in their 'middle' period (medieval?)

the Axial Age was a clear exemplar of the macro sequence which shows potential sequential and parallel aspects

this parallel/sequential aspect can be seen as a minimax of some kind to maximize teleological directionality and lateral integration as one process.

Modernity resumes the sequential logic after the lateral synchrony of the Axial Age, the reason is transparent: the end state of globalization needs unique focus...

The transitions never repeat themselves and always restart at a frontier area, the so-called frontier or acorn effect: e.g. Israel at the frontiers of ancient Egypt, Persia at the frontier of 'Sumer', Greece at the frontier of the Middle East. India and China in this period are obvious related cases of frontier effects. Note thus that the modern transition occurs in one of the last areas of the Eurasian sphere...

This model can be used as a tool and then replaced with a simple chronology of epochs, and we see two such very clearly (probably seven in all starting 8000BCE Or even 10000), from 3000 to 600, then 600 to 1800, followed by a new epoch, the modern after 1500/1800 (our marker points are relative to 300 year transitions) showing the start of a new epoch in this series. We can see that we are already using this model! An example is our instinctive sense of the 'middle ages', clearly a sense of the middle section of the epoch emerging from the Axial Age (better called the Axial interval).

This model we should note is a generalization of the Israelite sense of the Axial period and thought it evidence of 'god' in history. This effect is NOT the result of theistic action, which would be cosmic (or to an atheist nonexistent), however and the point is obvious from the way it generates religion, secularism, in one and the same pattern. But this data does leave the question of 'where the blazes' does all this come from? We should adopt a provisional agnostic stance here, the value of our model which merely shows what is going on, not how. We have attempted a number of discussions of this in WHEE and Enigma of the Axial Age, but in the final analysis we don't understand our own process of evolution, in deep time and in history, but we do receive many indications of how to proceed and here is the crucial point: we don't have to produce a theory of this to proceed: the macro action as we perceive it is always in the past in a transient interval and we are left with a series of 'to do' potentials that we must realize as our own free action. We thus don't actually require the model but we would do well to at least hold it in reserve as tool. We will otherwise make all sorts of mistakes, e.g. history is random and shows not teleological. Using this model as a tool we get a strong red light warning that that is false.

This model is tailor made for postmarxist historiography but conventional science, historiography, evolutionism, and marxism will do everything they can to suppress this model. But perhaps not for long. As the reign of darwinism and scientism collapse people will begin to ask where they went wrong.

R48G: Eurocentrism, the eonic model and the left

<http://darwiniana.com/2017/04/11/r48g-eurocentrism-the-eonic-model-and-the-left/>

The eonic model is too controversial for many but it explains very easily many of the questions that tend to vitiate real understanding such as the Eurocentric focus of accounts that peddle the idea of 'Western civilization' or the Christian West. The actual facts of the rise of the modern are so strikingly similar to those of Axial/Classical Greece in antiquity that we get a clue to something more complex. That modernity is as aspect of macro induction is too much for most, but the evidence suggests it, starting with the eerie timing of the whole complex of transition areas depicted in the model of the eonic effect

The problem with this developmental process is the ambiguity of macro and micro processes: the overall effect is benign while the larger sphere of influence falls into the hands of ambiguous exploiters, e.g. imperialists, exploiters...At least, in all cases, the phases of imperialism in the transition zones were short lived. The American case (which is not a transition zone for the early modern, although at the end it became a staging area for democratic emergence) with its late imperialism is now beginning to fall apart, we suspect.

The point here was well understood by Marx/Engels who saw clearly the transient effect of the rise of modernity in the transition zone in Europe and the crisis this provokes in the process of globalization. That the fate of modernity fell into the ambiguities of the capitalist globalization is a misfortune although in principle the process was projected as a benign potential. The modern transition is unique in the way it spawns a leftist challenge to the degeneration of modernity/globalization's imperialism and exploitation. It is important to see that the modern transition is not inherently a capitalist process and here the marxist left has tended to its own oversimplification. But the point is clear that our macrosequence, so pure in its spectacular initializations is at risk from the unmodified field of streaming history not directly effected by the larger process. The point is that the macro effect doesn't come with a police force and simply injects its transitional zone with creative influences, the outcome be what it may. Here the modernist transition needed desperately a counterpoint to its 'benign'/'malign' capitalist innovations and this was almost immediate in the almost providential appearance of figures such as Marx/Engels. Even with this the challenge to the capitalist tidal wave has been weak, and the Russian revolution has most unfortunately discredited the attempted correction. But the general point is clear: undiluted capitalism is not the same as the rise of capitalism and requires desperately a corrective.

We can thus both strong endorse the marxist classic (with other parallel socialist and related movements) and yet caution at its limitations.

It would not be hard to correct the correction and it is important to consider that if the emergence of capitalism was grossly flawed the emergence of its challenger could itself shows its limits.

The value of the eonic model is that it demonstrates the logic of modernity in the context of larger world history and suggests a broader set of 'modern innovations' beyond the economic as a field of culture, soon to be warped by capitalist emergence. As noted the ambivalence of marxists/socialists is a crucial aspect of this macro transition and yet these movements have not so far succeeded in their task of bringing capitalism into harmony with the emerging culture of modernity.

The question of Eurocentrism is solved at a glance by the eonic model: modernity (not the same as the Italian, etc, Renaissance) arises in exact timing 2400 years after the onset of the Axial Age in one of the last frontier zones (Europe) of the Eurasian field of emergence civilizations driven by the macrosequence. The modern transition from 1500 to 1800 produces a spectacular set of innovations in religion, science, politics, philosophy, literature, art, technology and economics. But the latter two

categories are really independent social processes influenced by the macro effect to be sure, but not the same. Technological and economic streams and innovations can occur continuously in all eras and are not discontinuous injections. Some cases to be sure are borderline, capitalism itself perhaps, but the interaction of these processes is very complex. However, the sudden appearance of complex art, etc, on schedule, rapidly waning out of the timing interval, is almost impossible to explain by any other model. Why is it so much literature and art suddenly appear in our transition zones, Germany, England, France, etc, in the transition interval and then wane almost immediately after the divide. How explain a similar effect for modern music? We are totally outclassed by the eonic effect and barely know what hit us. We should put both the American and Russian cases as not really a part of the modern transition, but are sidewinders that become direct candidates for diffusion from the core zone.

This is at first a preposterous model of history but no other model can explain so many strange aspects of world history.

The dubious claims for Islamic/African sources of the modern//How African Muslims Civilized Spain

We commented on this yesterday: <http://darwiniana.com/2017/04/10/an-islamic-pipedreamheres-how-black-muslims-lifted-europe-out-of-the-dark-ages-news-telesur-english/>

I am glad Counterpunch reprinted this perspective which we commented on yesterday at another publication site.

The argument for the African origin of civilization and here a related argument as to Muslim Spain and modernity is a puzzling argument, and one that won't stand up to the evidence. <!--more-->

Overall the evidence suggests higher civilization emerges from the Neolithic in the Sumerian and parallel Egyptian transitions (well clarified by our eonic model) after gestation in the Natufian/early Neolithic and pre-Sumerian phases of the Levant, Anatolia, and northern Mesopotamia. Other parallel starting points are not ruled out, as such, and our 'eonic model' is a warning about the complexity of the evidence of parallel/independent emergence: we don't have the full evidence of the Neolithic but it would seem that the onset of that era occurred later in all regions adjacent to the Near Eastern source of later civilization, and that evidence suggests that the Neolithic is much later in Europe, India/China and Africa. The Neolithic is not the same as the discovery of agriculture, as such, and the latter's possible multiple independent emergence in different areas is more than possible. But the Neolithic is a complex civilizational whole as a stage of historical development, witness the complex emergence of state religions in the temple complexes of northern Neolithic pre-Sumer. The influence of Egypt on Greece is clear from the record but this is much later, and quite in the wake of the onset of the 'first' phase of higher civilization (the real onset of near higher civilization might better be considered northern Sumer ca. 5500 BCE), e.g. well after 3000 BCE (Mycenean/Minoan phases), along with 'Mesopotamian'/Near Eastern diffusion in the same era. But from the perspective of the eonic model the sudden take off of Greece in the Axial Age, parallel to those of the Israel/Persian and Indic/Chinese zones (in the wake of Sumerian diffusion of the previous era) is part of our strange macro sequence. If

that is too controversial it nonetheless is clear that Greece in its flowering in the Axial Age was part of the diffusion of the original phase of higher civilization, and there is no evidence that this is 'African' unless, of course, we mean Dynastic Egypt from which a strong field of diffusion into Africa occurred. By the time of the Greek Axial Age the African subcontinent was just beginning to enter its Neolithic and this era was probably prior to, for example, Bantu diffusion, meaning that much of the southern sector zones of Africa were still in the range of Paleolithic (e.g. San peoples). It was actually the contribution of western African peoples migrating to the full African sphere in the spread of its Neolithic that brought Africa to the first phase of (Neolithic) civilization. That Africa was a very difficult environment to master suggests the importance of this achievement (modern Europeans initially died in droves on entry into this complicated and dangerous environmental field).

These claims for African influences on Greece, or Islam/Spain are highly dubious and certainly don't account for the rise of modernity (a similar set of claims are often proposed for Islam without any African connection).

It is important to see that higher civilization came very late to Europe and it is really the diffusion from the Roman Empire that gestates what is to come later.

One can only recommend a careful study of the 'eonic effect' to get a suggestion as to the sudden take off of certain sectors of Europe in the sixteenth century. Modernity is thus no more 'European' than the Axial Age is Greek, or Israelite, Indic, etc... And it is important to see that the modern transition springs from a subset of European cultures, in all cases frontier areas of the old Roman imperium: Spain, France, England, Holland, Germany. The only model that can account for this is the eonic effect interpretation, whatever its problems.

The reason the Eurocentric interpretation prevails springs from the confusions over 'western civilization', Christian chauvinism, etc...A closer look shows the connection to a larger developmental sequence and here the 'frontier effect' of the eonic model can help to see how the European transition (what we call modernity) in the period of the 'early modern' is, bafflingly, an aspect of the so-called macrosequence. If that it still controversial the fact remains that Islamic influences in Spain are a poor candidate for explaining the rise of the modern.

<http://www.counterpunch.org/2017/04/11/how-african-muslims-civilized-spain>

Red Forty-eight Group: dealing with marxists is completely frustrating...the need for a new left...

April 10, 2017 <http://darwiniana.com/2017/04/10/red-forty-eight-group-dealing-with-marxists-is-completely-frustrating-the-need-for-a-new-left/>

Dealing with marxists is completely frustrating and the fact has to be faced that the current left is stuck with a mindset that will preempt any real revolutionary movement. Failure to move on is proving deadly at a time when a desperate climate catastrophe is underway. Beyond even that the question of capitalism remains as a riddle to be solved and an era to be overcome, but the current left is almost moribund. Perhaps there is an invisible component not seen in public, but the reality I suspect is that most marxist/communists have given up the struggle and are content to recycle over material and write ever more books in the Marx canon of 'religious' texts. We have suggested a set of simple steps:

make marxism into an appendix and historical saga

refound neo-communism in a post-theoretical constitutional 'recipe' mode

leave behind historical materialism and economic fundamentalism

adopt an ecological communist platform with a robust environmental perspective

bring democracy and communism into conjunction

work via evolutionary and/or revolutionary perspectives toward a revolutionary national/international system....

etc...

I think that marxists, if they can snap out of hypnosis, could move very rapidly in such a new direction, and the result could lead rapidly to a robust challenge to the current system. But the left has to offer a near guarantee it will make revolution an honest and open process that can evade from the start its curse of stalinist reputation...

R48G: the eonic model beyond the shipwreck of marxism...

April 10, 2017: <http://darwiniana.com/2017/04/10/r48g-the-eonic-model-beyond-the-shipwreck-of-marxism/>

More and more it seems to me that a full endorsement of the macro model for the left is in order, save only that it is an uphill struggle dealing with stalled legacy thought systems on the marxist left. Somehow the marxist left got shunted into a form of reductionist scientism, which couldn't handle modernity's complexity, nor even correct debrief religious traditions.

The question of history is far more complex than the question of economic systems in succession. In general the evidence of history is clear: something in the category of 'developmental evolution' operate behind the scenes helping to drive the onward progression of civilizations. The 'civilizations' are not the point: it is a series of transitions generating new epochs that are the real dynamical entity. Civilizations are too diffuse to show a dynamic, contrary to the views of the muddle Toynbee and Spengler.

A view of 'eonic effect' can help to put modernity, and the left, in context and this can relieve analysis from economic obsession and value-free sociology. The 'eonic model' is in a way a successor to the attempt by Hegel to resolve Kant's Challenge and does so in a far more empirical fashion without the mystifications of 'spirit' or anything else.

The socialist left needs a robust historicism that can deal with values, the emergence of freedom, and the place of free agents in the realization of history. This in the context of a complex and elusive design of driven evolution/development that creates a potential that man himself must realize. That is the key point with the debate over democracy, liberalism, and communism/socialism. They are all attempts at the same thing: what Kant called the 'perfect civil constitution', and our model shows how this process is operating in the case of modernity. The implication is that we must realize a truer democracy and this must be prefaced with communist axioms on the grounds we deduce from analysis that a fair system of equals can only emerge in a shared culture of resources placed in a Commons. The 'private property' of the capitalists is really an aspect of what Marx called 'primitive accumulation' and the point is obvious, or should be, that, say, the resource of carbon petroleum has been expropriated by 'capital' as a form of plunder of universal ownership.

The value of the eonic model is the way it requires a careful analysis of historical facts, and elusive interpretations between facts and value of both the realized past and the realizable future.

It founds ideas of the 'evolution/emergence' of freedom very easily and subjects the idea of deterministic history to a full critique.

The left has been left behind in the muddle of economic analysis and a new and nimbler form of historical analysis is needed to create a new communist left beyond the shipwreck of marxism...

WHEE section 4.2a: Big Histories, Universal Histories

April 10th, 2017 · <http://darwiniana.com/2017/04/10/4-2-big-histories-universal-histories/>

The idea that 'Big History' brings science to the realm of history is a new myth (the idea appeared, coincidence or not, in the wake of WHEE to try to scotch its heresies) and an almost ludicrous one. Clearly an entire dimension has been lost to science and that is related surely to issues of directionality/teleology. Beyond that lies a complicated realm that we haven't even discovered yet. We must infer the existence of such a realm, but its reality would seem to be reflected in, for example, the data of the eonic effect. In general, the emergence of life is so far unexplained, and there is a clear directional aspect there, a point obvious to figures at the start, from Lamarck to the teleomechanists. It's a bit early for science triumphalism...

The question of history simply won't yield to reductionist thinking.

Scientists out in left field, terribly sorry//How Things Hang Together | Articles | Inference: International Review of Science

April 10th, 2017 · <http://darwiniana.com/2017/04/10/scientists-out-in-left-field-terribly-sorryhow-things-hang-together-articles-inference-international-review-of-science/>

This cheery account (book/review) would seem (I don't have the book) to misunderstand the failure of science to really grapple with evolution, history, psychology, and sociology. Science has not reached these fields in the way it has with chemistry, genetics, etc...To cite Wilson's sociobiology as relevant to this question exposes the unreality of scientists are they confront a level of life and cosmos that is not prefigured in physics fundamentalism...

<http://inference-review.com/article/how-things-hang-together>

Source: How Things Hang Together | Articles | Inference: International Review of Science

An Islamic pipedream//Here's How Black Muslims Lifted Europe out of the Dark Ages | News | teleSUR English

April 10th, 2017 <http://darwiniana.com/2017/04/10/an-islamic-pipedreamheres-how-black-muslims-lifted-europe-out-of-the-dark-ages-news-telesur-english/>

This analysis is a pipedream that should be quashed on sight because it is a form of Islamic anti-modern propaganda that doesn't explain the facts. It is true that Islamic civilization influenced European history and culture but it did not generate modernity, nor was it a culture of blacks, as such.

One must recommend a study of the eonic effect, history-and-evolution.com, to see the larger context of modernity which had very little to do with the influence of Islam.

<http://www.telesurtv.net/english/news/Heres-How-Black-Muslims-Lifted-Europe-out-of-the-Dark-Ages-20170409-0026.html>

The Mortal Marx

December 5th, 2016 · No Comments

The constant equivocation over Marx is obviously ideology in the usual disguise. The point should be simple: the Marx cult apart, we should be taking the Marx phase as a legacy and start from scratch with a new perspective on the core issues: the status of capitalism, and a movement to postcapitalism. Marx had a brilliant strategy and thesis but it looks fragile and refuted now: historical materialism and stages of production theory don't animate the left correctly anymore.

The issues have been made too complex, in part because of the obsession with theories and the non-starter of creating a marxist science. That distraction has cost the left much of its credibility. A simpler solution is to create a post-theoretical schema that doesn't distract itself with debates over materialism and idealism and instead adopts version of free agents in history able to confront and meet the challenge of capitalist globalization. This is an ironic confirmation and refutation of 'stages of production' theory: given the crisis of climate change, for example, the capitalist stage of production is going bankrupt.

But we have to evade the now confusing morass of marxist theory, granting it the deep respect deserved by the 'classics' and a reworking for a new present and future.

Our formulation of 'market neo-communism' tried to do this by creating a hybrid of liberal and communist themes: this can make the transition to a form of 'communism' a part of the democratic revolution. We are in a truly stunning crisis: many would argue that a highly authoritarian system would be required to make a postcapitalist transition. But there again our formulation provides just such a hybrid. Whatever the case all the current socialist groups need to consider their positions carefully. In the crisis we face the far left will get one last chance, so the question is, how to play the hand/cards in a deft combination of communism and democracy. I think market neo-communism, a newly coined term that has never quite been used, can offer a rough matrix of one potential solution, save only that the issue of one nation state in transition must confront a global matrix of nations entangled in capitalism. We can offer a two-pronged strategy: national and international neo-communism.

Note the 'neo-': we must create something that will bypass the chronic prejudice of the failed marxism/leninism, nonetheless grasping their essential gist. All the arguments over whether Marx got it right are useless: he and Engels created a foundational starting point. The rest is up to us...

Source: Public Books — The Mortal Marx

R48G: Not our president...we have no government...the revolution transition starts effective immediately...

December 4th, 2016 ·

There is no way come hell or high water we can acknowledge the Trump fraud as a valid presidential person...the revolutionary transition starts effectively immediately

archive: the eonic model versus historical materialism

April 19th, 2017 ·

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...

archive: critiquing Islam

April 19th, 2017 ·

Dismantling Islam? Xtianity well on its way down the tubes...the secular equivalent of religion

May 13th, 2016 ·

It is not for me to indulge in moral debunkings of Islam, but as a global citizen I do have that right, and have that right against the fanaticism of much legacy Islam. In any case, it is appropriate to step beyond conventional cultural politics to offer some 'free advice', a dubious category. It is simply my opinion that Islam is doomed and will have a chaotic exit into the secular future, which can take centuries or decades. Turkey shows how the decades timing is actually real.

Why is the secular fated to win here? In fact, I am not sure myself, but if you study my WHEE: history and evolution.com you will see the plight of the Axial Age (and after) religions, e.g. Xtianity and Islam. Because Xtianity was actually in the modern transition zone it underwent a 'reformation', and this is instructive. This reformation did not replace Xtianity with atheism or science. It left it as it, almost. After that the trek out of canonical Xtianity began, with a kind of climax in Kant, Hegel, Schopenhauer, and then the much inferior secular humanism.

Moslems should take note of this but realize their 'reformation' won't happen like that, if they have one at all. Freely dissenting individuals have to perform the task of this reformation, and they should be brisk about it: I have to wonder if the world system isn't just convulsing over Islam to tear it to pieces. Be wise, and help fellow moslems to pull themselves away from the vanishing legacy....Islam is complicated by a corrupt yet truly hyperadvanced gnosticism in the form of sufism. The latter is a lost cause, and has degenerated as far as I can see into a dangerous mafia. Say goodbye to it.

Moslems and the rest of the world are out of time for religious idiocies: some new perspective based on modernity is the only way out in a period of coming catastrophe.

It might help if the 'secular' sphere hadn't been filled with so much second rate junk, like the new atheism. What is needed is the secular equivalent of religion which consists among many possibilities of:

the question of god is insoluble, standing up to gross theism, and gross atheism, both.

a Kantian critique of metaphysics

something like his ethical system

outstanding beliefs in soul, standing up to neuroscience and scientism

outstanding beliefs in 'will', free agency, and carrying the debate over 'free' will

A general sense of there being a 'spiritual' realm (which like the Indic Samkhya can be 'material hi/lo')

the ethical and aesthetic as clear exemptions to reductionist physicalism...

etc...

archive: christians vaunt ethical religion, but the Sinai myth is baseless

April 19th, 2017 ·

Singer is a dangerous idiot...but do Xtians even have an ethics? The Mt. Sinai myth is an insult to modern intelligence...

May 13th, 2016 ·

http://www.evolutionnews.org/2016/05/in_a_debate_wit102840.html

These critics on the religious right make life too easy. Refuting Singer is pointless: he is a straightjacket case. The fact of the matter is that religious xtians have no real ethical system themselves. Where is it and what are its tenets? You cannot use the Old Testament for this. Period.

archive: the solution to Kant's Challenge

April 19th, 2017 ·

The solution to Kant's Challenge (and the Hegelian idiocy over the end of history) is sixteen years old, but the academic community refuses to even look at the solution

May 12th, 2016 ·

I am often shocked by the strange mental state of academics, and in particular Kantians, what to say of those in the cohort of the Hegelian confused, over Fukuyama. A whole generation has been turning in circles around the 'end of history' nonsense, a fictitious discourse, while a simple solution to the question, more specifically, to the issues of Kant's essay, was provided by WHEE: history-and-evolution.com..

You can challenge this solution, but to do that you have to lift the ostracism of Iron Cage muffled voices that can't acknowledge the existence of anyone outside their propaganda field.

Face reality, the solution to Kant's Challenge is sitting there waiting for a simple comment from the frozen idiots in the so-called philosophy field.

Secularism: definition distorted by new atheists

Before_2016

Sufism and the 'dark side', in this case without the popcorn

October 31st, 2015 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/2015/10/30/dismantling-xtianity-and-islam-as-failed-religions/>

It is one thing to dismantle xtianity, but with Islam the situation is much more difficult. It is hard to understand Islam: its interior sequence is complicated and misunderstood. Mohammed is complicated, and misunderstood.

Let me change my terms: dismantling Islam can't be enjoined. It is happening on its own.

Most of all Islam is rendered obscure by the embedded sufi legacy, of which I have been extremely critical. I think the sufi gang, part of it, is a mafia inside Islam. But that is a generalization that won't quite work, or prove convincing. I have exposed a part of it in the jewish sufis, like mr. gold, people trying to play bad guy to get initialized into the hidden brotherhood inside a brotherhood, proof of evil to gain access to a coterie of devils.

Sufism has its own 'standard operating history' with its great moments. It also has a hidden subset who control the elusive 'seed plexus soul' techne, as opposed to technology. I think it is still controlled by pious divines, up to a point, but that something has gone awry. It is one of the most guarded secrets of the whole religion, and I suspect that most sufis have been deprived of any knowledge of their own legacy, what to say of ordinary muslims. I think something has gone wrong here.

I bring it into the open to try and demolish the whole game, Islam, sufism, the whole shebang. Once the world knows they will take Islam to pieces. And try to gain control of the inner tech.

One thinks of Stalin's fascination with the humanzee, and beyond that the danger of really sordid idiots like stalin gaining control of biotechnology.

The sufi legacy contains something even more explosive and controversial, and yet it was intended for the whole of the moslem world. And I think the same was true of xtianity, at the start. The conversions of the early followers were based on something they didn't really speak of. There may have been something like a precursor of the sufi legacy in early xtianity, before it died out. I thin the whole game was invented in Egypt gnosticism, or its ancestor in the era before the age of the pyramids. That's the suspicious rumor.

In Islam, this is not dying out, but becoming the tool of hidden rogue sufis. I can't quite say, but I have observed only two categories, naive beginners, the pious fools cynical xufis exploit. A spiritual technology as intricate as the sufi soul process requires honest men, good hearted people, men who pray. I think Islam was invented as a milieu to create decent men who could use this soul technology. But the whole thing failed. Instead it got some really dangerous occult rogues, Crowley style, but not fakes as he was. These people you never meet, and have made the sufi game worse even than the Stalin nightmare, which never actualized. This other one did, and while I am not sure of the facts, it seems that the temptation of creating manufactured souls as drones in a sufi slave racket has realized. The problem lies in the reckoning of good and evil that wrecks the judgment of otherwise rational men, not unlike what happens to students of Nietzsche: they bomb as amateur villains. Sufis are the same, and they host a lot of shady characters. The soul tech didn't survive all that. That is worse than horrifying. It is like the neoliberal privatization of jails. For profit. Here we suspect the creation of 'hell' as anartificial religious fake that can do what Gurdjieff called the 'work': extracting conscious energy from drones who joined the sufi movement, the profit in torment, and suffering. Gurdjieff often spoke of the huamn frame as a factory that could be made much more efficient. Such industrial language is entirely suspect. What's the output from the human worker, and who profits?

If all this is paranoia on my part, let it be so named. But those in the know are silent, and my wager they would speak finally was silly.

So you might wonder less why I am disenchanted with sufism, and thence Islam. Moslems however are oblivious to their situation, sitting ducks, but so many they have safety in numbers. Islam is a complex religion with a subtle core: I can't comment properly.

Xtians live in a dead movement, not so dangerous, but without religious practice of any kind. Prayer mumbling and Santa Claus. Xtians may be a pack of fools, but they are generally harmless, at least as religious nuts, but 'jolly good fellows', 'decent chaps', religious you know. I will defer on Islamophobia to confess to some degree of sufismophobia to issue warnings about the dark side in sufism, and the shadow it casts over Islam. If you saw the movie about Darth Vader you know about the dark side, but the real thing comes without popcorn. Have I scared you?

Am I fair? What is the answer? I have posed a set of questions here over the last five years, to wait and see if moslems or sufis of good faith would open a dialogue. No result, so my suspicions increase. Those who are ignorant are goodhearted but feckless idiots. Those in the know are a hidden mafia and alarmed anyone would proclaim the Secret in the open. The place of the sufis brotherhoods is not clear to me. But most must be fake.

So I redouble my efforts to play sufis against moslems by telling the latter they are ignorant dupes of this religion. Their individual 'share' has long since been taken away by hidden rogue sufis. But I must finally just ask, what is going on? what are the real facts of the case? These religions were safecracked by rogues like Gurdjieff types, except worse as psychopaths who wish to make drone 'workers' to supply spiritual energy to a hidden elite. How could this come about without being found out?

You won't find out, as an ordinary moslem, and I think you should quietly abandon this derelict vehicle. So that is the alternate version of debriefing Islam, beside debriefing xtianity. But the burden of doing this is on you. It is possible to move deftly inside Islam toward an intelligent 'reformation', to start. But each is free to simply walk away. The issue is not atheist secularism. That's not the point. Leave the religion and take god with you, if you like.

I do not think groups like the new atheists are of any help here. The god question, who cares, be on the defensive as a philosophical theist/atheist. The real issue is to slip away, to belief or non-belief, each has its dialectic.

Don't get on a high horse here. Too many western (american) politicians, psychically attacked by sufi blackmagic have reacted in paranoid shock, and now we see the war on terror from westerners who also wish to dismantle Islam, not in the sense I meant. Let's pursue a more intelligent version, mindful of the limits of the secular, the complexity of spiritual subjects.

Time for Xtians to ditch Xtianity?

July 31st, 2015

<http://darwiniana.com/2015/07/31/at-issue-the-gross-idiocy-and-error-of-covenantal-judaism/>

I think that critiquing judaism is one thing, but Xtianity is showing signs of its own internal decay and chaotification. And I think the Prosperity Gospels will be one of the final nails in the coffin. But the issue of Israel is going to sink judaism and take Xtianity down with it.

I think that the new atheism has totally confused the issue. The issue is not 'god' which is an insoluble question, but the 'metal fatigue' effect that has made Xtianity almost unusable by an increasing number of people.

It is time to sweep the new atheist gambit to one side and focus on a robust secular/religious culture of the future. And here science has not been helpful. Darwinism is the foundation of the new atheism and this pseudo-scientific ideology has created a false modernity of scientism, with help from many other quarters.

The situation created by Israel and the destruction of the American political system has not exactly proceeded without Xtian help. This calamity is grounds for sweeping Xtianity aside as a newly malevolent religious cancer.

The sad thing about Xtianity is that noone understands it. It is a magical obscurity that speaks in riddles and, ...lies, and there is no real way to really know what this religion is about. We cannot even register the facts on the ground of its (early) history. We are always running in circles with false information.

I suspect that spiritual powers of a high order that do understand it have simply ditched this religion, and dumped their jewish eugenic experiment into the bourgeois sphere and flushed the toilet. Jewish fertilizer. Hey, don't knock it. If a nazi catches up with you, just say, leave me alone, I am ViP human fertilizer.

Running modern politics from the Old Testament is grotesque at this point. And so on. We have made out point.

But to exit from Xtianity is not so simple, turning everyone into an atheist misses the point. We need a more Kantian perspective on theology and for many a clear path beyond theism. But we can't make the mistake of religious fanatics who made theism compulsory. The new atheists are making the same mistake in reverse, this time with bad science to enforce belief. People like Dawkins show the same religious idiot/fanatic mentality in an atheistic brand.

The rise of modernity is a very full and robust universe of systems, beliefs, religions, anti-religions, philosophy, science, etc...There is no excuse for the current attempts to make scientism the new theocratic center of gravity.

For starters, Xtians can begin to study religion to put their very narrow theology in context....

Stirrings beyond the neo-liberal dead world

June 30th, 2015 ·

http://history-and-evolution.com/whee4th/intro1_1_1.htm

The strange circumstance of an American culture beset with Bible Belt assaults on evolution is by now a conventional narrative, but it forgets that the US alone has resisted the onset of Iron Cage darwinism and the time is ripe for the left, consistently on the side of confusion here, to take up the critique of evolutionary ideology, and do it right, not as in the feeble attacks on sociobiology of a generation ago, but in the spirit of a new search for the basis of science. The left doesn't realize it but it cannot recover a public reputation and impetus without matching the right's disenchantment with darwinism (mixed with its ongoing social darwinist subnarrative) and proceeding to a new level of evolutionary discourse in association with a better science than we have now.

This was the sub-text of *Last and First Men* and the creation of a society able to 'evolve future man' would be a tour de force but as things are now far beyond the capacity and ken of the by now obsolete nineteenth century materialists of the era of Marx.

The question of materialism is as good as any in the attempt to create a world view of the future left, but the radical yogis of antiquity came to this point of conflict with the conservative factions of their world and spawned the materialism of Samkhya as a universal category of spiritual discourse. The modern left should take up the genre to learn to speak the languages of culture now fluxing through the new age movement. The language of materialism blended with the legacies of buddhism, yoga, and jainism is already an ancient achievement, so the figments of a future left can learn these dialectics with a view to a global discourse beyond the stale verbiage of the Second Internationale.

We seem to be seeing remarkable surges of something still alive after the era of the neo-liberals. Figures like Sanders seem to evoke a response to the exhaustion and nausea of a generation of the liberal/left disappointed at every turn. Let us hope that the older left can be ready with something more than the worn out marxism of...the older left.

Is the 'soul' a spiritual technology of demiurgic powers in nature?

May 23rd, 2015 ·

<http://www.gurdjieff-con.net/index.php?s=soul+seed+plexus>

<http://darwiniana.com/2015/02/24/soul-and-sufistic-legacies/>

One of the ironies of modernity and the religious legacies of antiquity is the way the hidden spiritual technology of the sufis is leaking out into the public domain, or at least trying to.

It is ironic that modern materialism can suddenly seem primitive next to the elusive plexus/soul seed phenomenon which is very hard to get any information about.

I think this question impinges on the original emergence of homo sapiens and that this, pace J.G.Bennett discussed here many times, connects to the suspicion as to the realm of 'demiurgic powers', that is,

beings superadvanced but within 'existence' or higher nature (same as lower nature, but still undiscovered by homo). The 'soul' technology of early man has spawned a descendant, but knowledge of this has been virtually unknown in most historical civilizations.

Perhaps in the new era of history we entered with modernity this situation can improve as knowledge becomes available.

There is an irony here: this is an issue of materialism (of the soul), but it is so elusive it appears (if it appears) as a 'spiritual' phenomenon...

We have suggested the communist left, reborn, as a future sponsor of this mysterious technology, the major religions having made a botch of the question.

If so, the left is in a lot of 'school boy' trouble. It is hardly competent for this as yet, next to the howls of protest from traditional religionists, really visceral howls. but religionists have lost their connection to the 'working class', to the 'urban proletariat of the modern urban wasteland...They are thus the only candidates, But a bit klutzy on spiritual issues, to say the least, nearly neanderthal next to the stellar (hoity) toities of new age movement. We can foresee leftists carted off to Zen monasteries and locked in for years, marxists banished to the caves of Almora, communing commies holding 'last suppers' in catacombs of the modern metropolis...

The man, the soul, the will...

May 27th, 2015

Last and First Men brings the issues of communism, revolution, and religion into conjunction, and this in the context of the idea of evolution. The model in WHEE and LFM is speaking to a new post-religious ('religion') culture that must nonetheless graduate from religion, so to speak.

You can cashier Xtianity but you have to explain just how it worked to claim that you think it failed. And that is hard. In a way it is too hard, we can't normally understand the clever trickiness of gnostic mephistopheles issuing magical 'cash' for the juice of religions in expansion. That's the catch, and what gives us the sense too often of being in the phases of a complicated magical illusion.

The left will have to succeed without that or else be entangled in the old-fashioned way. I think that man is graduating from religion, and the first final exam came with the emergence of buddhism. But the issues of religion are invariant and in modern culture the issue recurs under the rubric of 'will', and man's inability to really understand himself. Xtianity helped him for long to operate under the mystery of will using the grace of churches and their blessings. But the test of graduation is coming and the spell of Nietzsche is an ample symptom of the sharks beginning to move in on the waning of religion.

I think the left will default to many of the functions of religion in its way of helping the poor, but also the 'poor in spirit'. The way must be reborn in a new form for an era of materialists, without sentimental religiosity. But the issues are the same, one way or the other, and here the challenge posed in the previous post is that of man, and certainly proletarian man, coming to understand the 'exploitation of will' beyond the exploitation of his 'work'. The 'will' in man is the key to his liberation, so the left must graduate from positivism to understand man as a body, a soul, and a will. The three are one yet distinct. This is, of course, the course that comes after he has graduated via, say, buddhism. So modern man is really advanced in a new age by a peter's principle that gives graduation, but no exam. The status of the will is the advanced course. But man in modern guise can barely do the make up on two thousand years of meditation. He simply fall behind, and begin to disappear into the dark zones. Sinners stripped of their will, unite you have nothing to lose...

Engels our first munzerian..Marx and the xtians of the hyparchic future

April 30th, 2015

Last and First Men envisions a kind of Xtian church taking up the path of communist endeavor all the way to revolution. This need not be anything dogmatic or anything like a coup d'état on the left. A streamlined 'church' at the level of thought can (in fact, Engels almost did this exercise ages ago in the 1840's) connect the 'materialist' left with a larger circle of humanity, its religious concerns, superstitions, and genuine epiphanies. This church at the level of thought can realize itself at any moment but in the general case, we can simply recollect the xtian source of the first communist movement. It was a blunder of amnesia for 'historical materialists' to think religion was always reactionary. The reality is the 'revolutionary' buddhism of the axial age and the same for the early Xtian movement, growing out of the judaic-zealot 'revolution' against rome. We should see that the 'roman' xtian was soon coopted but that there was always a seditious assumption among those of the catacomb, and the metaphor of the virtual future in the theme of the 'church of god' and the 'church of man' was a powerful prophetic religion of religious metaphors of social transformation. Although we can't clone the past, we can come to see that the Munzerian explosion at the early modern has seeded our future modernity with the task of an analogous futurist/prophetic movement, now at the limits of the capitalist universe. Xtian communism is a prophesy of the early modern, and the laughter of the frozen zombies of reactionary religion will soon confront the results predicted by the citizens of the reformation. In a finesse of dialectical equilibrium this was accompanied by the Calvinist conversion to capitalist greed in a new demonic of the 'virtues', and this will play itself out until the moment of the Big Flip and the moneychangers are thrown out of the temple. Once and or all.

The idea of a virtual church (as in the Preface to LFM) is useful as almost more efficient than the realization of an actual religious cult. The latter remains entirely possible: any xtian church that decides to move in relation to social justice has entered this terrain already and this can help xtians realize their long lost aspiration to a new 'kingdom', one that was conceived and then realized as the church of rome which soon begat the sense of its temporal failure. So the stakes have been set for millennia and right on schedule the last wager is set.

I would not ask any historical materialist to envisage sentimental religion as his new belief mongering conversion. Historical materialism was a useful right of passage to clear the mind of spiritual nonsense. But the core idea of a church born of the virtual future in the revolution of the kingdom is 'grand cliché' with bullseye aim. And its time is coming. In fact, it is here.

And there is a new new age rumor: the astral conversion of 'Marx' to the 'church of and in the virtual future'.

We should discuss further the issue of jews and xtians in any conception of an xtian future. I think this is both a deadly question and a hidden venue to an interesting outcome: the jew as outsider all over again, along with jewish fascination with the superman comic (their bourgeois contribution to the future of all and everything): the jew as sacrifice in a croyleyan apocalypse of the magical sacrifice...What? something more mundane: the disguises of the 'overman' in a jewish vagrancy of the spirit....

If that doesn't scare you we can add some thrills, and a serious way to keep a munzerian church for foundering in antisemitism, etc, etc...the 'private eye' path to a reckoning of the origin of the Holocaust...To be continued...

'Evolution' and the assembly of complex objects

March 24th, 2015

<http://darwiniana.com/2015/03/24/origin-of-life-researcher-on-why-evolution-theory-needs-revision/>

I think that it is not so much a question of revising 'evolution' theory as finding one that works for the first time. Here the model of 'evolution' in WHEE can help, because the term 'evolution' goes into free fall in a situation that has no genetic connection. We use the term all the time for any kind of developmental situation. So it is not a big deal to 'revise' the usage. The word hardly has a usage, while the Darwinian version is simply up in the air.

The model in WHEE is a reminder that if 'random evolution' fails, and surely it must, then the basic task of a theory of evolution must be to have a map of the construction of complex entities. So look at a factory and remind yourself, after natural selection fantasies collapse, that a complex object must be constructed according to complicated design rules (and design here has no theological implications) and this leaves biological evolution in the limbo of our own (heck, that's too hard, let's stick with natural selection) difficulties with complex objects.

Biology has spent so long on the wrong explanation that the above comes as a shock. The evolution issue in WHEE is a very special case in the sense that 'man in history' constructs his own civilization, but a close look shows a more subtle situation where this self-evolution is part of a larger system that guides creativity. That is not at all what darwinism suggests.

I think that the problem is not easy to solve because in the end the limits of observation prevent us from seeing how nature 'evolves' complex entities, and in any case current can't allow any kind of directional process. But it is hard to see how the 'construction of complex objects' can be other than teleological. Review the options, as above, and it sinks in that we hardly know how evolution occurs at all.

Gaian gardens of life

March 26th, 2015 ·

http://history-and-evolution.com/whee4th/chap3_5_1.htmA Gaian Matrix

It might help in moving to a new perspective on evolution to consider the Gaia hypothesis and the suspicion that planetary life has a planetary source and nurture.

If we examine the 'macro effect' we see something far more complex than one-track evolution: we see a complex directional system that can multitask and deal with complex cultural entities and show feedback over long periods of time (intermittent teleology).

One should avoid the mistake of thinking such entities as 'alive': in all the muddle of J.G. Bennett's work one issue seems to emerge as both novel and useful: the clear distinction between 'aliveness' and 'consciousness', a term whose semantics is completely scrambled. Bennett's idea, which he could not complete coherently, was that 'consciousness', unlike the 'vital' energies of organisms in a natural environment, was a cosmic energy, was associated with the larger cosmic life. We don't know what that means, and our discussions of consciousness in two or more almost opposite meanings is not helpful. Ordinary mechanical consciousness is not really conscious at all, as many in mindfulness workshops suddenly get a glimpse of. The issue of 'cosmic consciousness' is a new age plane wreck, but the core idea is onto something. The interest of Bennett's take (although it is mangled Schopenhauer) is that the 'will' in nature can be a property of cosmic bodies. Beware of such a statement: it is not the ordinary sense of the will in man. And we should note that the planet Earth and the film called the 'biosphere' are related but different factors. The 'will' in nature is the higher end of the lower mechanical laws we find with physics. But the point is that 'cosmic consciousness' and the 'will' of cosmological entities are just about the right 'bon idee' for a future theory of evolution, if we can bypass the already accumulating pseudo-science being made out of Bennett's fragile thinking.

The point is that we get a sense of something beyond life that can process the mechanics of a biosphere in the 'gardens of evolving life'.

All of this amounts to saying that god as a designer in evolution/history no longer works. The 'god' factor has disappeared into a vast universe (or multiverse). The design of life springs from a lower scale of planets and biospheres.

This seems to suggest that cosmic entities, while not alive, are conscious. That doesn't follow or make sense. Bennett's system is too crude here. It refers to an 'energy' that is not focused via a 'mind'. So what does it mean outside of that context? We don't know, but pace Bennett it is the lowest cosmic energy. Note that the 'will' is not 'conscious'.

The term 'will' is almost a mystery. The association with human 'will' power, confuses us. The laws of physics are to lower nature as the 'laws of will' are to a higher nature, thus in a continuum from the 'laws of physics' meanings. We see how the idea of 'god' so easily derailed into confusion here. This sounds weird, but this nexus of ideas is almost tautologous, given the right definitions of terms.

Stream and sequence: religions, axial ages, and reformations

March 30th, 2015

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=stream+and+sequence>

Our analysis of world history in WHEE doesn't honor 'sacred' and 'secular' distinctions. It has another more useful distinction of 'stream' and 'sequence': the Axial Age produces two monotheistic 'sequence' transitional areas, archaic Israel, and the hard to understand Zoroastrianism of Persia. We only see the Israelite succession in the West, but the Persian blending with Israelitism at the conclusion of the 'Israelite' transition (of Israel/Judah) is one of the key moments of the (mostly unwritten) Axial Age. This was a world historical first, a blending of Semitic and Indo-European 'monotheistic' strains with an extra boost given to the underdog semitic peoples crushed by the Roman Empire. It would seem that the Persian strain resurfaced explosively in Islam, but in a new set of disguises given the later history of the Middle East and the transient character of the Persian Empire. Recall from WHEE the issue of the 'frontier' effect: Persia was a very advanced culture flourishing after conquest at the core zone of the ancient Sumerian civilization and its succession. So why wasn't it the prime locus of the onset of a monotheistic age? Once we understand the frontier effect we see that the macro system never returns to the same spot, i.e. core Sumer 2400 years later. The macro system favors the underdog in a frontier area, almost the middle of nowhere for its time, but the zone of multiple effects of diffusion from Egypt and Sumer. The Israelite (Israel/Judah) transition is a tour de force barely appreciated by either Jews or Christians. Instead of expanding into empire it becomes an ironic experiment in the 'incredible disappearing kingdom' as its theme becomes 'dealing with empires' as underdogs. That seems odd, but if you reflect the saga of Israel is its symbolic disappearance from history after creating a 'seed monotheism' (not yet Judaism): the effect is stunning: creating a religion torn away from its geopolitical roots enabling its universalization. And then just at the last moment, during the Exile, the results blends with Zoroastrianism and begins its course toward the era of the coming of Christianity.

Note that ancient Israel staged a 'reformation' of the classic temple religion/culture of antiquity in the middle east.

But we should note that the resulting religions of Christianity and Islam are stream phenomena created to move through the mideonic period to create new forms of oikoumene. The issue of theism and atheism haunt us now but the original focus was the attempt by Christianity and Islam to create new civilizations in the wake of paganism. With respect to their age periods they were thus innovations of the proto-modernist type.

But Christians and Moslems should note the way the 'sequence' effect returns with the modern transition. The modern transition will prefigure the future of religion in a very powerful way. We cannot be sure the 'stream' phenomena of the post-Axial Age will survive collision with the modern transition. But just here the issue of 'reformation' buys time into this new epoch, and Moslems, Christians and Buddhists are learning the lesson of a new epoch.

This is why the Protestant Reformation is often so mysterious: it is not longer the Christianity that came into being in the era of Constantine. It is suddenly a new question mark with an affinity to the coming capitalist revolution, and then becomes an adjunct to the movement of abolitionism. It has many sides, and its has survived into recent times because it was amped up at the beginning.

Where it goes from here is not yet clear, but the issue should be of concern to Moslems because the term 'modern' is not sufficient to describe a viable future in the coming epoch visible at its start in the early modern. One of the problems is the way the 'modern' has gone stale, and then to rancid in some

cases. It is hard to see how to innovate toward modernism in an age when the original American experiment is now beset with covert agencies, false-flagging, drones, and executive assassination. The founding fathers must be gaping through the clouds in puzzlement at the outcome of their experiment.

The future of the present epoch is still uncreated, so we can be careful to study the nature of real progress in the context of decline from a 'sequence' point now entering its long endurance test in the future stream.

We have arrived at the moment foretold by the revolutionaries of the year 1848...

January 24th, 2015 ·

<http://last-and-first-men.com/>

We have arrived at the moment foretold by the revolutionaries of the year 1848. The future of the world system at the end of globalization remains tremendously uncertain, but the crisis of capitalism at a time of planetary danger summons at once its dialectical companion, the idea of communism. We cannot indulge the shibboleths of the failure of communism, if capitalism is itself a failure. It is useful therefore to consider the question of emergent communism in the wake of the French Revolution in the context of the model of macroevolutionary history demonstrated in World History and the Eonic Effect. The difficulties of historical materialism suggest the need for a larger dimension of the historical, and a look at the place of economic systems in the record of civilization. It is important to take the idea of communism (we must immediately recast the idea as a 'new communism') critically, but can we do the same for the delusive dogmas of capitalism? And the issue of evolution in its Darwinian ideology prone to social darwinist manipulations of class warfare becomes the object of critical enquiry. The danger of the current paradigm is the promotion of the idea of capitalism as an evolutionary game of the survival of the fittest. But the reality is the danger of social and species degeneration under the regime of unlimited market civilization. A future evolution of man is not the drama of the last man proposed by Nietzsche, but a social context of cooperation that can allow the development of man in a coherent and caring environment beyond the destructive character of markets: a framework of postcapitalist communism is the foundation for a new and future man, evolving as a species, and not as a series of warring evolutionary degenerates in competition.

Booknotes: Why Homer Matters

January 16th, 2015 ·

Discussion of:

Why Homer Matters...

One of the best perspectives on Homer is to see him in the context of the historical model of WHEE where we see that the Homeric corpus is one of the most spectacular instances of the action visible in the Axial Age. We fail to see the way the Old Testament and the Homeric corpus emerged in an eerie parallelism. Our distinctions of 'sacred/secular' were not honored in the dynamic of the Axial period which seems to amplify the cultural strains of multiple 'civilizations' in parallel, in a time-slice of their longer absolute histories or streams.

This induces the irony of the contrast of cultures and the unique status given to the Israelite, which was actually as primitive at its core as the world of Homeric Greeks. The reciprocal ironies of sacred/secular and archaic/modernized flit back and forth between the two worlds of the Greeks and the tribes of Canaan.

The world of Homer is only the beginning of a rich sudden eruption of poetic grandeur and Homer is soon followed by a rich legacy of poets from Archilocus onwards to the final majestic phase of greek tragedy, often thought of as set of 'slices' out of Homer.

Homer begins the query that is never final in the series from Aeschylus to Euripides, what is the tragic? and this riddle sinks into the background only to resurface in modern times with Shakespeare (and Racine).

We can see that 'tragedy' is the riddle of riddles in the 'evolution'/history of art/literature, and appears twice in two successive 'transitions' in the 'eonic sequence'. That is a puzzle that stands beyond the sacred and secular and unites both in a genre that is counterpoint to the theodicies of monotheistic religion. This contrast is often the source of commentary either for religion as transcending tragedy or as a secular barb against religion in a expose of the theodical dreamworks of religion. I think that in the context of the Axial Age we confront the strange parallel emergence of the Greeks and the Israelites, and more in the further parallels of the Indic/buddhist and the world of China with its Confucian/Taoist choral parallel, an extraordinary synchrony of cultures.

The emergence of Greek Tragedy is thus one of the rival 'design' sagas to challenge the Judaic, but in its peculiar way of turning archaic polytheism into art. http://history-and-evolution.com/whee4th/chap5_2_5.htm

Towards a neo-communist exit from the 2nd Internationale legacies

January 12th, 2015 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/2015/01/11/133273/>: Secularism not inherently atheistic

It is important to not let the new atheists/secular humanists get away with defining 'secularism' as entailing atheism. I am neither a theist nor an atheist and I find this distortion of the usage to be pernicious. It arose, to be sure, fairly early because the battle against theocracy during the Reformation set the contrast of religion and modernity, no matter that modernity began with the Reformation. It wasn't until latter that critics of religion began to equate modernity with atheism. This is clear from the eighteenth century shift, and the collision of revolution and religion in the French Revolution. And this was directly connected to the emergent atheism of figures like Marx. But the equation of secularism with atheism is a pernicious and very limiting confusion that condemns religious groups to attack secularism, as if people in modern times didn't have freedom of belief.

The meaning of 'secularism' must be founded on the breadth and diversity of the 'modern transition' and we see a long list of counterpoints.

Closed world of marxist cult

January 9th, 2015 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=last+and+first+men>

I am often surprised at the failure of many leftists to see the limits of marxism: that is because they cannot easily mix with outsiders, and have a closed view generated by conformity. That creates a situation of naivete: the general public won't even listen to many of the old jargonized pitches of classic marxism.

The intent in Last and First Men is to change the 'habits' of thought that cluster around the 'dead mass' of nineteenth century to bolshevik cliches.

At a desperate moment radicals are so turned off they start to reinvent the subject in chaotic fashion. LFM shows a way to do that systematically while still doing justice to the canon.

I think more generally that 'historical materialism' is a dead duck in a culture now dominated by as many buddhists as marxists. It is irresponsible at this point to turn off systematically so many in the general public.

The issue of neo-communism can make ample use of the old marxism and yet completely change all the labels, rewrite theory/history and translate the core ideas of class and ideology to a new framework.

As things stand now the old marxist left is blocking any real activist group in the way it dogmatizes stale jargon.

I cannot even subscribe to the main marxist listservs to exchange commentary. Hard to believe

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 postivism, 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.

The failure of dialectical materialism

January 8th, 2015 ·

<http://darwiniana.com/?s=dialectical+materialism>

The reason for my attack on dialectical materialism is not based on some logical/scientific objection, quite the contrary: after a generation of the New Age movement many would look back on nineteenth

century dialectic as old-fashioned, and to underpowered compared to the more recent versions of 'non-dual' experimental thought.

A book like Ouspensky's Tertium Organon completely stole a march on the left from the right. More generally the lore of ancient Samkhya is far more fertile here, with its genuine 'triads' instead of dialectical dyads.

I do Not reject the dialectic, which should mean basically a 'debate', a correlation of opposites in thought. It also has a close relation to metaphors of transformation, etc...

But I think the time has come to move on: no one not already converted to marxism is not going to spend much time on dialectic.

So I think that a whole new canon of postmarxism is needed. It would be almost impossible to excise the dialectical legacy however.

But there is a simple solution to that: do the dialectic! Last and First Men reinvents what it calls 'dialogical metadialectic', which can be used to examine the self-referential dialectic argumentation on the validity of 'metadialectic', i.e. some triadic connection to a reduced dyadic dialectic, ...

We have better things to worry about at this point.

Let's put it plainly: put dialectic on the sidelines as a research project in need of critique, state all axioms/theorems of neo-communist logic on simple logical deductions. And leave it at that. The left can't afford to waste its energies defending dialectics. And the confused use of dialectics to explain revolution, historical change, evolution, etc, are too marginal to be useful anymore.

The issue of revolutionary/evolutionary change is clearly discussed in LFM using a completely different kind of discussion.

There was an old debate about whether dialectic could be applied to nature, with Engels challenged here many times. The critique is important but this just shows how marxists wish to reinvent 'samkhya' with triads for dialectics. The confusion of the two is a blind spot for marxists.