

The Crisis of the Anthropocene

Table of Contents

Preface	1
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

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

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

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 cliches, 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 Wlodzimierz 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 sophistical 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.