



---

## DEMOCRATIC MARKET NEO-COMMUNISM

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

The current election of Trump suggests the american system has entered the kind of reactionary deadlock that has too often cursed its history, witness the period leading up to the american civil war. The reign of climate deniers coming the fore simply amplifies an already disastrous situation, created by the american 'rogue state' with its imperialist wars fueled by the military-industrial complex, its deep state and uncontrolled covert agencies

showing strong evidence of false-flag dark ops, next to a corrupt political system beholden to capital interests. The developing crisis of climate change confronting a political system unable to respond shows a system entering the critical zone. The current system is not stable and we need to consider the dangers in the situation we face. If nothing else the revolutionary option is failsafe logic, the ready fire-extinguisher. But 'if nothing else' is not enough as the failure of the powers of be calls for intervention. It is also possible the imputation of revolutionary change can lead to preemptive change on the part of the established regime.

It is important to consider the revolutionary option and to declare in advance what the aims of revolution should be. This is nothing less than what the founders of the american system suggested might be needed, 'a republic if you can keep it'. Democracies emerged in revolutionary periods of turbulence and the founding fathers anticipated the future of this reality. Here we will propose a hybrid of democratic and socialist models in the form of what we call 'democratic market neo-communism'.

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

- the bolshevik/stalinist outcome of the Russian revolution

- the limits of classical economics used by Marx

- the failure to consider neo-classical economics and its ideology

- exclusive emphasis on the working class rather than the 'universal class'

- the confusions of historical materialism and its stages of production theory

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

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

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

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

This essay is short, a gesture toward a longer discussion, and a way to jolt thinking into a dialectic on the revolutionary prospect. We have clipped the material to outline form to jumpstart a new line of thinking about the crisis we face. We must act now, within a time frame of less than a decade to be ready for what we face.

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

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

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

Communism/socialism has many confused representations, ours will 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.

## **1. The Crisis of Climate**

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

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

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

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

5. We must both transcend and fulfill the liberal tradition, that is, the result must have a democratic core. The 'end of history' debate was bogus but had a point: the progression of epochs in history shows a definite process beyond mechanics toward the realization of freedom, thence democracy. The goal of postcapitalist logic must be to establish a true democracy free of the domination of capital powers. Democracy is more than the rights of

capital and is founded in the shared ecology of the Commons.

## **2. History and Evolution**

2.1 The marxist theory of historical materialism is a teleological theory of history and puts excessive emphasis on economic determinism. We can propose an empirical outline of world history as a substitute and create a chronology of history since the Neolithic with an extension to the evolutionary emergence of man. In the process we can refound Marx's early objections to darwinism. Our view of history can point to a useful sketch of a path to a real evolutionary theory even as it remains agnostic as to theory and yet aware of the fact of evolution. This approach can free thinking from the social darwinist curse that has used evolutionary darwinism for social darwinist exploitations and class warfare.

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

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

2.3 The basic outline clearly delineates a immense spectrum of emergent properties from the Reformation to the Enlightenment. The sudden appearance of so many innovation near the divide point is not accident. We see that revolution in the early modern is a strong element in the change of epochs, but we can also see that revolution in the post-divide period will

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

2.4 As noted the industrial revolution and capitalism emerge very rapidly near the divide point of the modern transition. In tandem emerges a series of chase plane successors and this are crisis vehicles for a system that is unstable on its way to globalization. Within a mere two centuries we can already see that capitalism is likely to destroy planetary civilization without intervention.

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

### **3. Democratic Market Neo-communism**

3.1 The issue of capitalism is beset with an immense amount of sophisticated pseudo-science and the twin confusions of classical and neo-classical economics have confused all parties that they don't know what they are doing. Our historical model allows us to contain this confusion with a simple strategy: no economic model using the calculus of differential equations can

be valid for human society because the element of free agency distorts any causal line of outcome. This technicality is decisive and allows us to escape the completely misleading implications of fake economic theories which ape the methods of physics in a preposterous fantasy. There is only one way to deal with economies: apply axioms as free agents to produce constructs to be evaluated in practice. That's the bottom line. The attempts to found capitalism in theory is thus misleading. The reality we see now is the danger of unrestricted free markets and the severe threat of human extinction in a system out of control.

3.2 The question of markets is very tricky nonetheless and the early marxists were not prepared for the so-called economic calculation debate. But that debate seems less cogent now. With no solid economic theory no claims for the inevitability of markets can retain their validity as dogma. The left soon produced a series answers, here which in turn have been criticized, and now in the period of computational machines and artificial intelligence the planning at any level of economies is foreseeable. Overall the fact remains that planning and market socialisms look as though they had been shown up in practice by a superior capitalism of markets. For a generation after the era of bolshevism that seemed convincing but the reality check since induced shows that while socialist economies may be inefficient capitalism is going to be fatal. We MUST asap find a postcapitalist set of alternatives. In any case our framework allows a transitional or else permanent phase where markets exist inside a communist framework. This is not the same as 'market socialism' with its liabilities and many debates.

We need a functional system that can allow survival in a climate catastrophe. The experience of bolshevism was misleading and isn't really a demonstration of anything, but in a crisis it shows that botched planning is still a viable economic possibility. We can do much better than that. We must start from scratch and find a new way to do economics, with simple praxis (or what Popper called piecemeal social engineering) as the bottom line. We design a socialist system to satisfy certain social, ethical, and human requirements. Alienation in a frankenstein created by us is the obsolete muddle of capitalism. We found economics in the values of equality, populist economics rights, and a stance prepared on issues like basic income, AI and the evolution of labor forces, cooperatives, unions, etc... Our approach is not completely beyond markets in any case, so this sophisticated debate over planning is out of date. We respond that it is madness to dogmatize about

the efficiency of markets if they decimate the Amazon to produce hamburger mania in couch potatoes in the American television culture. The notion of the end of history decreeing the inevitability of market craziness. The whole debate needs to be torn up as we start from scratch. The second world war shows that planned economies can be constructed in a manner of months if circumstances demand it.

3.3 We have considered then a hybrid we call democratic market neo-communism, described in the endnote. We envision a three sector system with both planning, markets and semi-anarchist/autonomous sectors, a carefully balanced set of opposites

3.4 Let us envision, with the question of revolution as a sword of Damocles, a peaceful electoral transition to the new system envisioned, unrealistic or not. The factor of revolution will not go away and is the critically dangerous transition, one that must produce some form of democracy. The failure of the Russian Revolution here was clear, but it was in many ways the result of Tsarist social mechanics with no experience of democracy and the classic Civil War whose outcome induce totalitarian mania from which the revolution could not recover. But the American revolution shows the correct set of stages: an imperial revolt, and then a constitutional phase. The latter is the point at which democracy must be founded in the context of the democratization of private property in the Commons. No democracy is possible in a system of plunder where commons resources are privatized by predatory capitalist powers (so-called primitive accumulation). In a communist system with many likely antagonists a balanced system of strong authority must guard the revolution, but it must be matched with a strong set of individual rights, and economic populist must be the foundation for a new socially broadened form of democracy that is more than voting for a few neoliberal posters, etc..

3.5 Last and First Men: the transition to postcapitalism is an operation on an immense scale and invokes the level of evolution itself...We must bring our perspective to the level of terraforming, ecological Gaian perspectives, and a secular equivalent of religion. We can adjourn this discussion to the materials in *Last and First Men, Out of Revolution, The Crisis of Modernity*. (Amazon, web pdf)... The blog *Darwiniana* has many discussions here, and links to the pdf versions of the books cited.