

“ThisIsAlways.mp3”: “This is always...” [Betty Carter]

[“150510thespear.mp3”:]

What we are doing... is for always... and for everything... Why should we settle? We deserve it all because we are 'all'... We are as infinite as our love...

But it is also true... that until we have a movement... a global movement... 'power' will force us to choose... and... to the one I love... I would not want her to experience any diminishment of her life... nor would any of you for yours...

I am won... that is certain... and now I am even more motivated... to do what I can... to see a global movement for generalized human freedom...

Perhaps there is someone out there who could help establish... using my home as base... for a physical space... a non-profit for the planning of just such an artistic flowering that an advancement of global human freedom means.

I think it's time to seize the initiative... because 'power' can keep us reacting *ad infinitum*. Just a few people can change the world... reclaim our global humanity.

Unfortunately... heretofore 'power' has provided the most dramatic example of what a very few... a Miniscule Few... can do... to us all... all life devastated in the wake of their very focused energy... it's time to stand with the earth and provide the counter-energy to their global misanthropy-plan.

All we would need is a few folks with vision in the arts to comprise the guidance – I suppose they would officially be a 'board'... but perhaps a better image is a spear.

---

[“150510thestorymustchange.mp3”:]

*Today's show*: “Establishing a 'safe' place to plan and express our love: places for the cultivation of soul-sufficiency... which necessarily means: helping each other get 'big' – the process of reclaiming... sharing... and expanding our original 'selves'...” (Part 4)

May 6, 2015... Sisters and Brothers: Over the course of these conversations... certain 'root-issues' catch at our feet and tell us to pause and dig deeper. We need 'numbers'... we've said repeatedly over the years... in order to begin to create the alternative to global-'power'. “What erodes our numbers?”... we've paused several times at that question... pointed our 'logic' at it... and found such things as: coercion in child-rearing... and the various forms of 'division' that are sown in us and which course essentially throughout the overall 'system' (all of them variations of the basic division between 'citizen' – 'barbarian'... or... put another way... the division between intellectual and manual labor...)

...and we've found 'coercion' and 'division' to be... in many ways... the twofold-heart of the system of 'class'... in order to compel us... from birth onwards... 'to come in'... and to convince us to believe 'there is no alternative' to it... and that... therefore... “labor is our inevitable lot”... that we are forever condemned to implement the plans of others... and to never probe our own... or even to come to know they exist... for far too many of us...

...and most recently... our foot tripped on the issue of 'obedience'... as the base mindset... the deep training... of 'class'... needed to inculcate a belief in the inevitability of 'power' (without...) and internalize discipline ('power' within...) early... requiring a relinquishment of our own power... our unique gifts... in order that global-'power' might direct our human energy as it sees fit...

And all of these key... root... issues... 'power' continuously keeps pushing underground... and manufactures innumerable song-and-dance numbers to keep us distracted from recognizing the thought... that there are... quite likely... hidden truths we should be delving for.

Please listen again to this wordbeat-excerpt from a recent show on this question:

“150506onbuildingnumbers.mp3”: “So all the various ways our numbers are systematically reduced... our numbers available to come to consensus... on the need to discuss what should be the world we live in – how do we make what we want... come to be... Because we in the U.S. have this codified right to 'pursue happiness'... and that is not an individual pursuit... they try when they put out their propaganda to frame it that way and make it seem loony... but... rather... it is in fact our right as a people to come together and collectively discuss: What does it mean... to 'pursue happiness'... if not to realize our inherent gifts... our right to grow our knowledge... as they do!... or as they think they do but as we do authentically... ...our right as a people to pursue truth... We have the codified right to come together and discuss how we do that... as a collective... as a people... In a sense I'm asking the same question that our Academe Three are asking: How do we confront the dilemmas facing our ability to move on as a global humanity? How do we do that? Because we are... all of us global humans...living in a moment when the story has to change...” [From our February 1, 2015 show.]

...and it is not coincidence that... this moment when all the suppressed issues of 'class'... of 'power'... that explain the nature of our containment... are coming to the surface... is simultaneously the moment that Karl Marx... Rosa Luxemburg... and Our Good Three have been telling us inevitably falls due – when a 'system' that has been eating without stint is finally brought the check...

...how did they put it?

...as the “social productiveness' of labor” increases – as 'power' sucks the life out of us and vests it in (relatively) permanent objects (an objective only realized with our obedience...) – they have no need for the greater number of us...

...and... they – Karl, Rosa and our Good Three – are unanimous... that the day will arrive – and that day is now – when 'power' has no need for a significant percentage of us... So we have a choice... we can either claw and scratch at each other to be one of those few 'the system' has a need for... or we can choose each other: love... and solidarity...

...and what we have been considering in our recent focus on the importance of being able to express our love... is that a key place to begin digging for these hidden truths... is with that core hidden truth within each one of us in a 'class' system: that our human energy should not be directed by the state...

(...and in future shows we'll be considering that this is the missing piece in Alice Miller's analysis – although her contribution to our understanding of our entrapment under 'class' is critical... and she is absolutely right when she says:

As long as the child within is not allowed to become aware of what happened to him or her, a part of his or her emotional life will remain frozen, and sensitivity to the humiliations of childhood will therefore be dulled.

All appeals to love, solidarity, and compassion will be useless if this crucial prerequisite of sympathy and understanding is missing. (*Alice Miller, For Your Own Good: Hidden Cruelty in Child-rearing and the Roots of Violence*, p. xv)

...and that this is the critical juncture... where that must change... our human energy must be reclaimed...

---

[“150510safedesign.mp3”:]

...and that this is the critical juncture... where that must change... our human energy must be reclaimed...

...and to begin to do that... we need 'safe spaces'... as...

...reclaiming our human energy globally is based in...

...“reclaiming our 'within'...”

...and how do we do that if not by coming together in discussion – with a dual purpose of understanding: global-'power'... and 'internalized discipline' / the inauthentic (false) self – i.e., in order to upend... both of them...

...and while there will be inevitable infiltration... if we 'do our planning' of these spaces right... we can nullify that tactic...

Sisters and Brothers... we've been discussing the two sides to our dilemma... which is our containment under 'class': the 'outer' and the 'inner'...

The Outer – from the Inner  
Derives its Magnitude –  
'Tis Duke, or Dwarf, according  
As is the Central Mood –

...and we've asked... where... at what point... does the reclamation of the true self – that self capable of becoming 'soul-sufficient' – start... and... with Emily's guidance... we've turned the spotlight on the internalization of global 'power'...

...global-'power' without... is premised on... global-'power' within...

...and noted the critical fact that as we reclaim our 'within'...

...we get targeted...

...which... again... makes the creation of 'safe spaces' a critical need...

What makes a space 'safe'?... safe for the envisioning and building of a new world without coercion? Put practically: no agents... no infiltration. But... as that's not possible... is there a way to design a space... a project... such that the very act of participation in it... builds it... moves it toward its goals...

If so... what would that design be?

What helps to realize the goal of a world premised on individual self- and soul-sufficiency? Let's slightly modify Kropotkin's guidance: he told us that “freedom is always the best solution to the problem of gaining our freedom...”

If we want a world with no coercion... a space that's 'safe' would also be premised on the absence of coercion... beyond fundamental agreement on the end-goal as the purpose of our participation...

—

[“150510soulsupport.mp3”:]

We're making the case here that reclaiming the abandoned 'self' requires that we confront our training in obedience. Now... Alice Miller makes an interesting point... one which could be interpreted as a version of what De Tocqueville said about 'obedience'... Recall that he said that: “Men are not corrupted by the exercise of power or debased by the habit of obedience; but by the exercise of a power which they believe to be illegal [...control the thoughts and you do control the reality – I guess that's the essence of what De Tocqueville is saying here... – P.S.] and by obedience to a rule which they consider to be usurped and oppressive...” Alice Miller writes... using the word 'adaptation' in the sense of 'obedience':

One might ask whether adaptation must necessarily lead to depression [which... she argues... it does under 'class'... – P.S.] Is it not possible, and are there not examples, that emotionally conforming individuals may live quite happily? There are indeed such examples, and above all there were more in the past, for depression is a disease of our time. Within a culture that was shielded from other value systems, such as that of orthodox Jewry in the ghetto... an adapted individual was not autonomous and did not have his own individual sense of identity (in our sense) that could have given him support; but he did feel supported by the group... Of course, there were some exceptions... [She is but pointing out that our nature is communal... that we are tribal... and that until 'rule' commandeered it... our communalism was used for us... – P.S.] Today it is hardly possible for any group to remain so isolated from others who have different values. Therefore it is necessary today for the individual to find his support within himself, if he is not to become the victim of various interests and ideologies. This strength within himself – through access to his own real needs and feelings and the possibility of expressing them – thus becomes crucially important for him on the one hand, and on the other is made enormously more difficult through living in contact with various different value systems. [What's missing here in her

analysis is hidden 'power'... because way she puts it suggests that there are these equally-weighted competing ideologies and value-systems... when... in fact... when you have amassed all the resources of the planet to support your particular ideology... that moves the entire world the way you want it... – P.S.] These factors can probably explain the rapid increase of depression in our time and also the general fascination with various groups. [She's thinking here about the 'appeal' and spread of fascism... which she expands on in *For Your Own Good...* – P.S.] (Alice Miller, *Prisoners of Childhood*, p. 59)

---

[“150510thechoice.mp3”:]

This raises an interesting question... one that also comes up in this notion of 'the development of the productive forces'... and returns us to the question we asked last week... “How is it possible for us to think that 'power' 'develops' us as it uses us?”

I think the way clear through all the issues compressed in this discussion is... again... to remember the authority of the earth as it is ever-expressed in counter-definition to the false authority of 'power'... or... as Nikola Tesla put it: “With... the full development and a perfect system of wireless transmission of energy to any distance man will be able to solve all the problems of material existence. Distance, which is the chief impediment to human progress, will be completely annihilated in thought, word and action. Humanity will be united, wars will be made impossible and peace will reign supreme.” (Quoted in *Waking Up*, p. 59 – 60)

The authority of the earth – present in the urge to grow our gifts in adventurous interrelationships with new lands and experiences... no less than in our communal traditions – is voiced in classless... as well as in 'class' societies. On the contrary... it is precisely the point of the totalitarian drive which came to exist in the era of De Tocqueville and Bentham to silence this authority of the earth... in order to compel our participation in the project of achieving... and fixing permanently in place... global-'power'.

It is under a global-'class' system when our need to grow our gifts is utterly silenced.

The issue is 'force and division'... the choice before us in this transitional time is between the Open Society and Totalitarianism...

...or... in Kropotkin's terms: between Freedom... and Authority.

---

[“150510powerfettters.mp3”:]

Marx concludes by saying that the law of the tendency of the rate of profit to fall is “in every respect the most important law of modern political economy... It is from the historical standpoint the most important law.” [*Capital*, III] It implies “that the material productive power already present, already worked out, existing in the form of fixed capital, together with the scientific power, population etc., in short all conditions... for the reproduction of wealth, i.e. the abundant development of the social individual – that the development of the productive forces brought about by the historical development of the productive forces brought about by the historical development of capital itself, when it reaches a certain historical development of capital itself, when it reaches a certain point, suspends the self-valorization of capital, instead of positing it. Beyond a certain point, the development of the powers of production becomes a barrier for capital; hence the capital-relation a barrier for the development of the productive powers of labour. [We've been led to believe... when Marxist analysis talks about “the development of the productive powers of labor...” that it is somehow simultaneously a development of us... when... as we're about to discuss... the opposite is the case... And the notion that this takes priority... this notion that the development of the our 'productiveness' takes priority over us... is a key blind-spot... or source of myopia... in Marx's analysis... – P.S.] When it has reached this point, capital, i.e. wage-labour, enters into the same relation towards the development of social wealth and of the forces of production, as did the guild system, serfdom, slavery, and is necessarily stripped off as a fetter. [To say that wage labor gets “stripped off as a fetter...” it's important that we understand that... even if so... that doesn't end 'power'... The global-state statesmen could end the wage – or call it something else... per Bentham... and Plato... you could call it a “guaranteed minimum income”... attach a few conditions for receiving it... – it's still someone else feeding us... we're still 'pets'... is the point... we still haven't grown up... So when Rosdolsky says wage labor gets “stripped off as a fetter...” I don't think the analysis goes

deep enough... and that's where we're going in upcoming shows... – P.S.] The last form of servitude assumed by human activity, that of wage-labour on one side, capital on the other, is thereby cast off like a skin, and this casting-off itself is the result of the mode of production corresponding to capital; the material and mental conditions of the negation of wage-labour and of capital, themselves already the negation of earlier forms of unfree social production, are themselves results of its production process. [When he says that there will be a 'casting-off' of 'unfree social production he implies that we will then be in charge... but... as we're going to be discussing... and as our Good Three are going to say... that is far from guaranteed... and it is certainly not inevitable... – P.S.]

“The growing incompatibility between the productive development of society and its hitherto existing relations of production expresses itself in bitter contradictions, crises, spasms. The violent destruction of capital not by relations external to it, but rather as a condition of its self-preservation, is the most striking form in which advice is given it to be gone, and to give room to a higher state of social production.” [I don't think they're going to take that advice... because it isn't 'capital' that is our adversary... but rather these 'global-state-statesmen'... who stand in the way of our freedom... – P. S.]

The third section of the *Rough Draft* ends with this prognosis of “breakdown.” (Roman Rosdolsky, *The Making of Marx's 'Capital'*, 1968, p. 381 – 382)

(Hasn't the Political Theater produced by the Right of late been amusing?... their relentless... no matter how nonsensical... attempts to 'blame' the sinking global-economy (predicted by Marx...) and the loss of the hegemonic status of the US... on the Left overall... and Barack Obama in particular... as they tear and scrape... fangs all a'froth... in their single-minded attempt... to regain the office of US president? And the very fervor of it should tell us that what these 'power'-guys have in mind for us... in reclaiming that office... is not something we want to see.)

[“150510managementfetish.mp3”:]

Within the social relations of capitalism, however, the workers need an enormous effort to combat the limitations of their wage-labour status [...and we're going to be delving more deeply into that difficulty: into how that 'wage-labor status'... using different language for sure... gets crafted... in mother's lap... – P.S.], the status more impotent today within the production process than in any previous epoch of capitalism; for never before has the individual performance of a worker been reduced to such fragments and fractions of fragments of a job as is his contribution to the present-day high-grade socialised labour process. At the same time, the productivity of his labour has increased a thousandfold compared to the labour done in the one-man shops of the Middle Ages. But the productivity is not his in terms of his individual labour, and taking his individual operations as a standard of judgment the productivity is that [...or seems to be that... – P.S.] of the capital in whose employment he works and dependent on the efficiency of the management. Hence the managerial fetishism that pervades our society, the accepted belief that modern industrial establishments or indeed large-scale establishments of any kind cannot be run without their hierarchy of managers in control of every detail of production and of organisation and in particular, of course of the workers. This fetishism accrues to the socialisation of labour by the fact that it is in the wrong hands, wielded by management in the service of capital and for the exploitation of labour instead of being the foundation for working class power in a society of production.... As seen from that angle the functions and conditions of [workers'] own socialised labour take on an appearance as of an object-nature extraneous to them, to be studied, elaborated, and enforced upon them by separate agents. (Alfred Sohn-Rethel, “The dual economics of transition,” *The Labour Process and Class Strategies*, 1976)

[We'll be returning to this quote as we continue unpacking the issue of 'obedience' with the help of Alice Miller in future shows... Suffice to say... an initial thought on this... is that the confusion we feel at age... say... two... as we experience the imposition by parents of their requirement for obedience... that that confusion over 'obedience'... which gets resolved under 'class' as 'power'-worship... easily transfers over to the whole mysterious work-process itself – a cast-veil of mystery that reinforces our submission to what seems the vast knowledge of an inscrutable 'power'. What we have to discuss is how to reincorporate this knowledge back within us... – P.S.]

[“150510fascismhasarrived.mp3”:]

So this transition-moment we're in... is a 'getting our own back'-moment... and that starts within... becoming 'soul-sufficient'... in places... spaces... that foster the rediscovery of 'self'... and in fostering the same in our Brothers and Sisters... We need each other to develop our thought... absolutely.

---

[Today's reading: we continue with Chapter 5 of Giovanni Arrighi's, Terence K. Hopkins', and Immanuel Wallerstein's *Antisystemic Movements*... "1968: The Great Rehearsal"... – P.S.]

*1968: A Rehearsal of What?*

[During our April 19, 2015 show... our Good Three asked...]

If 1968 is analogous to 1848 as a failed world-scale revolution and as a world-historical great rehearsal, for what sort of world-revolution may it be the great rehearsal? Can we on analogy project today's underlying secular trends, specify what was new about yesterday's new social movements, and thereby sketch in advance likely trajectories of the confrontation and progressive social changes they suggest? As we move chronologically towards the 1990s and the 2000s, our historical social system, the capitalist world-economy, continues to be faced with difficulties in four principal arenas.

[...and the first one was the shake-up in the geo-political scene... the claims of the global statesmen of China... and Russia... and India... rising... as they jockey for place... no hegemonic state to cast the deciding vote. Recall they said:]

...Hegemony is giving way to its conceptual counterpoint, the condition of rivalry... The possible realignments of alliances between the five major actors – the US, the USSR, Western Europe, Japan, and China – are only now beginning. And everyone is approaching such realignments most gingerly and most fearfully. Hence, US hegemony is being eroded without any clear, and therefore reassuring, world order to replace it...

[...and then they wondered whether... and how... the total consumption of the earth... that pot of cash they sit on... conveyed with it the necessary control mechanisms to... in my words... keep the cattle herded...]

We proceed now to the other difficulties Plato's Tribe face in their 'self-less determination... to rule the human race... – P.S.]

Second, the contradiction between labor and capital, given both the increasing centralization of capital and the increasing marginalization of large sectors of the labor force, will remain elemental. The new social movements have increased the worldwide pressure for higher wage-levels with world capital seeking ever more to respond to this pressure by reducing the size of labor input. As a result, there has perforce been a rising level of material well-being for a significant sector of workers and a deepening relative immiseration of many others, hence an absolute and relative increase in the inequalities of well-being among the world's workers. There has been thus a widening scope for the mechanism of unequal exchange in world-scale accumulation.

[“150510drawnandquartered.mp3”:]

...As a result, there has perforce been a rising level of material well-being for a significant sector of workers and a deepening relative immiseration of many others, hence an absolute and relative increase in the inequalities of well-being among the world's workers. There has been thus a widening scope for the mechanism of unequal exchange in world-scale accumulation.

At the same time, capital's increasing search for safe havens from organized labor unrest carries with it of course a growing relocation of industrial proletarianization and hence of collective efforts to control that process and / or to ameliorate its effects. The net result may well be an increasingly class-conscious focus to the nationalist sentiment that pervades the zones outside the core, particularly in semi-peripheral states. Similar phenomena are increasingly occurring in socialist states, notably (but certainly not only) in Poland. [And in this context we should consider further Sohn-Rethel's point about how global 'power's design of the global 'class' work-system – i.e. a work-system global in scope – so (continuously and increasingly...) fragments our work experience that we feel it as external... and superior... to us – i.e. as disempowering... – P.S.]

Third, the ability of states to control their civil societies is diminishing. Historically, it is through the constitution of civil society, and its subsequent extension – notably, through the 1848-engendered 'incorporation of the working classes into society' of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries – that one traces the successive transformations of the monarchies and patriciates of the nascent capitalist world-economy into its constituent and still evolving states. The organizing contradiction from the inception of stateness, state power versus civil rights and liberties, remains central to the state – civil society relation. Over time, of course, the scope of each has greatly expanded, thus sharpening the struggle, which the post-1968 world-scale 'human rights' movements profoundly reflect. The notion that ruling strata seek to legitimate their rule – so that they are as morally obligated to command as those they claim to rule are morally obligated to comply – is both very old and very widespread.

Weber's central theoretical claim – that certain beliefs in popular consciousness are an indispensable condition of routine compliance and so of the 'stability' of the relational network administering the rules – remains plausible....

[A restatement... it seems... of Bentham's point (or Plato's... for that matter... that 'the people' must be trained to obey by strictly controlling what thoughts are allowed into our consciousness... for 'governance' to occur... – P.S.]

...However, the very increase in the efficiency of the ways in which each state controls its civil society, the expansion of an instrumental bureaucracy, itself creates the limits of its efficacy by generating an ever more widespread skepticism among those whom the bureaucracy is administering. The reach of authority has come to be more and more denied, as both the US and USSR governments, among others, have increasingly discovered. 1968 symbolized the outburst of such skepticism. For a while, the coming to state power of old social movements limited this corrosion of authority. But these new regimes were quickly swept up in the increasingly 'anti-state' consciousness of the mass of the population.

This process has been spectacularly abetted by the impact of new technology on the ability of states to control their space. Electronification is physically different from electrification and does not so much abridge the space of social relations as abridge the capacity to control social relations through controlling their space. The implications for stateness remain to be explicated – and experienced. But the control of populations through controlling the space they and their relations with one another occupy – as citizenry, as communities, as individuals – is in the process of being fundamentally undermined in the two key directions formed by the modern world-system's spatial jurisdictions, within states and between states.

Fourth, the demands of the disadvantaged status-groups – of gender, of generation, of ethnicity, of race, of sexuality – will get ever stronger. We must hear Gallaudet here and add the physically handicapped, who comprise the true pariah stratum of historical capitalism. All six status-group relations are deeply different one from another, and even more so in their specificities in the world's social structures, but they share three features. Each was a ground of a new left reproach of the old left. Each in a very real sense is as much a contradiction among the people as an element of the capital – labor or state – civil society contradiction. And the oppressed of each explicitly seek not the turning of the tables but social equality, not only structurally but ideologically as well (in the sense of the elimination from social consciousness of *presumptions* of superiority / inferiority in relations of gender, generation, ethnicity, race, sexuality, able-bodiedness).

We therefore project probable realignments in the alliance systems of the interstate system along with increased sharp economic fluctuations, a sharpened (and in particular a geographically widened) class struggle, an increasing inability of states to control their civil societies, and a persistent reinforcement of the claims to equality by all the disadvantaged status-groups. It is very unclear, in the nature of things, where this will lead. After 1848, the world's old left were sure that 1917 would occur. They argued about how and where and when. But the middle-range objective of popular sovereignty was clear. After 1968, the world's antisystemic movements – the old and the new ones together – showed rather less clarity about the middle-range objective. They have tended therefore to concentrate on short-range ones. There is clearly a danger that if organizations concentrate on short-range objectives, even in the name of long-range ideals, they may sacrifice middle-range success or even middle-run survival.

We have no answer to the question: 1968, rehearsal for what? In a sense, the answers depend on the ways in which the worldwide family of antisystemic movements will rethink its middle-run strategy in the ten or twenty years to come. 1917, for good or ill, was the result of an enormous amount of collective and conscious effort by the world's old left in the years following 1848. No doubt it was also the result of structural developments in the capitalist world-economy. But it would not have happened without human organization and revolutionary programs.

The risks of drifting are very clear. The tenants of the status quo have not given up, however much their position is weakened structurally and ideologically. They still have enormous power and are using it to reconstruct a new inegalitarian world order. They could succeed. Or the world could disintegrate, from a nuclear or an ecological catastrophe. Or it could be reconstructed in the ways in which people hoped, in 1848, in 1968.

[This concludes Giovanni Arrighi's, Terence K. Hopkins', and Immanuel Wallerstein's *Antisystemic Movements*]