

THE MARXIAN TONALITY OF ORGANOPOLITICS

Michel Weber¹

ABSTRACT: To explore a synergy of sorts between Whitehead and Marx is very tempting in the context of the current global systemic crisis.¹ Since Foucault's lecture given at the Collège de France in 1975–1976, the concepts of biopower and biopolitics have been widely discussed in academic and political circles. It seems more to the point here to speak of the need for an organopolitics. In a nutshell, Marx's ideal and pragmatism should be distinguished from Marxism, and preserved, together with his twin concepts of class consciousness and class struggle. His concept of class needs however some new foundations, while his materialism and determinism would be advantageously replaced by panexperientialism and creativity.²

Nine steps are expedient to probe the stakes and outline the project.

KEYWORDS: Alfred North Whitehead; Karl Marx; Global systemic crisis; Biopolitics

I. THE GLOBAL SYSTEMIC CRISIS

The circumstances in which the possible alliance between Whitehead and Marx arise are really exceptional: "It is inevitable that global climate change will produce social and economic collapse on many parts of our planet. Out of the dust of that collapse, a new ecological civilization can arise. It's far better for humans and for the planet, however, that we act now, rather than waiting for the full force of the calamity to strike."³

¹ It was the project of my *De quelle révolution avons-nous besoin?* (Paris, Éditions Sang de la Terre, 2013) and this horizon is also framing my *Political Vindication of Radical Empiricism. With Application to the Global Systemic Crisis* (Claremont, Process Century Press, 2015).

² The Author wishes to acknowledge the help of Dr. Arran Gare and Hank Keeton, who made valuable suggestions to improve the argument.

³ Philip Clayton and Justin Heinzekehr, *Organic Marxism. An Alternative to Capitalism and Ecological Catastrophe*, Claremont, Process Century Press, 2015, p. vi.

By means of introduction, let us clarify the nature of that crisis, which is more complex than one usually thinks.

1.1. Energetic & Biospheric

First, the energetic crisis is present, but not always palpable, since M. King Hubbert created the “peak oil” model in 1956 and accurately predicted that the United States oil production would peak between 1965 and 1970. In 2009, an expert of the *International Energy Agency* claimed that the production of conventional crude oil peaked in 2006, and this was stated in the *Agency’s* annual report *World Energy Outlook 2010*. Whether this is the case or not (there is no consensus) does not really matter as international politics makes plain that all major actors are already behaving as if it had happened and are thus seeking to master the remaining resources (oil, of course, but also rare minerals and water: cf. Richard Heinberg’s *Peak Everything*, 2010). They most definitively act as if peak oil was *behind* us.

Second, the biospheric crisis is equally contemporary. The exhaustion of natural resources (water, biodiversity, minerals, ...) is not the only biospheric issue, *abrupt* climate change—and its correlate, chronic pollution—also constitutes a major concern. So much so that scientists now probe the concept of “sixth mass extinction” that would include a near term human extinction: a two degree increase of the global temperature by 2030 would lock our fate with the breaking of the food chain.

In this regard, the conclusions of the *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (IPCC) need to be taken *cum grano salis*. The IPCC was set up in 1988 to do exactly what its name claims: to allow the governments of the G7 to master communication on scientific research about climate change and to substitute for the *United Nations Advisory Group on Greenhouse Gases*, created in 1985, that was not compliant enough. This means basically two things: in 1988 there was no doubt that climate change was going to play a vital role in geopolitics and that neither scientists nor lay people or the UN should be left without some form of tutorial. Hence a two-speed process: scientists gather data, run their predictive tools and work on a consensual report that is then submitted to political representatives. As a result, two lies are basically fostered: on the one hand you hear politicians speaking about bare scientific facts that amply justify whatever

decisions they (don't) make; on the other hand, scientists claim that their findings are purely objective and that the decisions are political, i.e., that they have no responsibility whatsoever in the current state of affairs. The deaf answers to the mute. However, a recent evolution is remarkable: although the IPCC is among the most conservative scientific bodies on the planet, and—to repeat—although its reports are written under political pressure, it now admits that global warming is irreversible without geoengineering, i.e., without the use of technologies that are still in the limbos: not engineered or untried.

1.2. Demographic crisis & Social Unrest

Third, the demographic crisis: in such a critical context, the Malthusian pressure is more problematic than ever, with the human population expected to surpass 9 billion by 2050 (a 50 percent increase, largely in developing nations, the U.N. predicts). From the perspective of Western imperialism, this also means that Whites will see their demographic weight plunge below 10 percent.

Fourth, pandemics and social unrest are expected, especially in countries without social security system: riots, famine and overpopulation wars are likely, all the more so since speculation keeps an iron hand on the price of grain while meat-consumption is not discouraged in first-world countries.

Recently Europe has discovered that mass migration is already happening. This could be good news if the climatic dimension of the Syrian unrest was underlined or the true nature of the “Arab spring” was probed. Unfortunately, the current narrative in NATO countries prevent any awareness of the stakes. On the one hand, the fact that the obedient “freedom fighters” (the disobedient ones are promptly labeled “terrorists”) are manipulated, armed and trained by the usual suspects is obliterated, while nobody acknowledges that these refugees come from Turkish camps, not war zones, and that the primary question would be to define why and how the Western gates of these camps have suddenly opened. On the other hand, such an influx of migrants will help to bolster the neoliberal agenda and boost private profits: societies and communities will become more atomized, wages will be depressed, and the right wing-will gain points in polls and seats in the parliament.

1.3. *Economic Imperium & Political Vacuum*

Last but not least, the political vacuum in which all these crises take place is staggering. Since politicians do not represent the citizens anymore (nor the proles nor the denizens) but represent themselves and the corporatocracy (or inner party), each of these issues is aggravated by the politicians complete lack of *common sense* and of visionary management.

Interestingly, although there is *in the civil society and in academia* no consensus on these crises—let alone on their intrinsic correlation—, if you read the literature leaking (purposively or not) from *military and intelligence circles*, you find that all these issues—minus the political vacuum—have been a major concern for more than a dozen years.⁴ Please also note that “terrorism,” which seems the sole interest of politicians, is of no real relevance for the intelligence community. The next step is self-evident: filling the political vacuum with *prismatic* “military intelligence.” None of these crises is indeed really problematic for the inner party: each crisis represents a call to deepen neoliberalism and, as a matter of fact, each embodies new commercial opportunities. Whatever the threat, some commodity or some service will be provided for those who can afford it.

We are thus facing a cultural collapse, as outlined by Tocqueville in 1835, Emerson in 1836 and Thoreau in 1849. The forerunners of political ecology understood that generalization of technique through technoscience is biocidal and, eventually, genocidal. But this time the decline is different: indeed, we have to contemplate a terminal crisis, i.e., near-term human extinction (by 2030).

2. WHAT IS CAPITALISM ANYWAY?

In sum, all these crises represent various sides of one single disaster: capitalism *qua* political system, i.e., the oxymoronic “market democracy.” It is because of the greed and lust for power of a few thousands individuals worldwide that the social tissue (now being globalized) is corrupted and that the entire biosphere—starting with human beings—will continue to be exploited until exhaustion and

⁴ E.g., Mark Townsend and Paul Harris, “Now the Pentagon tells Bush: climate change will destroy us,” *The Observer*, Sunday 22 February 2004.

collapse.

Capital is at the roots and in every leaf of the current economic tree-system, which means basically that those owning the capital are providing its very sap and, as such, they benefit from a special status, shared, to some extent, with those controlling the capital. In order to remain at the core of this system and to reinforce their grip on societies and the planet, capitalists foster a double agenda. All and everything should become an economical matter; and the real economy (or what is left of it) should be totally immersed in financial schemes. This means of course that there is no “commons,” that every single good is, or should be, the private property of somebody.

In such a system, all factors of production are disposable except the capital. All economic actors can be taxed (and the taxes used only for military purposes) except capital. In other words, only the market-value matters, the labour that is required to produce goods is basically irrelevant. This economic paradigm is however chronically inadequate and totally incoherent. There is no pure form of capitalism: the pure market is a process nowhere to be found. The main reason for this is called “military Keynesianism” in Academia or the “Pentagon System” by Chomsky.⁵ The military is, for instance, the main stimulus for technological innovation. Research and development are too often funded only because of their military potentialities. Chomsky reminds us that when started to teach at the MIT, in 1955, the philosophy department was entirely funded (directly and indirectly) by the military. Researching generative linguistics and analytic philosophy do constitute a strategic field. It is not only a matter of conformism of thought, both socially and technologically: computer science, image processing, control systems engineering, AI, robotics etc. rely upon such basic disciplines.⁶

The utopic “pure market” is especially not likely to be implemented in a system that thrives only thanks to the various forms of technical, functional and

⁵ It is alluded to in Clayton & Heinzekehr (*Organic Marxism*, p. 53); see M. Weber, « The WW3 Scenario: An Appeal to Sanity » in Michel Weber et Vincent Berne (sous la direction de), *Chromatikon X. Annales de la philosophie en procès — Yearbook of Philosophy in Process*, Louvain-la-Neuve, Éditions Chromatika, 2014, pp. 9 sq.

⁶ In addition, analytic philosophy can be seen as part of the reframing of human minds of the Technetronic Era; see M. Weber, “Much Ado About Duckspeak,” *Balkan Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 3, Issue 1, 2011, pp. 135-142.

planned obsolescence, with the help of financial credit and the sting of advertising. Hence it is misleading to claim that “October 1929 was in large part the result of the “pure” capitalism of the 1920s.” It was a speculative crisis springing from a sharp decline in production—and the economy recovered only with armament production for WW2 (and it did not stumble again thanks to the cold war).

3. THE COMMUNIST IDEAL

In front of all this actual systemic misery stands the communist ideal, which remains to this day largely unimplemented. It belongs to the realm of utopia and has been adumbrated many times before Marx and Engels (*Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei*, 1848): in the West, its first signs are to be found in *The Assemblywomen* (or *Ecclesiazusae*, c. 392 BC) of Aristophanes and in Plato’s *Republic* (c. 380 BC).

In 1516, Thomas More enshrines the word “utopia,” alluding to the place that “is not” and the place “of happiness.” More makes plain the equivalence that exists between Christianity and communism (but he spoke in the desert of course): the domain of happiness is not—but should be—a physical place. Before More, Ficino (1482), Pico della Mirandola (1486) and Agrippa (1510) have argued for their own blend of the best possible world. After More, utopias become more radical and sometimes theocratic: see the works of Paracelsus (1527), Bruno (1584), Fludd (1617), Andreae (1619) and Campanella, 1620. Later, Francis Bacon (*New Atlantis*, 1627), James Harrington (*The Commonwealth of Oceana and a System of Politics*, 1656), and Fourier’s “phalanstères” (1808) attempted to outline a scientific utopia. The idea was always the same: to replace the illusion of a liberal construction of society by a social construction of freedom.⁷

4. COMMUNIST PRAGMATISM

Pragmatism is not a vain word for communists. In their “Theses on Feuerbach” [1845], first published in 1888, Marx and Engels underline that philosophers should help transform the world instead of merely speculating about it. (“Die

⁷Jacques Généreux, *Le Socialisme néomodernisme ou L’Avenir de la liberté*, Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 2008.

Philosophen haben die Welt nur verschieden *interpretiert*, es kömmt drauf an, sie zu *verändern*.”) This was a very bold claim in the post-Kantian context of academic philosophy, but the transformative virtues of philosophy were clearly central in the early days of the philosophical adventure—with an important difference, however: the transformation at stake was not social but individual.

This relevance of Feuerbach, of Schelling, and of Hegelian Neoplatonism in general, for the development of Marx should not obliterate, however, the importance of the Scottish philosophical historians, and especially of Smith’s *Wealth of Nations* (1776), where one can already find the idea of class struggle at work.⁸

5. ASSESSING MARX’S LEGACY IN PRACTICE

So far, we have claimed that the communist ideal has not been empirically falsified and that, likewise, the communist pragmatism remains very much alive. What about the actual legacy of Marx?

It is far too simplistic to claim that Marx, Lenin, Stalin and their kin have left an unredeemable legacy. When the historical facts are revisited with less prejudice than usual, it becomes plain obvious that no communist revolution has ever had the chance to develop peacefully; it has always been struggling with reactionary forces seeking frantically to recover lost wealth and to prevent contagion by all means. When Stalin initiates, for instance, massive purges in the army at the eve of Nazi attack, he seeks to deal with the numerous traitors conspiring with the enemy.⁹ Why the Ukrainian genocide?¹⁰ Why was Hiroshima vitrified? To see how far one could get away with a war crime of unprecedented scale? To test the available devices (“gun” and “implosion”)? To convince the Russians to lose all hope for a peaceful post-war? Neither

⁸ Gare, Arran, *Beyond European Civilization: Marxism, Process Philosophy, and the Environment*, Bungendore, Eco-Logical Press, 1993 & *Nihilism Inc.: Environmental Destruction and the Metaphysics of Sustainability*, Bungendore, Eco-Logical Press, 1996.

⁹ Geoffrey Roberts, *Stalin’s Wars: From World War to Cold War, 1939–1953*, New Haven & London, Yale University Press, 2006. On the Toukhatchevski trial see for instance Arno Mayer, *The Furies: Violence and Terror in the French and Russian Revolutions*, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 2001 and Annie Lacroix-Riz, *Le Choix de la défaite. Les élites françaises dans les années 1930*, Paris, Éditions Armand Colin, 2006 (nouvelle édition complétée et révisée, 2010).

¹⁰ Douglas Tottle, *Fraud, Famine and Fascism: The Ukrainian Genocide Myth from Hitler to Harvard*, Toronto, Progress Book, 1987.

Dulles nor Patton ever thought this would be a good idea: merciless bombing should be implemented as long as need be. Why build an “Iron Curtain”? Was it to stop people from fleeing communist totalitarianism, to prevent them from accepting the higher wages of the West, or to quell the subversive activities of Western agents seeking to destroy the communist experiment? There are many actors who still could answer that question. But they will only answer in private. Public opinion has now been carved by 60 years of propaganda. Take for instance the inversion of the results of French polls: in May 1945, 57 pc of French citizens considered that the war against Nazi Germany had been won by Russia and only 20 pc by the USA; in June 2004, the same question brought the exact opposite results, with 57 pc claiming the USA had won the war.¹¹

This general policy of containment is what Chomsky has named the “Mafia principle of global hegemony:” the will to crush all revolts against the capitalistic status quo, even the smallest one, in order to prevent the disease of freedom from spreading to other areas. The other main examples are more or less well-known: Iran (1953), Cuba (1959), Indonesia (1965) and Chile (1973). They cannot be addressed here.

6. ASSESSING THE COHERENCE OF MARX

If the adequacy of Marx has never really been tested in the past, we are left with the puzzle of the coherence of his system. The question is actually twofold: on the one hand, the coherence of *Das Kapital* could be assessed for itself and in its historical context. The general feeling is that the internal coherence of Marx’s system is high—but that is of no real practical use since his system is not, or has never been, adequate or adequately implemented. Anyway, such an enquiry is more speculative than pragmatic and it should be left to scholars who are endowed with the proper knowledge and inclination. On the other hand, the coherence of Marx can be recreated within the current state of affairs.

Our premises have been stated *supra*: the Global Systemic Crisis requires a new worldview; capitalism constitutes its main—if not sole—root; the

¹¹ *Frédéric Dabi*, « 1938-1944 : Des accords de Munich à la libération de Paris ou l’aube des sondages d’opinion en France », <http://www.revuepolitique.fr/1938-1944-laube-des-sondages-dopinion-en-france/>, février 2012, p. 5.

communist ideal has been left untouched by history; the communist pragmatism is more urgent than ever; the communist legacy should be assessed in light of the wars it has been obliged to fight; and Marx's adequacy needs to be envisioned from the perspective of a synergy with Whitehead's. Basically, materialism and determinism should be replaced by panexperientialism and creativity.

Under the hypothesis that the core of Marx's system lies in the concepts of class, class consciousness and class struggle, the first thing to do is to define a concept of class that will not directly rely upon the historical Marx, especially since it has been problematic from the beginning. We need a broader argument, independent of the question of the relations of production: if there is such a thing as social classes, they mould the social tissue in a deeper way. In other words: everything should be done to avoid reading Marx as reducing all that matters in human experience to a certain type of economics and, by the same token, as adopting a blind materialism. Moreover, the current levels of unemployment, the widespread use of computer and robots, and the atomization of society basically falsifies the old concept of class and make class consciousness far more difficult to obtain than in the XIXth century. As a result, we should not seek to enforce the concept of class *per se*; class struggle is a praxis that has only fairly recently replaced *another* form of social polarization: cast alliances.¹² It is however possible to reconstruct the concept of class from ethological categories and to give a bright new life to the concept of class struggle.¹³

From a Whiteheadian perspective, Marx is apparently crippled with two main handicaps: materialism and determinism. *Economic materialism* can aptly describe the ideological core of the XXth and XXIst century. It has had only nefarious consequences, both in capitalist and in communist societies.

¹² M. Weber, "On a Certain Blindness in Political Matters," *Cosmos and History*, www.cosmosandhistory.org, Vol. 7, N°2, 2011.

¹³ See M. Weber, *Political Vindication of Radical Empiricism. With Application to the Global Systemic Crisis* (Claremont, Process Century Press, 2015). Cf. Aleksandr Bogdanov, e.g., on Tektology, but also James Burnham (*The Managerial Revolution: What is Happening in the World*. New York: John Day Co., 1941) and Harry Braverman (*Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*, New York, Monthly Review Press, 1974).

Moreover, in light of Whitehead's remarks on the vacuity of materialism,¹⁴ it is obvious that Marx could be rescued from such a short-sighted vision of cosmic evolution. The concept of determinism does not allow us to understand the evolution of nature or the transformation of culture.

In sum, dialectical materialism is a mistake that has fostered technophilia and productivism. In fact, Marx believed that Russia could avoid capitalism; it was Plekhanov who coined the terms *dialectical materialism* after the death of both Marx and Engels, while *historical materialism* was coined only after the death of Marx himself.¹⁵ The notion of dictatorship of the proletariat is extremely problematic: on the one hand, the term *dictatorship* is impossible to take seriously, because it involves the blind imposition of the will of some (hopefully the majority) to others; on the other hand, proletariat is the mirror image of capitalism and industrialism...

An organic Marxism would be centred on the concepts of organism and creativity and provide a humanistic worldview that would be, *a maxima*, technophobic.

7. ATOMISM AND CONFORMISM

The communist ideal, just like all utopias worthy of that name, has a twin engine: a process of individuation (an *ontogenesis* such as the one Piaget argues for), together with a process of socialization (a *koinogenesis*, underlined by Stern or Bateson, that could be understood in line with the *phylogenesis* championed by Spencer). Through life, each and every one of us unavoidably seeks his or her own destiny. Autonomy or independence is the key-word here; and it involves creativity and freedom. Although it makes sense to understand community from the perspective of the interactive aggregation of individuals-in-the-making, the argument can be made that community always comes first, that no individual was ever born in a social vacuum (although s/he can die of course in a social void) and that most of individuals do not reach a social consciousness of sorts. There is no pre-social individual but one can imagine a pre-contractual

¹⁴ Alfred North Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World. The Lowell Lectures, 1925*, New York, Free Press, 1967, p. 107.

¹⁵ James D. White, *Karl Marx and the Intellectual Origins of Dialectical Materialism*, Basingstoke and New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 1996.

one. Solidarity or heteronomy is what matters here, i.e., some form of efficacy and determinism.

The free market ideology negates these two premises of authentic life: individuation is replaced by conformism and solidarity by atomism. Since “nations [...] are resistant to changes in the present system,”¹⁶ they should be disposed of and this is indeed the very goal of all the meta-structures that have been sponsored by Western capitalism since 1944 such as the Bretton Woods (1944) tools (International Monetary Fund and the World Bank) and the recent “free trade agreements” (Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, etc.). Multinational corporations are by no means passive in this process since they are trying to obtain all the power levers that used to be political.

8. RESPONSIBILITY

The expected end of “market democracy” is likely to seal the return of totalitarianism, not the disposal of the capitalist oligarchy. We especially need to realize that climate change is a political problem and that it requires a political solution. This is not only a matter of mobilizing people, but also of allowing ourselves to understand our predicament.¹⁷ The financial crisis, together with its economical, socio-political and energetical dimensions — peak of uranium (1980), peak of conventional oil (2004), peak of gas (2010) —, define a global systemic crisis far worse than the two previous global crises that have crippled modern societies in 1870 and 1929. We have to contemplate a terminal crisis, i.e., near-term human extinction (by 2030).

Who —if anyone— is responsible? In so far as he or she is taking part in the system, something that is (almost) totally unavoidable, every citizen is responsible. Of course, some are more involved than others and the oligarchy carries a huge responsibility. (Please note that while “the market” is an abstract entity, most oligarchs are easy to identify.¹⁸) From the perspective of our current discussion, it is important to acknowledge that academic scholars

¹⁶ Clayton & Heinzekehr, *Organic Marxism*, p. 13.

¹⁷ M. Weber, « Oldthinkers unbellyfeel Whiteheadian socialism », L. Lamza, J. Dziadkowiec (Editors), *Advances in Process Thought: Society, Education, and God*, forthcoming.

¹⁸ Official rankings do exist (*Forbes*, *Washington Post*, *Fortune*...) while some sociologists have brought interesting conclusions to the fore. Cf. Geoffrey Geuens, *Tous pouvoirs confondus. Etat, capital et médias à l'ère de la mondialisation*, Anvers, EPO, 2003.

constitute the main group of people responsible for our cultural collapse. Given the lack of vision and the atavistic greed of most humans, scholars —and especially those who teach— are supposed to be their “brother’s keepers.” This constitutes the old ideal of university, that was still alive in Humboldt (1792), Newman (1852)... and in Whitehead’s *Organisation of Thought, Educational and Scientific* (1917).

One should not forget Klemperer, who argued boldly for the responsibility of the German academics in the rise of Nazism: it was their duty to denounce the emergence of war-fascism, something that was obvious in the early thirties. Klemperer, a German Jew who survived the Nazi regime because of his marriage with an Aryan, has described in detail how the German people had been lured into Nazi totalitarianism by the manipulation of words, propositions, symbols, patterns of thought and the like. In a nutshell, his interpretation is quite straightforward: on the one hand, Klemperer is full of commiseration for the suffering of the German *people* and does not condemn them, not even for the fate of the Jews after 1933; on the other hand, he has a deep grudge against the German *intelligentsia*, that had all the data in hand and all the intellectual tools to understand the storm ahead. Often they simply did nothing, and sometimes they welcomed it warmly. According to Klemperer’s experience, academics, scholars and other intellectuals are actually responsible for the cultural collapse orchestrated by Gœbbels.¹⁹

9. THE FATUM OF EDUCATION

As a result, the *fatum* of education will define the contingencies of our cultural

¹⁹ Klemperer wrote in his August 16, 1936 *Tagebücher*’s entry: “If one day the situation were reversed and the fate of the vanquished lay in my hands, then I would let all the ordinary folk go and even some of the leaders, who might perhaps after all have had honourable intentions and not known what they were doing. But I would have all the intellectuals strung up, and the professors three feet higher than the rest; they would be left hanging from the lamp posts for as long as was compatible with hygiene.” (*Ich will Zeugnis ablegen bis zum letzten: Tagebücher 1933–1941*, Berlin, Aufbau Taschenbuch Verlag, 1999, p. 126) See Omer Bartov in *Germany’s War and the Holocaust*, Cornell University Press, 2003, p. 201. The original reads: “Wenn es einmal anders käme und das Schicksal der Besiegten läge in meiner Hand, so ließe ich alles Volk laufen und sogar etliche von den Führern, die es vielleicht doch ehrlich gemeint haben könnten und nicht wußten, was sie taten. Aber die Intellektuellen ließe ich alle aufhängen, und die Professoren einen Meter höher als die andern; sie müßten an den Laternen hängen bleiben, solange es sich irgend mit der Hygiene verträge.”

collapse. Like society, education is now managed with a spit-vision. On the one hand, you have the upper class enjoying the benefits of schools and colleges dedicated to each single individual and fostering solipsistic-fraternity rather than the use of technique and technology as pedagogical tools. On the other hand, you have the bulk of the society that struggles—and usually fails—to obtain some access to a fair education. Teachers and professors of the first class (no pun intended, but appropriate) enjoy various advantages, including a good salary. Those working for the « proles » (Orwell's term) are underpaid, they work in miserable conditions and tend to be replaced by technology eventually.

First class professors have the duty to foster a democratic agenda that basically runs against their own interest and is certainly against the interest of their employers. It should thus be clear that balancing market forces is not an option. During the Glorious Thirty (1946–1975), capitalism needed citizens to produce and consume and sometimes even vote—this is not the case anymore, as economic depression and political austerity reveals. The contemporary vulgate of (democratic) freedom and human rights are merely tools used by imperialists to bring down governments that are not submissive enough; freedom and human rights do not apply to allies and certainly not home. In this great dormitory—as a Taoist text calls the Universe—nightmare is the only mode of lucidity.²⁰

ⁱ Dr. Michel Weber is Director of the Centre for Philosophical Practice (Brussels) and Adjunct Professor at the Department of Educational Foundations of the University of Saskatchewan. His current research program mainly deals with political philosophy, the philosophy of psychiatry, and Ayurvedic medicine. Dr. Weber is the author of fifteen monographs (e.g., *The Political Vindication of Radical Empiricism*, 2016) and the (co-)editor of fifty books (e.g., with Will Desmond, *Handbook of Whiteheadian Process Thought*, 2008). His publications are sampled here: <http://chromatika.academia.edu/MichelWeber>.

²⁰ Émile Cioran, *Syllogismes de l'amertume*, 1952, in *Œuvres*, Paris, Éditions Gallimard, 1995, p. 753.