

Pr. Dr. Michel Weber
weber@chromatika.org,
Centre de philosophie pratique, Brussels
University of Saskatchewan, Canada

THE GLOBAL SYSTEMIC CRISIS AND THE REQUIREMENTS OF A WHITEHEADIAN SOCIALISM

One main exemplification can be provided in line with our discussion of the political relevance of Whitehead's corpus: an analysis of the meaning and significance of war. In 1904, James proposed a different diagnosis: "Our permanent enemy is the noted bellicosity of human nature. [...] The plain truth is that people want war.¹" Three complementary functions of the art of war can then be introduced, the more obvious coming first and the more concealed last.² We will rely upon the lead of James, Mumford and Orwell.

3.1. Visible functions

The most visible, obvious, military business is self-defence: military action is said to be justified when a country has to respond to an unjust aggression by a third party. This means to assume the defence of one's own territory, including air defence as well as securing the territorial waters that are sometimes extended to the Exclusive Economic Zone (370 km). In most cases, the security perimeter of a nation is sharply defined: the territory itself, the 22,2 km of territorial waters, and the airspace. Hence the mission of the army, navy and air force is unequivocal. Unfortunately, this comfortable clarity has always been blurred by "diplomatic" issues (remember Clausewitz's argument according to which "war is diplomacy by other means"). Firstly, military business is not only about self-defence *per se*, but about defending one's strategic interests. From that perspective, it is possible, indeed advisable, to control *manu military* remote territories that appear essential to preserve one's "way of life."

Secondly, wars of pre-emption are said to be justified when they involve responding to an imminent threat of an (unjust) aggression. One should not wait until aggressors actually initiate their attacks before "self-defence" becomes permissible. Preventive wars are more controversial because they involve military attack in the

¹ William James, "Remarks at the Peace Banquet," 1904, re-printed in James 1911, 300-304.

² A first exploration can be found in Weber 2011.

absence of both self-defence and so-called pre-emption. But if the threat is totally uncertain, why should be the preventive action so sure?

Thirdly, (even) more eccentric arguments have been built lately: war on drugs, humanitarian wars and war against terrorism allow the “international community,” i.e., the NATO countries, to dispose of any regime refusing their diktat. A sure sign of the pure rhetorics at work is the fact that it is *ipso facto* invalidated if a non-NATO country attempts to use it: how does the “international community” react when Russia claims to salvage democracy in Afghanistan or China to prevent a massacre in Libya? Would Iran be allowed to settle religious wars in Africa?

3.2. Liminal functions

The next functions are liminal, which means that they still remain partly lit by the official narratives.

Firstly, the religious dimension of war needs to be underlined. War is a sort of sacrament; “war is the *strong* life; it is life *in extremis*.” (James 1911, 269); it brings us our first — and often last — “glimpse of effective life” (Mumford³); it puts us in contact with the Ultimate (Eliade 1965, 176).

Secondly, in war also dwells a moral theory. Martial virtues provide the behavioural metrics: intrepidity, contempt of softness, surrender of private interest, obedience to command, must remain the rock upon which states are built (James 1911, 287-288).

Thirdly, no less impressive are the sociological consequences of war. Martial virtues are also the enduring cement of society, they provide social coherence (Girard⁴), drill and regimentation (Mumford), “order and discipline, the tradition of service and devotion, of physical fitness, unstinted exertion, and universal responsibility” (James 1911, 292-295). Furthermore, war bridles the Malthusian threat twice: at home it enforces eugenism both in the sense of raising the more apt to war and to dispose of the weaker; abroad, it secures the superiority of one group, ideally through slavery and genocide if need be.

3.3. Invisible functions

The last set of functions are “invisible” in so far as the cultural narrative seeks to prevent the awareness thereof. Here dwells the purely ideological function of war: the deep foundation, control and stabilization of society.

Firstly, politically. War not only keeps inequalities intact, it fortifies subordination in front of an external menace. War creates unanimity and so much distractions that all forms of dissensus become unlikely and, if they arise, extremely difficult to spread.

³ “In view of its end products—the dead, the crippled, the insane, the devastated regions, the shattered resources, the moral corruption, the anti-social hates and hoodlumisms—war is the most disastrous outlet for the repressed impulses of society that has been devised.” (Mumford 1962, 310)

⁴ Girard, René, *Mensonge romantique et vérité romanesque*, Paris, Éditions Bernard Grasset, 1961.

Secondly, economically. The economical stakes are extremely high; they can be sorted in three sets. Primo, military interventions enable a nation to loot raw materials needed by its industry and to open new markets when need be. As far as we can tell, all the wars since 1945 have been predation wars (essentially for oil), accompanied with the necessity to open new markets (the archetype remaining the Opium wars of 1839–1860). Secundo, even in the absence of war, the militarity [?] itself constitutes a very efficient device to steer clear of overproduction without indulging in social welfare. Orwell writes: “The primary aim of modern warfare [...] is to use up the products of the machine without raising the general standard of living” (Orwell 2003, 218).

War is an extraordinary waste management device to the benefit of power. Huge budgets are spent on projects that are socially completely useless. The orders are paid by the State, i.e., financed by taxation of the poor and by loans provided by rich. Who is the best customer, the ideal consumer? Burroughs claims that it is the addict because “the junk merchant does not sell his product to the consumer, he sells the consumer to his product,”⁵ the very same is true of the military but the scale of the sale is unprecedented and the industrial involvement unmatched. Mumford makes this plain: “An army is a body of pure consumers. [...] The most wanton and luxurious household cannot compete with a battlefield in rapid consumption. War is the chief instrument by means of which the ruling classes create the state and fix their hold upon the state” (Mumford 1962, 86-106).

Tertio, the militarity [?] is also the main stimulus for technological innovation. Research and development are more often than one thinks funded because of its military potentialities. One should not indeed focus on the immediate return of some disciplines, such as space exploration and rocket science. Chomsky reminds us that when he started to teach at the MIT, in 1955, the philosophy department was entirely funded (directly and indirectly) by the military sector. 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 In a nutshell, we obtain what is called military Keynesianism in Academia or the “Pentagon System” by Chomsky.

Thirdly, the key-vault is psychological. Primo, the capitalistic ethos of industrial nations is a culture of predation, aggression, violence, of making demolition necessary *and* pleasurable.⁷ War breaks the tedium of a mechanized

⁵ William S. Burroughs, *The Naked Lunch* [1959], New York, Grove Press, 1991, p. xxxvii)

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.

⁷ “The European race’s last three hundred years of evolutionary progress have all come down to nothing but four words : selfishness, slaughter, shamelessness and corruption.” (Yan Fu, *Complete Works* Vol. 3, Zhonghua Book Company, 1986, p. 629)

society but, paradoxically, it involves more conformism, more technique, more drill and regimentation, more alienation.⁸ In sum, “war is the supreme drama of a completely mechanized society.”⁹

Secundo, as a result of all this, war is absolutely necessary: “If no enemy really existed, it would be necessary to create him, in order to further this development.” (Mumford 1962, 309-310) This is exactly what Orwell meant by “war is peace.”

Tertio, war is the core of a class struggle of an unknown nature and magnitude. It is not just a matter of keeping factories busy, boosting employment and muzzling the opponents. Or of sanctioning infantility in the blind personal obedience required of “citizens.” War unleashes the sadism of the oligarchs. Three important points can be indicated here. First of all, war is not directed outwards anymore, but inwards: “war is waged by each ruling group against its own subjects, and the object of the war is not to make or prevent conquests of territory, but to keep the structure of society intact” (Orwell 2003, 228).

The *modus operandi* is terror, which means that anxiety is created and nurtured as against fear or phobia. Fear is actually a positive feeling, it mobilizes you toward action (basically to fight or to flight). Anxiety is immobilizing: the subject is aware of a threat but cannot pin-point it. Phobia is intermediate: the fear of a specific object, place, action, is generalized and it is always projected on irrelevant contexts. Why anxiety? Because it brings total power on individuals. Whereas most people tend to think that the oligarchs are ruling over us for our own good — because there is no way people could manage their own lives by themselves — Orwell adamantly claims that the inner party actually seeks power entirely for its own sake.¹⁰

The quest of power for the sake of power necessarily translates into the motto of totalitarianism: terror is an end in itself (Arendt 1958). Terror is less how you rule than why you rule. O’Brien is very straightforward about this when he lists the four ignoble truths of totalitarianism: power is not a means but an end; power is collective, it is power over human beings; power seeks total control of the mind in order to totally control matter (and the body); power necessarily consists in the capacity to impose suffering and, ultimately, to torture: “How does one man assert his power over another?” — “By making him suffer. Obedience is not enough. Unless he is suffering, how can you be sure that he is obeying your will and not his own? Power is in inflicting pain and humiliation. Power is in tearing human minds to pieces and putting them together again in new shapes of your own choosing” (Orwell 2003, 305-307).

⁸ Mumford 1962, 309.

⁹ “War is the supreme drama of a completely mechanized society; and it has an element of advantage that puts it high above all the other preparatory forms of mass-sport in which the attitudes of war are mimicked: war is real, while in all the other mass-sports there is an element of make-believe: apart from the excitements of the game and the gains or losses from gambling, it does not really matter who is victorious.” (Mumford 1962, 309)

¹⁰ “You are ruling over us for our own good. [...] The Party seeks power entirely for its own sake.” (Orwell 2003, 301)

The individual who realizes that his or her social status allows him or her to inflict suffering, in whatever way (mild humiliation, instrumentalization, infantilization, etc.) has beaten the bait of power. Depending on the circumstances, that person will, or will not, start the long journey that leads to become a priest (or a priestess) of power, as Orwell says. It is difficult to obtain a picture that would match all idiosyncrasies, but the main pattern is easy to visualize with the help of the experience gained in psychotherapy.

If you aim at more power, you try to become able to inflict more suffering on living beings: a car or a watch do not suffer when misused but a dog or a colleague do. If you have little resources yourself, you will probably seek power only over animals and ill-treat them. Most scenarios involve nevertheless domestic violence over children and women. But some individuals cannot quench their thirst for power that way either. Raping women or men (undoubtedly a form of torture) could be the next step — but this is hardly the last one since the victim can still survive and usually make sure to keep appearances together (denial is one of the surest sign of PTSD). Then comes the epiphany of the need to torture itself, that can still accommodate rape and finally necessitates murder. The cycle is however not complete until the power seeker attacks the weakest human beings: sometimes elderly, often children, and eventually infants or even newborn.

The abduction, torture, rape and murder of children is the ultimate form of the quest of power. It is the truth of the inner party. It is the truth that Goya was trying to picture and that Sade made plain. It is likely to be truth of the own tormented childhoods of these individuals. It is the very reality that citizens cannot confront for obvious emotional and rational reasons.

References

Arendt, Hannah, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (New York, Harcourt Brace & Co., 1951; enlarged edition, 1958).

Burroughs, William S., *The Naked Lunch* [1959] (New York, Grove Press, 1991).

Girard, René, *Mensonge romantique et vérité romanesque* (Paris, Éditions Bernard Grasset, 1961).

James, William, *Memories and Studies*, ed. by Henry James Jr. (Longmans, Green and Co., London, Bombay, and Calcutta, 1911).

Klare, Michael T., *The Race for What's Left. The Global Scramble for the World's Last Resources* (New York, Metropolitan Books, 2012).

Klemperer, Victor, *LTI — Lingua Tertii Imperii: Notizbuch eines Philologen* (Leipzig, Reclam Verlag, 1947).

Mumford, Lewis, *Technics and Civilization* [1934] (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, 1962).

Orwell, George, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* [1949]. Introduction by Thomas Pynchon (London, Penguin Books, 2003).

Robinson, W.I., "Global Capitalism and its Anti-'Human Face': Organic Intellectuals and Interpretations of the Crisis," *Globalizations* (2013), DOI: 0.1080/14747731.2013.828966.

Van Wyk, Alan and Michel Weber (eds.), *Creativity and Its Discontents. The Response to Whitehead's Process and Reality* (Frankfurt, Lancaster, Ontos Verlag, 2009).

Weber, Michel, "Much Ado About Duckspeak," *Balkan Journal of Philosophy*, 3/1 (2011): 135-142.

Weber, Michel, "On a Certain Blindness in Political Matters," *Cosmos and History*, 7/2 (2011), www.cosmosandhistory.org.

Мурашкин Михаил Георгиевич

Доктор философских наук,

профессор кафедры философии и политологии

*Государственного ВУЗ «Приднепровская государственная академия
строительства и архитектуры»*

ФИЛОСОФИЯ: КЛАССИЧЕСКИЕ ОСНОВЫ И СОВРЕМЕННЫЙ ВЫЗОВ К НЕКЛАССИЧЕСКОМУ

Философия - это знание о человеческом бытии. Философия – это знание о фундаментальных принципах и основаниях человеческого бытия. Философия - это знание характеристик человеческого отношения ко всему окружающему. По происхождению термин "философия" связывался с влечением, любовью, страстью, но не к любым вещам, а к рассуждению, познанию, знанию отражающему высший дух. То есть философия – это любовь к мудрости. Цель философии – найти место человеку в окружающем его мире.

Философия - это теоретическое ядро мировоззрения. Повышенная динамика социальной жизни все время требует новых мировоззренческих идей, которые регулировали бы жизнедеятельность людей. Это и вызывает к необходимости философские обобщения.

Есть эпохи, когда обостряются мировоззренческие вопросы, ответ на которые ищет человек, чтобы обрести смысл себя в мире. Эти эпохи появляются в связи с тем, что традиция не обеспечивает отбор и передачу социального опыта, в результате чего не ясно, что из опыта предыдущих поколений сохранять, а что отбрасывать.

Социальное предназначение философии – это поиск новых мировоззренческих ориентиров. Философ осмысливает основания культуры в социальной жизни.

Философ осмысливает мир при помощи категорий. При помощи категорий концентрируется значимое в социальном опыте. Категории представлены