

1975-02-03: [MARXISM] Relationship of Project Fox to Marxist theory

There is a nominal relationship between the affluent-nonaffluent basis of the *Project Fox* and communist theory of the economic basis of society, in as much as each posits the social and ideological superstructure of society in terms of economic potentialities and institutions. The difference lies in the premises of how these economic factors work, in a more or less moral or historically justifiable manner. Communism assumes exploitation of the disadvantaged by a power elite as a function of human psychology of individual greed; the new interpretation assumes that the perpetuation of a dominant leadership class was not intrinsically immoral, though it may take that form in particular instances, and may show that aspect in the last phase of a particular stage when its historical justification is weak but the form of dominance lives on because the superannuated elite is reluctant to give up its hold). *Project Fox* assumes that at the end everyone in society agrees that the survival of the whole is the highest good, and that those on the lower echelons on a year-in-year-out basis suffer as they must, occasionally, because they realize that there is no alternative to the survival of society except to protect the continuity of the ruling class. *Project Fox* therefore, pursues a basically different human psychology, one of the belief in the survival of the corporate whole.

At different times this sense of suffering for the corporate whole is subject to the severest test: to wit, in times of famine & pestilence. The lower elements in society may then feel that the larger conception of their society is not one worth defending, and that only a local unit deserves loyalty; this would be truest in early modern times, for example, where a particular region suffers famine not because it did not raise enough food for its inhabitants, but that much of it was drained off by the state in the form of taxes. These same people in prosperous times, however, accept the system of the larger state readily because of undeniable advantages of spiritual identification with a loftier social idea, not to mention material benefits which come from complex state structures that can promote commercial and technological systems that a primitive society could not. So, if one takes the average of the attitude of the lower classes **over time** one sees that consensus in the survival of the whole large unit does operate. This, the new system argues, is an irreducible attitude, a fundamental premise of the existence of any state. Communism would argue that such a consensus is a big lie sold to the people by those who exploit them; prosperous times make it easy to sell that lie, hard times expose its fallacy and require force to compel obedience. [In a series of comparisons & contrasts like this, one could show how basic communist theories derived from its premise of evil human nature can be turned around and the same events seem justifiable in terms of the ultimate historical good, no matter the operation of the system upon the masses, from our distant point of view.]