

ICLC Strategic Studies:

Heuristic Applications Of The Higher Theory Of Manifolds To The Current Strategical and Subsumed Tactical Situation

By Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

U.S. Labor Party Presidential Candidate

April 3, 1976 — As of March 31, the world has entered a transitional period in which old habits of judgement and orientation are useless and even contraindicated for practical evaluation of most of the emerging phenomena of the strategic and national-tactical developments. For this reason, very few persons in the world, beyond the relative handfuls of Labor Committee and Labor Party cadre-forces, are intellectually pre-trained to understand those processes which will be decisive in determining the outcome of this immediate several weeks and months directly before us.

It is essential that that hard-core does competently understand these processes.

It will also be, not so incidentally, necessary to employ this same advanced conceptual approach to competently understand certain of the abrupt tactical innovations which I, in particular, will undertake. There is nothing properly mysterious in this, no need to rely upon anything approximating "blind faith" in my powers of judgement. If you can see the world as it actually is, then everything I shall do is eminently comprehensible and predictable in terms of the higher scientific standpoint in which I understand the current situation.

This article is dedicated to emphasizing the chief features of the special method required. It is most directly addressed to the hardcore of Labor Committees and Labor Parties cadres, who are qualified to understand this more directly, and who must employ it at this juncture. On the principle that we conceal nothing from the labor movement generally concerning our methods and so forth, even though many of those persons may not immediately fully understand what I say in better than a descriptive sense, this advice should be given publicly rather than through "internal membership channels." As for the enemy agencies looking over our shoulders as we respectively write and read this, let us be amused at their simian's efforts to puzzle out what this information signifies.

The Higher Theory Of Manifolds

The significance of the terminology, "the higher theory of manifolds," is adequately qualified by combined references to the **Campaigner** issue devoted to the "transfinite," by the "Italy Lectures," by Rockefeller's **Fascism With A Democratic Face**," and by **Dialectical Economics**. Our conception of the theory of manifolds, and its anthropological basis and applicability, is adequately developed in those cited sources.

It needs to be stipulated that we are properly obliged to use the terminology, "higher theory of manifolds," to avoid confusion with the relatively simplistic (and wrong) theories

of manifolds predominating in the doctrines of physical relativity and developed notions of topological theory.

As we have emphasized, Einstein's and related work in general relativity, unified field investigations and quantum physics suffers from the blunder of seeking to analyze whole processes in terms of merely a single manifold system of fixed fundamental characteristics, plus the failure to give up aprioristic geometric corruptions in respect of "the small."

In contrast, as we have proven our case in terms of established crucial evidence, the universe is necessarily premised on systems of what may be termed "nested manifolds," each of a higher order than is mistakenly assumed in the quasi-Gaussian distortions of accredited relativity doctrines. The latter, quasi-Gaussian misinterpretation of the problem of manifolds, we have noted, necessitates the persistence of certain devastating and vicious metaphysical ontological blunders, such as those respecting the notion of "energy" itself, which suffices to preclude a coherent solution to the general field problem.

In view of the qualitatively distinct methodological and "axiomatic" features of our notion of manifolds, it is indispensable to employ the "higher theory of manifolds" to designate our own approach.

This is not simply a more advanced theory, but is the immediate basis for our political practice, the "secret" — if you wish — of our accelerating global influence despite massive "containment" programs, and of the eerie fear of our ostensibly small forces variously expressed by the Rockefeller and Harriman currents of the "Atlanticists." Without employing exactly this method, it is impossible to comprehend the varieties of actual and alternative potential political-economic transformations to which the world is presently subject even during the very short-term period, at this second quarter of 1976 crisis-juncture.

Our approach depends absolutely upon applying our energies, on very short notice and in a concentrated way, at certain momentarily crucial points of current developments. Without the conceptual approach we employ, it would be more or less impossible to predetermine which such points of access for intervention have the potentiality of translating a very small amount of concerted physical effort into a relatively massive shift in the overall political-economic situation. Without that same specialized method, it would be virtually impossible to predefine the kinds of intermediate results which are the short-term, direct goals of such interventions.

It is permissible to employ the chess analogy — within very strict limits.

The novice chessplayer approaches the game in terms of short-term "piece-exchange," and traps which are developed either through standard, memorized routines, or otherwise developed on such short notice as several moves ahead. The qualified chess player not only looks eight or so moves ahead, but plays the game as a whole as a kind of shifting Gestalt, in which subtleties of position are decisive to the ultimate result. The novice chessplayer is easily defeated by a qualified opponent precisely because the novice is merely a relatively "more practical" person, who sees chess-board reality only in terms of very immediate tangible advantages in piece exchanges and checkmate threats.

Up to that point the analogy holds for our political problem. To win the ultimate result, defeat of the Atlanticists' fascist forces, it is essential to develop a winning strategic position through the intermediation of a succession of ostensibly ill-defined and small positional-deployment gains. These gains are not actually ill-defined, but merely appear to be vague and inconclusive to the person lacking the appropriate methodological competence — just as a person still immersed in a stone-age culture would find the distinction which identifies rich ore-bearing rock more or less vague and incomprehensible.

Returning to the chess analogy, such apparent subtleties are decisive for determining who wins.

It would be feasible, at least on principle, to outline our current strategic perspectives in terms of a direct application of our version of the higher theory of manifolds. That would be useful, if we had the time and resources to develop such a portrait, and also on the condition that we had a substantial organized force capable of assimilating and applying the result in that form.

For the moment, it is sufficient to show how the conception of nested higher-order manifolds suffices to explain the current political-economic situation.

Hegel explicitly and correctly rejected the notion that a universe could be axiomatically defined in terms of **linear continuity** (e.g., simple scalar displacement in space and time), or, implicitly, in terms of a simple manifold of the sort exemplified by the quasi-Gaussian Einstein-Weyl model. The basic unit of action of any universe in a series of nested, successively-ordered universes, can only be to the transformation which develops the universe toward its successor. The significance and necessity of the particular event or thing is the change or **negentropy** of the universe associated with the existence of that event or thing within the universe as a whole. Consequently, the unit of continuity of an actual such universe is not a scalar, or continuity otherwise like that of the simplified Einstein model, but a non-linear "displacement" of the form of negentropy.

The constant feature which survives as invariant through successive transformations, from one nested universe to the next, is the only fundamental unit of action for the universe. This conception determines the notion of negentropy.

This has an explicit and eminently practical representation in real economic analysis. That demonstration is the kernel of the Labor Committees' unique original theoretical-practical contributions to scientific knowledge in general. It is for this reason that we were able to develop a unique solution to the kind of complex breakdown crisis immediately before us, whereas no other existing institutionalized agency had developed the necessary competence to effect such a result. We refer to the discoveries behind the "International Devel-

opment Bank" program and its domestic-U.S.A. "Emergency Employment Act" complement.

Politics

The application of this theory directly to the situation now before us is as follows:

In brief, rather than employing the theory of manifolds directly to the evidence, we are applying that knowledge **heuristically** to the understanding of the practical strategical and national-tactical problems at hand.

That is the object and form of this present outline.

The Problem Of Fact

The most pervasive fallacy which must be overcome, especially on behalf of those leading strata of working-class cell and network leaders immediately associated with our full-time organizers, is the understandable blunders those broader layers around them tend to make in defining and interpreting what are termed "facts."

For reasons we shall immediately indicate, over prolonged periods — decades or more — within the experience of this society,

For reasons we shall immediately indicate, over prolonged periods — decades or more — within the experience of this society, certain occurrences and groups of occurrences have indeed the practical significance implied by the ordinary worker's usage of the term "facts." Abruptly, as society plunges into a crisis, those habituated notions of facts cease to function; the world no longer "makes sense" in the terms of reference to which the worker has previously become accustomed. New definitions of what constitute a "fact" are urgently wanted at that point.

Either that search for the new definitions occurs through a kind of floundering-about, in which case fascism and the early end of civilization is almost certain, or a more direct approach to developing the wanted new definitions is employed, in which case we probably win — there are no absolute guarantees in any kind of warfare, political struggles included — and humanity survives quite successfully.

This general difficulty is rather more complicated for the short term immediately ahead. We are now passing through successive phases of crisis-developments, such that in each successive phase the meaning of "fact" is qualitatively altered, and then in the next, quickly succeeding period, qualitatively altered again.

This is complicated further by the fact that the next several months will represent a succession of crisis "branching points" globally, in regions, and within nations. At each point, there are two or more alternative paths which developments may take, each such pathway quickly leading to a new crisis and "branching point," each pathway determining a significantly different immediate meaning for the term "fact."

In consequence, it is impossible to prescribe a strategic or national-tactical policy for the months immediately before us if that policy is premised on anything but a knowledge of the deeper processes which determine the varying significances of the notion of "facts" for all the kinds of alternative, successive pathways history may take during the immediate weeks and months of fundamental global crisis.

From the standpoint of the higher theory of manifolds, the problem so posed is easily mastered. From any other standpoint, strict understanding is virtually impossible. This is the reason that a direct leading role by the International Caucus of Labor Committees' leadership is indispensable to ensure a

successful outcome for the period of crisis immediately before us.

As we emphasized and illustrated in treating the phenomena of bonapartism, the component forces opposed to fascist austerity and general war commitments are each viable and important within their own right, with essential qualifications of knowledge as well as organized forces which we may lack. However, by themselves, or in an aggregation which does not include us as a leading influence for the determining of strategic policies, it is probable that those forces would be crushed by the Atlanticists well before the end of 1976 in the developed capitalist sector and most of the developing sector, and war erupt before the end of 1977.

The adducible most essential reason for our indispensable importance to humanity at this time is exemplified by our mastery of the basic, preliminary notion of an applied higher theory of manifolds. The problem of "fact" most directly illustrates the nature of the difficulties involved.

"Geometry

In a truly relativistic conception of the universe as a whole, there are no abstract apriori notions of space, time and matter allowed. To compare this with the crudest interpretation of the world among today's typical merely educated person, relativism rejects the notion of the universe as involving the study of movements of physical bodies in time against a backdrop of abstract Euclidian three-dimensional space. The relativistic notion of the universe employs the term "higher geometries," precisely because of the history of the way in which these notions were developed. But the use of the word "geometry" should not be understood to signify "non-Euclidean geometry" (merely a more sophisticated version of metaphysical Euclidean ideas of apriori geometric space)' geometry in the true relativists' sense signifies those new ideas which replace the old ideas of geometry.

In the new so-called geometry, matter, time, and space are one and the same continuous substance, and geometry signifies the notion of the set of coherent universal physical laws corresponding to what are termed "invariant" features of physical developments within a continuous space-time-matter medium.

The essential fact of such relativistic geometries is a **unit of action** which can be assumed to have equivalent value (determined in the same lawful way) in various parts of the same space-time-matter continuum. Because of the equivalence of geometric and algebraic formulations, the algebraic expression of such invariant units of action has a geometric interpretation, such that physical space (in the relativists' sense) is characterized by an invariant method of measuring the amount of work which must be done to move from one to another local condition of physical space as a whole. That characteristic or invariant measurement of space-time-matter displacements implicitly defines what is termed an "n-dimensional geometry" of physical space (actually a space of a transfinite ordering of dimensionality.)

The fallacy of prevailing relativistic systems (as we and our collaborators have shown in other published writings on this subject), is that they attempt to interpret the physical universe in terms of a single manifold-system based on **fixed** invariant internal relations. This is aggravated by the perpetuation of the linear, primitive Gaussian notion of determination of invariant relations "in the small," in the sub-

atomic scale. As a consequence of these two blunders, we are burdened with the ontological metaphysics of the energy-quantum conception and the unavoidable clutter of various added field factors which is intrinsically unsusceptible of a coherent, unified interpretation within such a conceptual framework.

It is for the same reason that the existence of human free will and even life itself are essentially not only inexplicable in terms of existing physics doctrines, but are downright violations of the laws of the universe as perceived in those doctrines.

We have shown that Hegel's development of the notion of successive social orders, each of successive specific sets of internal universal laws, is a pro forma solution to the general problem encountered in relativistic physics today. We have also shown that, despite Marx's and Engel's profound want of rudimentary competence concerning physics, Marx's 1843-1845 epistemological discoveries represent the germ of a practical and crucially-conclusive solution to the extension of Hegel's pro forma solution to the real physical domain. The result corrects the otherwise obvious essential fallacies of existing relativistic doctrines, and provides a methodological approach to advances in physics which is in conformity with crucial experimental evidence — even though the explicit results so indicated have not yet been developed as physics.

More relevant to the topic immediately at hand here, this approach removes the absurdity of excluding life and human creative will from among the lawful phenomenon of the physical universe properly conceived.

Our own achievements in economic theory and related political matters are a direct result of correcting the previously dominant error of omission in Marx's work, eliminating thus certain tendencies for error in the effort to apply a Marxian approach to current history. This same methodological achievement of ours is the direct basis for our ability to accurately predict the approximate timing of successive phases of the current capitalist breakdown crisis as early as the 1958-1960 period.

It is worth returning briefly to comment upon the implications of this development for scientific knowledge in general. Imagine the curious spectacle of the physicist, a human being whose profession exemplifies nothing but the achievements of the creative free will, espousing as fundamental universal law a theory of physics which absolutely excludes the existence of life, free will — and the physicist himself, therefore, — from this physical universe!

In brief, the relevant result in our hands is this. Although Hegel's conception of a predetermined unilinear ordering of historic development is a simplistic extravagance, his discovery of the notion of successive societies, each a universality internally characterized by unique "sets" of universal laws, stands as one of the most indispensable conceptual achievements of human history. From the standpoint of the theory of manifolds, Hegel's successive societies represent a nesting of successively higher order universal manifolds, analogous to the same universe's successive evolution into higher universes, with each successive universe determined by distinct sets of coherent universal laws. Moreover, and this is the kernel of Hegel's genius, Hegel solved the problem of determination of the particular, discrete phenomenon within a continuous whole taken as primary.

The application of this theory to the situation now before us is as follows.

In any relatively short interval of development of a phase of society of a definite kind, the characteristic specific feature of that society adducible from its mode of development defines the approximate equivalent of a set of universal laws specific to that phase of that society. Consequently, in the experience of persons within that society, certain forms of activity as characterized by such rules represent the effective measure of reality within that context. Consequently, certain features of life so determined have the significance of "fact" under such conditions. As facts they represent not only generally acceptable interpretations of events, but that interpretation is inseparable from an associated implicit notion of what practical action ought to be taken in response to the event. We might therefore properly term such "facts" to be "practical facts," since their conditional validity is inseparable from the effectiveness of the kinds of actions they imply; they are called "facts" essentially because the reactions they imply "seem to work" within the framework of that phase of that particular society's development.

Then, however, bring that society to a point of discontinuity, such as the present phase of capitalist breakdown crisis. The society has reached the point at which it can no longer exist on the basis of the previously dominant sets of institutions. As a result, what worked as reactions to events in the past no longer works. In a very meaningful sense, the laws of the universe have suddenly broken down insofar as relations within that society approximate a set of implied universal laws of social practice. Consequently, what was effectively a "fact" in 1971 is no longer a fact today.

The situation is more complicated, as we have already indicated.

There are two basic deliberate alternatives available to the capitalist sector today. One is the degenerated universe of Schachtian austerity and police-state rule on a virtually global scale. In this universe, an entirely new definition of facts prevails. The other is typified by the International Development Bank proposal, in which basic facts of experience are defined differently than either the world of 1971 or the Schachtian world. Finally, if neither of the two feasible universes is chosen, we have the special universe of absolute chaos.

None of the four alternative universes yet fully determines what is a fact. The old universe is dying, but it still tends to contribute to determining what a fact is. The Schachtian universe is on the verge of becoming the total replacement for the world we knew in 1971, and that emergence is already influencing the definition of fact. The International Development Bank proposal is also influencing the course of events in some nations and in the global situation as a whole. The IDB also determines therefore the significance of facts. There is also a threat of growing chaos, which also determines facts.

That is merely the overall situation. The process of moving from the existing, collapsing universe of 1971 into one of the three alternative new universes cannot occur as a simple direct leap from one into the other. The institution needed to establish one of the new alternative universes are not in place; they will come into place as the outcome of successively intervening intermediate, short-lived sub-universes, each of which immediately contribute to determining what constitutes a fact for that moment.

As we attempt to move this process of choice-filled transi-

tion toward the IDB universe, we are obliged to reach the condition at which such institutions exist through certain intermediating phases which approximate the condition of sub-universes of very short durations.

For example, throughout the advanced-capitalist sector there is no government currently in power which, in its present policies and position, would be politically prepared to make the treaty agreements indispensable for establishing the International Development Bank. Yet, such treaties with the Comecon and developing-sector nations are absolutely essential to the creation of credit for the bank. However, there is a process of potential successive approximations on a global scale which can affect or change existing governments to the effect that within weeks or months, the first phases of movement toward a working IDB come into place.

Consequently, if one proposed to force existing governments to directly implement the IDB, the task must seem formally an impossibility. Yet, if the possibility for a rapid succession of intermediating developments is clearly understood, no such difficulty as initially appears to prevail stands in our way. This process incurs the difficulty, however, that the definition of fact at each extremely-short-lived phase of intermediation is significantly altered.

For example, I often hear in respect to this or that force with which we have to deal, "But only yesterday you said of that ... To which I must reply that today's world is not yesterday's world; by slightly changing the correlation of forces in the world, under conditions of rapid change already independently occurring, we have changed the nature of facts. The ordinary person retorts that this all makes no sense to him. That precisely expresses the crucial problem we are treating in this article.

My Personal Situation

Through my position in this organization, I am placed at the apex of a process which intersects various governments and leading political and economic forces on a world scale.

From the standpoint of previously recorded history, this circumstance is quite fantastic: an independent and still relatively small force, which began from scratch only at the moment the current breakdown crisis began, in mid-1966, developing without a basis in fractions of even previously-existing tiny socialist groups, let alone mass organizations, developing not only absolutely without any outside support, but under increasingly aversive conditions of "political containment" by the ruling powers of the combined capitalist and developing sectors, today is situated in a keystone position, affecting governments, political parties and nations even to an extent beyond the direct comprehension of some of the leaders of the governments and parties involved.

There is no approximate precedent for this, or for the special personal situation of knowledge and responsibilities in which I now find myself. There is nothing properly mysterious in any of this, nor anything hidden from access to general public knowledge by our own publications on any significant aspect of this, yet it remains nonetheless fantastic.

I am not surprised that the leading Atlanticists are quite "freaked out" in horror to discover that we represent potentially the major source of danger to their crisis-wrecked empire. (There are indications that certain leading forces in the Comecon sector are also frightened, although in a different way, by our development.)

This circumstance strikes me with special force, because I am situated at the apex to the effect that everything of signi-

ficance to be reported or to be decided converges upon my attention and judgment from all parts of the Labor Committees' own and many other channels on a global scale. Yet, it is not unique to me otherwise, but is shared by key members in the leading executive committees, and only in a diminished degree by members in less central leadership and organizing responsibilities.

We have developed the capability, especially during the past four years, to direct our relatively tiny physical resources for activity to crucial points of the political-social process to such effect that — with increasing skill and influence — we are frequently able to so alter the course of events on national and sometimes a global scale from the course events would have otherwise followed. Because we are essentially alone, entirely dependent upon our own resources, and because we have learned that there exists no other force which would duplicate our role if we did not exist and did not see, every major development within nations of the world as a whole forces us to place that on the agenda as a matter whose outcome will be significantly affected by either our effective intervention or failure to act.

This circumstance has developed in to and in the leading strata of the organization the habit of taking personal moral responsibility for our duty respecting all major developments. The fact that we have been effective to varying degrees, in some important national and global developments, has increased our sense of practical moral responsibility for our contribution to the general fate of humanity by increasing our influence among other forces, such that our initiatives today have enormously more influence than a similar degree of effort even during the Summer or Autumn of 1975.

In this circumstance, we operate not only from a general strategic programmatic perspective, but must daily gauge the shifting composition and deployment of political and social forces on both sides of the pro-Atlanticist and anti-Atlanticist struggle, and changes in policy and factional composition of the constituent forces themselves. Every slight alteration rightly causes us to reestimate the present global correlation of forces and issues in terms of the effect of such shifts. In each case, the result is a discerned shift in the overall situation which we must exploit to advantage of the anti-Atlanticist forces, or a weakening of the position of the anti-Atlanticist forces to which we must promptly respond with a compensating countermove at some possible point of access somewhere in the world as a whole.

The more effectively we respond, the more influence, information and consequent moral responsibilities we incur.

As a general consequence of this experience, under the acute stresses of full-time, intense responsibilities we have experienced since the end of 1973, the leading strata of the organization have accumulated a detailed overview of the world in their heads which is in general superior in knowledge to that of any of our opponent forces' leading figures. The intensive daily briefing and associated informational procedures have been an essential part of this, but more significant has been the accumulated practical experience of our executives in developing a professional competence over several years of making strategic military-like decisions in that informational context under the most intense, stressed circumstances, in each individual case virtually without letup during the period since the end of 1973.

This is most notably the case at the top executive levels of

the organization and in key political intelligence sections, but extends with slightly diminished degree of involvement and responsibility down to the full-time field organizer, a person better-briefed than many key U.S. congressmen and many executive department officials even on matters of each congressman's and official's specialized areas of responsibility. This also bears upon the hardened professionalism of our Labor Committee cadres, to the effect that the potential new recruit finds joining the Labor Committees a leap in quality of intellectual life beyond the prerequisites of the ordinary merely-educated person.

Our situation, vis-a-vis the majority of the population, even the highly-placed typical official, is that we know not merely a few special facts, but that we understand those facts in the context of both a mass of knowledge not possessed by the ordinary person, and the experience of a method of assessing such knowledge which the ordinary person has yet to develop. In these circumstances, we are obliged to make firm judgments, which we know not only to be correct but urgent and essential, which are usually difficult for the ordinary person to independently dispute or corroborate unaided — because of the person's limited background knowledge and lack of appropriate experiences in effective analytic methods.

We have learned, by and large, now to cope with such discrepancies. We have learned to address ourselves to the potential self-consciousness of the worker (with varying effectiveness from one of our cadres to another) and to focus upon crucial evidence through which we are able to prove our conclusions to workers and others in terms of reference and judgment immediately available to them. The first duty of science is to make advanced discoveries beyond the trained capacities of the average person; the second duty of science is to determine how to make those discoveries comprehensible for practical use by the average man to whom they represent productive technology and so forth.

It is not possible, of course, to discover any "pedagogy" by which an entire science can be made comprehensible to workers in the proverbial "twenty-five words or less." Neither can one train an individual to be a competent automotive design engineer in the same time required to learn to operate an automobile. It is the second duty of science which is analogous to teaching an individual to operate an automobile. It is not possible to simplify scientific work so that anyone can simply, naturally become a competent scientist. It is possible and indispensable to develop effective, efficient and relatively straight-forward methods for teaching workers to understand the principles of useful operation of the new productive devices produced through successive scientific discovery and engineering development.

If we can not successfully transform ordinary skilled and semi-skilled workers into qualified political scientists, we do develop methods for achieving their practical comprehension of such "engineered" results of science as the International Development Bank and Emergency Employment Act — in those latter two products in which the success of our communication-effort is already demonstrated.

The task of this paper is to emphasize to our cadres the need to analyze current developments in a certain manner, a manner for which they are pre-trained. This type of analytical approach can not be immediately transferred as a whole to the average worker. It is the duty of the cadre to understand the successive layers of intermediating develop-

ments through which we are passing, and then, based on such understanding, to next make such products of understanding comprehensible in a practiced way to the workers associated with us. This is a parallel to the proper relationship of scientists and engineers generally to the skilled and semi-skilled productive worker. In this case, we have shifted the point of relationship from the productive technology per se to political work.

The March 31 Example

The abrupt transformation which occurred throughout the advanced capitalist sector on or about March 31 is a suitable illustration of the way in which general shifts in determining manifolds occur under crisis conditions. It is also an illustration of the inherent predictability of the principal feature of a crisis.

March 31 had developments which predetermined that it would be a definitive crisis-point. Primarily, March 31 marked the first-quarter-ending roll-over point for a major section of outstanding financial instruments. This coincided directly with governmental financial crises, both of national sectors and in municipal debt crises in the U.S. and Western Europe. This also coincided with impending pre-scheduled and provoked labor upsurges, labor-movement demands and self-defensive measures which ran smack into employers' resistance. The employers' resistance — whether by private corporations or governmental units was itself a direct result of the March 31 financial rollover conditions.

On March 31, it was no longer possible for the advanced-capitalist sector to continue to exist under hitherto existing institutions. Without a general 30 per cent or higher abrupt slash in levels of production, real wages and social services, it was not possible to stabilize even temporarily the bankrupt institutions centering around the major New York banks, the International Monetary Fund-World Bank, and the Euro-dollar market. Either these monetary and financial institutions had to be put through bankruptcy, and replaced by new monetary institutions, or the existing social institutions, including labor-management institutionalized relations of the past, had to be destroyed.

This, as we have outlined earlier — with a precision that has astonished so many immediately after the fact — March 31 signalled the provoked outbreak of a generalized political mass-strike upsurge radiating from the U.S. — unless the developing sector acted against the leading bankrupt monetary institutions prior to March 31.

We are now operating in a new general manifold, in which facts are determined quite differently than they were during even the weeks of March. By June 30, this present period, the present manifold-system, must come to and end one way or the other.

However, that does not mean that the three-month period from March 31 through June 30 is a fixed order. It is subject to abrupt crisis-shifts into entirely new manifold-systems. Any of several among the various possible key coup d'etats now under consideration for key nations would radically shift the world-order into a new manifold-system. Five or six key nations of the developing sector could act, virtually on a moment's notice, to shift the world manifold-system qualitatively. A crushing of the U.S. working-class upsurge would, meanwhile, probably put us quickly into a manifold-system within which general thermonuclear war before the end of 1977 is predetermined with almost absolute certainty.

The kinds of changes which may occur, changes involving branching alternatives into new intermediating manifold-system states, are perhaps not easily foreseen by the average

merely informed person. It must be understood that the Atlanticists are engaged in destroying the existing institution of

The kinds of changes which may occur, changes involving branching alternatives into new intermediating manifold-system states, are perhaps not easily foreseen by the average merely informed person. It must be understood that the Atlanticists are engaged in destroying the existing institutions of Western Europe and the U.S. (in particular), under circumstances of collapsing world trade and other shock-effects of the collapse-phase of this depression. The institutions being destroyed by the Atlanticists are nothing but the very institutions whose interdependent stabilizing effects have hitherto been the basis for institutional stability in those nations and regions. Each cracking of existing institutionalized arrangements immediately sets into motion or "unleashes" locked-up potential developments of a sort which could not otherwise become so significant so quickly. In consequence, each ratchet-stop of the Atlanticists' program of austerity for Western Europe and elsewhere represents a crisis-point, a branching-point, at which abrupt, intermediating new manifold-system states erupt.

At each point, various forces will intervene to influence the shift from one or another new alternative. In many cases, these shifts to intermediating alternatives will be determined by a relatively small amount of physical intervention into some crucial aspect of the then-current "structure" of political and related configurations.

Naturally, we are preoccupied with detecting such crucial points of intervention. Moreover, the Atlanticists, who have learned to fear our actions of that sort as the greatest source of potential danger to their interests, will intervene in the effort to inoculate against or counteract our influence. The Atlanticists' interventions against us will in fact often strengthen our effectiveness by thus emphasizing the importance they attribute to us. Therefore, a few of our actions are taken for the purpose of luring the Atlanticists to intervene in such a way as to produce an effect which we desire at that specific juncture.

The Inclusive Reality

There is admittedly, one path of development in this situation which leads through a process of provoked socialist revolutions to workers' governments in a bloodied North America and Western Europe. However, that variant is relatively improbable at this time, chiefly because of the lack of competent socialist leadership of mass-based institutions in Western Europe and so forth.

For example, the case of France. Suppose, as is possible, that a political mass strike against austerity erupts in France. This would be represented by the CGT and CFDT trade-union federations, the French Communist Party, the farmers' organizations, under conditions in which the agent-ridden Communist Party and CGT-CFDT leaderships would be incompetent to contemplate becoming the government of France. In such a case, the probable outcome would either be a new government formed by the Gaullists, or a Vichy-linked coup d'etat of the pro-New York bankers' right-wing forces. A related, if significantly distinct, condition is the case of Italy.

In summation, the best overall variant of this period is that specified by the International Development Bank program, in which anti-Atlanticist pro-capitalist and capitalist governments would bankrupt the Atlanticist institutions to form a triangular treaty organization banking system with the developing and Comecon sectors.

The particular, moment-to-moment maneuvers and so

forth which the world will take during the immediate crisis period will represent variant pathways leading either to such a result or to the Schachtian horror of general thermonuclear war and global ecological holocaust.

It is therefore proper to make a certain working distinction between strategy and tactics for this immediate crisis period. Our overall strategy is to establish the IDB within the overall strategic terms we have defined. Within that continuing contest of strategic policy, it is necessary to make short-term tactical maneuvers, often abruptly, as one would in the course of general war. Strategy involves the overall transition from the manifold of pre-March 31 to the new general manifold represented by the International Development Bank. Tactics pertains to the intermediating short-term variants situated between the overall departure and arrival points of strategy.

What we are emphasizing, therefore, is that tactics need not be considered in the simplistic terms otherwise appropriate to a fixed manifold system. Despite the fact that these maneuvers are "merely tactical" in overall historic-strategic terms, the proper determination of tactics demands the most sophisticated approach yet considered by man.

Because, as we have emphasized, the leading cadres and others of the Labor Committees have had approximately a decade of development in which to master the background

knowledge required, and because of nearly three years of the most intensive political-strategic deployments ever conducted in the history of political movements, our organization has the developed capabilities in knowledge and method to provide the "general staff" direction and field officership which the current struggle demands.

The duty of those cadres, as we enter the concluding stages of this war against the fascist thrust of the Atlanticists, is to be self-conscious of those qualifications they have developed, and also to be aware of the urgency of always making clear to the larger forces the exact kind of new intermediating manifold-systems within which our immediate tactical deployments are situated. It is only also necessary, at the same time, not to become so enamored of the richness of the immediate tactical situation's complexity that the confining reality of the strategic situation is put momentarily out of sight. To revert to the chess analogy: Do not become so enamored of the brilliancy of a particular tactical maneuver that the contest as a whole is put out of sight.

As for the rest, provided we succeed, it will perhaps be five or ten years before a large segment of the population properly understands the nature of the principles we are employing to this end. No matter; once we have victory, we shall have the leisure to clarify the theoretical side of the Labor Committees' extraordinary accomplishments.