

# Kamala Harris' quote 'what can be, unburdened by what has been' is pure Marxism

August 3, 2024

By Dr. Rich Swier



One of the viral videos of Harris is a chant she does about becoming and being and so on. It is likely it is a lot more sinister than mere cackling idiocy, which she would have the uninitiated believe. Her father was an Ivy league Marxist prof. She cannot, not know this material, and she cannot have achieved her political heights by sleeping her way to the top. I know of far, far better looking women that couldn't even sleep their way to the middle and with greater effort. She got where she is because she is part of a Marxist cabal that are central to organizations in Washington and elsewhere.

**From Stephen Coughlin on June 29 of this year:**

My awareness of the "Counterspell Group" is recent. Not sure who runs it so I'll follow it with a discerning eye. See what you know in its X-feeds and take the time to convert to knowing what you see and make the call yourself.

There is the shocking epiphany many reach, for me accidentally, that, for example, Marxism is hardwired to Hegel along theosophical lines, and Hegel executed a covert form of Hermetic

Alchemy. In turn, one can than hardwire this into the ongoing “gold, silver, base metal” triangle of Plato’s Republic understood along the metaphysical lines established in Plato’s Timaeus. It’s a covert (initiate) theosophy.

In the pre-modern world, there was a concept of time that emphasized a sharp and severe distinction between “Being” and “Becoming,” the lack of awareness of which means you cannot understand either Plato or the Bible. (“I Am” Being/God created time and space “Γένεση” [Genesis] – becoming. That, for example, ‘God [Being] so loved the world, he put his only son in Becoming.’) This concept has all but been erased from modern awareness and as such has deracinated the West from its own roots.

The dialectic arises directly out of this distinction. Hence, to understand Marxist nature of Harris’s “what can be, unburdened by what has been,” one must first recognize that its Marxist authority derives from the dialectical nature of the statement.

Removing “I Am” – Being – from the equation – everything that has become to this day must be negated in pursuit of everything to come tomorrow. Tomorrow’s reality is premised on today’s destruction (dialectical negation), which only exists to move history forward in a perpetual state of destruction of all that is (perpetual revolution) for all that will be. This is accomplished through praxis (doing it without saying so). This practice assumes eternal existence of perpetual becoming that negates, through mere praxis, Aristotle’s Act (Pure Being) and Potency (unrealized Act that can become) distinction thus negating both Maimonides and Aquinas without having to ever say they did.

**Thus, Harris’s statement becomes THE justification for the complete destruction of all institution that currently exist (the ones she took an oath to ‘support and defend’. It fits precisely with the Frankfurt School’s “Aufheben der Kultur” (Destroy the Culture). The term “aufheben” connects the Marxist with the Hegelian with the alchemical notion of the dialectic – in which the movement of history forward is the process of converting man from base metal to silver to gold – a real practice from which the term “chemistry” is derived but which also serves as the hardwired metaphor for man’s hermetic pursuit of a transhuman perfection as mankind “ascends” to the gold standard. “Ascended beings” – or the X-Men.**

But of course, all the dialectic does is negate. Cultures that adopt it get destroyed. In this regard, the branded name for this dialectic of destruction – “Aufheben der Kultur” is “Cancel Culture.” One does not have to be a practitioner of metaphysics to recognize the perennial form. In this instance, that Marxism is hardwired to Hermetic Alchemy by way of the dialectic. **HARDWIRED!** For those who get uncomfortable concerning the esoteric nature (and occult is the theological term for esoteric) of the Marxist equation, you either have to deal with it – account for it – or stay on the porch.

BTW – What’s the difference between alchemist turning base metal into gold and Federal Reserves creating money out of loans backed by nothing? My sense is that “Counterspell Group” may be seeking to expose this relationship. In this instance, the Marxist nature of Harris’s claim

is that “what can be, unburdened by what has been” is simply an initiate form of aligning her vision with the Marxist “Cancel Culture.” Know what you see!

**WATCH:** [If you dismiss variables you assume are unimportant you miss the entire picture](#)

**WATCH:** [It's not Word salad it's Marxism](#)

In a May 31, 2017 [Communist Party USA](#) column titled [Test your Marxist IQ!](#) [Scott Hiley](#) And [Alvaro Rodriguez](#) wrote:

In the 1970s, Marxist feminists launched the [Wages for Housework](#) movement, which demanded a wage, paid by capital, for all the labor involved in keeping wage workers ready to work: cooking, cleaning, childbearing and rearing, etc. What was their aim in demanding wages for housework?

- a. To supplement the income of single-earner families
- b. To give homemakers a sense of accomplishment and pride
- c. To weaken capital by depriving it of unpaid labor
- d. To end the sexual division of labor between home and factory

(Check your answer [here](#).)

The correct answer is (c).

The Wages for Housework movement was a feminist movement that saw capitalism as the main perpetrator of the oppression of women. Specifically, members of the movement drew attention to the fact that the existence of capital depended upon the unpaid labor of reproducing the working class (i.e., keeping wage workers able to work), usually performed by women. The women who performed this work contributed as much to capitalist profits as [mostly male] wage earners did, but their work was labeled as fulfilment of a biological destiny rather than labor in service to capital. By forcing capital to pay for labor-power in the home as they would for other labor power, they hoped to diminish capital's ability to profit from unpaid labor. As Silvia Federici, one of the movement's major theorists, wrote, “We live every minute of our lives in service to capital, and it is time to make capital pay for every minute of it” (“Counterplanning from the Kitchen,” 1975, republished in *Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle*). The idea of wages for housework entered the political mainstream—Daniel Patrick Moynihan proposed it, for example, in the context of welfare reform—but did not come to fruition. As Federici notes, it is a revolutionary demand, in the sense that it is incompatible with the continued functioning of capitalist production.

According to Marx's "General Law of Capitalist Accumulation," as capitalist firms grow...

- a. the productivity of labor increases, and workers' standard of living decreases.
- b. the productivity of labor remains stable, but workers' standard of living rises.
- c. machines replace human labor, resulting in a shorter work day.
- d. unemployment decreases, resulting in a rise in wages.

(Check your answer [here](#).)

The correct answer is (a).

As capitalist accumulation progresses, the productivity of labor increases and workers' standard of living decreases. Sounds paradoxical, right? In vol. 1, ch. 25 of *Capital*, Marx explains the cycle of accumulation. As firms grow, they buy more equipment, which requires more workers to run. However, due to technological progress, each new generation of equipment requires fewer workers to set in motion. So the growth of a firm is generally an increase in the ratio of machines (fixed capital) to human labor (variable capital). As firms grow, they tend to reduce their labor force—a trend recognized even by bourgeois economists. This is the process that we've seen with automation of the manufacturing sector. As we've seen over the past four decades, massive increases in industrial productivity result in unemployment, underemployment, and a lower standard of living for the working class.

Marx wrote this section of *Capital* to refute the idea that the growth of business is good for workers—an absurd claim still made by many mainstream economists.

In the Marxist understanding of society, what is the State?

- a. The state is just an administrative organization independent of economic classes.
- b. The state is a coercive and repressive force created to maintain the ruling class in power.
- c. The state is a neutral body above classes and whose purpose is to keep the peace.
- d. The state is a political organ created by a democratic process.

(Check your answer [here](#).)

The correct answer is (b). In the Marxist understanding, the state is an organ of class rule.

While bourgeois theorists tend to see the state as a set of institutions above and beyond classes and capable of reconciling different interests, Marxists recognize it as an organ for the oppression of one class by another. Engels states that the state is a "special coercive force". It holds the exclusive right to use violence to maintain class rule and consists of special bodies of

armed men having prisons, etc. at their command. The best form of the state for the capitalist class is a “democratic” shell where wealth exercises its power indirectly, but all the more surely. Speaking of the capitalist state, Lenin says “It establishes its power so securely, so firmly that no change in persons, institutions or parties in the bourgeois-democratic republic can shake it.” The capitalist class will resort to an undemocratic form when its class rule is in jeopardy. It can and has resorted to brutal militaristic dictatorship and force (fascism), to protect its interest.

The state is distinct from the government. Governments change rapidly, based on the results of elections (or the outcomes of coups), but only revolution can change the class basis of state power. In some sense, the government is a terrain of class struggle. The process of forming governments registers the relative strength of different class and social forces; by changing the composition of the government (i.e., from conservative to progressive), the working class can place some limits on how the capitalist class wields state power.

Do you think Kamala Harris would pass this test with a 100%. We do!

©2024. [Dr. Rich Swier](#). All rights reserved.



[DrRichSwier.com](http://DrRichSwier.com)

This article is courtesy of [DrRichSwier.com](http://DrRichSwier.com), an online community of citizen journalists, academics, subject matter experts, and activists to express the principles of limited government and personal liberty to the public, to policy makers, and to political activists. Please visit [DrRichSwier.com](http://DrRichSwier.com) for more great content.