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To every single First Worldist who falsely claims they're revolutionaries for the sake of their ego, and their own self-pity

To the tens of millions of Third World people who die while First Worldists cry about not being able to afford the newest iPhone
"To tell the workers in the handful of rich countries where life is easier, thanks to imperialist pillage, that they must be afraid of 'too great' impoverishment, is counter-revolutionary. It is the reverse that they should be told. The labour aristocracy that is afraid of sacrifices, afraid of 'too great' impoverishment during the revolutionary struggle, cannot belong to the Party. Otherwise, the dictatorship is impossible, especially in West-European countries."

Vladimir Lenin
"Speech on the Terms of Admission to the Communist International"
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Chapter 1
Introduction
We in Marxism are in the middle of a crisis. All around us Marxism is at its weakest point in history. As I write these words the Communist Party of the Philippines is preparing to abandon armed struggle to ally with the fascist Rodrigo Duterte. The Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia are currently in peace negotiations. The Naxals in India are experiencing dwindling numbers. In the First World, Marxism is dead. Yes, it is dead. It has been replaced with "Social Justice Warriors" on Tumblr who have committed themselves to demanding liberal reforms. Workers across the First World have emphatically said no to communist revolution. Marxism in the First World, is persona non grata.

Never before has the world Marxist movement been faced with such a dismal situation. The majority of Marxist groups are liberal democratic groups, seeking to get elected to offices that won't allow them to get elected. The possibility of an armed revolution is non-existent. People are lining up behind Bernie Sanders and the Democratic Party, or Jeremy Corbyn and the Labour Party, in order to accept concessions from the bourgeoisie. Marxist groups are under a complete delusion that the First World "masses" are going to rise up at any moment.

There can be no doubting the reality that surrounds us. Liberal academics who pass themselves off as Marxist intellectuals are all scratching their chins, struggling to find some way to consider the global one percent to be revolutionary. They strain and squint their eyes until they see something they want out of the First World "masses." Why? Because they won't accept the truth that is before them; and has always been before them. The First World is not revolutionary.

History tells us this is so. Marx predicted that it would be the industrial working class of the advanced capitalist nations that would lead the way towards revolution. This prediction has been totally wrong. All of Marxist history tells us that it has been the
most backward of countries, the most oppressed of peoples which have led the revolution. This simple fact is adamantly denied by First Worldists. They cannot demonstrate in any way, shape, or form that Marx was correct here. Yet, despite that, they continue to insist that the most privileged workers in the world are a revolutionary potential waiting to happen.

All manner of rationalizations are invented to justify it. Often they point to the plight of Native Americans as proof of the First World's oppression. The dishonesty is astounding that they would project the plight of 2% of the population onto another 300 million who live astronomically better. They insult Native Americans by essentially claiming that they are as oppressed as them. Despite all the writings on the subject by Mao, and Lenin; First Worldists deny that they are beneficiaries of imperialism. Their denial goes hand in hand with their lack of revolutionary potential.

We are in the middle of a crisis. A crisis in Marxist theory. Each great contribution has spawned a wave of revolutionary activity. Marx, Lenin, and Mao, all witnessed an upsurge in struggle as a result of their theoretical contributions. We on the other hand, have witnessed nothing. Most of us have sat back and watched Occupy Wall Street and cheered it on. Every time there is some kind of noise being made, Marxists automatically assume it to be the beginning of something. Every time they have been let down.

Why?

At this moment in time, our theory has grown completely stale and out of date. The theories of the big three heads of Marxism are inadequate for our historical period, with our material conditions. The world, no less capitalism itself, does not remain static. It is dynamic and always going through change. We cannot claim the world is the same as when Marx wrote Kapital. We cannot say it is the same as during the time of Lenin. Nor can
we say it is the same as the time of Mao. We must accept that times have changed and that our theory has to change with it. This is the very nature of science; Marxism is supposed to be the science of revolution.

We need a fourth stage in the development of our theory. That theory has already been mostly provided to us by different sources. Third Worldism is the newest development that will lead the way to revolution. First Worldists have lost their revolutionary potential. They repeat the same failed ideas over and over again, in the pattern of insanity. They refuse to accept the truth, because they are unable to overcome their own egos and self-pity. We must move forward in theory.

I cannot speak for all of Third Worldism. I am only one man in a small trend that is beginning to rise. I can only speak for the general idea of Third Worldism. My views do not necessarily represent those of the prevailing Third Worldist groups: the Maoist International Movement, and the Leading Light Communist Organization. I am not a member of either group, nor would I claim to speak for them. I am only presenting the general idea of Third Worldism to the public. After having read this book, I suggest you go out and look into these two groups to get a better understanding of where they stand.

I must make it clear, however, that I use the term Maoism-Third Worldism tentatively. There actually is no such ideology. I've used it in this book and other places to differentiate myself from the two previously mentioned groups which have their own ideologies. MIM Theory and Leading Light Communism respectively. I don't know what other title to use, but I feel that simply using Third Worldism in this case is not enough. So please do not get the impression that there is a Maoism-Third Worldism. It is just a term that I myself am using for this book.

It is my wish that this book serves as a basis for a Third Worldist ideological education. This should certainly be expanded upon
with other works by other people. Please view this book as "Third Worldism 101." We must certainly develop it further.

Jason Unruhe, 2016
Chapter 2
Who is Really Revolutionary?
Introduction
Who is Really Revolutionary? This is a question we must ask ourselves in the course of developing a strategy for revolution. Who is willing to fight, who is more incline towards reform? This means the difference between who has the potential for building revolution and who does not. A lot of people claim they are revolutionary, but how many actually are? How many actually engage in real struggle, not liberal college activism or blogging? Their numbers in the First World are virtually non-existent. Almost no one actually fights against capitalism in any meaningful way, in any way that actually brings revolution. First Worldists have a terrible habit of exaggerating their conditions and the work they do.

Who is Oppressed?
Communists in the First World consider themselves to be an oppressed group. They proclaim that the police are on them all the time. Organizations like the RCP Canada and the New York Maoists claim that they suffer oppression from the police. They compare their "struggles" to those who suffer under the boot heel of fascism like the New People's Army, or the Naxals. Can we really make this comparison?

In the Third World, you get shot for being a communist. If the police or government know you're a communist you can bet you're going to be locked up accused of crimes you didn't commit. Your life is in danger if the government knows you're a communist. In the First World you can walk up to a police officer and say you're a communist and he won't care. In my own experience, I've had police walk right into the room where I record videos, covered with communist paraphernalia, and merely comment that it was interesting. I've stood in the Ontario provincial offenses court explaining dialectical
materialism to a cop. You cannot claim communists are oppressed.

I do know where these groups get this idea from. When they go out and take protest actions they might get arrested. When the RCP Canada threw bricks at police during the G-20 Summit probably a few of them got arrested. The RSCC in New York had several of their members arrested for yelling at the former U.S. military general and Director of the C.I.A. David Petraeus. This is not the same as being persecuted for being a communist. These arrests were for individual protest actions. They were not for being communists. Communists here experience no more harassment from police than any other protester. In the First World, Blacks suffer from police repression. Black people collectively are targeted by police for being Black. That is what police oppression looks like, and how it is made manifest. By placing these two groups side by side, we can see who really is oppressed in the First World.

If you got arrested as a communist in America or Canada, no one would really care. People have more sympathy for someone who goes to a bakery and is refused a cake because it's for a same-sex wedding. The general public won't care if a communist is arrested in a protest action. In fact, many politicians and media talking heads already think communists run the United States.

It is simply ridiculous to claim that communists are persecuted in the First World. You would suffer a hundred times more police persecution for being Black. There's a reason why you can go to a protest in a Che Guevara shirt and wave a hammer and sickle flag and have nothing happening to you. If you did this in many Third World countries you would be risking being killed. There is a reason why First World communist's headquarters is a liberal collage activist group, and in the Third they are guerillas hiding in the jungle. Communists in the First World are not oppressed. The government doesn't care about communist groups. They're
much more concerned about radical environmentalists, Muslims, and right wing militias. The government doesn't even consider us a serious threat.

**Who Fights for Reform or Revolution?**
The biggest obstacle that Marxist revolution faces is reforms. It has almost always been reforms that have put an end to revolutionary struggles. In the First World, reforms have stopped every revolutionary movement. The death of the communist struggle in the United States was brought about by the New Deal put forward by Franklin Roosevelt. This made promises of serious reforms to the public that put an end to radical action in America. Even if we look towards the 1960s and the entire Civil Rights movement, we see the same. People were taking quasi-radical action for equality that ended in reforms. Has equality for women and Blacks been achieved? No. But the serious action and revolutionary spirit behind it died out with reforms. Even the upheaval of the 1960s was not going to go towards revolution. People still believed in the system and wanted reforms, not revolution. People who truly despised the system went out and formed unscientific utopian communes. Despite the fact they almost universally failed, it spoke to what they were really wanted. These radicals wanted out of the system, not to destroy it and build a new one. They didn't want to fight it, they just wanted to get away from it in a minimal way which didn't challenge anything. Third World people don't get to build a nice safe space away from the horrors of Third World poverty.

When capitalism went into a great crisis in 2008, a moment when capitalism *could have* collapsed completely, people still refused revolution. People went one of two ways. Either they blindly believed that the U.S. government was socialist and caused the problem, or they turned to Barack Obama. Obama came onto the scene promising change, not revolution. He
denounced the "greed" that caused the problem.¹ He promised a more "fair" capitalism, to return the privileged middle class to where it was. He offered reforms not revolution. The American public jumped on it. The rest thought he was a communist and denounced even reforms. Clearly, neither side had any revolutionary potential. Each side wanted reforms in opposite directions. A majority of people in America still believe in the system.

But what of those who don't? What about those who have lost faith in liberal Western democracy? 54.9% of the population voted in the last federal election.² Many of those remaining 45% have no faith in the electoral system. But what are the main reasons for not voting? The top four main causes for not voting are: Too busy (15.5%), illness or disability (14.9%), not interested (13.4%), Don't like the option (12.9%). Additionally: inconvenient place (2.7%), and forgot to vote (2.6%).³ Discounting those with disability and illness issues 47.1% didn't vote because it just wasn't important enough to them or they didn't care. We should also add that 18.3% of those who didn't vote gave other reasons or didn't know why. The most common reason is people believing their vote doesn't have an impact.⁴ These numbers are only for registered voters that didn't show up to vote. For those who didn't register to vote, 51.6% said they were not interested or refused to vote.⁵ Those who don't believe in the system are completely apathetic about it. It doesn't even matter to them.

Where are we supposed to find people for revolution? Even those who have a vague belief that the system is a fraud are ambivalent towards it. Are we supposed to count this as a possible revolutionary potential? If they truly opposed the system and thought it was wrong, they would be fighting against it. These people don't participate in the system so where is their protest against it? Nowhere, because those disenfranchised voters' lives are materially high enough that they don't feel a need to do anything about it. They're well off enough that the
effects of not voting are not serious enough to motivate them into action. These people don't have a revolutionary potential. They are not willing to rebel because they're comfortable enough in their own ambivalence.

We as Marxists should not be fighting for reforms in the First World. I think there are two primary reasons for this:

1. Already we face a "working class" that is not revolutionary.

2. Any concessions increases harm to the Third World.

The "working class" here is already unwilling to fight. First Worldists like to deny it, but living conditions have a significant impact on a class' revolutionary potential. An increase in those conditions would decrease the potential further. What draws people to Marxism is the recognition that capitalism cannot help them, and that capitalism is the problem. Every liberal reform is designed to prove otherwise to the worker. When Marx wrote about the working class, he was writing about the 1850s industrial England and Germany where reforms didn't exist. Every time a reform goes through it is further evidence to non-communists that capitalism works. We cannot win them over to our side so long as they still believe in capitalism, until they see that revolution is the only answer.

Look at it this way: if you fight for an increase in the minimum wage in the Third World, you're risking your life. When Jean-Bertrand Aristide tired to raise the minimum wage for textile workers in Haiti, he was overthrown by a U.S. coup. Many people were killed in the resulting violence. All this for just a bare minimum by which to survive. Contrast this with the U.S., where if you want to increase the minimum wage all you have to do is vote for the Democrats, a bourgeois party. Barack Obama has already called for the minimum wage to be increased and has said all members of Congress should support it. What does this tell us? It tells us that the First World bourgeoisie isn't
concerned about an increase the minimum wage. However, they are willing to kill and overthrow Third World countries for increasing it. Sure, some bourgeoisie don't want it to be increased here, but a majority do because they see it as a benefit for them. This alone is very telling about the struggle for reforms.

Raising the minimum wage in the First World not only doesn't increase worker's revolutionary potential, it also isn't even perceived as a threat to the capitalist system.

How can communists in the First World talk about using the minimum wage as a rallying point to build class consciousness when the Democratic Party is already doing it? Any attempt to organize "workers" around the goal of increasing the minimum wage will be stolen away by liberals. Anytime you try to organize a program along a liberal line, the mainstream liberal party is going to win those "workers" away from you. If you push for minimum wage, asking for people to engage in a guerrilla war against the U.S. government, while the Democrats push for the same thing only asking that you vote for them, who do you think "workers" are going to support? Communists in the U.S. (let alone the rest of the First World) have never been able to reach and become attached to the working class. They have systematically failed all throughout history. There is a very clear reason for this. They have almost always followed the Democrat line. No socialist country has been built through reforms. (No matter how hard Venezuela tries.)

Frederic Engels had already seen the problem that we see today as far back as 1879.

"... For a number of years past (and at the present time) the English working-class movement has been hopelessly describing a narrow circle of strikes for higher wages and shorter hours, not, however, as an expedient or means of propaganda and organisation
but as the ultimate aim. The Trade Unions even bar all political action on principle and in their charters, and thereby also ban participation in any general activity of the working-class as a class. The workers are divided politically into Conservatives and Liberal Radicals, into supporters of the Disraeli (Beaconsfield) ministry and supporters of the Gladstone ministry. One can speak here of a labour movement (proper) only in so far as strikes take place here which, whether they are won or not, do not get the movement one step further. To inflate such strikes — which often enough have been brought about purposely during the last few years of bad business by the capitalists to have a pretext for closing down their factories and mills, strikes in which the working-class movement does not make the slightest headway — into struggles of world importance, as is done, for instance, in the London Freiheit, can, in my opinion, only do harm. No attempt should be made to conceal the fact that at present no real labour movement in the continental sense exists here, and I therefore believe you will not lose much if for the time being you do not receive any reports on the doings of the Trade Unions here.”

When First Worldists try to organize for reforms they are really just handing people over to liberals. When they argue for reforms they are allying in the same cause with the Democrats. If they do this the "working class" is just going to leave them for the Democratic Party.

To the second point, these reforms come at the expense of Third World people. When the "working class" in the First World increases their share of the imperialist plunder, the bourgeois simply increase the size of the pie in order to keep up the rate of profit. In a system where the wages and living standards of First World "workers" are already subsidized by super-exploitation, all
further increases come directly from an increase to that exploitation. First World people already live off of the blood of the Third World. Any further benefits can only come from squeezing the Third World even harder.

In the Third World, when you fight for a reform you're fighting for something that will barely keep you alive. A slight increase in the minimum wage in a place like the Philippines means the difference between two and three meals a day. In the First World it means the difference between a few more luxury items or not. When Third World workers and peasants strike for more social spending, they're asking for indoor plumbing, running water. They often end up getting killed for it.

Exactly how is fighting for reforms going to make First World "workers" more revolutionary? We can clearly see that they'd rather ally with the Democrats for the same reforms. If they already don't want to take radical action there is no reason why we should believe pushing for reforms is supposed to accomplish that. If the reforms are obtained, how is that supposed to increase class consciousness when they've just been shown they can make things better by not fighting?

Who are Our Friends? Who are Our Enemies?
The main question Mao asked when trying to determine a path to revolution is, "Who are our enemies? Who are our friends?"

"Who are our enemies? Who are our friends? This is a question of the first importance for the revolution. The basic reason why all previous revolutionary struggles in China achieved so little was their failure to unite with real friends in order to attack real enemies. A revolutionary party is the guide of the masses, and no revolution ever succeeds when the revolutionary party leads them astray. To ensure that we will definitely
achieve success in our revolution and will not lead the masses astray, we must pay attention to uniting with our real friends in order to attack our real enemies. To distinguish real friends from real enemies, we must make a general analysis of the economic status of the various classes in Chinese society and of their respective attitudes towards the revolution."^{10}

What we see today is something that most Marxists don't want to acknowledge. The "working class" in the First World is not out for revolution. They do not want to overthrow the system and replace it with a new one. They don't want to use communism as a hammer. Instead, of having a revolutionary aim of greater equality, they are only seeking more for themselves. When we look at the global distribution of wealth we already see that the First World has too much. If we were to equitably distribute the world's wealth, which as Marxists we're supposed to, we can see that the First World would drop significantly. At a 72:1 wealth gap between the two worlds^{11} we can get an idea of how big it is going to be. Even if revolution was achieved in the First World, the value would still have to be distributed back to the Third World where it came from. We're not talking about reparations, we're talking about a reorientation of where the wealth that is generated by the Third World is going to.

As utopian as First Worldists see the "working class", they are still going to reject the reversal of the global value transfer. Any communist can claim they would be in support of it, but would the First World "masses," who have been promised more go along with it? I sincerely doubt that they will support the revolutionary party when they're told they can't have two cars in their driveways, or a new television every year. Or, being told that apartment buildings will be constructed instead of detached homes with their own backyards. Closing the wealth gap would make these things a relic of a past global economic order. First World people would demand that these things be returned and
revolt against the revolutionary party. People would demand that the old ways be returned. They would demand that their privilege be returned to them.

The First World "working class" cannot be seen as being capable of revolution so long as it is a privileged class. We cannot expect the capitalist class to simply give up their excess in favour of revolution. Nor can we expect First World people to give up their 72:1 wealth gap. We cannot expect those who have to give to those that don't have. First Worldists argue that consciousness will change during the revolution. This outlook is entirely wrong. We are talking about the real material world here, where there is not some instant transformation of consciousness. This is the utopian notion that anarchists argue for the elimination of the state as a means to transform society. They assume that all people will just support them against capitalism and the state. This is false. Transforming consciousness takes time, planning, and effort to change. This is a reality that is confirmed by every Marxist revolution there has been.

**Conclusion**

First World people cannot be considered the class allies of the global proletariat. First World people will not accept less just as the bourgeoisie will not accept less. First Worldists argue for a greater exploitation of the Third World to give more to the "working class" of the First World. We cannot see the average person in the First World as having something in common class-wise with a Third World worker or peasant. First Worlders do not want to give up their share of the imperialist spoils, nor can they really be forced to by the party. Revolution must come from the truly oppressed, the truly exploited. Once this happens the First World will begin to build its own class consciousness once they are no longer the beneficiaries of imperialism. Once they have nothing to lose but their chains.
Jason Unruhe
Chapter 3
Who is the Proletariat Now?
What is Proletariat?
The definition of proletariat can be perplexing to someone unfamiliar with all the nuances involved in it. On the other side of the coin it can seem all too easy to someone who uses the term dogmatically refusing to make adjustments as they are deemed necessary. In truth Marx used the term to describe people who were brutally oppressed and had “nothing to lose but their chains”. This hardly describes many First World people at all. Many of these people can book a day off work to go protesting, while those who did so in the past were doing so because they had been squeezed out of economic life. Back in the day a union went on strike risking their homes, money, and even their lives. When people strike today they have a decent living standard even if they don’t win. In the Third World those who strike risk their lives, in fact a good many of them are killed every year. According to the International Labour Organization there are 5,000 labour related deaths a day.\textsuperscript{12} That’s a day. The vast, overwhelming majority of them are in the Third World.

An excellent description of proletariat is someone who has nothing to lose but their chains. I think that really says more to how Marx said the working class would be exploited. If they were not under such exploitative pressure they would not be revolutionary. This is exactly what we see today with the “working class” in the First World who refuses to take serious, if any, revolutionary action. Many sections of this so-called working class actively sabotage and attack other sections based merely on preserving their own privilege above other workers. Some of them are even outright racist. There is no labour unity in the First World as there is in the Third World. Any attempt to claim so is rooted in denial and nostalgia for times gone past.

Today we see the new proletariat the working and poor of the Third World who often times have nothing. Sometimes they literally have nothing to lose but their chains. The immiseration of the Third World poor is sometimes even worse than it was for
working class people in Europe in the 17th century. No First World person has to walk five miles in order to get drinkable water. First World people don’t worry about dying of something simple as diarrhoea. The misery forced upon them by imperialism is producing some of the harshest living conditions that humanity has ever seen.

1. Nearly 1/2 of the world’s population — more than 3 billion people — live on less than $2.50 a day. More than 1.3 billion live in extreme poverty, that’s less than $1.25 a day.

2. 1 billion children worldwide are living in poverty. According to UNICEF, 22,000 children die each day due to poverty.

3. 870 million people worldwide do not have enough food to eat. Food banks are especially important in providing food for people that can’t afford it themselves. Run a food drive outside your local grocery store so people in your community have enough to eat. Sign up for Supermarket Stakeout.

4. More than 1 billion people lack adequate access to clean drinking water and an estimated 400 million of these are children. Because unclean water yields illness, roughly 443 million school days are missed every year.

5. In 2011, 165 million children under the age 5 were stunted (reduced rate of growth and development) due to chronic malnutrition.13

Primarily Marx put forward a description of the proletariat as people who were mostly expelled from economic society. They only earn enough in income in order to survive day-to-day. They have nothing to lose but their chains, the chains that bind them to bare survival. This clearly doesn’t describe the “working class”
in the First World. In fact, in the global structure of wealth transfer they actually have a lot to lose. Even those with the lowest income are still a part of the huge First World waste of food. Americans alone waste $165 billion in food a year.\textsuperscript{14} This number is staggering when we consider that the food thrown away is greater than the Gross Domestic Products of Albania, Nepal, Cambodia, Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Mozambique, Laos, Niger and many others combined.\textsuperscript{15} Almost 40\% to 50\% of food ready for consumption never gets eaten, but gets thrown in the garbage. First World waste alone exceeds the needs of the Third World. This says a great deal about who is suffering from capitalism and who is not.

Here is a good piece of information from the Leading Light Communist Organization:

“The majority of the world’s population live on under $2.50 (USD) a day. Over 80\% of humanity, more than 5 billion, live on less than $10 (USD) per day. (2) The vast majority in the Third World live very differently than the working class of the First World. For example, the average working person in the United States has a white-collar job. He has an income of $32,000 (USD) or over $87 (USD) a day. (3) There are more people in India alone who make less than $0.80 (USD) a day than reside within the borders of the United States. (4) The working class of the First World often has more access to capital than the Third World capitalists, which explains how First World workers can obtain debt that is larger than the lifetime earnings of many Third World workers. This is because the ability to have large debt in the First World is a sign of wealth, of access to capital, not a sign of pauperization as it is in the Third World. Also, the average person in the United States lives in a house in a suburban setting, not in the destitute ghettos of megacities or in impoverished rural areas as
Maoism-Third Worldism

Third World peoples often do. (5) The working class of the First World has much more in common with their own bourgeoisie, culturally and materially, than they do with the average Third World worker scraping by on survival wages. The latter, not the former, is who Marx described as the proletariat, as only having their labor to sell, as earning nothing but enough to eat and work the next day, of owning nothing, as having nothing to lose but her chains.”

“Virtually all First World peoples fall within the top 20 percent of global income. Most of the world’s richest 20 percent are First World peoples. Almost every person in the United States, for example, falls within the top 15 percent. A person in the United States at the so-called “poverty line” is at the richest 13 percent globally. (6) The top 20 percent, which includes the entire First World, accounts for three-quarters of world income. This leaves only one-quarter to be distributed to the bottom 80 percent in, mostly, the Third World. (7) The
only way that the current income levels for First World peoples are maintained is through the imperialist exploitation of the Third World. The world economy is one that directs value flows from the Third World to the First World such that the First World as a whole benefits. The only way to maintain or expand current income levels in the First World is by maintaining these flows. This is going to be the case whether a regime in the First World calls itself socialist or not. In fact, many regimes, especially in Europe, have called themselves socialist or social democratic. None of these regimes sacrificed the income levels of their populations in order to redress Third World exploitation by the imperialists."16

The statistics speak for themselves and reveal a great deal about global inequality. How is this built? How is it maintained? The answer to this is imperialism. It is the violent enforcement of capitalism into the Third World for the benefit of capital. The capitalist class comes up with all kinds of excuses and justifications for military operations to be carried out against the
global poor. These justifications have taken many forms, overt racist nationalism under the Nazis, for Queen and Country under British colonialism and the War on Terror launched by the United States. In each of these cases the economics of capitalism require these efforts to be carried out. What is commonly left out of historical analyses of these events is how much the working class benefitted from them. The oppression and exploitation of these countries for the benefit of the Empire or the First world made many products cheaper, making them within reach of some of the poorest sections of the population. Much of the increase in the living standards experienced by European and North Americans comes from the advancements of plunder of less developed lands through violence.

There can be little doubt here that First World people are not the victims of imperialism. By far they benefit from the systemic violence that is carried out against the global poor. Even now the wages of First World workers are paid for out of the exploitation of the global poor. They’re paid above their contribution to the labour process receiving much more value than they actually contributed. It is clear even from this description that will be expanded upon later that the First World “working class” is no longer one. As the First World is a parasite on the Third World so are the First World “workers”.

The world has significantly changed since the time of Marx, Lenin and yes even Mao. Inequality has polarized differently than Marx expected. This does not mean Marx is wrong. His analysis was correct. His formula for how inequality grows is also correct. The end result of that analysis however, was not what he had predicted. Marx’s theories remain true to today, but not entirely as he proposed them. Class struggle remains as important today as it did as it did in the mid-1800s, albeit in a new form.
The purpose of this work is to examine the workings of global capital and explain how it has caused the world to polarize the way it has. Finance capital has more power now that it has had in any time in history. It dominates and determines industrial capital, which produces all of the commodities and generation of wealth we experience and make us interact with each other. We need to see truly who benefits and who suffers from this higher stage of imperialism.

**Lumpenbourgeoisie**

A term lesser known by those who lack a proper knowledge of Marxism is “lumpenproletariat”. This word was coined by Karl Marx describing a section of the working class that lacks the ability to achieve class consciousness and thus is useless for socially useful production. This term denotes people who have no use in revolutionary struggle due to their inherently strong anti-social mentality and behaviour. In Marxist theory this section of the working class is an outright hindrance to the development revolution making them an obstacle on the path towards the creation of a classless society. This term comes from a German word *Lumpenproletarier*, which translates to "miscreant" and "rag". The Marxist Internet Archive claims that, "this term identifies the class of outcast, degenerated and submerged elements that make up a section of the population of industrial centers. It includes beggars, prostitutes, gangsters, racketeers, swindlers, petty criminals, tramps, chronic unemployed or unemployables, persons who have been cast out by industry, and all sorts of declassed, degraded or degenerated elements. In times of prolonged crisis (depression), innumerable young people also, who cannot find an opportunity to enter into the social organism as producers, are pushed into this limbo of the outcast. Here demagogues and fascists of various stripes find some area of the mass base in time of struggle and social breakdown, when the ranks of the Lumpenproletariat are
enormously swelled by ruined and declassed elements from all layers of a society in decay." 17

Marx also provides a description of the lumpenproletariat in, "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon":

“Alongside decayed roués with dubious means of subsistence and of dubious origin, alongside ruined and adventurous offshoots of the bourgeoisie, were vagabonds, discharged soldiers, discharged jailbirds, escaped galley slaves, swindlers, mountebanks, lazzaroni, pickpockets, tricksters, gamblers, maquereaux [pimps], brothel keepers, porters, literati, organ grinders, ragpickers, knife grinders, tinkers, beggars — in short, the whole indefinite, disintegrated mass, thrown hither and thither, which the French call la bohème”. 18

In its use, Marx uses the term lumpenproletariat to describe a section of a class that made up the political power of Louis Bonaparte of France in 1848. In Marx’s theory, this lower and unrevolutionary section of the population was a force he used to bring himself to power without the full cooperation of the other two classes, the proletariat and bourgeoisie. His rise to power was a combination of their support and an adherence to the interests of the “finance aristocracy”. It is important to note that that finance capital did not have the power it did today. In fact, it was subservient to industrial capital to a large degree.

While the full meaning of what Karl Marx intended is still debated in some circles today, there is one thing we do know for sure: he meant the lumpenproletariat as a section of the working class that had no revolutionary potential whatsoever. This is a piece of his theory that many have seen as of lesser importance when looking at class structure. However, today with the new global class structure that has arisen, it has new meaning again.
In Maoism Third-World there is a term, the *Lumpenbourgeoisie* that describes the First World “working class”. This word was coined by Prairie Fire a member of the Leading light Communist Organization. Later on in this book we will discuss how First World workers are paid above their contribution to the creation of value. This situation makes them net appropriators of value. In a sense they exploit Third World workers because they receive the value that they generated in a way similar (but not the same) as how the bourgeoisie steal value from the working class. As the bourgeoisie do not contribute to the creation of value and merely take what the workers create, First World people take more than they should.

When I describe this I am referring to the appropriation of value by First World people that give them the superior living standards that makes them too privileged to be revolutionary. While First World people may not be like what Marx described, pimps, prostitutes or organized crime, they certainly lack the revolutionary potential necessary for revolution. Clearly we cannot call them proletariat because they are not the primary generators of value creation, yet we cannot call them bourgeoisie because they do not own the means of production. We can call them lumpen because they lack revolutionary potential. So we use the term Lumpenbourgeoisie to describe their superior class position and their absence of revolutionary potential.

**Are Poor Americans Really Poor?**

As we look upon the situation of the masses of the First World today we do see a rise in poverty among the global beneficiaries of imperialism. Each day more people in the First World receive less in income like part time work (or working poor), many are pushed out of production all together, some of which are even left homeless. When First Worldist Marxists attempt to justify
their position of claiming that the First World is exploited, they often cite a long held statistical fact that supposedly 45,000,000 Americans live in poverty. Now, according to the Bureau of the Census, 45 million people, or 14.5 percent of all Americans, lived below the poverty line last year (2013). The percentage of Americans in this poverty decreased from 15 percent in 2012, the biggest decline that has taken place since the year 2000. But the level of poverty is still higher than the 12.3 percent it was in 2006, before the Great Recession began.

Here are some facts put forward by the Census Bureau in their latest study *Income, Poverty and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2013*:

- Real median incomes in 2013 for family households ($65,587) and nonfamily households ($31,178) did not experience a statistically significant change from the levels in 2012.
- A comparison of real median household income over the past six years shows that income is 8.0 percent lower than in 2007, the year before the nation entered an economic recession.
The poverty rate for families fell from 11.8 percent in 2012 to 11.2 percent in 2013. The number of families in poverty declined from 9.5 million to 9.1 million over the same period.

In 2013, 5.8 percent of married-couple families, 30.6 percent of families with a female householder and 15.9 percent of families with a male householder lived in poverty. For married-couple families, both the poverty rate and the number in poverty decreased. Neither the poverty rates nor the estimates of the number of families in poverty showed any statistically significant change between 2012 and 2013 for other types of families.

But are these workers in America really poor? Poverty in the US is defined by family size. A single person under age 65 in the US was considered “poor” in 2013 if his income was below $11,490. For a family of four in 2013, the threshold for poverty was $23,834.

A full-time worker in the United States would certainly not count as poor because the minimum wage of $7.25/hour would give an income of $14,500 or so a year (this assuming an average 2000 working hours in a single year: 40 hours a week times 50 weeks a year). In a household of four people which included two workers and two unemployed persons (most likely children), total full-time income would be at least $29,000 (2 times $14,500), which is also above the US poverty line.

Part-time workers who work 33.7 hours per week are not even really all that poor. At the minimum wage that person is still receiving $12,216.25 a year.

What does being poor in America, even mean? What are we talking about here? What kind of material hardships do First World workers face? In 2005, the typical household defined as poor by the US government’s standards had a car and air
conditioning. For entertainment, the household had two color televisions, cable or satellite TV, a DVD player, and a VCR. If there were children in the home, the family had a game system, such as an Xbox or a PlayStation. In the kitchen, the household had a refrigerator, an oven and stove, and a microwave. Other household conveniences included a clothes washer, clothes dryer, ceiling fans, a cordless phone, and a coffee maker.

This is what First World people call “unfair”.

Can we really call this poverty in comparison to the Third World? Some of the poorest people in the US benefit from the plunder of imperialism that would make upper-middle-class people in Bangladesh envious. As greater and greater levels of value are taken from the Third World and shipped to the First, it provides more affordable luxuries for the poor. Compare this to the poverty faced by the global poor who often times don’t have clean water. Some in Africa have to walk 5 miles in order to get any water. Deaths from something as simple as diarrhoea are very common place. There can be no denial that these American workers benefit from imperialism, and that their “suffering” is absolutely incomparable to those they stand over in the global class structure. Global poor are subjected to incredibly high levels of violence that are unimaginable to First World people. As a matter of fact, much of the violence is carried out by the soldiers of the imperialist countries themselves.

I’ve often heard the claim that poor people in the US are “shadow people”. This means that they go ignored, that their plight falls on the deaf ears of the bourgeois media. They feel like no one is listening to their suffering and they feel marginalized. Do we not see the talking heads of the Democrats on the news go on about raising the minimum wage? It has dominated the American airwaves for years now. In what reality do we not see this? By comparison, we hear very little in the mainstream media about the abuses that go on in the third
World, often times in the very sweatshops owned by the capitalists who provide ad revenue for those same news programs. How can First Worlders claim to unheard?

I’ve often said on the social media site *tumblr* that complaining about a lack of privilege on a website dedicated to providing an outlet for it is a First World privilege. One they the users of it openly ignore.

**Why First Worlders Will Oppose Revolution**

Revolution is first and foremost based upon the material conditions facing the class attempting to liberate themselves. As Marx famously said it was those who only had their chains to lose. When we look at the global class structure we see that the First World takes in far more of the global value creation than it contributes to, and well by far what it needs. There can be no question of this, the Third World does without because the First World steals far beyond what it needs to survive, and what it deserves from its own labour.

When First Worldist Marxist organizations talk about a redistribution of value they mean taking from the bourgeoisie and spreading it around amongst themselves. This is the classical Marxist theory where the workers take back the value generated by their labour. However, we must consider where value is generated today. It is not generated in the First World; it is generated in the third. When they speak of redistributing value, they’re talking about redistributing what has been stolen from others. This is clearly not a real egalitarian redistribution. It does equalize wealth across the nation but does nothing to equalize it among the entire process of creation.

Imagine a group of thieves steal an enormous amount money and the mastermind of the operation keeps a majority of it. Now imagine the other thieves find this unfair and push out the
mastermind leaving him with nothing and distributing it evenly among themselves. Does any of this shift any money back to the victim it was stolen from? No, it doesn’t.

Let us now imagine a different scenario. Imagine at some point in the future the workers of the United States organize and by some miracle manage to overthrow the capitalist class and begin to create a socialist society. That entire struggle would have been based on getting more for the social product that was previously in the hands of the bourgeoisie. Sooner or later revolution after revolution takes place across the world. During the socialist egalitarian transformation of the world value begins to transfer back to the third World to begin to bring them up out of desperate poverty. There would be a sudden loss of value in the First World due to its centuries of plunder. Correspondingly, there would be a drop in the living standard of First Worlders.

When I talk about a drop in living standards for the First World I’m not referring to a growth in poverty. I mean the excessive consumption of the First World will come to an end: A new cellular phone every year, a new car every 3 years, gasoline whenever it is wanted, seemingly endless supply of cheap disposable commodities, 50% waste in food would come to an end. This would be impossible to keep if there was a proper global egalitarian redistribution of wealth. This cannot be denied in anyway:
Here we again return to what makes a class of people revolutionary, their material conditions. The First World revolution is based on collecting more, not less of the social product. Once the First World masses begin receiving less, they will begin to resist the revolution. Keep in mind we’re not talking about the advanced vanguard, we talk about the average everyday person who doesn’t have the global class consciousness that the vanguard party would have. This process of global wealth transfer would take decades, maybe as many as seven decades. During this time the privilege of the First World will decrease causing a ruckus among First Worlders that have been promised more.

During this time the First World masses would become restless, even angry at their drop in living standards from great excess to need. That is the whole point of revolution, from each according to his ability, to each according to his need. In this case it would be from each according to his excess to each according to their need. Since the masses don’t have the advanced class consciousness necessary, there will be rumblings of great discontent. Eventually the masses will demand that things go back to the way they once were because they were “better off”. By better
we mean they had more. As this contradiction between the First and Third World masses escalated, the people would begin turning towards reactionary groups and ideas in order to get back what they once lost. Before long you would have a counter-revolutionary force coming from the people themselves demanding that the revolution be undone. This is even assuming no outside imperialist forces would be working their disruptive magic intensifying the social situation via sabotage and subversion similar to what we see today via USAID in Cuba.

The material conditions will drive reaction and the death of the revolution and the vanguard. Marx was a materialist and he based his political economy and his theories on the material world. This is where we begin our analysis and the construction of our understanding of the world around us. It is also the primary factor in determining a revolutionary situation, not a revolutionary force, but an objectively revolutionary situation. One of Chinese Communist leader Mao Zedong’s contributions was a new perspective on revolutionary conditions. He saw that the conditions for workers and their position in society were not ripe for revolution. The error of failing to recognize this was the near extermination of the party. It was Mao, who led the Long march to the countryside where they determined that it was the peasants who were in an objectively revolutionary situation. Mao broke from Marxist dogma to recognize the real material conditions that lay before them. Mao’s work shows us that we have to break from the dogma handed to us from people who lived in different material conditions. We must also do the same.

**Marxist First Worldists Can't Fight**

Many groups in the First World today roar constantly about carrying out People’s War acting as though they are in a constant state of war. They portray themselves as these heroic champions that will lead the First World masses to victory in the
United States or Canada. The idea is really silly in the light of the actual stage in the development of the contradictions in the First World. We are clearly in no way even halfway to having the material conditions necessary to carry out People’s War. Sometimes their writings on People’s War walk the line between hopeful dogmatism and outright delusion. No one can claim that People’s War is going on in the United States or Canada, let alone anywhere in the First World. These people do not engage in physical combat against bourgeois state forces. I’d be a lot of money that the people in these groups do not even own guns.

Two groups that are particularly bad for this kind of People’s War fluff are the Revolutionary Communist Party of Canada (RCP-Canada) and the New Communist Party (NCP). Both of these groups are notorious for spouting such rhetoric, acting as though they’re engaged in warfare against the bourgeois state.

A section of the NCP a group called the Revolutionary Student Coordinating Committee is very bad in this respect. A member of theirs Tafadar Sourov has claimed that they are the leaders of the Maoist rebellion of New York. The idea is simply ridiculous, it was made during a heated exchange in which Sourov claimed to be a revolution when he and several others were arrested during a protest action in which they yelled at U.S. General David Petraeus at their campus at The City University of New York (CUNY). This is a common problem with First Worldist groups, worse among First Worldist Maoists. They genuinely believe that getting arrested for causing a public disturbance is revolutionary acts. We see this with White American activists often enough. As they engaged in what they call “struggle” they brag about how many times they’ve been arrested protesting as though this were some badge of honour. People of colour have no such self-aggrandisement; they fear being incarcerated due to the harsh treatment they face. Being White and in jail and going through the legal system is far different from being a person of colour. This is a luxury afforded people with privilege,
not just White but First World as well. If one is arrested for carrying out *actual* revolutionary activity, in say the Philippines, they stand a good chance of being killed. In fact a good percentage of them are killed actually committing revolutionary acts.

In another instance the RSCC has claimed that they are going to carry out People’s War in the United States. In moments of foolishness they’ve claimed that their campus will be used as a base camp for guerrilla struggle. I have a difficult time describing the level of naïveté that would be necessary to genuinely mean such a statement. The organization is full of revolutionary romanticism that is utterly gullible. Their Facebook pages are filled with what we call guerrilla porn, photographs of past revolutionary actions, people posing with guns next to slogans. None of these people know what guerrilla war is, many have never even fired a gun let alone own one. Aside from just these two examples, there’s much more that can be criticized of the RSCC.

The other group the Revolutionary Communist Party of Canada does things similar to the RSCC but not as badly. They describe themselves as an underground organization who keeps their membership secret due to fear of police repression. I’ve no doubt that they face such police attention. However the group acts as though they are currently engaged in war against the Canadian bourgeois state. No such thing is true. In reality the RCP has no influence and merely uses the plight of actually oppressed groups to promote themselves. Shamefully, they use the suffering of minority groups to “talk themselves up” as though they are the vanguard leading change. What they do is they go to LGBT events, First Nations resistance rallies and pose as the saviours of marginalized groups. They carry out no such action to defend such groups; they merely give boisterous speeches about how Maoist theory can help them when Mao wrote on no such thing.
The only actions they have taken are questionable. A front of the RCP gang attacked a Men’s Right Activist swarming him and beating him. While I certainly have no sympathy for MRAs, but the attack can hardly be counted as revolutionary. Merely swarming an unarmed man is not comparable to a guerrilla ambush against government forces carrying out a firefight to protect peasant farmers. In their mind it does count as revolutionary action they’ve certainly bragged about it as such. The idea is simply childish.

Despite their claims of supporting minority sections of the population their University of Ottawa front group’s leader advocated the use of violence against women in the struggle for transsexual rights. During the controversy over the transgender issue Deep Green Resistance supported the acts of violence carried out against females handing out environmental materials by biological males. Violence against women is not okay and it is not revolutionary.

Lastly, as I stated previously the group has a habit of leeching credibility off of other organizations. In one reoccurring display the RCP holds readings with representatives of the Maoist party of Afghanistan, declaring that they “stand in solidarity”. The statement is ridiculous considering the group doesn’t stand at all. The attempt to associate themselves with an actual revolutionary group in such a way that implies that they are partners, or equals, is wholly dishonest. It is a blatant attempt to claim they have credibility by leeching it off of the Afghani Maoists because they don’t have any of their own. They don’t engage in any revolutionary activity. They primarily conduct wrecking activity against other groups. Their theoretical works are not much different than Mao’s, except with the name China crossed out and Canada put in its place.

Both these groups claim to be revolutionaries, yet they do no such thing. They have websites where they roar about People’s
War, but engage in no such activity. At best they engage in wrecking activity. In Leading Light Communist terms they would be called “cowardly lions”.

“The Cowardly Lion roars about revolution, yet does little to actually aid revolution. The Cowardly Lion is a guerrilla pornographer, who has never seen combat — as though online posting of images and news clippings of far-off battles aids those struggles one iota. The Cowardly Lion spams photos of AK-47s on facebook, yet would not know how to aim one at 50 meters. The Cowardly Lion roars about people’s war, yet wrecks those who attempt to carry it out. The Cowardly Lion has no respect for those who actually have put their lives on the line, who have spilled blood or risked prison. The Cowardly Lion chooses to wave the red flag, even when waving the red flag undermines solidarity with Third World struggles. The Cowardly Lion chooses to preserve his own identity as a “communist,” he chooses himself, over effectively aiding Third World struggles. Obviously, the Cowardly Lion is not really leadership, communist, nor front-line fighting material, however, the Cowardly Lion won’t even get his identity dirty with anything as mundane as activism that might actually objectively aid Third World struggles, albeit in a minor way: CISPES-type work from the 80s and 90s, anti-militarism, etc. The Cowardly Lion’s ineffective roars are a transparent projection of his own inadequacies more than a real expression of solidarity. Some Cowardly Lions roar about the pigs, but then threaten to call them when confronted. Some harbor snitches and traitors. The Cowardly Lion roars about security, as though he has anything to hide, as though the state cares about his blog. Cowardly Lions tend to travel in packs.
“Cowardly Lions are mostly harmless. At most they wield influence only over those more cowardly or foolish than themselves. They won’t fight. They can invent lies or spread gossip, but they just don’t have the credibility to inflict any harm amongst those that matter. And those who matter already know or won’t care. Would we really want someone in our ranks who could be influenced by a Cowardly Lion? Even when they seek to wreck, their fangs just aren’t that sharp. The Cowardly Lions only become really dangerous when they feel they are backed into a corner. They will snitch if they are too afraid. Otherwise, the jesters jest.”

Cowardly lions are cowards who speak as though they are fighters of the cause while they merely roar and engage in wrecking activity. But why do they do this? Why do they think such childish actions constitute “struggle”?

I know where this revolutionary hopefulness comes from. A Canadian radical left activist Steven D’arcy puts the situation very well:

“In this sense, there has been a deep and broad collapse of what Marx called popular “self-activity” (“Selbsttätigkeit”) — a terrifying lack of self-organized struggles of broad masses of people for social and environmental justice. We lack, therefore, the expansive pool of social antagonisms and conflicts upon which the Left could in former decades rely for infusions of enthusiasm, critical insights about the nature of the systems we oppose and how to defeat them, and what Rosa Luxemburg called “the forward-storming combative energy” of broad popular movements.”

Once having said this he states that the “actually existing radical-activist Left” responds to this situation by digging in its heels
proclaiming that they have all the answers. In other words, they resort to dogmatism. They repeat already known slogans and analyses and tactics that have already proven not to work in better times, yet they expect it to in bad times such as these. They think they would work “if only people would listen.”

D’arcy instead of truly understanding he resorts to revolutionary optimism. He says, “When large-scale, sustained, and broad-based popular mobilization returns — as surely it must... [the] Left will be swept away and replaced in the same way that those of the 1950s Left were swept away and replaced in the 1960s.” He believes that the correct time will simply reappear and fix us so that we’ll be properly radical once again. This idea is false, he has already stated the correct one:

“The struggles on which alone the Left can base its regeneration will not come from the radical Left itself. But the Left itself has to cultivate a capacity to recognize them when they do appear.”  

The reason he/we do not recognize it is because it does not occur in our own backyard. Our current radical leftist analysis prevents us from seeing the reality of the world around us. The conditions for radical Leftist action are elsewhere. They are not here in Canada, the United States or the United Kingdom. They exist in the Third World. The current leftist analysis is to look around our own society and look for those antagonisms that perpetuate the conditions for revolution. Via his own words he has already admitted they are not here. “We lack, therefore, the expansive pool of social antagonisms and conflicts upon which the Left could in former decades rely for infusions of enthusiasm, critical insights about the nature of the systems we oppose and how to defeat them...”

People in the First World (with few minor exceptions) do not suffer from the global capitalist order. They in fact benefit from it. We are bought off by the luxurious First World life with the
value stolen by imperialism from the Third World. We afford countless frivolous consumer commodities due to that super-exploitation; we have wages inflated far above our actual contribution to the creation of value. We are net appropriators of value which place us in a superior (and antagonistic) class position above the Third World. Our lack of sufficient social contradictions is the product of our environment, our class position. We are afforded all the luxuries to distract us and afford us the ability to not care about those who really do suffer. (Information regarding the transfer of value from Third to First World is available, it’s not necessary to repeat here.)

Think about our First World mentality: Why is that First World people only protest and complain about the imperialist endeavours while the Third World physically fights it? Because they have to, they are being killed we are not. Marx said “the workers have nothing to lose but their chains.” Those being bombed by imperialism, those slaughtered at the hands of the US backed Free Syrian Army don’t have anything to lose. We in the First World have everything to lose, all of our privileges, all of our plunder, all of our comforts. That is why we are not radical, that is why we do not fight. The Third World has to strike back at us; our inaction does them no good. If we fail to stop our own countries the Third World will have to defend itself. That desperation will be grasped by many groups, not necessarily good ones. 9/11 and ISIS are prime examples of that. Radical Islam has taken the place of the radical Leftism that existed in these places before imperialism wiped them out.

D’arcy is right, “the Left itself has to cultivate a capacity to recognize them when they do appear.” They have appeared right before our eyes, just not physically in front of them. The inability to see the source of the lack of social antagonisms, the source of First World privilege and its corresponding global imperialist structure, blinds us from seeing that first world people are no longer the proletariat. First World people are no
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longer proletariat because first world people are not marginalized. The primary contradiction is acknowledged by Lenin and Mao as imperialism, a contradiction that we benefit from. Both Engels and Lenin saw the First World’s privilege. The oppressed masses of the third world are the proletariat now; they are the globally oppressed class. We have so much more to lose than our chains.

Because there is no revolutionary action in the First World, any small thing they do, they consider as revolutionary action.

Steven D’arcy is far superior to the RCP-Canada and the NCP his writings clearly show that he is under no such illusions of grandeur. While I wholeheartedly disagree with his First Worldist line, I commend his dedication to real analysis of the material conditions we in the First World face. I think this shows a real honesty on his part that many First Worldist groups lack.

First world peoples can’t fight because they are not in a combat situation. They wouldn’t know what they were doing because they only Cosplay guerrilla struggle. They do not exist in material conditions which provide revolutionary grounds. Instead, they carry out acts of revolutionary theatre and loudly roar as though they were real.

I know I’m not a revolutionary. I have said countless times that I am a person on the internet who lives in the First World. I try to spread ideas and educate people. I have no such delusional ego as demonstrated by the RCP-Canada and the NCP.

When Do First Worlders Fight?
There is the question as to when First Worlders will fight. We should not assume that there isn't one. According to Maoism-Third Worldism the masses are not revolutionary because they are net beneficiaries of global exploitation that gives them the
living standards high enough so that they have something to lose in revolution. From this we can obviously deduce that if the First World became so poor that they didn't have anything to lose from revolution they would become revolutionary. However, we should keep in mind that if the First World actually became as poor as the Third World then the imperialist benefit would have already ceased to exist. The contradiction between the First and the Third World would have already been resolved. This would leave us with a Marxism closer to perhaps Marx's time. Regardless, this is not the situation we face right now. We are standing before a moment in history where the contradiction between the two worlds is at its sharpest.

Aside from this unlikely scenario, there are other times when First Worlders are willing to pick up a gun and at least threaten to take the violence to the capitalist class and its soldiers, the police and military. In recent American history there have been a few individuals who have carried out violent acts against the U.S. government. Even fewer have even been able to inspire such rebellious acts.

Most obviously these acts were committed by right wingers who were rebelling against injustices against them real or imagined. I say this not as an attack upon right wingers, but as a matter of fact, when it comes to resistance to government authority. I'm not suggesting that right wingers are Marxist revolutionaries waiting to happen, I'm merely looking at who it is that has the potential to commit such subversive acts. We cannot possibly have an honest analysis of First World revolutionary potential unless we fully examine who it is that has reason to fight and who is willing to carry it out.

Most of the violent anti-establishment events of U.S. history were so-called "terrorist" attacks carried out by right wing separatist types. The reason why I place quotation marks around the word terrorist is because I think the term is highly contro-
versial and is subject to very vague definitions. The problem is that you never can nail down the definition of what a terrorist is, nor a terrorist act. Traditionally it has been defined as "a violent act with a political or social purpose." This easily defines professional militaries as well, it also includes every single war that has ever been carried out. We are going to disregard this term because we're interested in what drove them to commit the act and what they actually did. The legal definitions of their acts are irrelevant. We're also going to stick to recent U.S. history because we need acts in the context closest to what First Worlders face now.

The most notable incidents include: The Oklahoma City Bombing in 1995 and the Posse Comitatus series of anti-government killings. These are the biggest, but there have been numerous smaller groups of killings that have occurred since these events.

In 2014: Tallahassee Police Ambush, Las Vegas Police Ambush, Kansas Jewish Center Shooting, Blooming Grove Police Shooting.

In 2012: Tri-State Killing Spree, St. John's Parish Police Ambush, Sikh Temple Shooting.

"The Posse Comitatus (Latin, "force of the county") is a loosely organized, far-right, social movement whose members spread a conspiracy-minded, anti-government and anti-Semitic message in the name of white Christians to counter what they believe is an attack on their social and political rights.

"Many Posse members practice survivalism and played a role in the formation of the armed citizens' militias in the 1990s. The Posse Comitatus pioneered the use of false liens and other types of paper terrorism.

"Developing strong ties to the white supremacist Christian identity movement, they believe themselves to be the true Israelites, chosen by God, and they state that the Jews sought to
help Satan to destroy civilization, and undermine white citizens' rights by means of the Federal Reserve and the Internal Revenue Service.

"Posse charters were issued in 1969 in Portland, Oregon, by Henry Lamont Beach, "a retired dry cleaner and one-time member of the Silver Shirts, a Nazi-inspired organization that was established in America after Hitler took power in Germany." William Potter Gale has been described by one expert as the founder of the movement.

"Posse members believe that there is no legitimate form of government above that of the county level and no higher law authority than the county sheriff. If the sheriff refuses to carry out the will of the county's citizens:

""...he shall be removed by the Posse to the most populated intersection of streets in the township and at high noon be hung by the neck, the body remaining until sundown as an example to those who would subvert the law."

On April 19th, 1995 Timothy McVeigh and Terry Nichols carried out the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in downtown Oklahoma City. The explosion destroyed or damaged 324 buildings inside a 16-block radius, destroyed or burned 86 cars, and destroyed windows in 258 nearby buildings, costing at least $652 million in damages. Around 168 people were killed and injured more than 680 others. McVeigh was caught within 90 minutes of the explosion by an Oklahoma State Trooper in a traffic stop. He was originally held for driving without a licence and for possessing illegal weapons.

According to his manifesto he believed the government had too much power and was interfering in people's lives. He questioned the hypocrisy of the U.S., particularly surrounding the Iraq disarmament crisis. He said:
"The administration has said that Iraq has no right to stockpile chemical or biological weapons ("weapons of mass destruction") — mainly because they have used them in the past.

Well, if that's the standard by which these matters are decided, then the U.S. is the nation that set the precedent. The U.S. has stockpiled these same weapons (and more) for over 40 years. The U.S. claims this was done for deterrent purposes during its "Cold War" with the Soviet Union. Why, then, is it invalid for Iraq to claim the same reason (deterrence) with respect to Iraq's (real) war with, and the continued threat of, its neighbor Iran?"28

Other criticisms concerning overreaching government power include the handling of the Waco, Texas incident and the Ruby Ridge incident in 1992.

In all of these incidents there is a few common themes. One in particular is a heavy emphasis on individual liberty, or in other words "to be left alone." This kind of hyper-individualism is prevalent among right wing groups. Keeping government out of people's personal lives when they believe that it is too intrusive. They have a deep reverence for the ideas put forward by the Founding Fathers. Commonly there is a fetish for the freedom and/or right to own firearms. Another good example is the recent standoff between the Oath Keepers and other militias against the FBI and Bureau of Land Management at the Bundy Ranch. Their whole purpose for being was defending Cliven Bundy's perceived right to use government property without compensation for it.29 30 He had this militia stand behind him even as he was in court resisting paying taxes. During the Ferguson, Missouri riots against the lack of justice over police killings they attended with the goal of protecting business
owner's property. Their priority is fully in line with that of the Founding Fathers, life, liberty and property.

Other groups have irrational fears of people being from another religion, another country or another race. Often they volunteer to patrol the border with Mexico to prevent illegal immigration. Many others are great believers in conspiracy theories that surround some kind of elite that are attempting to control their lives. This takes all kinds of forms like Jews, bankers, global cartels or other such forms of nonsense. Xenophobia and conspiracy theories or an irrational hate is a trade mark of how they think and what they believe.

What does this say about the willingness of First World people to fight? It says they are unwilling to pick up a gun for anything but their own persecution complex. All of these people chose to fight based on a perceived injustice against them personally. They saw no injustice committed in general, they were unable to see past themselves. Some of these perceived persecutions are based on nothing more than their own ignorant hate. People like some of these larger militias believe that Muslims are taking over the country, the idea is simply ludicrous. These ideas have strong roots in religious oppression. Hutaree militia is absolutely certain that there is a genocide against Christians coming where all decent God fearing people will be herded into FEMA camps where they will be killed Auschwitz-style. Others are of the New World Order variety who believe in a massive secular conspiracy of the same kind. When we look at them, we all see what they have in common: They believe someone or something is against them personally, they are hyper individualists.

If we take a step and a bit and look at their plans for survival, we see that same hyper-individualism that cares nothing for people in general. At most from looking at U.S. militia manuals we see their plans only include a very small group of small select
individuals. Of course personal survival is important, even a decentralized resistance. The point I'm making here is that there is no overall plan for defeating the "enemy" and building the society they claim they are trying to protect or bring. There is no consideration made in the overall because that is not the point. They only care about their own narrow individual self-interest. As a result, they offer nothing but mindless violence based on largely religious extremism.

When First World people are willing to fight it is only for themselves. They are not willing to fight in a struggle to liberate everyone. They rigidly adhere only to themselves. My point here is that there are no significant numbers of leftists willing to fight in the First World. The vast majority outright reject violent struggle, and those who claim they do are mostly feigning interest in it. Even if they were to fight their numbers would be so small they would have no significant impact. Those same right wing militias who are terrified of a conspiratorial Satanic, Islamo-fascist government would immediately ally with it (or just cheer it on) against any leftist group that attempted to challenge the capitalist order.

What about the rest of the right wing? In the U.S. alone the amount of right wingers vastly outnumbers left wingers. (Of course I am speaking about real left wingers, the Democrats and their supporters cannot be counted as leftists.) There is another moment when they will fight; when they engage in the imperialist wars. When that same government they don't trust tells them to fight just about any country in the middle east - based on some of the most superfluous of lies - they are the first to jump on board to begin fighting. Appropriately enough, they find the courage to fight when on the side of imperialism. When their interests are threatened, they are fully willing to lay it all on the line. Ironically, they are willing to fight in the name of the country, even though it is a form of collectivism, which is the opposite of what they're supposed to believe in. But it seems if
they recognise a common interest in U.S. supremacy they can cooperate. It does seem though that First Worlders are more willing to fight with imperialism than against it. I guess it's easier standing on the side of the imperialist war machine than against it.

Any perception that a First Worlder has the ability to stand on the side of the exploited Third World masses in physical combat is nothing short of adventurist-idealism. We must accept the poisonous and reactionary nature of the First Worlder if we are to have an honest analysis of the global class structure.

Useless First World Leftist Struggle
On the other end, we must accept what passes for the struggle for leftists in the First World. It is obviously not real struggle, it can in no way even begin to compare to what rightists in the First World are planning, and have even already carried out. When they do "struggle" they have extremely liberal tactics that essentially challenge nothing and are often outright reactionary themselves. The primary cause of this is their comfortable liberalism that allows them to not have to engage in a serious struggle.

One good example is offering a bottle of water that will donate 10¢ from every purchase to helping build wells in Africa. It's already a fact that the First World uses 95% of the clean water. This paltry amount does nothing to challenge the wasteful consumption of First Worlders that hoards this water away from those in desperate need of it. Starbucks offers "fair trade" coffee that promises to help develop the impoverished farmers. All this does is increase the cost somewhat so that some money can go to developing their communities. Meanwhile the super profits exploited from the farmers that causes the problem to begin with goes unchallenged. These are nice little concessions that can make them feel good about themselves as they are a part of
the exploitative imperialist machine. It reduces struggle to a selfish individual feeling good as opposed to struggling against the injustice.

When we see the left (or rightly called liberals) in the First World advocate for struggle, what do we see? A very common tactic, or should say the primary tactic is "conscious consumerism". The idea here is that if people simply make "ethical" choices in consumption, then the global pyramid of exploitation would simply cease to exist and be replaced with a more "fair" system. Of course, such an idea is purely utopian. Besides, what do they consider to be "fair" anyway? In most liberal viewpoints, it is merely more "equality". This is an extremely vague term that can vary greatly from person to person. They still wish to preserve their privileged position in the First World, because we know what would happen if there was a global equality. What liberals actually advocate is "feel good capitalism" or "conscience pleasing capitalism." In other words, only enough to make them feel better about the unjust privilege and power they wield over the Third World. They feel guilty because they know they have more comfortable lives, cheaper commodities and higher wages due to Third World exploitation. They don't want any redistribution of wealth, they want a nice comfortable program that can alleviate their conscience from having to acknowledge what a brutal murderous inhuman system they participate and ultimately support. Yes, the liberal doesn't advocate the end of capitalism, the source of all this suffering, they only wish to appease their guilt in what they think is their role in it. To them the true brutality of capitalism is on the heads of the capitalists themselves and that they are just minor cogs in the imperialist machine. The truth is their consumption patterns and profit motive drive the global capitalist order just as much as those of the capitalists. All they struggle for is enough to wash their own hands of responsibility, just make different consumer choices. Choose the "fair trade" products so that way, whatever exploitation that remains is not "their fault", but the fault of
some capitalist somewhere. In other words an unwillingness to truly struggle. They only wish to liberate their own selfish conscience. Can we say these people have revolutionary potential? No, in fact their ideas of "struggle" essentially keeps people from engaging in actual struggle. This is what is reactionary about it. it not only doesn't liberate, it prevents liberation.

First Worldist Marxists operate in a very similar way. They still believe that they have a revolutionary potential. In their minds, they are capable of overthrowing a system, many of them are even deluded enough to believe that peaceful change is possible via democratic reforms. The reason they think as much is because they are not in a revolutionary situation facing the sharpness of the contradiction that has reached its apex. When we look at the Black masses of the U.S. we see a very different picture. Much more of them recognise the need to have a violent overthrow of the system. Why? Because they feel the sharp end of the contradictions, much more acutely than middle and lower-class White people who don't suffer the racist aspect of class society as well. In other words, they don't suffer the worst that the First World has to offer because they receive the benefit of that same racist society. While there may be some revolutionary potential among the Black masses, their numbers are too small to achieve revolution. I think we should keep in mind that even if the Black masses did rise up, White American would be very happy to see the capitalist state's repressive apparatus come down on them.

A First Worldist Marxist often has the perception that they are not included among the exploiters or even beneficiaries of imperialism because they oppose it. They say "I'm against imperialism", which they are, but never acknowledge that they are a part of it. Part of what makes them inherently un-revolutionary is their conscience clearing ideology. If they are against it they don't see themselves as participating in it.
Subconsciously they are pacified into rejecting revolutionary action because they don't believe they benefit from it. Now combine that with the fact that they don't suffer from it either. This alone is enough to explain further why the First Worldist Marxist doesn't have revolutionary potential.

This is also why they very often fall for conscious consumerism. If they can't do real struggle they report to reactionary fake "struggle".

A Basis for Third Worldism in Past Marxist Writings

Many First Worldist Marxists scoff at the idea that maybe Marx or Lenin might have suggested a precursor to Third Worldism. Some would deny that they would ever hold such a position or think that First World people might be not be revolutionary. In fact, Engels and Lenin have quite a few letters where he describes certain privileged countries have very little in the way of a proletariat. Here I will place some quotes that show there is a basis for Third Worldism.

Frederic Engels, October 7, 1858 "Letter to Marx":

"The English proletariat is actually becoming more and more bourgeois, so that the ultimate aim of this most bourgeois of all nations would appear to be the possession, *alongside* the bourgeoisie, of a bourgeois aristocracy and a bourgeois proletariat. In the case of a nation which exploits the entire world this is, of course, justified to some extent."

Frederick Engels to Bebel August 30, 1883:

"Do not on any account whatever let yourself be deluded into thinking there is a real proletarian movement going on here. . .
"And--apart from the unexpected--a really general workers' movement will only come into existence here when the workers are made to feel the fact that England's world monopoly is broken.

"Participation in the domination of the world market was and is the basis of the political nullity of the English workers. The tail of the bourgeoisie in the economic exploitation of this monopoly but nevertheless sharing in its advantages, politically they are naturally the tail of the "great Liberal Party.""

V. I. Lenin, Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism:

"The export of capital, one of the most essential economic bases of imperialism, still more completely isolates the rentiers from production and sets the seal of parasitism on the whole country that lives by exploiting the labour of several overseas countries and colonies."

V. I. Lenin, "Notes for Lecture on 'Imperialism and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination':"

"300-400 million out of 1,600 are oppressors."

V. I. Lenin, "Speech on the Terms of Admission to the Communist International July 30":

"Crispien went on to speak of high wages. The position in Germany, he said, is that the workers are quite well off compared with the workers in Russia or in general, in the East of Europe. A revolution, as he sees it, can be made only if it does not worsen the workers' conditions 'too much'. Is it permissible, in a Communist Party, to speak in a tone like this, I ask? This is the language of counter-revolution. . .The workers' victory cannot be
achieved without sacrifices, without a temporary deterioration of their conditions. We must tell the workers the very opposite of what Crispien has said. If, in desiring to prepare the workers for the dictatorship, one tells them that their conditions will not be worsened 'too much', one is losing sight of the main thing, namely, that it was by helping their 'own' bourgeoisie to conquer and strangle the whole world by imperialist methods, with the aim of thereby ensuring better pay for themselves, that the labor aristocracy developed. If the German workers now want to work for the revolution they must make sacrifices, and not be afraid to do so.

"To tell the workers in the handful of rich countries where life is easier, thanks to imperialist pillage, that they must be afraid of 'too great' impoverishment, is counter-revolutionary. It is the reverse that they should be told. The labour aristocracy that is afraid of sacrifices, afraid of 'too great' impoverishment during the revolutionary struggle, cannot belong to the Party. Otherwise, the dictatorship is impossible, especially in West-European countries."

V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, "On the Tasks of Revolutionary Social Democracy in the European War":

"The conduct of the leaders of the German Social Democratic party, the strongest and most influential party belonging to the Second International (1889-1914), which voted for the military appropriations and which repeated the bourgeois chauvinist phrases of the Prussian Junkers and the bourgeoisie, is a direct betrayal of socialism. Under no circumstances, even assuming the absolute weakness of the party and the necessity of its submitting to the will of the bourgeois
majority of the nation, can the conduct of the leaders of the German Social Democratic party be justified. This party has in fact adopted a national-liberal policy."

V. I. Lenin, "Preliminary Draft Theses on the Agrarian Question":

"The industrial workers cannot accomplish their epoch-making mission. . . if they . . smugly restrict themselves to attaining an improvement in their own conditions, which may sometimes be tolerable in the petty-bourgeois sense. This is exactly what happens to the 'labor aristocracy' of many advanced countries, who constitute the core of the so-called socialist parties of the Second International; they are actually the bitter enemies and betrayers of socialism, petty-bourgeois chauvinists and agents of the bourgeoisie within the working-class movement."

COMINTERN: The Communist International: 1919-1943 Documents:

"The communist parties must bear in mind that while every bourgeois government is a capitalist government, not every workers' government is a really proletarian government, that is, a revolutionary instrument of power. The Communist International must consider the following possibilities:

"1. Liberal workers' governments, such as there was in Australia; this is also possible in England in the near future.

"2. Social-democratic workers' governments (Germany).

"3. A government of workers and the poorer peasants. This is possible in the Balkans, Czechoslovakia, Poland, etc."
"4. Workers' governments in which communists participate.

"5. Genuine proletarian workers' governments, which in their pure form can be created only by the communist party.

"The first two types are not revolutionary workers' governments, but in fact coalition governments of the bourgeoisie and anti-revolutionary labour leaders."

Mao Zedong, A Critique of Soviet Economics:

"In the various nations of the West there is a great obstacle to carrying through any revolution and construction movement; i.e., the poisons of the bourgeoisie are so powerful that they have penetrated each and every corner. While our bourgeoisie has had, after all, only three generations, those of England and France have had a 250-300 year history of development, and their ideology and modus operandi have influenced all aspects and strata of their societies. Thus the English working class follows the Labour Party, not the Communist Party.

"Lenin says, 'The transition from capitalism to socialism will be more difficult for a country the more backward it is.' This would seem incorrect today."

Mao Zedong, More On the Differences Between Comrade Togliatti and Us:

"Revisionism represents the interests of the labour aristocracy, and hence also the interests of the reactionary bourgeoisie. Revisionist trends run counter to the interests of the proletariat, of the masses of the people and of all oppressed people and nations. Ever
since the days of Bernstein, Marxism-Leninism has been repeatedly assailed by revisionist and opportunist trends, each in its day stirring up a commotion. But history has confirmed that Marxism-Leninism represents the highest interests of the largest number of people and is invincible."

Mao Zedong, Contradictions in the Contemporary World:

"Without support from the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and people of Asia Africa and Latin America, it will be impossible for the proletariat and the people in capitalist Europe and America to free themselves from the calamities of capitalist oppression and of the menace of imperialist war. Therefore, the proletarian parties of the metropolitan imperialist countries are duty bound to heed the voice of the revolutionary people in these regions, study their experience, respect their revolutionary feelings and support their revolutionary struggles. They have no right whatsoever to flaunt their seniority before these people, to put on lordly airs, to carp and cavil, like Comrade Thorez of France who so arrogantly and disdainfully speaks of them as being 'young and inexperienced'. Much less have they the right to take a social-chauvinist attitude, slandering, cursing, intimidating and obstructing the fighting revolutionary people in these regions."

Lin Biao, "Long Live the Victory of People's War!":

"Taking the entire globe, if North America and Western Europe can be called the 'cities of the world,' then Asia, Africa and Latin America constitute 'the rural areas of the world.' Since World War II, the proletarian revolutionary movement has for various reasons been temporarily held back in the North American and West
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European capitalist countries, while the people's revolutionary movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America has been growing vigorously. In a sense, the contemporary world revolution also presents a picture of the encirclement of the cities by the rural areas. In the final analysis, the whole cause of world revolution hinges on the revolutionary struggles of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples who make up the overwhelming majority of the world's population. The socialist countries should regard it as their internationalist duty to support the people's revolutionary struggles in Asia, Africa and Latin America."

Premier Zhou Enlai, Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars, China! Inside the People's Republic:

"Chairman Mao tells us that one must rely on one's own efforts. We cannot impose on you, nor can you just mechanically copy from us. You can see the American youth are gradually raising their political consciousness. According to our experience, it is always intellectuals who start out, because it is easier for them to accept revolutionary theory, and revolutionary experience from books. But for the movement to succeed you must go among the workers, because in the United States the working class is the great majority of the people, and the peasantry is quite small. And so to do that, you must go into them deeply. We have only our experience, but we are not at all well acquainted with your situation. So that must depend upon your own efforts..."

"Self-reliance proceeds from independence, and taking the initiative in your own hands. Yes, one must go through some arduous process."
Conclusion
From here we can see there is significant evidence, if not outright proof, that the First World lacks any real revolutionary potential. The bare truth is that First World workers are not proletarian due to their privileged position in the global class structure. Or in another way: In revolution they have much more to lose than their chains.
Chapter 4
Capitalism's Structural Need for Imperialism
The Origins of Imperialism

Despite much protestation to the contrary imperialism is entirely driven by the profit motive of the largest of capitalists in the First World. This by no means suggests that the same wouldn't happen to capitalists in what we call the Third World. If they achieved such a privileged position in the global order they would carry out the same inhumanities. It stems entirely from the profit motive itself and not any supposed advantageous characteristic, or virtue. There is no denying the link between the profit motive and the global drive for conquest. In no empire in history has there ever been the annexation of territory that wasn't driven by wealth. Without these, there is no purpose in conquest as it becomes a useless drain on the economy, as it drives towards its destruction.

Imperialism arose out of the contradictions in the production process and the realization of value in the market place. As the markets began to fill up with all the products available, new markets were needed in order to keep selling, in order to be able to sell more. These markets are often hindered by geographical locations. One set of capitalists carves out a territory for themselves where they can defend their collective interests. From this position they institute a state and declare their sovereignty and establish a state to deal with all the contradictions they face among them. Other capitalists carve out their territories and proceed to create their own state. Eventually capital expands to its national border and can expand no more unless it violates that very boarder.

Here is where the wars come into place. As is often the case, the capitalist doesn't just want to expand the market, they sell too; they need to expand it. When an industrial capitalist faces a situation where they experience something like a falling rate of profit, one solution is to open up to selling more units. There are, of course, other measures they can take, like the mechanization of labour, planned obsolesce, etc. Regardless, the
opening up of new markets has a multi-fold benefit. It allows the capitalist to sell more than it could before, it opens up access to cheaper resources and lower labour costs. Overall, the opening up of new markets is most advantageous for the capitalist. Since the capitalists already control the state, it's quite willing to carry out its wishes, especially if it means an increase in the economy. Sometimes it means greater profits for themselves if they have money invested in the proper industries. (One only has to look so far as George Bush's and Dick Cheney's connections to Halliburton and the Carlyle Group.)

What makes imperialism a continuous phenomena, is the fact that it is not enough to simply conquer a territory, one must also control it. Imperialism itself causes so very many contradictions, including in the country which is occupied. The demand for low cost labour places pressure on the occupied society to press down wages causing increasing poverty. This increases tensions between the working class and the state which is controlled by the imperialists. Sooner or later that pressure will manifest itself into an anti-imperialist struggle which threatens the imperialist order in the country. A popular movement will begin to rise, making certain demands for liberation and fairness. The harder the people struggle against imperialist occupation the harder the imperialists will try to suppress it. During this ever increasing pressure, guerrilla movements or civil wars can break out. When, in the imperialist context, another large global power may begin funding the movement or sending them weapons leading to a colossal loss of life. It is from here inter-imperialist conflict can arise. A good example would be the increasing tensions between China and the U.S. in Africa as both of them are making their way through the continent looking for all the imperialist plunder their hearts desire.

This is a relative description of how imperialism manifests. It does not necessarily proceed from this beginning or even reach this particular end. The flow of events can have ebbs and flows
that toss the anti-imperialist tide back and forth. In some cases the imperialist power can utilize certain local repressive measures in order to keep the population of the occupied country under control.

In Saudi Arabia, the U.S. uses the local Shari'a religious law to keep the population pacified. The logic is that if you're resisting the law you're essentially resisting the will of God, which is unacceptable and is culturally manipulative. In Ukraine right now the U.S. is perpetuating an ongoing civil war in order to preserve its imperialist benefits. A popular movement ousted the president of the country, leaving many different local groups to start scrambling for power in the resulting vacuum. The U.S. obviously knows its interests are threatened and thus begin backing whoever will ally themselves with them in order to main-tain their grip. Unfortunately (or appropriately enough) the U.S. has chosen to back White supremacist extremists. Due to the very nature of Ukraine itself, there is an ethnic and language divide as well. The local Russian population doesn't want to be under Nazi or U.S. control and would rather ally themselves with Russia right next door. This gave Russia an excellent opportunity to expand their imperialist interests into Ukraine via the ethnic Russians (and a rather good dose of Soviet nostalgia). From here we can see how the current tensions between Russia and the United States have come into the public spotlight. We can only guess where this situation will go.

We now remain glued to the television, or our favourite internet news source for updates as the situation between the two imperialist powers unfold. The truth is here, by the sheer "virtue" of the profit motive and the resulting contradictions of capitalism, we may potentially see another terrible world war in our lifetime. We have to face this insanely destructive possibility because one person said, "this is mine, you can't have it," and proceeded to build an entire economic system of exploitation, brutality and war for profits.
Why the Capitalists Created the Modern State

In order to truly understand the global imperialist order and how imperialism functions, we must go right back to the beginning and how it all started. Imperialism is the result of capital needing to expand beyond its borders. In past times, there was colonialism which was similar. However, in our modern era this takes on an entirely different form given the developments in the productive forces and the evolution of capitalism itself. Since imperialism is the capitalist class wielding the state for their own collective interests against other capitalists in other countries, we need to understand their relationship to the state. How does the capitalist gain control of the state? Did the capitalists create the modern state? This provides us with the jumping off point to understanding imperialism itself: the capitalist and the state.

Private property by its very nature is an exclusive ownership of something. At some point a piece of land was declared to be one person's own property which no one else had the right to even touch. The same goes with objects such as tools, a process and other things. The very basis is that one person has the exclusive right to that object or land which excludes anyone else from having any right to it. Capitalism is a system of commodity production for trade and sale. This presupposes the fact that the thing produced or traded (the commodity) has no use for the person who created it, otherwise they would not be engaging in exchange with it. This all creates "property relations" which in some past historical systems did not exist. For example, in tribal societies everyone was free to move as they please, there was no boundaries declared by someone who claimed they had an exclusive right to it. Relations between people at this time was a pooling of labour power to create all the necessities of survival. The creation of private property breaks up this communal life and morphs human relations into commodity exchanges. The exchanges of the products we need to survive.
Private property creates a certain set of social relations and social bonds between people and the property they own. This social relationship has to be recognised in order for ownership of property to be legitimate. This same relationship is also extends to businesses and corporations which have legally (under the law) the same rights as persons. This relationship between people and the property they own, forms the basis for all bourgeois societies, their social structure, their laws and legal doctrines which protect it; and their concept of human rights. In fact, all of bourgeois society revolves around the social bond between individual human rights and private property as it forms the center of almost all contractual based governments.

For private property to exist, there must be legal authority and legal system which exists to provide the basis for property ownership. There has to be a state in order to create and enforce the ownership of private property via laws and the enforcement of contracts; and the juridical right to challenge them. The existence of private property depends on some kind of central authority to give it a legal basis. If this doesn't exist, anyone can claim anything and every claim is as equally valid because neither "authority" has any basis for being considered legitimate over the other. To imagine a capitalist world devoid of a state is nothing short of utter nonsense.

The whole point of capitalism was to take away property from being a common use for anyone, and making it one person's property (or any legal equivalent to a person). This common lack of ownership, making it available to anyone to use are called usufructuary rights. The destruction of usufructuary rights in near totality, meaning the destruction of common ownership is necessary for private property and capitalism to exist. This is what began the basis for the creation of capitalism into a massive global system of individualised private property rights and exchange. A state is the basis for that entire system to function with capital circulation and accumulation.
For private property to exist, or exist as a process, it must be definable, nameable and identifiable. Usually this takes the form of land registry, or a patent registration. This process of claiming ownership extends into the realm of the bizarre. Knowledge can be considered intellectual property and can have the state enforce it, preventing people from using it, or even knowing it in the form of a confidentiality agreement. As I write this, corporations are in court fighting over who owns the very building blocks of life. DNA strands and sequences are becoming property, that can be declared to be property. The very essence of life itself, think about that.

An individualized property state is what capitalism is all about, and surplus value and money could not operate the way it does without it. However, this necessity is fraught with contradictions like all things in capitalism. These contradictions create antagonisms that give drama to the process that is capitalism. These are inherently irresolvable because private property cannot exist without a state, yet the state can hinder private property. There is no resolving this contradiction, no matter how much right wing libertarians, or "anarcho"-capitalists claim to.

One such contradiction is the necessity of a state to protect the freedom to use such property, while at the same time also places restrictions on its use. The same codified law that protects the right to private property also hinders the free use of it, so that it doesn't disrupt the rights of others to use their private property. Since private property requires a legal definition of a person in order for it to operate, it essentially creates a culture of individualism that arises at the same time as the increase in commodity exchange and the development of money to from the nature of the capitalist state. These rights have to be enforced by a state which has a monopoly on the legitimate use of force. Anything that threatens the individualized private property regime is also dealt with by the state and its use of force. The state must use violence to protect
individual property rights, rights that are within the context of a free market system. That centralized power is essentially used to sustain a decentralised private property system. The utopian belief in absolute free individual free based on a "fair" system of ownership is nothing more than a fiction of ignorance.

There are other problems in the free market of exchange that forces the state to go beyond its role of just merely preserving private property. For example, the maintenance and construction of public necessities, like highways, garbage pickup, education and healthcare. These services are vital and require a great deal of attention and maintenance in order to keep many aspects of the capitalist society functioning. Without highways, for example, the ability to move commodities across the country becomes limited. In addition, resources must be allotted to defend these pieces of property and assets. This comes out as police and military, etc. All these aspects require a state with a certain amount of power to handle all these requirements. It also requires a corresponding taxation as well.

Another very important job of the state is the management of the various sections of the population that are in contradiction with each other. The battle of Democrats and Republicans alone is a good indication of this, despite the fact that they really represent different sets of interests among the ruling class. Of course, these interests are also among the population as well. People want to be able to see a doctor, thus they back the "Obamacare" platform; as well as the insurance and medical supply companies that stand to gain from it. On the other side, you have Republicans that ignorantly decry this as socialism as a section of the population and businesses don't want to pay it in taxes. There are other contradictions as well. We have hostility between races right now with the killings of young Black men going without justice or punishment, like with Michael Brown. We also have an increasing antagonism between the economic top and bottom of U.S. society: the First World poor and the
financial aristocracy. To do this, there needs to be an illusion of democracy where various elected representatives can be appointed by popular vote to try and mitigate these societal antagonisms. These representatives are, of course, entirely determined by the capitalist class who support candidates and whose support a candidate cannot run without. A good deal of mechanisms are needed to navigate these difficulties, welfare programs are needed to keep the lowest of the society from violently lashing out against the capitalist class and to prop up demand, police to suppress uprisings, or just protest. The point of the state and its democratic mechanism is to try and keep as much social cohesion among these different groups while preserving the freedom and liberty of property ownership. In the U.S. this has had much success in pacifying the population into a dull stupor via false promises of hope and change combined with celebrity culture as distraction.

Markets face problems themselves, which can best and sometimes only be addressed by state intervention. Despite what many theorists have propounded, the market can and does fail from time to time. Any notion that capitalism is inherently infallible is simply facetious. Another important aspect is how to handle externality effects, the costs of a market society operating that no capitalist is willing to take on themselves. These are very real costs that are not registered on the market. A good example is industrial pollution, the erosion of the quality of water, air and soil, which the industrial capitalist does not pay for, (nor does he have to live with the effects of). In addition, there are positive and negative externalities that require, and people even demand, collective action to tackle. The exchange-value of housing is a good example. Investment or the lack of investment in a particular house or neighbourhood has an effect on the exchange-value on nearby homes and neighbourhoods. Houses too close to industry can make the home undesirable vastly decreasing its exchangeability. Great noise or pollution provides a large disincentive to purchasing a home. Traditionally,
this has been handled by creating zoning permits for various types of construction.

The majority of the population, which have any sense of reason conclude that there needs to be state intervention to solve these problems which require collective action. As a result, they accept that the resolution, or handling of such issues requires the state to place restrictions on, and hinder the liberty and freedom to do whatever you want with your property. The centralized power of the state must be used to mitigate the problems that arise as a result of decentralized property ownership. This is the necessary contradiction that exists because of the very nature of private property.

The monopoly on the legitimate use of force has existed in capitalist and pre-capitalist societies, which were also based on the exclusive and near exclusive ownership of property. Because of this inevitable aspect of the permanent marriage of the state and private property, the state has always and will always become caught up in war making. These capitalist states exist within the context of a global capitalist system of competition, exploitation, and competing economic interests. Because of these competing interests, states end up having to engage in diplomatic negotiations and global strategizing which is bound up with engaging in geopolitical opposition. These actions seek to gain power, wealth and resources from areas of the world in which a particular capitalist class has no access or any claim. War has always been known as diplomacy by other means. It's also essential for capitalists who want and need to expand their sphere of power and profits. Many of the capitalists in a single state have a collective interest in the carrying out of a domination of another territory, for more wealth, influence, etc. The influence and territory controlled by capitalists must be expanded and they are willing to use the state to do so.
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For the state to carry out such activities, it requires an enormous amount of resources including tax money. As a result of this, entire industries have appeared to facilitate it. Armament companies invest in war production using the research and development done by the Pentagon in the U.S., for example. This also drives the creation of the war economy that we see in the U.S. right now. Many liberals and others believe the reason the wars are carried out is because of the war industry, and that it supposedly has too much power. To them, imperialism is the result of a war economy, a corruption within the government that makes war happen. In truth, it is the other way around, capitalism needs to go to war. It is capitalism itself that creates a state for war and then produces an industry to profit off of it.

This is made manifest today with the Bush/Cheney connections to Halliburton. The oil companies that have funded campaigns, weapons manufacturers under the Carlyle group who stand to profit billions from the imperialist conquest that is going to happen anyway. In centuries past, British conquest was heavily influenced by a link between the state and London merchant capitalists. The merchants gained leverage by funding the war machine via the creation of the Bank of England, the country's central bank.

Source: Washington Post
Despite all this power over the state, the capitalist class's control over it is far from perfect. The more democracy that is made available, the less autocratic power the capitalist class can wield over the public. The democratic mechanisms must remain in place or the facade of capitalism will fail. This creates some breathing space for the public to make some decisions over the operation of the economy and the country. Popular movements can sometimes gain power within a society that end up curtailing the rights of private property which hinders the capitalist class. Labour unions can pop up and make demands and struggle against capital forcing some concessions. In the end, the capitalist operates within a legal framework that hinders its operation; but that it cannot survive without. This is why we end up with political struggles in public where people battle over ideas and talking heads in the media go out and spread propaganda. This drives the longstanding feud between Republicans and Democrats, the competing interests been capitalists navigating the political landscape of demands by the public. No matter what, in the end, the capitalist has no choice but to accept that the state is necessary, or his system will fall apart.

Expansion of Capital Beyond its Borders is Inevitable
There is one particular aspect (or contradiction) in capitalist accumulation that plays a major part in the promotion of imperialism; it's the difficulty between the production of value and the realization of it in the market. This may sound strange to those not educated in Marxist economics, often they have a view that value is subjective and always exists and/or doesn't exist. They will, however agree that a capitalist cannot collect value unless a commodity is sold on the market. This part of that contradiction is where expansion via imperialist conquest comes in; the need for profitability and thus the creation of the conditions necessary for it.
Two things must occur in order for profits to be realized in surplus-value. First, it must be generated by labour, and then that value has to be realized in the marketplace. These are absolutely essential if capitalism is to function. Profits collected are essentially the measure of the efficiency of this process. This is the very heart of capitalism itself and how it functions. If at any time this flow of capital ceased, the system would go into crisis. We should not forget, however, that these two phases in the circulation of capital stand in a contradictory unity.

There is always a great struggle taking place over who keeps the value generated by the workers. The capitalist is always trying to maximize profits while lowering the compensation received by those workers as much as possible. The workers are always trying to collect as much of that value as possible in various ways, like striking for higher wages. The capitalist is always trying to get the worker to bear as much of his reproduction cost as possible. Usually this goes into all kinds of tricks and methods the capitalist class uses. Unemployment for example, creates the reserve army of labour, so workers can be exchanged quickly, essentially manipulating the labour market in their favour. This battle cannot be resolved as the capitalist cannot make profits without workers working. The workers can, however, do without the capitalist. So as long as capitalism exists, we have an irresolvable contradiction that lays the foundation of the system itself: in the creation of value: worker vs. capitalist.

The capitalist class must always have some form of disciplining labour, some kind of coercive force that keeps the working class in check so that its demands do not threaten their interests too much. One of those methods (as I said previously) is unemployment. So long as there is a section of the population that is marginalized from work, there is someone who is at work that can be replaced if they demand too much. We know from the law of supply and demand alone, that if there was full employment the workers would have near absolute power, as
they could make any demands they want; because capitalists would be forced to compete with each other for their labour. Unemployment on the other hand, alleviates this weakness by keeping the supply of labour greater than the demand for it. If there was no unemployment, then the capitalist class would have to create it. This fact of capitalism alone has been the driving force behind two phenomena:

1. A reduction in the need for labour accomplished by the mass mechanization of production; or in Marxist terms lowering the organic composition of capital.\(^{34}\)

2. The opening up of new supplies of labour that are of an even lower cost to greatly increase the pool of unemployed. This has particularly been the case of the NAFTA\(^{35}\) agreement with Mexico; and the shifting of manufacturing to China with its reforms that have been taking place the last three decades.

The capitalist class must, in all possible ways, use every means they have to prevent and suppress all collective struggles by the working class against their profit motive, their collection of the surplus-value. This is another reason why they struggle so hard to keep regular people from exercising any influence over the state; to keep them from exercising any political power. The working class is at a severe disadvantage here, money is a representation of social value, thus the power of society itself. Since the capitalist class (particularly the financial aristocracy) have the lion's share of the money, it is them who wield the power over the state.

Thus, we see that the capitalist class needs to open up access to new markets for just the labour alone. There are of course other benefits. Here is where the diplomatic and the coercive mechanism of the state comes in for the needs of the capitalist class. Their demands can sometimes be made peacefully as with
the case of China, where you have a faux-communist party willing to sell its own people to foreign capital.

In other cases, you have a state that is willing to stand up for its own capitalist nationalist interests. Saddam Hussein was a good example of this. He resisted US demands placed upon Iraq, particularly with regards to the purchase of oil. Right before the Iraq War began, Saddam started selling oil in Euros instead of the U.S. dollars it had traditionally.\textsuperscript{36} Saddam refused to cooperate and instead undermined U.S. interests in favour of Iraq's. This is when false claims of "Weapons of Mass Destruction" and links to the events of 9/11 started being circulated in the media. There is much of the same that was done in Afghanistan.

Another example of this was the NAFTA agreement with Mexico. Despite any claims to the contrary, the agreement was highly disapproved of in Mexico. It was so unpopular because it required the government to rewrite the constitution itself. The document which details the very rights that were won via the Mexican Revolution had to be altered. The primary change was the elimination of the 27\textsuperscript{th} article which guaranteed land distribution to the poor.\textsuperscript{37} This seizure of land from the poor is what lead to the Zapatista uprising of the indigenous Mayan population; who were and are still the poorest of the population.\textsuperscript{38}

These are only examples from recent history. If we go further back we will find many more examples encompassing many other countries and competing interests.

All of this is bound up with another aspect of the contradiction between production and realization of surplus-value. The fact is the wages of worker's are the primary source of money for the purchasing of the commodities the capitalist sells. As the wages of workers decreases, their ability to purchase those commodities also decreases. Unemployed workers can't buy
commodities unless they are given subsidies via welfare programs. But even these are not a real demand, they are paid for out of taxes collected from capitalists and other workers. The misconception by bourgeois economists here, is that they mistakenly believe that unemployed workers (the reserve army of labour) is a growing aggregate demand. It is not, any more than the idea that decreasing wages is the base for an expanding market.

Here, we can go back to the words of Marx:

"The workers are important for the market as buyers of commodities. But as sellers of their commodity – labour power – capitalist society has the tendency to restrict them to their minimum price. Further contradiction: the periods in which capitalist production exerts all its forces regularly show themselves in periods of overproduction; because the limit to the application of the productive powers is not simply the production of value, but also its realization. However, the sale of commodities, the realization of commodity capital, and thus of surplus value as well, is restricted not by the consumer needs of society in general, but by the consumer needs of a society in which the great majority are always poor and must always remain poor."

This problem of effective demand is also an aspect of the capitalist need for imperialism. This balance can be dealt with numerous ways. One way is to increase the consumption of a strata of the population that is not actively engaged in production. Raising the salaries of non-productive people like lawyers, doctors, state officials, people involved in education and the military. The bourgeoisie themselves can be great consumers of luxury goods. But this consumption can only go so far. Another risky tactic is to extend credit to the realization and productive end. Workers can purchase commodities on credit to
pay back at a later date. This same credit is given to capitalists for the production process. All of this leads to values and surplus-values being bridged before their creation. Credit is a representation of value like money, but it can be extended ahead of the actual creation of value. The contradiction we see between production and realization is shifted to money and different value forms. This has been very useful to capitalism, which has gotten it through several hard times. This extension is what drives a lot of speculative activities; mortgages are a perfect example of this.

The price of homes goes up as more and more people buy them, the market is reacting to demand. But all of it is based on credit, a value form that exists ahead of the realization of value in the form of worker's wages. This means there may very well come a time when those wages do not equal the quantitative level of the credit value form. Meaning, workers don't earn enough in wages to pay off all those homes. During this time people have speculated on these homes using credit, which makes the disaster all the worse. The same happens with consumer credit. To keep up demand for consumer goods, credit card companies give credit for purchases ahead of the actual collection of necessary value in wages. In other words, workers can spend their value (wages) before they even receive it. From here we can see how credit allows capitalism to function through difficulties, but lays the basis for instability and crisis.

To give us a bit of an idea, we'll look at income and outstanding total consumer credit right before the Great Recession of 2008:
We should keep in mind that this income also went to all the necessities that the population requires as well. Now we will compare this to the credit that was outstanding:

Now we get a bit of a better sense of what I was talking about. This is by no means comprehensive and details everything that
was going on at this time, but it does give us some indication about how things were.

One method is to have production and realization occur in different sectors of the economy. Luxury goods usually follow this method. A minimum wage worker produces gold trinkets in a semi-mass producing facility. That commodity is then sold to a high income crowd taking in a far greater degree of value than was necessary for compensation to the worker. To put it another way: buy low labour, sell high commodity. This trick obviously doesn't work and cannot work for an economy as a whole, only certain smaller sectors of industry. In the overall, wages are still the primary source of value for purchasing the commodities produced.

The most successful way to handle the contradiction between the production and realization of value has been the neo-liberal movement that has been around for a few decades. This movement is what has given tremendous profit making power to Wal-Mart and Apple. The exporting of labour jobs to China (and other places) is not just about creating a larger reserve army of labour, it's also about drastically smaller wages and lower cost resources. Chinese steel is a good example, its low cost and high production accounts for 50% of the world's steel supply. \(^40\) What WalMart and Apple does is, they shift the production and realization of value geographically, to two different sectors globally. The production of value takes place in a low labour cost region like China, and then it is sold in a higher wage earning regions like the First World. This has a very important effect of shifting enormous amounts of value globally. Doing this has given WallMart and Apple what are known as "super-profits".

In this global transfer of value, these two companies can gain tremendous power over their competitors in the U.S. by being able to undersell them. It is difficult and expensive to get production facilities set up overseas, if you're a small business
it's impossible. Being able to do this has allowed WalMart to be able to undersell and destroy small businesses leading to their domination. They don't end it there with consumer commodities either. This cheap labour supply and capital domination has spread into optometrist services, hair styling, consumer credit cards, and in Canada, even walk-in medical clinics.

When this neo-liberal imperialism moves into a country, or rather, takes over a country, this is its specific aim. Everything it does is directed towards creating these conditions from foreign capital. As proof of this, we need look no further than what the international Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank prescribes for developing nations. This same prescription applies to any country that has co-opted by imperialism as well. It is called the "structural adjustment program".

These are examples of the typical demands that are placed upon an impoverished country (often recently conquered) in order for them to receive any much needed aid:

- Balance of payments deficits reduction through currency devaluation
- Budget deficit reduction through higher taxes and lower government spending, also known as austerity
- Restructuring foreign debts
- Monetary policy to finance government deficits (usually in the form of loans from central banks)
- Raising food prices to cut the burden of subsidies
- Raising the price of public services
- Cutting wages
- Decrementing domestic credit.

Long-term adjustment policies usually include:

- Liberalisation of markets to guarantee a price mechanism
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- Privatization, or divestiture, of all or part of state-owned enterprises
- creating new financial institutions
- Improving governance and fighting corruption
- Enhancing the rights of foreign investors with regard to national laws
- Focusing economic output on direct export and resource extraction
- Increasing the stability of investment (by supplementing foreign direct Investment with the opening of domestic stock markets)

Everything here is designed specifically for the purpose of making foreign investment more profitable. The destruction of state owned enterprises allows the services they provide to be bought up by transnational corporations, particularly public utilities like energy and water. A breaking down of trade barriers that protect local producers allow heavily subsidized foreign food to dominate the market as in the sad case of Mexico. It has all kinds of effects like making the labour supply greater from ruined farmers and greatly increased impoverishment; creating a greater dependence on foreign companies that come in to exploit. All of this is done to create better conditions for the capitalist in the production of surplus-value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>Own-account workers</th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Unpaid/ contributing family workers</th>
<th>Not Classified/ members of producer’s cooperatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>9020.1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5568.7 (includes employers)</td>
<td>2762.3</td>
<td>2682.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>8070.2</td>
<td>192.8</td>
<td>3078.9</td>
<td>2455.8</td>
<td>2361.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>6929.1</td>
<td>159.7</td>
<td>2600.5</td>
<td>2361</td>
<td>1807.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6806.4</td>
<td>232.2</td>
<td>2792.1</td>
<td>2235.9</td>
<td>1543.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: International Labor Organization.
This is the basis for First and Third World countries.

**Capital in Command!**
The needs of capital grow often requiring more and more state controls to keep the system of private appropriation firm, both economically and politically. The market can be regulated well enough through simple mechanisms. Political stability is a far greater danger to capital accumulation. Social unrest can cause entire industries, and indeed entire countries, to go into crisis and end up unprofitable. Here, more than ever, the state is required to enforce that stability, to ensure profitability. It is no coincidence that the greatest expressions of freedom in history were also the most costly for capital and its accompanying class, be it capitalist or feudal. True freedom, freedom from the domination by the private property owning class is the real path towards the liberation of humankind.

No matter what the bourgeoisie propagate to us, the capitalist class with the power of capital calls the shots in society and holds all of the social power via the accumulation of said capital; and money which is a representation of the social value generated by society. The top of the hierarchy is the capitalist class, they make the rules and they control the oppressive arm of the state apparatus. To truly be against domination, fascism is to be against capitalism itself.

Capitalism claims to be an expression and supportive of freedom, yet any fair analysis of history can show you why this is wrong. The only free man in the bourgeois society is the bourgeoisie, the private property owner, the accumulator of capital. Even the greatest philosophical defenders of capitalism itself proclaim that the owning of property is the hallmark of freedom. By their logic, of course, tribal society in which private property didn't even exist must have been the most brutally
oppressive of all. If one doesn't have property, they are clearly not free.

This ridiculous and ideologically inconsistent view of freedom as being something that can only be contained within the social relations of property ownership, is rooted in individualism. This individualism is taken to an absurd degree by notable Austrian economists and renowned sociopathic ideologue Ayn Rand. In their view, one must be in an absolute individualistic stance in order to be free from the supposed tyranny of other people existing. The basis is the rejection of collectivism which they see as a totalitarianism and fascism. This concept is absurd and flies in the face of known history. It is also tremendously hypocritical given that capitalism is a system of collectivism in the production of society's social values, yet it is individual ownership of that value. Capitalism is a system of the individuals stealing the product and value produced by collectivism. In their thinking they believe that individualism and collectivism are mutually exclusive. They most certainly are not. Despite their objections to Karl Marx's writings, they never answer his demonstration that they are part of the same whole.

“The transformation, through the division of labour, of personal powers (relationships) into material powers, cannot be dispelled by dismissing the general idea of it from one’s mind, but can only be abolished by the individuals again subjecting these material powers to themselves and abolishing the division of labour. This is not possible without the community. Only in community [with others has each] individual the means of cultivating his gifts in all directions; only in the community, therefore, is personal freedom possible. In the previous substitutes for the community, in the State, etc. personal freedom has existed only for the individuals who developed within the relationships of the ruling class, and only insofar as they were
individuals of this class. The illusory community, in which individuals have up till now combined, always took on an independent existence in relation to them, and was at the same time, since it was the combination of one class over against another, not only a completely illusory community, but a new fetter as well. In a real community the individuals obtain their freedom in and through their association.

"Individuals have always built on themselves, but naturally on themselves within their given historical conditions and relationships, not on the “pure” individual in the sense of the ideologists. But in the course of historical evolution, and precisely through the inevitable fact that within the division of labour social relationships take on an independent existence, there appears a division within the life of each individual, insofar as it is personal and insofar as it is determined by some branch of labour and the conditions pertaining to it. (We do not mean it to be understood from this that, for example, the rentier, the capitalist, etc. cease to be persons; but their personality is conditioned and determined by quite definite class relationships, and the division appears only in their opposition to another class and, for themselves, only when they go bankrupt.) In the estate (and even more in the tribe) this is as yet concealed: for instance, a nobleman always remains a nobleman, a commoner always a commoner, apart from his other relationships, a quality inseparable from his individuality. The division between the personal and the class individual, the accidental nature of the conditions of life for the individual, appears only with the emergence of the class, which is itself a product of the bourgeoisie. This accidental character is only engendered and developed by competition and the struggle of individuals among themselves. Thus, in
imagination, individuals seem freer under the dominance of the bourgeoisie than before, because their conditions of life seem accidental; in reality, of course, they are less free, because they are more subjected to the violence of things. The difference from the estate comes out particularly in the antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. When the estate of the urban burghers, the corporations, etc. emerged in opposition to the landed nobility, their condition of existence — movable property and craft labour, which had already existed latently before their separation from the feudal ties — appeared as something positive, which was asserted against feudal landed property, and, therefore, in its own way at first took on a feudal form. Certainly the refugee serfs treated their previous servitude as something accidental to their personality. But here they only were doing what every class that is freeing itself from a fetter does; and they did not free themselves as a class but separately. Moreover, they did not rise above the system of estates, but only formed a new estate, retaining their previous mode of labour even in their new situation, and developing it further by freeing it from its earlier fetters, which no longer corresponded to the development already attained.

"For the proletarians, on the other hand, the condition of their existence, labour, and with it all the conditions of existence governing modern society, have become something accidental, something over which they, as separate individuals, have no control, and over which no social organisation can give them control. The contradiction between the individuality of each separate proletarian and labour, the condition of life forced upon him, becomes evident to him himself, for he is sacrificed from youth upwards and, within his own
class, has no chance of arriving at the conditions which would place him in the other class.

"Thus, while the refugee serfs only wished to be free to develop and assert those conditions of existence which were already there, and hence, in the end, only arrived at free labour, the proletarians, if they are to assert themselves as individuals, will have to abolish the very condition of their existence hitherto (which has, moreover, been that of all society up to the present), namely, labour. Thus they find themselves directly opposed to the form in which, hitherto, the individuals, of which society consists, have given themselves collective expression, that is, the State. In order, therefore, to assert themselves as individuals, they must overthrow the State.

"It follows from all we have been saying up till now that the communal relationship into which the individuals of a class entered, and which was determined by their common interests over against a third party, was always a community to which these individuals belonged only as average individuals, only insofar as they lived within the conditions of existence of their class — a relationship in which they participated not as individuals but as members of a class. With the community of revolutionary proletarians, on the other hand, who take their conditions of existence and those of all members of society under their control, it is just the reverse; it is as individuals that the individuals participate in it. It is just this combination of individuals (assuming the advanced stage of modern productive forces, of course) which puts the conditions of the free development and movement of individuals under their control — conditions which were previously abandoned to chance and had won an independent existence over
against the separate individuals just because of their separation as individuals, and because of the necessity of their combination which had been determined by the division of labour, and through their separation had become a bond alien to them. Combination up till now (by no means an arbitrary one, such as is expounded for example in the Contrat social, but a necessary one) was an agreement upon these conditions, within which the individuals were free to enjoy the freaks of fortune (compare, e.g., the formation of the North American State and the South American republics). This right to the undisturbed enjoyment, within certain conditions, of fortuity and chance has up till now been called personal freedom. These conditions of existence are, of course, only the productive forces and forms of intercourse at any particular time."\textsuperscript{43}

The state under capitalism must always preserve the physical and philosophical basis of capitalism: the preservation of private property and the promotion of individualism, or "the cult of the self". When placed in the context of global imperialism, we get a much more vicious manifestation. The imperialist doesn't care one iota about the occupied people. They have no real vote anyway. This is quite different from the property domination at home, which is given a nice veneer of "democratic" cover. It doesn't take a historian to see how true this is when we look at what imperialism has done.

A good example of this complete disregard for people in preference for property under imperialism, is the Iraq War and subsequent occupation. After the immediate combat of the war the country was left in tatters, in many areas, even large cities, there was a great deal of lawlessness. Crimes out of desperation were rampant due to the total destruction of vital infrastructure and loss of employment. At one point looting began A particularly large target was the Baghdad Museum, which held
some spectacular relics of the past, beautiful cultural treasures. Looting destroyed much of what was there. During this tumultuous time the irrigation ministry which controls the water for vital crops was burnt down. However, the U.S. military, the occupiers spent not one drop of resources protecting these buildings. Right next door to the irrigation ministry was the oil ministry which was heavily protected. According to one Associated Foreign Press report: "The imposing building in the Al-Mustarisiya quarter is guarded by around 50 US tanks which block every entrance, while sharpshooters are positioned on the roof and in the windows."44

What was the priority here? Was it the preservation of culture? Was it the preservation of the organization of the production of food? No, the only thing the imperialists had as a priority was the protection of the oil, the very commodity they entered into the war for. Again, we see here very clearly one of the contradictions of capitalism, the contradiction between use-value and exchange-value. For the masses of people, the food that would have been protected, the cultural treasures that would have been saved, would have been great. The U.S. military saved what had the most exchange-value, the oil that made great profits. The value of selling oil was much greater than the need of people to eat. This is the epitome of profits over people. This is merely one small example, we could go into many others, but this will suffice to make our point.

Freedom cannot be expressed under the domination of capital. It is only through the elimination of capitalism that people can truly be free.

It's All Interconnected
You cannot separate capitalism from the state. To claim capitalism doesn't cause imperialism is to claim that capitalism can be separated from the state, and that competition and the
profit motive are detached from the desire for war. You can't, they are all bound up with the same force: capitalism itself. There can be no peace so long as capitalism exists, not between nations, not between the competing interests of various groups in the world.

True freedom from this barbarism comes from the uniting of all humanity under a single banner of Marxism as the guide to building a world without hate, poverty, and war. As long as we remain divided over petty notions such as national superiority, racial superiority, gender superiority, we will never be free. Until the tyranny of capitalism has been crushed, there can be no true liberation for the oppressed masses of the Third World. Any attempt to claim that capitalism is not the driving force of imperialism should be taken as nothing less than an attempt to keep the global order which keeps the majority of humanity in misery. Capitalism is not the way forward, it is the way down to create depths of inhumanity and despair.

"[...] Imperialism emerged as the development and direct continuation of the fundamental characteristics of capitalism in general. But capitalism only became capitalist imperialism at a definite and very high stage of its development, when certain of its fundamental characteristics began to change into their opposites, when the features of the epoch of transition from capitalism to a higher social and economic system had taken shape and revealed themselves in all spheres. Economically, the main thing in this process is the displacement of capitalist free competition by capitalist monopoly. Free competition is the basic feature of capitalism, and of commodity production generally; monopoly is the exact opposite of free competition, but we have seen the latter being transformed into monopoly before our eyes, creating large-scale industry and forcing out small industry, replacing large-scale by
still larger-scale industry, and carrying concentration of production and capital to the point where out of it has grown and is growing monopoly: cartels, syndicates and trusts, and merging with them, the capital of a dozen or so banks, which manipulate thousands of millions. At the same time the monopolies, which have grown out of free competition, do not eliminate the latter, but exist above it and alongside it, and thereby give rise to a number of very acute, intense antagonisms, frictions and conflicts. Monopoly is the transition from capitalism to a higher system.

"If it were necessary to give the briefest possible definition of imperialism we should have to say that imperialism is the monopoly stage of capitalism. Such a definition would include what is most important, for, on the one hand, finance capital is the bank capital of a few very big monopolist banks, merged with the capital of the monopolist associations of industrialists; and, on the other hand, the division of the world is the transition from a colonial policy which has extended without hindrance to territories unseized by any capitalist power, to a colonial policy of monopolist possession of the territory of the world, which has been completely divided up."\(^{45}\)
Chapter 5
Theories of Imperialism
Imperialism Evolves

Lenin is regarded as the greatest architect of imperialist theory, and his theories usually form the basis for all others. So I think going over his view of imperialism is a good place to start when we are looking at the contending theories. The point of Marxism, particularly as it relates to imperialism, is that it's ever evolving and changing. Imperialism today is not the same as it was during Lenin's day. Nor is it the same as it was during Mao's day. One of the biggest failures of Marxists in our time is the outright refusal to acknowledge this fact. Right now, Marxist-Leninists refuse to accept that imperialism today is different than it was during Lenin's time.

People who hold on to Marxism-Leninism are insisting that the world is still the same as Lenin described it. The world has grown, the capitalist system has evolved. Lenin's theory of reoccurring World Wars is no longer correct. It was correct during his time because of the stage of development imperialism was in. Today we clearly see there has been no Third World War. Competing national capitals no longer exist in the way they did during Lenin's time. It is no longer a world of competing multi-polar imperialist financial capitals. Coming out the Second World War, the United States obtained a dominant hegemonic role in the global economy. The Soviet Union was its only competitor, which as we see now, no longer exists. We have a unipolar imperialist world. The U.S. stands largely unopposed. Sure, China has a rising influence, but it does not have anywhere near the power that U.S. imperialism does. This alone demonstrates that Lenin's theory of reoccurring World Wars is now out of date.

When one considers himself a Marxist-Leninist, he is saying that the world has not changed in a hundred years. When we even think of this for even a second we know it's not true. The world has massively changed since the early 1900s. Just as it has changed since Marx's day in the mid-1800s. Imperialism wasn't even the same during the era of Maoism (1950s-1970s). Even his
Maoism-Third Worldism

ideas surrounding it are now out of date. Neo-liberalism alone has changed imperialism. Mao theorized about anti-colonial struggle. But we no longer live in the colonial era; we live in the neo-colonial era. Military force and literal physical occupation aren't necessarily required to keep a country under U.S. domination.

The era of Marxism-Leninism is over, the era of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is over. The wave of revolution guided by the correct ideology of Marxism-Leninism basically died out after the Second World War with the reorganizing of the world. The wave of revolution guided by the correct ideology of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism died out in the early 1970s when Mao went revisionist. What is left now are stragglers in the Third World who have yet to make any significant gains. In the first world, Maoism is an outright farce. We've got college running around pretending to be doing People's War without ever having fired a shot. Even worse, we've got college kids claiming that a backyard of a member's home is a 'base area'.

These waves of revolution are over. The eras of Leninism and Maoism; these waves of revolution have been defeated. We do not go forward by trying to repeat the past. We go forward put putting forth a new science based on the conditions we face today. Simply repeating formulas that have already failed to bring global revolution is the opposite of science, it is dogmatism. To hold the theories of Lenin and Mao as untouchable, things that cannot be improved upon, is nothing less than ignorant cultism. When we refuse to let a theory evolve, we are no longer doing science, we are doing religion. If we assume that the words of Marx, Lenin, and Mao are completely universal and must be a universal truth, we are spitting in the face of science. When we think of another science say, physics, do we do the same? Isaac Newton made great contributions to physics. Some of his ideas were proven untrue by knowledge gained since his time. From there we got Albert
Einstein and quantum physics. Where would we be if we said the latter two were wrong because Isaac Newton said otherwise? That would not be science at all. If we acknowledge that Marxism is the science of revolution, we do it a disservice by claiming Lenin and Mao's theories are infallible and are universally applicable.

We must acknowledge that the past two waves of revolution are over. Marxist thought has stagnated into liberal democratic reforms. It has degenerated into online forums that do nothing. It has degenerated into college kids running around claiming to be revolutionaries that have no connection to the public whatsoever. It has degenerated into Trotskyist groups advocating racist imperialism against the third world. Marxism-Leninism and Marxism-Leninism-Maoism are dead. A new wave of revolution must be forged by putting forth a fourth stage of revolutionary science. Anyone who does not acknowledge this is a fool.

**Vladimir Lenin's View of Imperialism**

To Lenin and all other communists, imperialism is the inevitable result of capitalism given its need to infinitely expand and its tenancy to concentrate into monopoly. Lenin formulated that financial capital was becoming ever more integrated with industrial capital. One of his main points was that the parasitic nature of financial capital was taking over industrial capital. As we have seen from the passage of history this is so; industrial capital has become the product of financial power. As capital concentrated it constrained aggregate demand levels. Increased levels of productivity went along with this decreased ability to consume, creating a kind of overabundance that could not be absorbed by the local working population. This lack of demand meant a falling rate of profit as greater numbers of commodities were left in warehouses and shelves unsold. It was this crisis
wreaking havoc upon the economy and causing increasing concern on the part of the capitalist class. A break occurred in the circuit of capital, the contradiction between the production of value and its realization took place. The value of commodities was produced, yet it was not realized via sale.

This lead to an overall falling rate of profit that seriously threatened the capitalist's sustainability. The only way to alleviate this was to expand the market further and incorporate either a lower cost production, lower cost raw materials, and/or increase the market in which to sell commodities. A larger market means more potential buyers. It was also required to open up new markets so that capitalists may invest returning capital in order to keep the circuit going; which perpetuates increased profits for the capitalist which increases his power. In the end, requiring the market to expand even more.

"As long as capitalism remains what it is, surplus capital will be utilised not for the purpose of raising the standard of living of the masses in a given country, for this would mean a decline in profits for the capitalists, but for the purpose of increasing profits by exporting capital abroad to the backward countries. In these backward countries profits are usually high, for capital is scarce, the price of land is relatively low, wages are low, raw materials are cheap. The export of capital is made possible by a number of backward countries having already been drawn into world capitalist intercourse; main railways have either been or are being built in those countries, elementary conditions for industrial development have been created, etc. The need to export capital arises from the fact that in a few countries capitalism has become “overripe” and (owing to the backward state of agriculture and the poverty of the masses) capital cannot find a field for “profitable” investment."46
In other words, it is necessary for capital to encroach upon the territories around it. This is a key point here: it is necessary. In Lenin's view, it compels the financial capitalists to use their control over the state to force open these new markets by wielding its coercive arm. In other words, the capitalist class requires the state to go to war against some country or another under some kind of pretext. This pretext, is the political cover justifying the sacrifice of state funds and the lives of working class people in war. All manner of justifications have been used, what they are is not important here; what is important is that they are made in order to get as much of the population to go along with it as possible.

With the war and its justification under way the capitalist is now looking for the saving grace of his profits. Here the life preserver is set up according to his particular needs. Once a territory is captured the capitalist class moves in and begins their profiteering. One aspect is the utilization of the occupied people as a low cost source of labour to produce commodities. Second, the exploitation of raw materials in order to decrease a good portion the constant capital cost of production. Third, there is usually the creation of an elite class in the occupied country, that become consumers of expensive commodities that are brought in from the imperialist core. (This local elite can manifest as local bourgeoisie and/or the comprador class.\(^{47}\)) Fourthly, and possibly most importantly, an undermining of the industry of the occupied nation. This destroys their local economic power, forcing the nation to become dependent upon investment from the imperialist nation. Combined, all these aspects break down the occupied nation to a level of economic weakness that forces it to become subservient to the imperialist power.

The end goal, the purpose of all of this is to drain value from the occupied country and sent it to the imperialist core. It is the enrichment of one country at the expense of another to
overcome the limits of capital. This is the economic and military conquest of a nation. Sometimes this doesn't require a military intervention. The funding of certain political parties is usually enough to obtain influence in order to achieve these aims. This kind of political manipulation is primarily carried out by right wing parties. They are the ones that usually advocate the deregulation of the economy, advocate selling off state assets, removing trade restrictions and allowing foreign capital to move into the country.

In this act of imperialism, there are two important phenomena that take place which are key to our analysis here:

Firstly, a great surplus is created which allows for the formation of a class within the imperialist core to develop ahead of others, the formation of a so-called "middle class" who receives a greater material life (more wages, more benefits) than others in the imperialist nation. We call it the "labour aristocracy", a strata of the working class population, which becomes rigidly loyal to the imperialist country's capitalist class. They arise as a force that seeks to protect capitalism, and as a result protect the capitalist because they would lose all those benefits. This even happens in the occupied country, an elite forms at the service of foreign capital. They too have a benefit in keeping the occupation going.

Secondly, there is an intensification of imperialist rivalry as various imperialist powers end up competing with each other for the occupied nations, or "spheres of influence" to use a more common phrase. As these imperialist nations (a collective capitalist class interest) begin competing with others there is a rise in nationalism. The working classes in each of the contending nations adhere to their country more rigidly and pronounce its right or virtue in what it does. This is one reason why patriotism skyrockets during war time. This abundant nationalism has a neutralizing effect against the inherent class
antagonism in the imperialist country. The working class begins to align with its capitalist class exploiting it in order to oppose the other nation which also has its working and capitalist class aligned to one another. The necessity of revolution domestically and internationally gets lost in this shift of social consciousness away from class struggle to nationalist sentiment. Imperialism has an inherent mechanism against class struggle built into it. Both of these phenomena builds the power of the bourgeoisie over that of the working class. This is one reason why Marxists needed a theory of imperialism and why Lenin created one.

Lenin described this as the basic mechanics of imperialism as a heightened period of capitalism, which is used to prop up the capitalist system as a whole. He did, however, conclude that imperialism was also inherently destructive towards capitalism itself. We know that capitalism itself is inherently unsustainable due to its own internal contradictions. While imperialism is a measure by which capitalism must employ to sustain itself, that same measure is destructive towards capitalism. In the short-term, it is salvation, in the long-term it is destruction.

As imperialism expands, there is an increasing antagonism between the various imperialist nations. Nation-states will naturally build rivalries between each other as they each grab for territory and spheres of influence. This means that sooner or later their boarders or spheres will come up against each other as the need to expand further grows. This eventually leads to both sides recognising the necessity of war in order to take such territory from each other. This was all proven correct by Lenin as it corresponded with the events of the First World War. Lenin's belief was that these inter-imperialist rivalries would end up undermining the countries themselves. First, imperialism would begin to destabilize, and then the core imperialist nation would unravel.
Lenin pointed out, a major destruction of productive capacity. These events did weaken the core nation states. Germany and particularly Russia were obliterated during that war. Lenin argued that this would cause the collapse of the imperialist core of the losing nations, destroying their capacity to be imperialist powers. He predicted that even the victors of the war would suffer terrible fates. The war would leave even the victorious countries in a weakened state unable to take advantage of the occupied nations. In the case of Great Britain, it lost most of its colonies after its trials during World War 2. During this period anti-colonial/anti-imperialist struggles broke out given the "breathing room" they had due to the decline of the imperialist powers. It was right after World Wars One and Two that these anti-imperialist struggles broke out and intensified. China gained its full independence from a destroyed Japan and a severely weakened National Party owned by the United States.

During this post-war time there would be great economic stagnation that would lead to a rise in class consciousness, and thus class struggle. This was the case after both world wars. The end of the First led to the rise of the Bolsheviks who took power in Russia. After the Second, the communist revolution took hold in China. After the First war, many worker struggles broke out across Europe. Post World War One the communists swung for power in Germany and the Anarchists in Spain. Post World War Two, worker struggles built social democracy in Western Europe as socialism took over in the East. This fact remains clear: the destruction of the imperialist core leads to the possibilities of intensified class struggle. Many of the Western powers agreed, which is why they made so many social democratic concessions to the working class. Mao Zedong agreed with this, and said that he and the Chinese people were unafraid of a Third World War. In fact, they welcomed it because it would only bring more people to socialism.
"People all over the world are now discussing whether a third world war will break out. On this question, too, we must be mentally prepared and do some analysis. We stand firmly for peace and against war. However, if the imperialists insist on unleashing another war, we should not be afraid of it. Our attitude on this question is the same as our attitude towards any disturbance: first, we are against it; second, we are not afraid of it. The First World War was followed by the birth of the Soviet Union with a population of 200 million. The Second World War was followed by the emergence of the socialist camp with a combined population of 900 million. If the imperialists insist on launching a third world war, it is certain that several hundred million more will turn to socialism, and then there will not be much room left on earth for the imperialists; it is also likely that the whole structure of imperialism will utterly collapse."  

Mao Zedong's View of Imperialism
After the Chinese revolution Mao's theories about class struggle and anti-imperialism had been proven true. Wang Ming and the 28½ Bolsheviks insisted that the Chinese revolution must be a worker's revolution, how Marx and Lenin said it must be. This kind of dogmatic and anti-scientific thinking (supported by Enver Hoxha later on) led to the near defeat of the People's liberation Army. The Nationalists were able to crush the rebellion because the masses were not behind the party. The party had drawn support from the industrial working class as Marx said, leave 87% of the population which were peasants uninvolved. They were trying to make revolution using less than 10% of the population. The party was nearly destroyed. It was only saved by Mao and a few others who insisted that they not give up and instead settle in the countryside far from the Nationalist forces.
concentrated in the cities. Thus began the Long March, the greatest tactical retreat in military history. Possibly the most costly as well, they lost almost 80% of their forces.

Resettling in the countryside, Mao gained leadership of the party and began an investigation into why they had failed, and how they should correct it. He decided that their failure was from a lack of an ability to reach the masses. Mao correctly recognised that the vast majority of the population in China were peasants, not European-style industrial workers. He then began an investigation into the conditions of the countryside to see what revolutionary potential they may or may not have. This gave Mao the ability to produce such works as *Analysis of Classes in Chinese Society* and *Report of an Investigation into the Peasant Movement in Hunan*.

His conclusion was that the revolution was to continue to be based on class. However, they must adapt that analysis to the concrete conditions of China and its rural population. The peasants were to be the wave that was revolution would bring about the defeat of the Nationalists and the capitalists. As history shows us, Mao was correct in his analysis. Marxism-Leninism was a basis, a scientific contribution, but it was not adequate for the time in which Mao engaged in struggle. A new scientific contribution was needed because the existing one was not correct for their conditions. The simple physics formula of throwing a ball works great day-to-day on Earth. But, if you escape the bonds of gravity, the formula must change in order to account for the lack of gravity. To ignore either of these, change in gravity and a peasant based society, is to be anti-scientific.

Mao created a new theory of the classes in the Chinese countryside, and the cities leading to a new theory of how to bring about socialist revolution. He also required contributions to theories on imperialism to deal with the Japanese occupation.
There was also the contradiction between U.S. imperialism and Japanese imperialism in the country. His analysis was proven correct by the victory they achieved where traditional Marxist-Leninist theory had failed.

The most significant aspect of Mao's contributions to the theory of class is New Democracy. It was a necessary idea for the unique condition that China found itself in when their revolution took place. In Marx's hypothesis, the advanced capitalist countries were going to be the ones who went forward into socialism, as the stage of human development after capitalism. China in this case, was actually mostly feudal, which meant it was actually behind capitalism in the process of development. The Communist party of China was left in a unique situation. They had a revolution on their hands, but largely didn't have capitalism. The question was asked, do we allow capitalism to progress under our watch, or do we develop some kind of theory about bridging the gap between feudalism and socialism? A question similar to this was posed by the Soviet Union. The first attempt at industrialization failed. Lenin suggested: "Communists who have no illusions, who do not give way to despondency, and who preserve their strength and flexibility 'to begin from the beginning' over and over again in approaching an extremely difficult task, are not doomed (and in all probability will not perish)." Nicolai Bukharin, in the debates among the central committee, suggested that the Soviet Union should outright build a socialist state in order to facilitate industrial development. Stalin argued against him, and as history shows, Stalin was correct.

The concrete conditions in China also necessitated the recognition of new terms necessary to classify them. Bureaucrat-capitalism, comprador-capitalism and semi-feudalism. In China's experience:
"In socialist society the basic contradictions are still those between the relations of production and the productive forces and between the superstructure and the economic base. However, they are fundamentally different in character and have different features from the contradictions between the relations of production and the productive forces and between the superstructure and the economic base in the old societies. The present social system of our country is far superior to that of the old days. If it were not so, the old system would not have been overthrown and the new system could not have been established. In saying that the socialist relations of production correspond better to the character of the productive forces than did the old relations of production, we mean that they allow the productive forces to develop at a speed unattainable in the old society, so that production can expand steadily and increasingly meet the constantly growing needs of the people. Under the rule of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism, the productive forces of the old China grew very slowly. For more than fifty years before liberation, China produced only a few tens of thousands of tons of steel a year, not counting the output of the northeastern provinces. If these provinces are included, the peak annual steel output only amounted to a little over 900,000 tons. In 1949, the national steel output was a little over 100,000 tons. Yet now, a mere seven years after the liberation of our country, steel output already exceeds 4,000,000 tons. In the old China, there was hardly any machine-building industry, to say nothing of the automobile and aircraft industries; now we have all three. When the people overthrew the rule of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism, many were not clear as to which way China should head -- towards capitalism or towards socialism. Facts have now provided the
answer: Only socialism can save China. The socialist system has promoted the rapid development of the productive forces of our country, a fact even our enemies abroad have had to acknowledge."\(^{51}\)

"The landlord class and the comprador class. In economically backward and semi-colonial China the landlord class and the comprador class are wholly appendages of the international bourgeoisie, depending upon imperialism for their survival and growth. These classes represent the most backward and most reactionary relations of production in China and hinder the development of her productive forces. Their existence is utterly incompatible with the aims of the Chinese revolution. The big landlord and big comprador classes in particular always side with imperialism and constitute an extreme counter-revolutionary group. Their political representatives are the Étatistes and the right-wing of the Kuomintang."\(^{52}\)

Importantly, *New Democracy* was designed with the specific conditions of China (with regards to imperialism) in mind. Lenin led a nation that had a feudal element to it, but also attempting to be imperialist itself. China on the other hand was a victim of imperialism, and suffered from the occupation of imperialist forces. China was also much, much more feudal than Russia was. These are two entirely different circumstances that call for entirely different plans for the construction of socialism. China suffered long term imperialist oppression at the hands of the Japanese, then to a degree, later under the domination of the United States backed Nationalist Party. China was faced with contradictions that did not exist within the Bolshevik experience. Using Lenin's writings as a basis, Mao adapted them to China's unique situation.
"What are China's old politics and economics? And what is her old culture? 

[...] 

"Since the invasion of foreign capitalism and the gradual growth of capitalist elements in Chinese society, the country has changed by degrees into a colonial, semicolonial and semi-feudal society. China today is colonial in the Japanese-occupied areas and basically semi-colonial in the Kuomintang areas, and it is predominantly feudal or semi-feudal in both. Such, then, is the character of present day Chinese society and the state of affairs in our country. The politics and the economy of this society are predominantly colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal, and the predominant culture, reflecting the politics and economy, is also colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal. New economy and a new culture economics is the base and politics the concentrated expression of economics."

Mao laid out how this process of transformation was to take place: 

"In the course of its history the Chinese revolution must go through two stages, first, the democratic revolution, and second, the socialist revolution, and by their very nature they are two different revolutionary processes. Here democracy does not belong to the old category--it is not the old democracy, but belongs to the new category--it is New Democracy. 

"It can thus be affirmed that China's new politics are the politics of New Democracy, that China's new economy is the economy of New Democracy and that China's new culture is the culture of New Democracy."
"Clearly, it follows from the colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal character of present-day Chinese society that the Chinese revolution must be divided into two stages. The first step is to change the colonial, semi-colonial and semifeudal form of society into an independent, democratic society. The second is to carry the revolution forward and build a socialist society. At present the Chinese revolution is taking the first step."\textsuperscript{55}

Often it is accused by Hoxhaists, and other dogmato-revisionists, that the Chinese Revolution was essentially reactionary because of its unique character; one that is, in Mao's own words, "fundamentally bourgeois-democratic". They are however wrong. They misinterpret what Mao is saying. He is saying it is a bourgeois-democratic in the sense that it is setting up a bourgeois-style democracy, not a bourgeois capitalism.

"Although such a revolution in a colonial and semi-colonial country is still fundamentally bourgeois-democratic in its social character during its first stage or first step, and although its objective mission is to clear the path for the development of capitalism, it is no longer a revolution of the old type led by the bourgeoisie with the aim of establishing a capitalist society and a state under bourgeois dictatorship. It belongs to the new type of revolution led by the proletariat with the aim, in the first stage, of establishing a new-democratic society and a state under the joint dictatorship of all the revolutionary classes. Thus this revolution actually serves the purpose of clearing a still wider path for the development of socialism. In the course of its progress, there may be a number of further sub-stages, because of changes on the enemy's side and within the ranks of our allies, but
the fundamental character of the revolution remains unchanged.

"Such a revolution attacks imperialism at its very roots, and is therefore not tolerated but opposed by imperialism. However, it is favoured by socialism and supported by the land of socialism and the socialist international proletariat."\(^{56}\)

The bourgeois-democratic, means building a democratic post-imperialist imposed dictatorship. It means building a democratic mechanism for the people to use that did not exist before. It is the rejection of the imperialist dictatorial control in favour of a national democratic process. This is what the Hoxhaists and other dogmato-revisionists *refuse* to understand.

The bourgeois-democratic, means building capitalist type industry, the capitalist type development of productive forces without the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The failure of those who reject Mao's theoretical contributions is to just assume that Mao wanted capitalism. What he is arguing for is a capitalist type production with a *proletarian* political leadership in control. A society cannot simply skip capitalism as a stage of development. This is tantamount to saying that you can just magically skip a stage in evolution. Even Marxist-Leninists today don't see the failing in their own the thinking. The Soviet Union had the New Economic Policy to deal with this very same problem. There is much that can be criticized about it. However, something like it was certainly necessary. In a way one *could* claim that if you disagree with New Democracy you're also disagreeing with the NEP.

Those dogmatic revisionists (like the Hoxhaists) who simply assert that Mao built capitalism, or just wanted capitalism ignore these important facts.
"If such a republic is to be established in China, it must be new-democratic not only in its politics but also in its economy.

"It will own the big banks and the big industrial and commercial enterprises.

"Enterprises, such as banks, railways and airlines, whether Chinese-owned or foreign-owned, which are either monopolistic in character or too big for private management, shall be operated and administered by the state, so that private capital cannot dominate the livelihood of the people: this is the main principle of the regulation of capital.

"[...] In the new-democratic republic under the leadership of the proletariat, the state enterprises will be of a socialist character and will constitute the leading force in the whole national economy, but the republic will neither confiscate capitalist private property in general nor forbid the development of such capitalist production as does not "dominate the livelihood of the people", for China's economy is still very backward.

" The republic will take certain necessary steps to confiscate the land of the landlords and distribute it to those peasants having little or no land, carry out Dr. Sun Yat-sen's slogan of "land to the tiller", abolish feudal relations in the rural areas, and turn the land over to the private ownership of the peasants. A rich peasant economy will be allowed in the rural areas. Such is the policy of "equalization of landownership". "Land to the tiller" is the correct slogan for this policy. In general, socialist agriculture will not be established at this stage, though various types of cooperative enterprises
developed on the basis of "land to the tiller" will contain elements of socialism.

"China's economy must develop along the path of the "regulation of capital" and the "equalization of landownership", and must never be "privately owned by the few"; we must never permit the few capitalists and landlords to "dominate the livelihood of the people"; we must never establish a capitalist society of the European-American type or allow the old semi-feudal society to survive. Whoever dares to go counter to this line of advance will certainly not succeed but will run into a brick wall."\textsuperscript{57}

It is spelled out right there plain and clear to anyone willing to be honest enough to read. The main industrial engines of the economy, the banking system, all the real sources of capital power lie in the hands of the proletarian state and leadership. Smaller industries without significant power were allowed to flourish in order to compensate for the lack of the necessary capitalist development in China's history. A country cannot simply 'skip' capitalism as an evolutionary stage of development. Clearly the power in society, both capital and the political, remain in the hands of the Party.

\textbf{Lin Biao's View of Imperialism}

One of the latest contributors to imperialist theory is Lin Baio, who, after the fall of Mao as a revolutionary, formulated the next leap in doctrine. It was him who first put forward the idea that imperialism had become a struggle of not just worker's versus capitalists, but the First World Countries against the Third World countries. This isn't exactly what he said, but it began such thought. Before this we had Mao, who stood firm that the primary contradiction was the imperialist country against the occupied country. Biao saw a new formation, he saw that there
was now a collective interest among all imperialist nations to keep a particular section of the world subjugated; not just in their particular clutches. An entire section of the world must be kept in such bondage for the profits of the imperialist nations. They all have a common interest in such subjugation.

Unfortunately, Biao didn't live long enough to form what he thought into a full theory. Currently, it's believed that he was assassinated by Mao; which I tend to believe is true. He produced the beginnings of what was to become Lin Biaoism. The theory was never formed which left all of it in the hands of those who agreed with him and the view he was beginning to give. From here, others have picked up what he wrote and tried to finish it, or at least make it into a full complete theory. The Maoist International Movement (MIM) has attempted to do so as well as the Leading Light Communist Organization (LLCO). However, in the interest of fairness the LLCO, they don't consider themselves Maoist-Third Worldist like myself. They have taken Lin Biao's writings and contributed a ton of their own to formulate their theory which they call "Leading Light Communism". But to make it the most clear for the reader, allow me to present to you the core aspect of Lin Biao's only real work on it, "Long Live the Victory of People's War."

"Many countries and peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America are now being subjected to aggression and enslavement on a serious scale by the imperialists headed by the United States and their lackeys. The basic political and economic conditions in many of these countries have many similarities to those that prevailed in old China. As in China, the peasant question is extremely important in these regions. The peasants constitute the main force of the national-democratic revolution against the imperialists and their lackeys. In committing aggression against these countries, the imperialists usually begin by seizing the
big cities and the main lines of communication, but they are unable to bring the vast countryside completely under their control. The countryside, and the countryside alone, can provide the broad areas in which the revolutionaries can manoeuvre freely. The countryside, and the countryside alone, can provide the revolutionary bases from which the revolutionaries can go forward to final victory. Precisely for this reason, Comrade Mao Tse-tung’s theory of establishing revolutionary base areas in the rural districts and encircling the cities from the countryside is attracting more and more attention among the people in these regions.

"Taking the entire globe, if North America and Western Europe can be called “the cities of the world”, then Asia, Africa and Latin America constitute “the rural areas of the world”. Since World War II, the proletarian revolutionary movement has for various reasons been temporarily held back in the North American and West European capitalist countries, while the people’s revolutionary movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America has been growing vigorously. In a sense, the contemporary world revolution also presents a picture of the encirclement of cities by the rural areas. In the final analysis, the whole cause of world revolution hinges on the revolutionary struggles of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples who make up the overwhelming majority of the world’s population. The socialist countries should regard it as their internationalist duty to support the people’s revolutionary struggles in Asia, Africa and Latin America."

Here Lin Biao doesn't clearly show the difference between the First and Third World. He sees revolution coming from the Third
World (the global countryside) eventually defeating what imperialist forces are there, then moving in to strike against their stronghold, the First World countries (global cities). Biao saw that there was a weak potential in the First World for revolution. He knew it was the global countryside that had the best chance of becoming a force that could create revolution. It had to come from the countryside because the cities comprised most of the collaborators to the imperialists. We can compare that to what we see today where the greatest collaborators with imperialism are First World "workers" themselves. They are often times petite-bourgeois in the occupied nations that want struggle and liberation from imperialism, and some of those people are even willing to fight more than First World "workers". This rings absolutely true, the national bourgeois of the Third World are more willing to fight because they stand to gain from struggle as opposed to the First Worlder who only stands to lose.

If a First Worlder fights, what is he risking really? He's risking quite a lot. He stands to lose his good living standard to end up as a guerrilla with no luxuries at all. He will lose home ownership, a safe and comfortable retirement, a life without the kind of pain and suffering he'll be facing. A Third Worlder, more specifically according to Biao, a global countryside person, has everything to gain. Did not Marx say that a worker has nothing to lose but his chains? Those in the Third World fight because they have nothing left to lose. They are in the worst of the worst conditions, just as the countryside is in much more difficult living conditions than in the cities.

**Third Worldist View of Imperialism**

Today, we stand before a very different age of imperialism than Lenin did a hundred years ago; and what Mao stood before 55 some-odd years ago. Today capital has expanded all over the world except for a few unique places, either due to underdevelopment (i.e. Africa) or staunch resistance (i.e. North
Korea, Cuba). Imperialist global capital was only in its infancy during Lenin's time. What we have today is very different. The theory of imperialism holds that there are competing national capitals which drive their respective states to war with each other. The economic state of the country is stretched to its limit as capital has spread as far as it can go within its own borders. To stave off an economic collapse, and a falling rate of profit it, must expand beyond those physical limits. It is at this point where capitalist countries begin their march to war against each other under their chosen pretexts.

This reality is what gave rise to Lenin's theory of reoccurring World Wars. Each country would expand to its limits and eventually force a confrontation where they must try and capture each other's territory to keep expanding and stave off crisis. This eventually culminates in a World War which destroys a great deal of capital, making room for the survivor to rebuild in a new geographical area. Lenin's reoccurring World War theory had a great deal of support after we had two World Wars. At that point it seemed he was absolutely correct.

Today we see thing a little differently. That Third World War never came about. That war, socialism was welcoming because it would turn even more people towards socialism. After the first we got the Bolsheviks. After the second we got a red Eastern Europe and a huge part of Asia. Mao famously welcome a Third World War without any fear of it:

"People all over the world are now discussing whether a third world war will break out. On this question, too, we must be mentally prepared and do some analysis. We stand firmly for peace and against war. However, if the imperialists insist on unleashing another war, we should not be afraid of it. Our attitude on this question is the same as our attitude towards any disturbance: first, we are against it; second, we are not afraid of it."
The First World War was followed by the birth of the Soviet Union with a population of 200 million. The Second World War was followed by the emergence of the socialist camp with a combined population of 900 million. If the imperialists insist on launching a third world war, it is certain that several hundred million more will turn to socialism, and then there will not be much room left on earth for the imperialists; it is also likely that the whole structure of imperialism will utterly collapse.\textsuperscript{59}

"The Chinese people are not to be cowed by U.S. atomic blackmail. Our country has a population of 600 million and an area of 9,600,000 square kilometres. The United States cannot annihilate the Chinese nation with its small stack of atom bombs. Even if the U.S. atom bombs were so powerful that, when dropped on China, they would make a hole right through the earth, or even blow it up, that would hardly mean anything to the universe as a whole, though it might be a major event for the solar system.\textsuperscript{60}

"Should the United States launch a third world war and supposing it lasted eight or ten years, the result would be the elimination of the ruling classes in the United States, Britain and the other accomplice countries and the transformation of most of the world into countries led by Communist Parties. World wars end not in favour of the warmongers but in favour of the Communist Parties and the revolutionary people in all lands. If the warmongers are to make war, then they mustn't blame us for making revolution or engaging in "subversive activities" as they keep saying all the time. If they desist from war, they can survive a little longer on this earth. But the sooner they make war the sooner they will be wiped from the face of the earth. Then a people's
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united nations would be set up, maybe in Shanghai, maybe somewhere in Europe, or it might be set up again in New York, provided the U.S. warmongers had been wiped out."61

As we know from history, this Third World War never took place. There's a few reasons why this didn't happen. Largely it was the advent of nuclear weapons. No one really wanted to fire the first shot because everyone knew that everyone was going to die. This is a good reason why we called it the 'Cold War'; no one really wanted to go hot in a major sense. That is not to say there was no violence. The Cold War also included a good deal of proxy wars in many Third World countries; many behind the scenes away from the cameras of the mainstream media. One of the most famous examples was the Soviet-Afghan War, which was against the Taliban backed up with the support of the C.I.A. In the Congo, Che Guevara fought his lesser known battle to liberate the country from the Belgians with aid from China and the Soviet Union.62 There was, of course, every battles across Latin America, which had both the C.I.A and the Cubans involved. None of these conflicts burst out into any open World War Three - because the global powers would have annihilated each other. This is not to say that capital didn't require it. The Soviet Union back on the capitalist path needed to expand into Afghanistan, while the United States need to expand into Latin America. The trouble was, the political consequences of this inter-imperialist conflict were too great to risk. After all, they're greedy, not stupid.

Obviously the Soviet Union came to an end under the reactionary rule and subverted into outright capitalism, as opposed to say 'closet capitalism'. When we look at the world today, removed from the 1960s of Mao's time and certainly the earlier 1900s of Lenin's time; we see that imperialist capital has taken on a change. Marx had predicted that financial capital would remain subservient to industrial capital because money
had always remained subservient to the mode of production. Here, we see an example of where Marx was wrong. Finance capital has come to entirely dominate and largely determine industrial capital. Why? I believe it is because now money can move so much faster than commodities. Investment schemes and financial instruments no longer have any real boundary. The ownership of financial capital has become the real power in the world, even greater than that of nuclear weapons. This is why the cycle of World Wars that Lenin predicted came to an end.

Financial institutions, those that wield financial capital are no longer the national capital interests that Lenin spoke of as the cause for the World Wars. Those financial powers now hold power in many countries, their investments are no longer limited by national boundaries. These financial companies have investments in almost every country in the world. For example, Goldman Sachs has investments in Australia, New Zealand, Germany, Italy, Korea, Russia, Spain, Brazil, France, India, Japan, Mexico, Saudi Arabia, Taiwan, China, and all over Latin America and Europe. Capital is no longer restrained to a single national interest as it was in Lenin's day. Just Goldman Sachs alone has a capital interest in almost every country in the world. If a war was to break out between, say Russia and the U.S., they would stand to lose no matter what. The same scenario is true with a war between China and the U.S. Sure, there are some moneyed interests that would make a ton off of weapons manufacturing, but they are fairly small in comparison to say the global financial giant's potential losses. They don't want world wars because now they have nothing to gain from them. They only have something to lose.

Sometimes I cannot help but laugh at the bourgeoisie and its defenders not coming to the logical conclusion about the lack of democracy in their own system. It's even funnier to see them make an argument against themselves without even realizing it. Case in point: I’d like to bring up something Slavoj Zizek
mentioned in a talk he gave at Mark’s Bookshop in Manhattan on October 26. He pointed to a statement by Anne Applebaum, the woman who wrote that dreadfully misinforming book on Soviet Gulags. This writer actually reveals the real truth behind the Occupy Wall Street, its need to exist and what it needs to do. In her vulgar attempt to bash the movement, claiming they don’t understand what freedom and democracy is, or how it works; she actually reveals the need to abolish capitalism.

"[...] in one sense, the international Occupy movement’s failure to produce sound legislative proposals is understandable: Both the sources of the global economic crisis and the solutions to it lie, by definition, outside the competence of local and national politicians...

"The emergence of an international protest movement without a coherent program is therefore not an accident: It reflects a deeper crisis, one without an obvious solution. Democracy is based on the rule of law. Democracy works only within distinct borders and among people who feel themselves to be part of the same nation. A “global community” cannot be a national democracy. And a national democracy cannot command the allegiance of a billion-dollar global hedge fund, with its headquarters in a tax haven and its employees scattered around the world.

"Unlike the Egyptians in Tahrir Square, to whom the New York protesters openly (and ridiculously) compare themselves, we have democratic institutions in the Western world. They are designed to reflect, at least crudely, the desire for political change within a given nation. But they cannot cope with the desire for global political change, nor can they control things that happen outside their borders. Although I still believe in
globalization’s economic and spiritual benefits — along with open borders, freedom of movement and free trade — globalization has clearly begun to undermine the legitimacy of Western democracies.

“Global” activists, if they are not careful, will accelerate that decline. Protesters in London shout, “We need to have a process!” Well, they already have a process: It’s called the British political system. And if they don’t figure out how to use it, they’ll simply weaken it further.”

Listen to what she says here in a moment of honesty: “Both the sources of the global economic crisis and the solutions to it lie, by definition, outside the competence of local and national politicians.” Here she literally speaks the truth; our political system cannot tackle the effects of international capitalism. The power of these transnational corporations transcends beyond the power our political institutions have, even at the most powerful national level. She admits this thing we have, falsely called democracy, is incapable of solving the problem we face. The consequences of global capitalist financial dealings, are due to their international character; and are out of control of democratic mechanisms. How much more truthful can she be?

Thus the truth is obvious, we don’t have a democracy. Again, it is spoken here: “…national democracy cannot command the allegiance of a billion-dollar global hedge fund.” If the powers that which control our economy, our country and our destiny are beyond our control, then this is certainly no democracy. After this confusingly honest statement, she begins to dig the grave of capitalism much further.

“Although I still believe in globalization’s economic and spiritual benefits… globalization has clearly begun to undermine the legitimacy of Western democracies.”
So now we have a direct admission that capitalism destroys democracy. At this point some readers may become confused. What is she saying here? Is she saying that we should abolish capitalism? Is this turning into an anti-capitalist speech? It seems that way, or at least anyone would draw that logical conclusion. However, she does answer this rhetorical question in the next paragraph.

“Global” activists, if they are not careful, will accelerate that decline. Protesters in London shout, “We need to have a process!” Well, they already have a process: It’s called the British political system. And if they don’t figure out how to use it, they’ll simply weaken it further.”

After having very honestly shown the capitalism undermines democracy and that the so-called democracy we have cannot fix this problem - She turns around and tells us to use that very system that she just said doesn’t work, to solve the problem. What has happened in this line of reasoning? How does she explain this blatant contradiction in her position? To her, I think there is none, she is saying something else. She is saying we can do nothing. If we accept the system we have then we must accept that it is beyond our control. If we do not, and try to build mechanisms to control them, we will destroy our own democracy.

She draws the conclusion that capitalism is the problem, but says there is nothing we can do about it. The solution is obvious, if capitalism is the problem, then we should get rid of capitalism.

Even the most casual observer will notice that this has not meant the end of wars. They have continued under this new order, but not the same as they did in the old. The conflicts in Afghanistan, and Iraq, are prime examples that show something very significant. What was it about these countries that made them different than, say Russia or China? Well, aside from the
obvious that those two countries could defend themselves; financial companies didn’t have any real investments in those countries. The Taliban and the government of Saddam Hussein were not receptive to foreign financial interests. When various tactics to open them up failed, they resorted to war and the usual excuses that go along with them. The government of Saddam Hussein had become outright antagonistic to U.S. financial interests. Saddam began selling oil in Euros instead of the long held tradition of U.S. dollars. When this move was taken, Iraq made an astounding amount of money at the expense of the U.S..

"A bizarre political statement by Saddam Hussein has earned Iraq a windfall of hundreds of million[s] of euros. In October 2000 Iraq insisted on dumping the US dollar - 'the currency of the enemy' - for the more multilateral euro.

"The changeover was announced on almost exactly the same day that the euro reached its lowest ebb, buying just $0.82, and the G7 Finance Ministers were forced to bail out the currency. On Friday the euro had reached $1.08, up 30 per cent from that time.

"Almost all of Iraq's oil exports under the United Nations oil-for-food programme have been paid in euros since 2001. Around 26 billion euros (£17.4bn) has been paid for 3.3 billion barrels of oil into an escrow account in New York.

"The Iraqi account, held at BNP Paribas, has also been earning a higher rate of interest in euros than it would have in dollars." Saddam made a very wise financial move that was making his country far more money that it would have been. Unfortunately, this was not so profitable for U.S. companies. The time was now
right to move in against Saddam, who had challenged their interests in the past with the Gulf War. Now was the time to correct their oil selling policy and grab a hold of all the investments they had been denied in the past. The timing was great as well, the ‘War on Terrorism’ was taking off with the successful invasion of Afghanistan. The American population was already in a war mood and taking advantage of First World xenophobic racism was easy. Afghanistan itself was an easy target, the use of the 9/11 attacks made it so simple to be politically acceptable to people. The country has a great deal of untapped resources, particularly minerals which have been known about at least since 2000.

"The country, however, has economic potential owing to considerable mineral resources of fossil fuels and precious and semiprecious gemstones. Additional mineral resources include barite, coal, copper, iron ore, lead, salt, sulfur, and zinc.

"[...] In the late 1970s, proven and probable oil and condensate reserves were estimated to be 95 million barrels. Apart from oil and gas, coal reserves have been estimated to be about 400 million metric tons[...]"

There are other countries on the U.S. hit list. Cuba, Iran, DPRK, and Venezuela now. What do you think all these countries have in common? They're all places where U.S. investment is either exceedingly low, or nonexistent. Capital has dominated the globe except for a few places. These are the countries that we must now have hostilities with. North Korea is the biggest shining example of a country holding out against global capital interests.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) has, at all costs maintained their autonomy, with much effort required. This is a concept that is wholly foreign to capital itself. To capitalism there is nothing outside of investment in as many
instances as possible. No one has thumbed their nose at U.S. capital interests as the DPRK has. It is important to clarify here that the DPRK is not free of its own capital. There is a fair amount of private property which negates any claim to the country being socialist. Despite this flaw, they have maintained their independence to an extraordinary degree given their circumstances. However, despite all of this, they are not entirely free of foreign capital. They are a small nation with a population of about 25 million. They are extremely restrained due to their determination to resist foreign domination. This has caused countless unjust embargoes and sanctions against them that has wreaked unbelievable havoc upon the nation. Despite all of this they have thrived in an isolated situation that capitalism absolutely could not have done. With this terrible weakness they do have to capitulate to foreign capital to a degree. Special Economic Zones (SEZs) are set up along the border with South Korea and China. China takes the most advantage of these zones. While the DPRK is strong in this regard, they are however not invincible.

The point here is that U.S. capital, the global capital super power, doesn't have its claws into the DPRK. This shows there are still some competing capital interests in the world; but they have mostly disappeared as they were in the days of Lenin and the theory of the cycle of World Wars. While this capital has dominated the globe across borders, making it a power greater than the countries themselves; there are still some contradictions among them left. It should be no surprise that the remaining capital's contradictions remain in the hands of the two largest global powers. The U.S. has been resistant in allowing Chinese capital to spread too far into its economy. The reason why this contradiction remains is because of the one set of capitalist interests, the U.S. has not dominated China as it has everywhere else. Yes, capital is global in nature with no real home, but most of those capitals come from the U.S. which still has a strong state that will defend its interests. China is on the
other end of this. China is the rising capital power seeking to dominate the globe as the U.S. has. They too have their own strong state that will defend their interests. While capital has no real country to speak of, it still has two primary camps which have a powerful state to defend their interests.

This is why China has investments in the DPRK and defends their interests. China has capital invested in them and the U.S. does not. The U.S. has not dominated their territory which is why they constantly push hostilities against the country. China has a strong interest in keeping the DPRK the way it is. If it were to fall, and U.S. capital interests take it over, then there would be a puppet U.S. territory on the border with China. Something China does not want.

What we see here is, that while capital has spread across the world and eliminated national capital interests for the most part: they are not gone entirely. What we have seen is in line with what Marx predicted. A polarization of wealth into fewer and fewer hands. Capital went from national interests which pushed a cycle of World Wars, to a near total domination that has left primarily two global capital powers left. Not all contradictions are gone, but the wealth has polarized globally. If the global capitalist order has evolved from Marx and Lenin's time, why should we assume that class relations haven't evolved as well? We do now have exceedingly rich countries and exceedingly poor countries. Why can't we see a class interests between the two? One certainly benefits off of the exploitation of the other. One certainly has more revolutionary potential than another. We must accept this fact as also true; there is a global class structure now, which leads us to the need for a new analysis of the global class structure. This need leads us back to what Mao said is the starting point:

"Who are our enemies? Who are our friends? This is a question of the first importance for the revolution. The
basic reason why all previous revolutionary struggles in China achieved so little was their failure to unite with real friends in order to attack real enemies. A revolutionary party is the guide of the masses, and no revolution ever succeeds when the revolutionary party leads them astray. To ensure that we will definitely achieve success in our revolution and will not lead the masses astray, we must pay attention to uniting with our real friends in order to attack our real enemies. To distinguish real friends from real enemies, we must make a general analysis of the economic status of the various classes in Chinese society and of their respective attitudes towards the revolution."

All we have to do in this new global capitalist era is replace "China" and "Chinese" with "global" and we see exactly what we need to do.

**First Worldism is Anti-Science**
Marxism is first and foremost the science of revolution. It is the science of unravelling the class contradictions that brings communism. To assume nothing has changed and that the words of Marx exactly reflect the reality we face today is the opposite of science. Science grows and it evolves just as society and social relations evolve. The failure of Marxism-Leninism and Marxism-Leninism-Maoism is that its adherents refuse to acknowledge this. They instead dogmatically hold onto words that reflected a different era with different social conditions. The world evolves, it changes, dialectical materialism itself (the basis of Marxism) is based on constant motion and change. It says things are always changing. Yet, Marxists are *not* applying it. Instead, they just grip tighter the words of the heads of Marxism, dig their heels into the ground, insisting that these men's words are equally valid today as they were when they
were written. Their refusal to acknowledge change is why they have never achieved revolution. There has been no revolution in the advanced countries, they have not even come close.

Science grows and evolves as more information is acquired. Science is always looking at new information as it is presented and compares it to what it already knows from experience. The new information, if correct, causes scientists to alter their theory. This is the nature of science. This does not exist in Marxism in First Worldists. First Worldists have rejected this view and have instead refused to accept new information which contradicts the theory, even in small places. To simply reject all new information and dogmatically hold onto an existing belief is called religion. This is the very thing that Austrian economics does. It takes classical laissez-faire economics and insists nothing has changed and that their theory based on a world that doesn't exist is still true. First Worldist Marxists have done this very thing to the detriment of Marxism itself. This dogmatic grip on theory was called by "cutting the feet to fit the shoes" by Mao when talking about strategy in revolutionary war.

"Some people hold a wrong view, which we refuted long ago. They say that it is enough merely to study the laws of war in general, or, to put it more concretely, that it is enough merely to follow the military manuals published by the reactionary Chinese government or the reactionary military academies in China. They do not see that these manuals give merely the laws of war in general and moreover are wholly copied from abroad, and that if we copy and apply them exactly without the slightest change in form or content, we shall be "cutting the feet to fit the shoes" and be defeated. Their argument is: why should knowledge which has been acquired at the cost of blood be of no use? They fail to see that although we must cherish the
earlier experience thus acquired, we must also cherish experience acquired at the cost of our own blood.""\textsuperscript{70}

Often First Worldists claim that France was going to go revolutionary in 1968. This is false, they were not. They were not about to become full of revolutionary violence. If they were, could they have been bought off with the benefits of imperialism so easily? No. Dialectics itself is treated as a science and often is called a science. It most certainly is not. Science grows with new knowledge. What new contributions to dialectics have been made? None. It is a philosophy to be sure, a very useful one. It is however not science. It is not infallible, just as every philosophy is not infallible. Dialectics is absolutely great, the best tool for looking at social forces and understanding contradictions in society; but it is not science. Here is a good example, Mao used dialectics to describe how a bomb works.

"Before it explodes, a bomb is a single entity in which opposites coexist in given conditions. The explosion takes place only when a new condition, ignition, is present. An analogous situation arises in all those natural phenomena which finally assume the form of open conflict to resolve old contradictions and produce new things."\textsuperscript{71}

Now, having this knowledge, go out and build a bomb, can you? Read Hegel and then Marx on dialectics and build a bomb. Does it work? No, because it can't tell you how to do it. Now go and study engineering and chemistry. With this knowledge you can build a bomb. Chemistry and engineering are sciences that advance knowledge, explain phenomena and enrich your abilities. Dialectics can explain some things, to understand some things, but it does not give you the ability to do. Dialectics is a philosophy with all the limits that philosophy has. Studying it cannot give you the ability to plan an economy. You need to study economics in order to do that. Knowing dialectics doesn't
provide you with a concrete plan to resist a Nazi invasion. Studying military tactics allows you to do that. Even then military tactics evolve like science does. New ideas, experiences and theories are being added to it all the time for different situations and composition of forces. Dialectics cannot do any of these things. They can only allow you to understand an aspect of these things, explain them to a degree. They do not give you the ability to carry out these sciences.

In that same work where Mao described how a bomb works, he also warned not to apply Marxism dogmatically because circumstances always change, contradictions alter, new conditions are faced. To ignore this is anti-Marxist.

"However, we must make a concrete study of the circumstances of each specific struggle of opposites and should not arbitrarily apply the formula discussed above to everything. Contradiction and struggle are universal and absolute, but the methods of resolving contradictions, that is, the forms of struggle, differ according to the differences in the nature of the contradictions. Some contradictions are characterized by open antagonism, others are not. In accordance with the concrete development of things, some contradictions which were originally non-antagonistic develop into antagonistic ones, while others which were originally antagonistic develop into non-antagonistic ones."72

This line is what is most important to remember:

"[...]some contradictions which were originally non-antagonistic develop into antagonistic ones, while others which were originally antagonistic develop into non-antagonistic ones."
The very essence of First Worldism is to dogmatically hold onto the words of the heads of Marxism in opposition to an evolution in the science of revolution. They dogmatically hold onto dialectics as though it were a science when it is not. There is a reason why revolution is not happening. This is why. Science has been shoved aside for the sake of hero worship. There is nothing wrong with praising those who have achieved great things in Marxism, but when you do it at the expense of Marxism itself: that is reactionary.

The worst example of this is Hoxhaism. Albanian leader Enver Hoxha was opposed to the revolutionary contributions by Mao that showed that perhaps the advanced industrialized nations were not the most revolutionary group. Marx himself had claimed this, but this is not what happened. Russia, the most backward of European countries, and China a very feudal society were the ones to carry out revolution. Once the Soviet union turned revisionist, Hoxha created the most dogmatic and anti-scientific way of thinking. Essentially, his line came down to whatever Stalin did was right, whatever Stalin said was right. As Mao became the ideological leader of revolution in the 60s and 70s, Hoxha vehemently opposed him and other leaders. Many of those he opposed were euro-communists, but he also opposed genuine real revolutionaries. Mao's ideas allowed other countries that would, by Marxist-Leninist theory, not be revolutionary to engage in struggle. Struggles broke out all over Latin America, Africa and Asia. Hoxha dedicated a great deal of time making straw man arguments, and spreading falsehoods against any Marxist or revolution of colour. The world had changed since Stalin and Lenin's time, but he absolutely refused to believe it and dogmatically held those views to a dishonest level. He did this to the point of sabotaging his own country by ruining foreign relations.
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We do not live in Marx's, Lenin's, or Mao's time. We live in a new one that requires a new theory. To refuse to acknowledge this is anti-science and anti-Marxist.
Chapter 6
The Theory of Maoism-Third Worldism
The General Idea

Marxism has been an ever evolving science, and like all science it grows and changes with new information absorbed. Leninism is a perfect example of this. Marx gave us a theory of class and exploitation which gives rise to the function and ultimately destruction of the society around us. He detailed the contradictions that give motion to each historical mode of production and how each one came into existence and ceased to be. Marx was the great thinker that set the ideology up so that we could have an understanding of what was wrong with the world and then hopefully fix it. Lenin was the theorist who gave us the theory for applying Marx's theories. The Vanguard Party is the theoretical contribution that allows us to take action in a meaningful way and build the socialist nation. His theoretical contributions with regards to imperialism give us the knowledge and theory to understand the contradictions between imperialist nations. This was very important for understanding the world during Lenin's time. Maoism too is a theoretical contribution that lays out how to take action in places that are dominated by other classes. The agrarian society of China was not like that of industrial Europe. The working class could not be relied upon to build revolution because it virtually didn't exist. Revolution had to come from the peasants, who were the revolutionary class. Mao presented ideas about continuing class struggle beyond the act of revolution itself, and how to facilitate further class struggle. He understood that revolution was not an event, but was an ever unfolding process that continues after the destruction of the bourgeois state. Imperialism had also changed during Mao's time that necessitated a new understanding of imperialism. The competing imperialist nations were no longer driving a repeating cycle of world wars as Lenin had theorized. Mao saw that the imperialist nations were now allied together to a degree to fight off a common enemy: socialism. There was a degree of cooperation among the imperialist powers because there was a common threat to all of them.
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We are in the middle of a fourth stage of revolutionary science. The material conditions of the world today are not the same as they were during Marx, Lenin, or even Mao's time. History marches on, and the contradictions of capitalism grow and develop as motion in societies continues. The world today is different from these past times. To claim that it isn't, or that "there is nothing new under the sun", is to outright deny historical materialism; one of the founding philosophies of Marxism. To deny this is to side with Francis Fukuyama, who had declared that history was at an end with the destruction of the Soviet Union. Even him too, the great reactionary theorist admitted he was wrong. Yes, the world has changed since the times of those great revolutionary theorists and leaders. Our world faces a greater polarization of wealth that was unthinkable during Marx's time.

"The principal contradiction, the main divide that shapes our world is the wealthy countries versus poor countries. A global city versus a global countryside. The exploiter countries versus exploited countries. The First versus Third World. This is what we need to understand to make revolution today. And revolution is the only answer to the problems facing our world.

"In 1820, the difference between the rich and poor countries was about 3 to 1. Today, it is about 72 to 1. The gap between the global poor and the global rich grows. The divide between the Third World and First World grows. The First World peoples live lives of luxury. The Third World people suffer.

[...]

"Half the world lives and dies on less than 3 dollars a day." The population in India making .80 cents a day or less is greater than the population of the United States. 40 percent of the world’s population, in the Third
World, receives only 5 percent of the world’s income.\textsuperscript{78} The richest 20 percent, almost all in the First World, receive 75 percent of the world’s income.

"22,000 children, all in the Third World, die due to poverty each and every day."\textsuperscript{79}

"Approximately 800 million people in the Third World World are still chronically undernourished, almost two-thirds of whom reside in Asia and the Pacific.\textsuperscript{80} Around 30 percent of all children in the Third World are underweight or stunted — mostly in Africa and Asia.\textsuperscript{81}

"A mere 12 percent of the world’s population uses 85 percent of its water, and these 12 percent do not live in the Third World.\textsuperscript{82} 1 in 3 people has trouble accessing water, mostly in the Third World. 1.1 billion people in the Third World do not have adequate access to water, and 2.6 billion lack basic sanitation.\textsuperscript{83} For tens of millions of people, just finding water is a life and death struggle. Hours, each and every day, just looking for water. Half of Third World people suffer from health problems related to unsafe water or lack of water at some point in their lives.

[...]

"We are in the middle of a world war, World War 3. The First World wages war against the Third World. There is a genocide against the Third World. Every year, far more people die in the Third World than died in the Holocaust. We must not be like the “good Germans” who sat silently as their neighbors disappeared into the ovens. People are burning and the Earth is burning."\textsuperscript{84}

Maoism-Third Worldism is a highly misunderstood ideology. The negative reaction to it is produced by three primary phenomena.
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First, a general ignorance of the ideology itself. Second, an extremely dogmatic application of Marxism. Three, an ingrained victim mentality brought on by past material conditions. If we are to understand Third Worldism, we have to get past these three hurdles in order to forward the science of Marxism.

People have a very terrible misconception of Third Worldism. Those who attack it demonstrate literally no knowledge of even the most basic concepts. For example, it is commonly believed that we think that there is no proletariat in the First World. Actually, we say there is no *significant* proletariat. Much of this stems from incorrect ideas about what the proletariat is. One can be a worker and not be a proletarian. One can be proletarian and not be a worker. These two things are not mutually inclusive. There is, however, overlap. Marxists today consider a worker and proletarian to be synonyms for each other. This is false. A peasant is proletarian, but that does not make him a worker. A person can be a worker who earns $80,000 doing wage labour, this does not however, make them proletarian.

Several groups in the First World can be considered proletarian. Native Americans are a good example. However, we should acknowledge that White workers will not ally with them. Racism is still very strong, and White workers benefit from their oppression. If Native Americans stood up and tried to make revolution, the White population would support the government beating them down. Even the most liberal supporters of ethnic equality would support such state violence. To deny this, is to deny the very racist nature of U.S. society. Could we expect the Black population of the U.S. at 13.2% to overthrow the other 86.8%? The whole point of *class* struggle is to have the *masses* carry out revolution against the minority capitalist class. If First World workers won't even fight for themselves, how can we expect them to fight for Black liberation? Even if we assume the best possible scenario of 100% revolutionary capability on the part of Blacks, their numbers are too small to achieve revolution.
Even if they did, it would be Black liberation, not class war. You have to have the working class on the side of the revolution for it to be a class struggle, a Marxist revolution. The exact same is even more true for Native Americans at 1.2% of the population. To suggest that such a small group of people could bring revolution is essentially the same error that Wang Ming and the 28½ Bolsheviks made in China. Such is nonsense and unscientific. Best case scenario with these struggles, these groups could carve out some kind of autonomous region from which they could exercise a modicum of self-determination. Given the economic nature of capitalism, any such autonomy would be utterly crushed by U.S. society.

Sometimes being proletarian doesn't mean you have revolutionary potential. Immigrants (documented or not) and migrant labourers are proletarian. They, however lack revolutionary potential. These people often risk their lives, leaving a country where they face the most horrid of exploitation and oppression. Are we supposed to believe they left those conditions to go and possibly fight a revolution under higher living standards in the First World? Why would a poor Mexican risk their lives in a revolution at home when they can take a smaller risk to their lives by crossing the border into the U.S. for a better life? What makes people think they're willing to carry out a revolution here in the U.S. when they didn't want to back home? This is very important to take into consideration when thinking about what groups have a revolutionary potential and which ones do not. The material conditions of Blacks and immigrants do not add up to revolutionary potential. We're talking about people who are not class conscious. To assume that these people are revolutionary is to automatically assume they are class conscious. They didn't come to the First World to fight, they came to get away from fighting, to have an easier life.

When we Third Worldists talk about proletarian and exploitation, we are misunderstood. People don't understanding
the argument we are making. As a result, they make all kinds of assertions against lines that we don't hold.

The second mistake they make is dogmatically applying Marxist theory. The whole point of Marxism is to be a revolutionary science. We can see very clearly that the world along with class and wealth evolves; and goes through qualitative changes. Refusing to acknowledge this goes against what Marxism is. People are taking theory based off of times past, under different material conditions, and trying to apply them today without any alternation. This is a terrible error. Once simply cannot take what Mao said about building revolution and cookie cutter it into a pre-made recipe for building revolution. It clearly doesn't work, and hasn't worked.

 Revolutionary periods come and go. Great waves of change arise and eventually die out. This is because the theory is put forward that works and pushes revolution towards its goal. Eventually things change and the theory no longer correspond to what is taking place, the level of development that is faced. The theory about creating change before the revolution takes place, is not the same as when revolution is happening. When the bourgeois state has been destroyed, class struggle takes on new forms; like tackling new contradictions. Mao once gave a great example of this in understanding antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions.

"The contradictions between ourselves and the enemy are antagonistic contradictions. Within the ranks of the people, the contradictions among the working people are non-antagonistic, while those between the exploited and the exploiting classes have a non-antagonistic as well as an antagonistic aspect. There have always been contradictions among the people, but they are different in content in each period of the revolution and in the period of building socialism. In the
conditions prevailing in China today, the contradictions among the people comprise the contradictions within the working class, the contradictions within the peasantry, the contradictions within the intelligentsia, the contradictions between the working class and the peasantry, the contradictions between the workers and peasants on the one hand and the intellectuals on the other, the contradictions between the working class and other sections of the working people on the one hand and the national bourgeoisie on the other, the contradictions within the national bourgeoisie, and so on. Our People's Government is one that genuinely represents the people's interests, it is a government that serves the people. Nevertheless, there are still certain contradictions between this government and the people. These include the contradictions between the interests of the state and the interests of the collective on the one hand and the interests of the individual on the other, between democracy and centralism, between the leadership and the led, and the contradictions arising from the bureaucratic style of work of some of the state personnel in their relations with the masses. All these are also contradictions among the people. Generally speaking, the fundamental identity of the people's interests underlies the contradictions among the people.  

What is labour aristocracy is also a very important question. What do we consider to be the elite of the working class who lack revolutionary potential? How do we define this position? Since we know that labour relations evolve alongside the evolution of the distribution of wealth; we can be sure that in the last hundred years since Lenin that it has changed as well. Let us start from the beginning as see how the class has evolved.
“To tell the workers in the handful of rich countries where life is easier, thanks to imperialist pillage, that they must be afraid of ‘too great’ impoverishment, is counter-revolutionary. It is the reverse that they should be told. The labour aristocracy that is afraid of sacrifices, afraid of ‘too great’ impoverishment during the revolutionary struggle, cannot belong to the Party. Otherwise, the dictatorship is impossible, especially in West-European countries.”  

Lenin, even all the way back in his day saw that imperialism was producing a strata of workers in the First World who had lost their revolutionary potential due to imperialist plunder. This was 1920, now almost a hundred years ago. Even back then he saw the working class of the developed world (we call First World today) was losing its revolutionary spirit. Can we assume that something has happened since then that has broken down workers in the First World today which has reversed this? Certainly not. First World "workers" are incredibly better off now than they were a hundred years ago. A century ago many of them didn't even have indoor toilets. It wasn't until 1919 that indoor toilets were being placed in homes. Today, even among the lower strata of "workers" you can find many luxury consumer items such as air conditioning and iPhones.

People in the First World today wholly fit Lenin's early definition. During his time he was largely speaking of a privileged section of the working class of the advanced nations. Today we can see superior benefits for the people of the lowest sections of the advanced nations. This absolutely cannot be denied. First World "workers" are given vastly higher living standards over workers in the Third World. These superior living standards were acknowledged by Enver Hoxha when he witnessed the reconstruction of Western Europe, robbing it of revolutionary potential.
"The development of the economy in the West after the war also exerted a great influence on the spread of opportunist and revisionist ideas in the communist parties. True, Western Europe was devastated by the war but its recovery was carried out relatively quickly. The American capital which poured into Europe through the 'Marshall Plan' made it possible to reconstruct the factories, plants, transport and agriculture so that their production extended rapidly. This development opened up many jobs and for a long period, not only absorbed all the free labour force but even created a certain shortage of labour.

"This situation, which brought the bourgeoisie great superprofits, allowed it to loosen its purse-strings a little and soften the labour conflicts to some degree. In the social field, in such matters as social insurance, health, education, labour legislation etc., it took some measures for which the working class had fought hard. The obvious improvement of the standard of living of the working people in comparison with that of the time of the war and even before the war, the rapid growth of production, which came as a result of the reconstruction of industry and agriculture and the beginning of the technical and scientific revolution, and the full employment of the work force, opened the way to the flowering among the unformed opportunist element of views about the development of capitalism without class conflicts, about its ability to avoid crises, the elimination of the phenomenon of unemployment etc. That major teaching of Marxism-Leninism, that the periods of peaceful development of capitalism becomes a source for the spread of opportunism, was confirmed once again. The new stratum of the worker aristocracy, which increased considerably during this period, began to exert an ever more negative influence in the ranks of
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the parties and their leaderships by introducing reformist and opportunist views and ideas.

"Under pressure of these circumstances, the programs of these communist parties were reduced more and more to democratic and reformist minimum programs, while the idea of the revolution and socialism became ever more remote. The major strategy of the revolutionary transformation of society gave way to the minor strategy about current problems of the day which was absolutized and became the general political and ideological line."

It would be hard to argue that the situation in the First World today is objectively more revolutionary than it was back in his day. We're surrounded by people who simply refuse to do revolution. Marxists have been trying to organize the working class into revolution in America for more than a hundred years. They have systematically failed every single time they have tried. There can be no denying this. The theories the First Worldists have been using are not working, have never worked, and never will. They absolutely refuse to step back and look at their ideology and theory to see what is wrong. Even if you don't agree with the Third Worldist line, you still have to acknowledge (if you're honest) that revolutionary organizing in the First World has been a total failure. There hasn't been any revolutionary potential in the United States since the 1930s.

We can very clearly see who is bought off and who is not. When worker struggles got too strong in the First World, people got the "New Deal". When worker struggles in the Third World get too strong they get murdered by the government. If they get way too powerful, they get bombed by the United States. The stark reality of labour struggles between the First and Third World is quite apparent. People are made to disappear, found
dead in a ditch if they protest the boss in the Third World. If you protest the boss here you lose your job, go on welfare.

Another thing is that First Worldists are dogmatic about what constitutes exploitation. They maintain that merely being employed counts as exploitation. This is far from the truth. There is the entire issue of value creation and the relationships that are formed from the production process. When they dogmatically assert that this is what exploitation is, they're claiming that CEOs are exploited as well. CEOs are employed by a company to carry out a specific function that facilitates the operation of the business. Technically, if they dogmatically hold on to the theory, then they are claiming that the bourgeoisie are exploited. We really have to look at value generation and the social relationships that form inside and outside the production process.

Finally, First Worldists have a victim mentality. They genuinely believe that they are terribly oppressed and comparable to the Third World. They do literally claim to be in the same class. The fact is, almost all exploitation in the First World is gone. "Workers" are so used to the idea that they are the oppressed masses that they can't break from the mindset. Despite Lenin already telling us that workers in the advanced countries benefit from imperialism, they refuse to accept this as reality. They have lived so long with the idea that they are the wrenched of the earth, that they can't accept that such an idea no longer corresponds to reality. Even the most awful of jobs at Wal-Mart and McDonalds are incredibly more comfortable than even the higher end of jobs in the Third World.

The First Worldist mentality and self-perception actually thinks that a $1.50 a day worker in Gahanna is in the same class, at the same level as a now $15 dollar an hour Seattle coffee barista. Such an idea is absurd, but this is what their theory holds. This is what it claims. This is their plan of action when they talk about
proletarian internationalism. The "working class" in the First World is not the working class that once existed. They are not the people who have nothing but their chains to lose.

There are other problems with First Worldism as well...

First Worldism has a problem understanding racism. They're stuck in the liberal bourgeois academic mindset that sees racism as something foreign to capitalism and the resulting social relations. To them racism is a mindset or, a particular set of beliefs that are merely the product of bourgeois propaganda. They see it as something the ruling class just does to break up worker unity. This is partially true. The mistake they make is to remove racism from the context and the material conditions in which it exists. Traditional Marxist theory and "post-Marxist" Althusser-style attributes racism to a "false consciousness". This view is incorrect. We cannot simply view such phenomena outside of its actually existing concrete conditions. This goes a long way to understanding why liberal education programs have been unable to eliminate racism.

Marxist theory teaches us that social situations and phenomena are in a constant state of change. The contradictions of society are constantly in a state of motion which brings that change. Racism is not the same today as it was a thousand years ago. Nor is it the same as it was 100 years ago. The advent of Social Darwinism and the Bell Curve have given a scientific veneer to the ignorance of racism that was previously just an ignorance. Marxists certainly don't deny that race intersects with class. The problem is that their concept of class is terribly out of date which prevents them from being able to fully grasp the problem. Let us look at the history of Marxism in the First World, or the advanced industrialized nations. First Worldism attests that racism is merely a false consciousness that prevents workers from seeing their collective class interest. If this were true, then how is it possible that workers over 100 or so years have been
unable to make the realization? Marxists keep pushing this false consciousness idea, yet they never seem to be able to get through to the "working class". Why?

Think about the society we have here today. We have many different ethnic groups all living in their own communities with a few exceptions. This phenomena is nothing new and has been around for over a hundred years. There used to be exclusively Irish communities, Italian, and Jewish. These communities largely no longer exist. Why? Because they've become integrated into the rest of society. We no longer see Italians or Irish as separate, they are seen as White people. To a very large degree Jews, who are Ashkenazi are considered to be White and are given White privilege. Other groups have not been integrated fully into the society. Now we have clearly Black communities as the result of gentrification. We used to have Chinatowns and Vietnamese communities. Now we have what can best be described as "Asiantowns". These Asian immigrants have, to a degree given up their identity as Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese, in favour of a pan-Asian identity in response to the discrimination they face. Few Native Americans identify according to their tribe (or Nation), many now identify as Native-American.

There are still many groups that are not integrated into the rest of society fully. The best example is the Black population. The discrimination they face places their lives in danger as we've seen from now constant police killings. What does this non-integration equal? A lack of a unified class identity. There isn't a common class consciousness, because these groups - who are not integrated due to racism - are seen as outsiders, as different, not members of society. This racist block is a huge problem in trying to create a class identity.

One good reason is that class is now a global structure, not a national structure. We're looking at the intersection of race and
class via an outdated model of class. This is where we go wrong. Class is no longer as simple as seeing all people as having the same class interest. First World workers both, Black and White benefit from imperialist super-exploitation. The ruling class has a direct interest in perpetuating a national chauvinism that makes out global people of colour to be inferior on some basis or another. We often hear "those people" don't build up their societies because of some inherent flaw they've invented. In their world outlook we're justified in going into their countries and plundering their resources and cheap labour. According to them, if we don't do it, "they'll never develop". The "Coalition of the Willing" was right to go into Iraq, destroy it and set up a puppet government. This is based on the idea that "those savage backwards Muslims don't know what's good for them", so we better take care of them. The White Christian civilizer mentality that justified colonialism and land theft for profits lives on with a new face.

The "working class" of the First World will support such actions under all kinds of false pretenses because it is in their interest to do so. Many pro-Iraq War people droned on about lowering gas prices. Think about the seriousness of this. There are people who genuinely wanted a war which would cost countless lives (now we know was about million and a half) just so they could pay less at a gas pump. Just sit back and think about the utter inhumanity of that. How is this so justified in their eyes? Because they believe that the Iraqi people are lesser human beings. They believe that Iraqis deserve to have this happen to them for not being as virtuous as First World people. Besides, if they were as virtuous as us, why wouldn't they have developed? Such people always ignore the history of colonialism and imperialism which have played a great part in the underdevelopment of the Third World. Capitalism wants people to think this way because they have a very important interest in it. Capitalism is always seeking lower and lower wages and resources that compels the system to produce rationales for invasion and mass murder.
As a result of this ingrained racism that is perpetuated, as a justification for imperialist hegemony, we have a domestic consequence. That racism, which is perpetuated against global people of colour is not limited to them alone. If we're supposed to see the Muslims over there as inferior savages, can we be surprised that we see the ones here the same? As we're fed a nonstop diet of how backward and incompetent Africa is, it reflects on the attitude towards Blacks here as well. The "working class" here benefits from it tremendously, and they know it. We want cheaper gas from Iraq, we want cheaper goods from China. This racist mentality is sustained by imperialist conquest that has a sustained impact on race relations here at home. Often such people who immigrate to the First World are segregated from the general community, they are looked at as different; and in some ways shunned. As a result, they end up forming their own communities to serve each other because they are largely excluded from the society as a whole. This is the reason why we have a Chinatown, why we have whole Indian and Pakistani communities, and a good reason why we have gentrification.

When people of colour are excluded from the society at large it benefits White workers. The less other races are allowed to have the better jobs, the more of them are there for White workers. This also has the effect of raising wages in the labour market. The less people there are available for a job, the greater the price of labour is, meaning the higher wages they can get. This is a very clear material benefit for White workers. The same thing could be said for gentrification and home prices. As lower income people are pushed out, prices rise. As less people are able to afford homes in certain neighbourhoods, the greater their property value is. Far from simply being a "false consciousness", these First World workers *materially benefit* from racist oppression and segregation. These workers are not simply "brain washed" by a bourgeois ideological apparatus. They recognise a very real benefit from their discriminatory
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behaviour. To say these people simply have a false consciousness is tantamount to idealism. If this is the case, then the bourgeoisie simply has a false consciousness as well.

Why? Because this is not just about false notions concerning the colour of skin. U.S. Sociology professor David Wellman says, "racism is a social relation, not the mere ravings of racist subjects." Racism is structurally built right into the system itself and how it functions. It is not just an idea, a false belief. This is why liberal reforms cannot eliminate the problem of racism. It goes well beyond a mere false idea. The racism we see here in our own society is the same racism that affects the global wealth structure as well. As Zack Cope argues in *Divided World, Divided Class*:

"Against reductionist approaches to conflicts within the working class, the methodology involved in the following examination of racial, ethnic and national chauvinism is materialist, critical and realist. Where much mainstream academic and liberal political opinion has concentrated on exclusivist chauvinism as the product of misunderstanding and/or mistaken identity—in short, as a (set of) erroneous idea(s) eradicable through education—the task of the sociologist is to analyse the objective causes and conditions for working-class disunity. As US Sociology professor David Wellman argues, racism, a virulent strand of chauvinism, is not merely a set of prejudices in the minds of some individuals. It is not possible to educate racism out of existence since racial oppression does not originate through indoctrination programs by racists; "racism is a social relation, not the mere ravings of racist subjects."

With all of this, we're not saying revolution shouldn't happen, or that we should do nothing. We're saying that the potential for
revolution does not reside in the First World. The people of the First World are too comfortable, even with the Great Recession to revolt. Yes, there is poverty, we have never denied that. There is poverty in the First World. We are saying that there is no significant revolutionary potential that would be worthwhile trying to organize. Americans are more likely to have a "revolution" out of a White nationalist identity. The "left" of the "working class" still demands concessions from the capitalist class. The recent victory in California for a $15 minimum wage is all the proof you need. Why is anyone going to risk their lives in a guerrilla war against the government when you can just legislate another pay raise?

We say that we should not waste time and resources trying to appeal to people who don't want to fight. We say save all the resources for people who are truly oppressed, and truly do want to fight. It's easy to take the liberal non-violent legislation route when you're not the one being bombed by imperialism. Especially easy when you're the one benefitting from that bombing. Third World people should realize that First World people are not their allies. They are their enemies. They refuse to fight as Third World people are made subject to ecological disaster, and genocide from U.S. military action. First World people may claim to care, but they don't. Not enough to actually give up their worthless liberal non-action and help. They won't go against their own interests; they won't throw down their own privilege to engage in struggle... Because they don't have to. They can sit nice and comfortably on the spoils of imperialism.

There are a few anomalies in the First World who will still fight. Those that still do have a revolutionary potential. Those who will not sit idly by as the Third World is obliterated into greater and greater suffering. Those with a real revolutionary spirit will have to step up and cast aside those First Worldist pretenders and become real. The real revolutionaries will log off of Facebook and go on to aid the struggle of those from the darkest corners
of the world. Those who are real have an opportunity to prove that they are real by casting aside dogma and picking up the most advanced revolutionary science. A few anomalies will resist the nonsense of social justice warriors that want to be language police instead of revolutionaries. The liberal First World garbage must be left behind to wallow in their self-important ideological destitution. A real struggle must come from real people. Those real people must stand up.

The First World revolution won't be televised, nor will it be streamed from an iPhone. It isn't going to happen at all. The hipster college activists are not going to take the system down with their blustering and phony indignation. Facebook groups are not going to rise up against the system. They can't even stand up to Mark Zuckerberg. They can't even achieve struggle outside of internet memes. These useless children of online "activism" need to be swept out of the way to make room for those actually interested in ending inequality, injustice... ending Capitalism.

“Taking the entire globe, if North America and Western Europe can be called ‘the cities of the world’, then Asia, Africa and Latin America constitute ‘the rural areas of the world’. Since World War II, the proletarian revolutionary movement has for various reasons been temporarily held back in the North American and West European capitalist countries, while the people’s revolutionary movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America has been growing vigorously. In a sense, the contemporary world revolution also presents a picture of the encirclement of cities by the rural areas. In the final analysis, the whole cause of world revolution hinges on the revolutionary struggles of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples who make up the overwhelming majority of the world’s population.”97
Stand-in Proletariat
History has shown us by now that there is no significant proletariat in the First World. There is no social base for class struggle leading to revolution. The exploited class, the proletariat is in the Third World. So where does that leave First Worldists? It leaves them without a revolutionary class. First World groups have to some degree or another recognised this fact. Since there are no workers to organize, they refuse to be organized, they instead followed the words of Lenin... incorrectly. Lenin said to go out and find the lower and deeper sections of the proletariat. Find the lowest and most exploited class possible and bring them to the struggle. The vanguard party should lead them to revolution. "And it is therefore our duty, if we wish to remain socialists to go down lower and deeper, to the real masses...". This what they do, they go out and find another exploited group to show solidarity with. Class struggle would tell us to work in accordance with the Third World proletariat. Instead, they choose some group in the First World because their dogmatism tells them so.

The only people they can try and ally with are identity politics groups. These groups come in many different shapes and sizes. They range from sexual minority rights, gender identity, racial liberation, environmentalism (to a degree), etc. The First Worldist Marxist groups champion their case as if it was their own. Sure, they do believe in liberation of those oppressed people, but that is not actually their goal. Their goal is class war, the abolishment of capitalism. These groups are aiming in a completely different direction. Usually they don't particularly care for having Marxists around. If we run around championing these groups and allying with them, we will never achieve our goals. If pressured enough the bourgeoisie will make
concessions to these groups. These concessions are the same that we have seen all through history. Equal protections under the law, legislation for protection, etc. Once these are achieved the identity group will stop their struggle because they have gotten what they wanted. This is why identity groups are not a basis for social revolution. *They are not there for revolution.*

Identity groups are not out to revolutionize the country with a whole new system, they are out for integration into society. An LGBT group wants to be considered equal to heterosexual people. They are not calling for a massive reorganization of the productive forces with the specific goal of reorienting the base and superstructure. All identity politics movements want are the same privileges as everyone else. They want the same access to capital, public spaces, disposable income, etc. In no way does this mean they don't deserve to be treated like everyone else. This means they're not of a revolutionary mindset. They are of an equal privilege mindset. You are not going to get class revolution out of them.

Looking at the history of the civil right struggles we see that very few people were actually interested in revolution. The demands made by people were not unreasonable, they wanted equality and an end to the Vietnam War. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. called for Blacks and Whites to live in harmony, where one would not be judged by the colour of their skin, but by the content of their character. He wanted peace and equality with Whites. He did not want an entire abolishment of all existing oppression. He did not want a socialist state. Neither did his followers.

'In a sense we've come to our nation's capital to cash a check. When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all men, yes, black
men as well as white men, would be guaranteed the "unalienable Rights" of "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness." It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note, insofar as her citizens of color are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America has given the Negro people a bad check, a check which has come back marked "insufficient funds."\[^{99}\]

I think it's really important to look at exactly what he is saying here. He is saying that African-Americans are entitled to the basic rights and privileges that make up what the "American Dream" is. He wants those same "unalienable rights" for the Black population. Those rights are access to property, the right to sell, the right to buy, access to financial capital, the right to own property and wield it to exploit another person's need, for profits. I don't believe that M.L.K. was a bad person. I says he was shooting for the same thing that all Americans were shooting for: a chance to be a part of the illusion that is capitalist society. If by some miracle there was total racial equality in the United States, there would be no fundamental alteration to capitalism itself. This is important because the economic system forms the basis for global exploitation and oppression. An African-American with the same full rights as a White person is just as much a terror to the Third World as a White person is. Having access to the same benefits of oppression against Africa does nothing to help the far more oppressed African people.

This is what M.L.K. was shooting for, equality not revolution. He and his followers were not on-board with guerrilla war against the government. Any attempt by outside influences to subvert the movement into that would absolutely fail. In the end it would really just cause the destruction of the civil rights movement. Many Marxists have a tendency (because of their support for identity politics) to pay uncritical lip service to the historical figure. They uphold MLK as a hero (which he was)
without acknowledging the inherent contradiction there. M.L.K. was looking for capitalist "equality", he was not looking for *true* equality.

As we look at the Baltimore riots today, we see the same kind of thing. Marxists are vastly exaggerate what is happening. People are running around with Facebook pictures of a flag that says "People's Republic of Baltimore". What kind of nonsense is this? There is no revolution happening there. These riots are an angry response to a terrible injustice that has been committed against the Black population all across the United States. There is no class consciousness here, there is only racial consciousness. First Worldist Marxists have a history of taking these events, and making them out to be heroic acts of resistance. Bob Avakian's RCP has labelled the riots after the Rodney King assault a "rebellion". No, it was a riot in response to continued oppression. It was not an organized act of defiance, it was an explosion of suppressed anger. Does this mean that these riots were unjustified? Does this mean that those riots were wrong? No, of course not.

What I am saying is that Marxists are taking these events unscientifically and jumping on them like a bandwagon without correctly understanding what they are. Marxists are trying to dogmatically replicate what Mao did before them. Mao said the peasants were a wave, a rising tide of revolutionary potential that should be organized and guided by the Vanguard Party.

"In a very short time, in China's central, southern and northern provinces, several hundred million peasants will rise like a mighty storm, like a hurricane, a force so swift and violent that no power, however great, will be able to hold it back. They will smash all the trammels that bind them and rush forward along the road to liberation. They will sweep all the imperialists, warlords, corrupt officials, local tyrants and evil gentry into their
graves. Every revolutionary party and every revolutionary comrade will be put to the test, to be accepted or rejected as they decide. There are three alternatives. To march at their head and lead them? To trail behind them, gesticulating and criticizing? Or to stand in their way and oppose them? Every Chinese is free to choose, but events will force you to make the choice quickly."

What we had with the Rodney King riots and currently have with the Baltimore riots are not the same thing as the peasant struggle in China. Here, African-Americans are an oppressed minority of the population, based on race, a struggle that Marxists are attempting to subvert. In China, the peasants were an oppressed class that comprised 80+% of the population. The Vanguard Party under Mao had the ability to lead them. Peasant farmers were oppressed and exploited on the basis of class, not race. Marxists stand for class struggle. They were the same struggle, a class struggle. That is the difference between Mao's revolution that led the largest country on Earth to victory; and the miserable humiliating confrontation between Black Lives Matter and the Avakian RCP.

Gender activists are a good example of identity politics, as they literally are about identity. They comprise about 2% of the population. Again, even if we assume total revolutionary potential, their numbers alone are insufficient to achieve any revolutionary goal. The gender activist community is mostly made up of Tumblr blogs. People don't realize that the number of those who do publicly carry out activism is a very small portion of the community. (This is not surprising given that it is the First World.) There are almost no gender activists interested in radical action, let alone revolution. Gender activists are not interested in revolution. Their only goal is to achieve a status equal to that of "cis" people. All they want are the same rights and protections that all First World people have. They are an
oppressed section of the population, but they certainly are not a revolutionary group. They don't have communist revolutionary potential. Why? Because they are not a class by the Marxist definition, they are an oppressed group. If we're talking about communist revolution, then we're talking Marxist theory.

Some First Worldist Marxists have invented a new class called the "precariat." Essentially, these groups claim that First World workers who are in a precarious position constitute a new class. Usually they are people who are at risk of losing their jobs, they make the lowest of (First World) wages, and constantly live in fear of becoming unemployed. Also, they're people whose work situation is sporadic. Sure, this situation is awful, I've been in it myself. This is not, however, an alteration in someone's class position. This is not a new class. It can be debunked from two standpoints, the First Worldist and the Third Worldist position. From the First Worldist perspective, this is not a new class. In fact, it's not even something new. The dogmatic First Worldist view of class is simply reduced employment. Being a precarious worker doesn't change their position as employed by a capitalist at all. Their relationship to the means of production changes in no way. Besides, having precarious work is nothing new to the migrant, or even historically for that matter. During Marx's time this same phenomenon existed, and it garnered no special attention by Marx. From the Third Worldist view, their claim makes even less sense. Even part time and even precarious workers are still beneficiaries of imperialism. Their relationship to both the means of production and the global distribution of wealth doesn't change. I find it to be the most First Worldist position to hold. They're literally inventing a new class to put themselves in as a way of claiming they have revolution potential when it means nothing. You can't manufacture a new revolutionary outfit for yourself out of nothing. You'll only end up being the revolutionary with no clothes.
Women on the other hand have played a very important role in revolution. They are however not the backbone of the revolution. The backbone is class, not feminism. This is not to say that women are not oppressed. It means that women's struggle is not what communist revolution is based upon. It is a goal of it, but it is not the motive force. If we were to eliminate sexism from capitalism, just like with race, capitalism would continue to function. Capitalism doesn't need these prejudices, but it does use them. Many capitalist firms are run by women, and they also pay the women wage earners less than their male counterparts. These female bourgeoisie care nothing of their fellow women in this case. They are out to make a profit off them and will use anything to achieve a higher return of surplus value. This includes discriminating against other women. These bourgeois women do this to other women because of their class position, not patriarchy. First World women benefit from the super exploitation of female workers in the Third World. They receive a share of the global inequality in wealth. Capitalism is a system of inequality, such a system is incapable of eliminating inequality. There cannot be equality among women let alone equality between men and women so long as capitalism exists. Feminism today is not interested in abolishing capitalism, they're interested in having the same rights and privileges that men have. They defend the rights and privileges of capitalism, a system of inequality. This does nothing to fundamentally challenge patriarchy. It cannot defeat patriarchy.

If a Marxist group insists on championing such movements, all they are really doing is looking to co-opt them. They are really only using those movements for their own purposes. African-Americans for example are well aware of this as are many other groups. There is a reason why a lot Black rights movements reject having White people in them because they often face attempts to take over their struggles. A good example of this is the Black Lives Matter struggle. They specifically focus on Black lives for two reasons. First, because it is Black lives that are
disproportionately killed, subjected to violence. Second, if they let it become All Lives Matter, White liberals will end up invading their movement and completely taking it over. Once they do so all the radical action will be eliminated in favour of useless liberalism. African-Americans will drop out of the movement. White liberals will destroy the Black Lives Matter movement. It will also deemphasize the disproportionate killing of Blacks by police, completely killing the intent of the movement to begin with. Once this happens African-Americans will leave the group and go elsewhere, if they don’t give up on struggle entirely. This will collapse the Black Lives Matter movement leaving nothing by a small group of liberal activists with nothing. Done in this was the Marxist movement will only end up ruining the Black liberation cause.

Why do First Worldists so heavily rely upon such groups as a stand in proletariat? Why do they so uncritically ally with these movements? Why do they try to co-opt and infiltrate these other movements? Why does the Avakian RCP try to subvert the Black Lives Matter movement to communist revolution? Because First World communists have no movement of their own. There is no communist movement in the First World. There are certainly communist groups. But there is no communist movement. All protestations to the contrary mean nothing. A Facebook group does not constitute a movement. A social club of 10 people does not constitute a movement. A student activist group does not constitute a movement. A blog doesn't constitute a movement. All these things combined do not constitute a movement. There is no communist consciousness in the First World. Communists are not achieving anything in the First World. Despite this they obnoxiously compare themselves to actual movements and struggles in the Third World like the New People's Army in the Philippines. Marxists here have no movement, thus they resort to stealing the movements of others. The Avakian RCP attempted to take over the Occupy
Wall Street movement and the Black Lives Movement because they don't have a movement of their own.

The strategy proposed by Lenin and others is to include those "lower and deeper" oppressed and exploited groups into the communist movement. They did not say to go forth and subvert other people's movements and make them into your own. The strategy is to accept other struggles into the communist one, not the other way around. You cannot make a gender identity struggle into a communist one. You can, and are supposed to, make the gender identity a part of the communist one. This is a good reason why Marxists in the First World absolutely fail. There is no class based movement to which other struggles can be incorporated. This is the First World, it is not possible to build a class based revolutionary movement.

Maoists in the First World are the absolute worst when it comes to this. They misunderstand and misuse Mao's theory, "Unity, Struggle, Unity". They absolutely fail to understand what Mao was actually saying here in terms of building a revolutionary movement. Mao said to unite with groups on the things that we agree on. Then we struggle with them over the things that we don't agree on. Once we win them over, we unite with them again towards the same goal of communism. This is not what First Worldists are doing with all of these groups. Mao was saying we had to have them join our movement by winning them over to our side. First Worldists just run out and say they support any group that is oppressed and claim solidarity. They have no moment of their own for which to draw them into. They just end up championing their cause instead of communist revolution. They're incorrectly trying to build a revolutionary movement.

This position by First Worldists is also a death trap that ensnares the revolutionary movement by failing to recognise primary and secondary contradictions. As Mao explained:
"As we have said, one must not treat all the contradictions in a process as being equal but must distinguish between the principal and the secondary contradictions, and pay special attention to grasping the principal one. But, in any given contradiction, whether principal or secondary, should the two contradictory aspects be treated as equal? Again, no. In any contradiction the development of the contradictory aspects is uneven. Sometimes they seem to be in equilibrium, which is however only temporary and relative, while unevenness is basic. Of the two contradictory aspects, one must be principal and the other secondary. The principal aspect is the one playing the leading role in the contradiction. The nature of a thing is determined mainly by the principal aspect of a contradiction, the aspect which has gained the dominant position.

"But this situation is not static; the principal and the non-principal aspects of a contradiction transform themselves into each other and the nature of the thing changes accordingly. In a given process or at a given stage in the development of a contradiction, A is the principal aspect and B is the non-principal aspect; at another stage or in another process the roles are reversed--a change determined by the extent of the increase or decrease in the force of each aspect in its struggle against the other in the course of the development of a thing."102

Not all contradictions are of equal importance. Any claim that there is no primary contradiction is an outright violation of Marxism, and simply denies the dialectical nature of social conflict. Since the age of Lenin we have understood that imperialism is the primary contradiction in the world. Today we understand that this has evolved into the imperialist
contradiction between the First and Third World. If we place all contradictions on the same level we end up fighting for none of them, achieving none of them. If we use all efforts on many simultaneous goals we will achieve none of them.

There is a very specific reason why none of the aforementioned oppressions can be abolished, so long as class divides still exist. The class struggle is what lays the groundwork for the production of a world that is free from all forms of oppression. To claim otherwise is unscientific reactionary nonsense. Capitalism as a system cannot end any inequality and oppression. It is a system totally dedicated to and requires inequality in order to function. The whole purpose of capitalism is to give more to some and less to others. This is the very definition of inequality. No one can speak of equality between men and women so long as inequality exists. Because bourgeois women will pay lower class women less on the basis of class, not patriarchy. It is directly against their class interest to be fair to other women. Communism seeks a world without contradictions between people. Once you have a society not based upon divides, but closing divides, you can begin working on those inequalities. All struggles of race, gender, sex, are all meaningless endeavours if you intend to build them in a world where inequality is the rule. You must lay the foundation for equality before equality can be built. This is why liberals have historically failed to build equality, because they do not recognize class as a primary contradiction that must be overcome to build the possibility for other equalities. Instead, they dogmatically insist that just passing laws and educating people will be enough. No, we must build an equal world in order to achieve equal relations.

None of this can be accomplished without abolishing capitalism. In order to do that, we must recognise the primary contradiction of imperialism. Since class based revolution in the First World has been clearly shown to be impossible, we must forward
Global People's War. The Third World must liberate itself from the oppression and super exploitation of the First, which refuses to make revolution. Once this has been achieved, the Third World can unite in action to defend themselves against imperialist aggression much more effectively. The loss of super-exploitation will cause the First World to economically collapse as it will be unable to sustain itself. At this time the common class interest will become apparent to First World people. This is what will stimulate them to organize for class war. Only then can First World people have revolutionary potential. At that moment it is up to First World people to build their own communist revolution.

It is only when the groundwork for equality has been laid that these other struggles can have success. Our tactical goal is to go to these groups and struggle with them to understand that our way is the only way to achieve their goals. They are supposed to unite with us in the communist struggle because we are the only ones who have the correct tactic to build the world free from all forms of oppression. They must be convinced to join us. We must not uncritically and unscientifically champion their causes and support them in actions that run counter to revolution, and sabotage their own goals. We must win them over to our side and our movement if they are to achieve their goals and ours. This is what is entirely forgotten about by First Worldists. They have no movement, they are incapable of building one because the First World is not revolutionary. They refuse to accept this fact, no matter how apparent it is to them. First Worldists are on an entirely self-destructive anti-scientific course. First Worldists are the biggest enemy that Marxism faces. They sabotage themselves via their own dogmatism.

Politics in command, revolutionary science in command! Not identity politics!
Resistance and Revolution

One of the most common objections to Third Worldism is the false belief that we advocate doing nothing. People have the perception that we believe that the path to revolution is just standing around waiting for revolution to happen elsewhere. This "do nothing-ism" is far from what we advocate. First Worldists often use this as a straw man argument against us. In our view we see the struggle for revolution in the First World as being a waste of resources and energy that could be more productively used elsewhere. As First Worldists have little to no knowledge of our theory they simply believe that we have washed our hands of the global North and resign ourselves to inactivity. This is quite far from the truth. We advocate no such thing.

While the First World is devoid of any significant revolutionary potential, that does not mean it is devoid of revolutionary people. There are always some anomalies who, despite their global class position, still have a revolutionary spirit. These people must come forward and leave all the pretenders and fakes behind. They must charge ahead and leave all those phonies to their wallow self-aggrandization. The real revolutionaries must reject the dogmatism that plagues Marxism and fight for real change. We must rise above collage activist groups cosplaying revolution with childish antics and internet drama. We must leave behind in the dustbin of history the ivory tower academic elitists who tout themselves as great theorists while they drown real revolution in dogmatism fueled by self-importance. The real revolutionaries must stand up, sweep aside ego and set upon doing real work that creates liberation. Those small few who have real revolutionary potential must work in the most reactionary realm as a forward light.

In our view we see it simply put as: Revolution in the Third World, resistance in the First. Organization can be quite fruitful in the imperialist countries. Under no circumstances should First
World Marxists think they have nothing to contribute to struggle. Everyone, regardless of class position can have value and contribute. It is only a matter of finding our roles and following orders. There should be no sadness in realizing that the First World lacks revolutionary potential; the opposite should be true. One should celebrate that they have discovered a new path, a new way of struggling that can be productive! For the First Worldist this should signal a new positive because their orientation has changed. The endless and unwinnable struggle has always been to convince First World people that our way is correct and that they should rebel against capitalism. This has always failed for the working class of the advanced industrialized nations. No longer does one have to be a slave to this agonizing and frustrating task of trying to raise class consciousness among people who simply refuse to do so.

In the First World resistance is the goal, not the destruction of capitalism. We only need to work to create better conditions for Third World people to carry out the struggle. We don't need to win, we only need to resist. Defeating capitalism in the First World is a task beyond our ability at this time. The material conditions and the level of consciousness are insufficient. But those of us who are revolutionary can still carry out actions to aid revolution. All Marxists should recognise that imperialism is the primary contradiction. The exploiter nations versus the exploited nations. As First World people, we live in the belly of the beast as Che Guevara described. If this is where we are, then this is how we should act. If we are to live in the beast's belly, then we should act according to our position. Our duty as revolutionaries is to give the beast a stomach ache. We should carry out actions that would destabilize the imperialist core, allowing the exploited countries the chance to have some breathing room for revolution.

So what can be done? First and foremost, we should actively seek out national suicide. We must recognize that we are the
enemy. Our country, our privilege, our nationalism is the enemy. Our whole world (the First World) is the enemy. This concept must be grasped if we are to truly understand what it means to fight for national suicide. Our economic system must fall. Our troops must lose the war, they must not be hailed as heroes, but condemned as criminals. We must recognize the right of Third World people to attack us back for all that we have done to them. Our social system must break down. Our privilege must be destroyed. The primary goal is to end imperialism. We must discover ways to end the wars. Bringing the troops home is an invaluable effort that can do so much good. Foreign control over nations must be opposed and measures should be taken to stop it.

So what can we do? The anti-war movement is the best place to start. Anything that opposes the wars has some value, somewhere. Yes, this movement is dominated by liberals, but we can and must push it beyond the limits placed upon it by liberals. Spreading awareness is the easiest thing to do to begin right away. The more anti-war sentiment that can be whipped up the better. Let us take this liberalism and drive it toward something more radical. We don't necessarily need violence. These particular anti-war groups should remain non-violent. Their goal is to attract more people to the anti-war side. While normally activism doesn't achieve very much, historically the anti-war movement can move some boulders. One of the best aspects of the anti-war movement during the Vietnam War was its ability to draw in people from all different sorts of causes. Disgruntled veterans angry at having served could be somewhat united with Black power elements that refused to serve defending a system that oppresses them. Pro-American White liberals who opposed putting their lives on the line could fight for the same cause as people who virulently hate the United States for its imperialism. The anti-war platform today can draw people from the anti-Obama camp who think he's an evil "Keynesian-Islamo-Cultural Marxist-Nazi" destroying America
with same sex marriage. The ever obnoxious pathological self-involved libertarians also support the anti-war movement on the basis of it being big government socialism. The greatness here is that anti-capitalists and pro-capitalists can push for the same goal. It doesn't have to be for the same reasons, it just has to be the same goal.

As long as we don't compromise on ideology, there should be no problem with seeking the same goal as reactionary forces. We both want the same thing in this immediate struggle. I think we should see the libertarians for what they are: useful tools. Their ideology will drive the death of capitalism faster than anything else. Why not use them in this struggle? Let us take advantage of their ignorance and help them ruin the First World. In the end it can only serve to help the Third World revolutionary movements, and place us in a position to struggle for revolution at home when the time comes. If we acknowledge that the material conditions are too high, then decreasing them will increase class consciousness. Yes, we must go directly against our class interest if we are to achieve a revolutionary potential. This is a huge reason why First Worldists refuse to accept the Third World line. They are unwilling to do what is right for the whole, instead they seek only for themselves. This is counter to the revolutionary spirit. First Worlders like to quote Che on being selfless, but none of them want to do it.

Often we say that there is no point in engaging in electoral politics. When Marxists have advocated not participating in the bourgeois system; they have done so on the premise that revolution cannot come that way. They are as correct today as they were when they spoke those words. However, we should acknowledge that we are not doing revolution here. We should consider voting for groups that are anti-war, and on this basis alone. The biggest anti-war ticket is the Libertarian Party. One of their biggest goals is ending the wars. Think about what would happen if such a candidate really got into office and did that.
Ending the wars would have an immediate benefit. Troops occupying the Philippines and other places would get a big boost to their revolutionary movements. Foreign aid to terrorist governments would be another benefit. It would be astounding if Israel lost its American funding. Colombia is another good example of a terrorist state. With no funding going into the military, the FARC would have a much easier time struggling. Venezuela would benefit immensely if funds were withheld from subversion operations. Of course, all of this is a big "if". It remains to be seen exactly how much a libertarian president would be able to get away with. Sooner or later, if that person did enough damage the ruling class would step in and stop them.

Killing off the welfare state is also a big advantage for First World resistance. If such a libertarian gets into power they will destroy the things people need. They will disassemble all the benefits of imperialism that keep First World people from having revolutionary potential. The elimination of public health insurance and welfare programs for people would produce a huge class shock. Such a reduction in First World privilege would have a major proletarianizing effect. The elimination of the minimum wage would have disastrous consequences for the lower and middle class. Marx said that the worker's have nothing to lose but their chains. This would certainly reduce the "working class" to a level where they only did have their chains. This would be the start of a growing proletariat in the First World. If we wanted to build a revolutionary potential in the global North, this would be the way to do it. Sure, it would be horrible for the people there, but not as bad as the people who suffer globally constantly from imperialism.

Another great thing that First World comrades could do is raise money for Third World revolutionary groups. Part of being where we are, is being where the wealth has been transferred. This gives us a prime opportunity to collect the necessary funds.
to pay for struggle. We live in a society where many people have disposable income and lots of liberals like doling out money instead of actually doing something. Invisible Children and Kony2012 is a prime example of just how lucrative it can be. I think it was one of the greatest money making schemes in recent memory. A good point to make here is that we should not necessarily do this under the red banner. First World people (particularly Americans) have been conditioned so well to reject anything that even sounds like it might be socialist. Forming an activist group to carry out all manner of liberal activism asking for donations would have an effect. Some comrades could create a fake grassroots conservative organization, promising to support conservative ideas. Taking the money of the biggest supporters of imperialism should be no moral quandary for us. Taking money from the global bourgeois should be a high priority. Revolution isn't cheap, it often costs millions.

Islamic charities that serve as fronts for collecting money for terrorism have been extremely successful. I'm not saying that all Islamic charities are funnelling money for terrorism, but some are. Doing this has been very efficient in raising funds. There's all sorts of plans to raise money that can be carried out. They range between legal and illegal. The mafia has given some tremendous examples on how to launder money. This is a tactic that works, we should not be shy about using it. We should use all means at our disposal to collect money for the revolutionary movement. This is our place in the global revolutionary movement. We're not front line soldiers like those in the Third World; but we can make our contribution. We can still make a big difference.

In past revolutions, groups have done whatever was necessary to pay for the struggle. Many people accuse the FARC in Colombia of selling cocaine and decry them for it. I say they would be fools not to sell it. Who cares if a bunch of First World bourgeois swine get addicted to a party drug? Their decadent lifestyle, their self-involved ways should be used against them.
Did Marx not say that a capitalist would sell us the rope we'd use to hang him if he thought he could make enough money off it? In Southeast Asia, many groups conduct illegal logging of teak in order to pay for their struggles. Others create and sell drugs, particularly Ecstasy. They call it the Golden Triangle for a reason. Despite heroic and romantic stories about the Chinese Revolution, there was a great deal of opium trafficking by the People's Liberation Army. Back then opium was as good as cash, sometimes better. Back then a group of communist rebels would attack a wealthy landlord and beat him until he gave up his silver and opium. Then they would beat him or his son until he gave up the rest. This is the reality of collecting money for the revolution. It is violent and dangerous, because that is what war is.

Look at the other so-called rebels of the First World. The libertarians and the anarcho-capitalists. They advocate violence against the state, but what do they do? Ask them, they say they'll take down the government by running off into the woods and use Bitcoin and 3D printers. In reality they choose the most non-violent means possible to resist. Why? Because despite all their rhetoric they are not oppressed. They are not radical. They are privileged whiny foot stamping children who want more, more, more. The gluttony of the First World mentality can never be satisfied.

War, including class war, is not a humane act. It's not a dinner party as Mao said.

"...a revolution is not a dinner party, or writing an essay, or painting a picture, or doing embroidery; it cannot be so refined, so leisurely and gentle, so temperate, kind, courteous, restrained and magnanimous."

The use of violence is absolutely necessary. You need to carry out war to end war.
"We are advocates of the abolition of war, we do not want war; but war can only be abolished through war, and in order to get rid of the gun it is necessary to take up the gun."\(^\text{108}\)

It is only the goal that is humane or inhumane. We do not whine about the use of violence, we see it for what it is: a tool to be used to achieve a goal. It is violence, death, and suffering. Paying for it is no different. First Worlders complain, saying that it goes too far. Says who? The people who won't struggle for revolution? The people who aren't even trying to? The people who are cosplaying it? We detest this notion of, "it makes us just as bad as them". We should scoff at their bourgeois morality. No one should ever see the violence carried out by the oppressed as being equal to or the same as the violence of the oppressor. To do so is to side with the oppressor. The masses have the right to use whatever means necessary to win the struggle for their liberation. If the oppressor countries don't like it, then they can stop oppressing. If you're not willing to fight, if you're not willing to inflict suffering to defend the masses, then don't call yourself a Marxist. We stand for violence towards an honourable goal, not violence towards a dishonourable goal. There is a very clear difference. Everyone says "fuck the system", few are willing to actually fuck it.

Mao said it's fine:

"It's fine. It is not "terrible" at all. It is anything but "terrible". "It's terrible!" is obviously a theory for combating the rise of the peasants in the interests of the landlords; it is obviously a theory of the landlord class for preserving the old order of feudalism and obstructing the establishment of the new order of democracy, it is obviously a counterrevolutionary theory. No revolutionary comrade should echo this nonsense. If your revolutionary viewpoint is firmly
established and if you have been to the villages and looked around, you will undoubtedly feel thrilled as never before. Countless thousands of the enslaved--the peasants--are striking down the enemies who batten on their flesh. What the peasants are doing is absolutely right, what they are doing is fine! "It's fine!" is the theory of the peasants and of all other revolutionaries."^{109}

First and foremost, there should always be an effort to educate people on the Third Worldist line. We can't win over as many of those with real revolutionary potential as possible, if our ideology isn't known. Spreading our word isn't the same as the spreading of any other Marxist tendency. We're not looking to recruit as many people as possible. We're looking to recruit the best people possible for a given job. First Worldist Marxists have a really bad history of accepting anyone into their organizations without any education in the ideology. If someone wants in, they get taken in. Well, that's more like a social club than a revolutionary group. The resistance in the imperialist core should be harder to get into than the most exclusive club. Because we're looking to build an elite group for First World resistance and sabotage actions, we need to take quality over quantity. Since Marxist organizations in the First World have had such a hard time recruiting, they generally accept anyone into their groups without any kind of screening process. To work in the imperialist core we need the best, not the most people.

We need to find those that are truly serious, not people looking to pose for guerrilla porn. Anyone can proclaim that they're revolutionaries and posture as if they're to be the vanguard of the revolution. A lot of people do it on the internet. How serious is anyone? Everyone claims they're willing to die for the cause, but ask those people to donate $20 and all of a sudden they start getting nervous and start looking for excuses. This happens all the time. People talk all kinds of fluff about what they would
do in a revolution, and about how real they are. People are "willing to die for revolution", but they won't donate $20. First Worldists are gigantic posers, they talk all the time about what real revolutionaries they are; but they never do anything, they never accomplish anything.

Being a Third Worldist isn't about cosplaying revolution. It isn't about Facebook posturing, calling yourselves "the leaders of the Maoist rebellion of New York". It isn't about being a low rated blog proclaiming to be a "semi-clandestine organization". It isn't about pulling childish antics to get the attention of lunatic fringe media like Alex Jones. It isn't about posting pictures of yourself on Facebook wearing a ushanka. It is not about running a Facebook group with your friends banning anyone who disagrees with you. Being a Third Worldist in the First World is about putting aside your ego and recognising that you're not the vanguard of the revolution. It's about fulfilling a role that needs to be filled; even if it isn't glamorous, or something you can brag to your friends about. It is about building revolution, not conducting wrecking activity on others. It is about being serious and doing real work for an actual revolution. It's about not doing what is best for you and your ego. It is about doing what is best for the global exploited and oppressed class.

**Economy Evolves - So Must Our Theory**

It is an irrefutable truth that economy has evolved since the very days when economy began. Humanity has progressed through several modes of production, as trade and the means of production themselves changed. Economy is rarely static, even the smallest events and have an impact in the way it functions. Sometimes even large events like the Great Depression and Great Recession have their influence. The point is that economy is always in flux. Marx noted the dynamism of capitalism to alter itself to adapt to new conditions. this has always proven to be true. Whatever obstacles capitalism has faced, it has managed
to keep itself afloat - even if not as profitable as it was previously.

Marxism itself is meant to be such a science. One that can adapt to the changing world around us. Two of those great contributors were Lenin and Mao. Both of them saw that the world and its economy were not the same as they were in Marx's time. This is especially true of Lenin, who created the Marxist theoretical basis of imperialism. Financial capital had grown beyond what even Marx himself predicted. He claimed that financial capital was to always be subservient industrial capital. This turned out to be incorrect. Lenin showed how financial capital was the driver of imperialism, and how workers followed it.

"The enormous dimensions of finance capital concentrated in a few hands and creating an extraordinarily dense and widespread network of relationships and connections which subordinates not only the small and medium, but also the very small capitalists and small masters, on the one hand, and the increasingly intense struggle waged against other national state groups of financiers for the division of the world and domination over other countries, on the other hand, cause the propertied classes to go over entirely to the side of imperialism. “General” enthusiasm over the prospects of imperialism, furious defence of it and painting it in the brightest colours—such are the signs of the times. Imperialist ideology also penetrates the working class. No Chinese Wall separates it from the other classes. The leaders of the present-day, so-called, “Social-Democratic” Party of Germany are justly called “social-imperialists”, that is, socialists in words and imperialists in deeds; but as early as 1902, Hobson noted the existence in Britain of
“Fabian imperialists” who belonged to the opportunist Fabian Society."

Lenin's theories on imperialism remain mostly true to this day. I'd say there is a slight difference given the evolution of the global economy. Lenin showed that Marx was wrong on this count regarding the role of financial capital in the future. It was Lenin's contribution that allows us to understand imperialism today. Lenin recognized the necessity of updating the theory of Marxism, in order for it to fit the material conditions of his day. It was this work that went a long way towards saving Marxism from the Second International that would have driven the theory towards "Social-Democracy."

Mao Zedong also made his mark on theory by creating a great contribution to it. He noted that you didn't necessarily need the industrial working class as a basis for communist revolution. It was the failed experience of Wang Ming and the 28½ Bolsheviks that proved the idea to be false. Relying on the workers in a country where 80+ percent of the population were peasants, was incorrect. As the uprising was defeated by the Nationalist Forces, the Long Mach began.

Under Mao's leadership he began an investigation into China's material conditions that were different from that of Europe; and what Marx himself had said. His conclusion was that the peasants were to be the motive force of the revolution, not the industrial working class. He described the peasants longing for liberation to be a "wave." The task of the party was to guide that wave towards socialism. He too recognized that the theory did not fit the conditions of China. Thus, he made theoretical contributions which gave rise to the revolution. He was correct in his work. His theories began wave a revolutions across the oppressed world during the 60s and 70s.

It is not without precedent that we must update our theory of Marxism to fit our own historical and material period. We are at
a crossroads right now. There has not been any significant new revolutionary activity. Those that remain are left over from decades past: the Naxals and the New People's Army, for example. We must do the same now to preserve the science. We must adhere to the spirit and intent of Marxism to save it from stagnation.

In any given historical period, it is the producers of wealth who are the exploited. At different points in time, it's a different group of people. This was put so well by Eleanor Marx, Karl Marx's daughter:

"The sum thus entering the pocket of the capitalist Marx calls surplus value. It is not all profit, but it includes the employer’s profit. He has to share it with others: with the Government in the shape of rates and taxes, with the landlord for rent, with the merchant, etc. The laws that regulate this repartition will be explained in the third Book (2nd volume) of “Das Kapital,” which, together with the second, the author has left in manuscript... Thus, all classes of society not composed of actual and immediate producers of wealth (and these, in England at least, me almost exclusively wages-laborers), all classes, from kings and queens to music-masters and greengrocers, live upon their respective shares of this surplus-value. In other words, they live upon the net produce of the surplus labor which the capitalist extracts from his workpeople, but for which he does not pay. It matters not whether the share of surplus-labor falling to each member of society not actually a producer is granted as a gift by Act of Parliament from the public revenue, or whether it has to be earned by performing some function not actually productive. There is no other fund out of which they can be paid, but the sum total of the surplus value
created by the immediate producers, for which they are not paid.”

The exploited are the "immediate producers of wealth" who are not paid the full value of their labour. During Marx's time that certainly was the industrial working class. In feudalism, it would have been the peasantry. Marx's prediction was that wealth would polarize between the capitalists and the working class. Today we see that's not what happened. In our modern bourgeois democracy, we can clearly see that there is a middle class. This middle class is a historical development of capitalism that was created to place a buffer between the rich and the poor. Marx predicted that the poorer countries would catch up with the advanced countries placing all workers on relatively the same level. It was because of this prediction that Marx said, "worker's of the world unite." Did this equalization between countries happen? No, we can see the astronomical growth of inequality between the rich countries and the poor countries. Wealth did polarize, just not as Marx had predicted. The wealth divide has become a global one.

Can we say that the "immediate producers of wealth" are still where they were during Marx's time? No, it has changed as capitalism has changed. There has been a great de-industrialization of the First World. The Lion's share of the manufacturing has been moved overseas to China and India most primarily. Very little remains left in the First World, particularly the U.S.

By no means do we claim that there is no manufacturing in the First World countries. Instead, we refer to the First World as "mall economies." (In bourgeois economics, it's called a service economy.) When you look at any mall you see that very little is actually produced there. Almost everything is manufactured somewhere else, then brought to the mall for retail distribution. One of the few exception is the food court, which still creates
value by producing the commodity on the premises. This we think, describes the First World in general. Our economy has been transformed largely into the a service sector economy. Data from the Bureau of Labor Statics is very revealing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. Employment by Industry (Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extraction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and logging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goods producing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraction:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondurable goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service providing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and warehousing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and business services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and hospitality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government (Federal, state and local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Employment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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U.S. Gross Domestic Product by Industry (in Billions of Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraction</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>152.9</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>184.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing, and hunting</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>108.9</td>
<td>239.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods producing</td>
<td>285.1</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>689.8</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1212.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>131.5</td>
<td>243.6</td>
<td>467.3</td>
<td>511.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>235.6</td>
<td>558.3</td>
<td>968.9</td>
<td>1415.6</td>
<td>1701.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service producing</td>
<td>711.0</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>1945.3</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>4404.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>186.3</td>
<td>347.7</td>
<td>617.7</td>
<td>797.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>198.3</td>
<td>400.4</td>
<td>686.2</td>
<td>884.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>145.5</td>
<td>173.9</td>
<td>264.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and warehousing</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>172.8</td>
<td>301.4</td>
<td>402.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>108.3</td>
<td>235.6</td>
<td>417.8</td>
<td>623.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, insurance, real estate, rental</td>
<td>152.8</td>
<td>446.8</td>
<td>1049.2</td>
<td>1997.7</td>
<td>3007.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### and leasing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>and leasing</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>173.1</th>
<th>516.5</th>
<th>1116.8</th>
<th>1782.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Professional and business services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional and business services</th>
<th>40.5</th>
<th>134.1</th>
<th>376.7</th>
<th>678</th>
<th>1272.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Educational services, health care, and social assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational services, health care, and social assistance</th>
<th>29.8</th>
<th>83</th>
<th>199.6</th>
<th>381.6</th>
<th>555.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food services</th>
<th>27.8</th>
<th>68.5</th>
<th>153.9</th>
<th>277.6</th>
<th>356.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Other services, except government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other services, except government</th>
<th>1038.3</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>2788.1</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>5800.5</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>9951.5</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>14526.5</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Sum of extraction, goods producing, and service producing may not be equal to totals due to rounding.

### U.S. Trade Balance (Billions of Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Goods</th>
<th>Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>-19.41</td>
<td>-25.50</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>-80.87</td>
<td>-111.04</td>
<td>30.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>-376.75</td>
<td>-445.791</td>
<td>69.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-516.90</td>
<td>-645.12</td>
<td>150.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What we can see here clearly, is that the creation of value - actual physical commodity production - has been shifted to the Third World where the capitalist can obtain a greater rate of profit. Marx, based his analysis and conclusions on the conditions of his time; how the economy functioned when he was investigating it. We must do the same now, we must see how our economy functions; in order to determine who are the producers of wealth.

It is he who does not receive the full value of his labour which is considered exploited. In the First World today, we primarily have a service industry. It is true that this service industry facilitates the movement of the commodity along to the customer. The person behind the counter at Walmart has a different social manifestation of their divide from the Chinese sweatshop.
worker who produced the commodity. What they are confronted with is a division of labour.

"The division of labour is the economic expression of the social character of labour within the estrangement. Or, since labour is only an expression of human activity within alienation, of the manifestation of life as the alienation of life, the division of labour, too, is therefore nothing else but the estranged, alienated positing of human activity as a real activity of the species or as activity of man as a species-being..."

"The factors we have to consider are: Firstly, the propensity to exchange – the basis of which is found in egoism – is regarded as the cause or reciprocal effect of the division of labour. Say regards exchange as not fundamental to the nature of society. Wealth – production – is explained by division of labour and exchange. The impoverishment of individual activity, and its loss of character as a result of the division of labour, are admitted. Exchange and division of labour are acknowledged as the sources of the great diversity of human talents – a diversity which in its turn becomes useful as a result of exchange." ¹¹⁸

The division of labour in Marx's day was relatively small. People worked on the same assembly line, while others worked in another room performing skilled labour. One man may have carried the pig iron to the foundry while another hammered it into particular shapes. One man may produce the given shape of a widget, while another smoothes out the surface of his creation. All of these people lived in relatively the same geographical location, and had relative levels of wealth.

Today the division is a global divide. The people on the other end of commodity production are a faceless entity to the other side of the world. Often times, we are told they're trying to kill
us or take our jobs. As that division physically grew with necessity, via the falling rate of profit; so did the gap in wealth between the two. Production is now a global endeavour. A man mines tin out of a Bolivian mine, then sends it off to China for production into a commodity. Eventually it finds its way to a Walmart shelf, stocked by a customer service representative. Now, we do not so much face someone who has a lower hourly wage. We face someone who makes a fraction of our own. 80$ a day compared to 2$ a day.

Is this divide really relevant? Marx thought so.

“We must make the same distinction between him and the wage-workers directly employed by industrial capital which exists between industrial capital and merchant’s capital, and thus between the industrial capitalist and the merchant. Since the merchant, as mere agent of circulation, produces neither value nor surplus-value. It follows that the mercantile workers employed by him in these same functions cannot directly create surplus-value for him. In other words, that he does not enrich himself by cheating his clerks.”

The flow of commodities from production to the customers hand is not a simple movement. It must pass through many hands before it reaches the customer. Each point in the path must acquire a profit. Elsewise, the movement of the commodity would break down. Once a commodity is produced it is moved off to a middle man, a person who buys goods from producers and sells them to retailers. From there the retailer sells it to the customer. At each point in the movement of the commodity, someone has made a profit. The profit of the middle man and the retailer was not obtained from the employees of each. It is only the worker who produced the commodity who has created any surplus-value.
Marxism is very clear in saying that it is the labour used to create the commodity that produces value. It is the source of all profit. Certainly the employees of the middle man help facilitate the realization of value, but they are not direct producers themselves. As the productive capability of capitalism grew, so did the unproductive sectors that facilitated the capitalist system. The First World, as we've seen from the previous data, is the center of that unproductive sector.

What is significant here is that the First World worker is paid far, far, above the value of the labour. They are paid well above their contribution to the production process. The worker that produces the commodities is paid $2 a day, while the person who simply moves it is paid $80 a day. The First World worker isn't producing any wealth, yet is paid above the value of their contribution to the process. Being paid above their contribution is a part of imperialism.

"The relatively cursory passages of Imperialism are expanded into a rather fuller argument in “Imperialism and the Split.” The existence of a labor aristocracy is explained by the super-profits of monopoly, which allows the capitalists “to devote a part (and not a small one at that) to bribe their own workers, to create something like an alliance...between the workers of a given nation and their capitalists against the other countries.” This “bribery” operates through trusts, the financial oligarchy, high prices, etc. (i.e., something like joint monopolies between a given capitalism and its workers). The amount of the potential bribe is substantial—Lenin estimated it as perhaps one hundred million francs out of a billion—and so, under certain circumstances, is the stratum which benefits from it."120

If even in Lenin's time workers could be paid above the value of their labour in a "bribe," what makes us think this has not
increased in our time? The gulf between the First and Third World has only grown as proven by previous data presented. Are we supposed to believe that capitalism hasn't changed since Lenin's time? Or should we believe - as First Worldists would have us believe - the this "bribe" no longer exists? The divide is very real, and qualitatively different; no matter how much First Worldists try to deny it.

In the course of the development of capitalism, Marx predicted that wages would inevitably be pushed down to a bare-subsistence level. A minimal about by which a person could possibly survive. He categorized it as the immiseration of the working class. Wages, would be reduced to the level of being just enough to get the labourer to come to work. The cost of the "reproduction of the worker." This does not describe the average worker in the First World. It most certainly does not describe Western Europe. There are, however, isolated pockets of it, primarily undocumented workers. You cannot claim this represents the First World worker. Almost all of them have a wage that is above the value of their labour. This does adequately describe the working conditions of Third World workers.

The LLCO explains this quite well:

"Even though Marx was wrong about the exact details of immiseration, this view of value allows for what is seen today. Under Marx’s model, it is possible for value to be transferred from direct producers to others. It is also possible for value to be transferred from direct producers to direct producers. In other words, First World direct producers can obtain a share of the surplus that originates in the Third World. Even if a direct producer in the First World is adding to the global social product through his labor, at the same time, he is subtracting from the global social product the same
way that other exploiters do. He is obtaining a share of value from the Third World. This offsets whatever value he produces. This makes him a net-exploiter, just like members of other exploiting classes."¹²¹

So how do we know who is exploited or not? This is certainly an important question. One that has been answered magnificently by Comrade Serve the People:

“Comrade Marx pointed out that labor is the substance of value. He said that the number of hours of average abstract socially necessary labor needed to produce a commodity represents its value. That means labor of average productivity under the given working conditions for the specified type of work. Therefore, if traded at value, one hour of labor put into harvesting parsnips is exchangeable against one hour of assembling washing machines (if the labor in both cases is of average productivity).

The nominal GDP of the entire world was $31.9 trillion in 2002. This figure represents everything produced in the world, including services (which tend to be overvalued), in a year’s time. The population is about 6.4 billion people. Assume that 2/3 of them work full time on a typical US schedule of 2000 hours per year. Then the value of average labor is $7500 per year, or about $3.75 per hour. (Slightly higher, actually, since the world’s population was a bit lower in 2002 than it is today.)

Elsewhere I have seen estimates from the UN that the world’s nominal GDP in 2005 is about $36 trillion. That would put the value of labor at $8400 per year, or $4.20 per hour. What is the implication? In the US, the minimum wage is $5.15 per hour, and even higher in some states and cities. If average labor is worth $4.20,
then even people making the minimum wage are overpaid on average by about 23%. The average wage in the US is about $18 per hour, which is more than 4 times the value of labor.”

All of this goes a long way to explaining what Third Worldism theory is proposing. This development in the relationship between workers internationally explains the divide between the First and Third World. We can see that the immeseration of the proletariat has been shifted to the Third World where greater levels of profit can be found in manufacturing. The pool of purchasing power to buy those commodities can be found in the First World. The commodities we purchase today are in far greater numbers than they were in decades past. Everyone's parents are happy to remind them how much less they had as children. This divide in wealth and the production process has allowed us to collect more of the value produced than in generations past.

To understand this better, we need only look at what constitutes poor in the First World and the Third World. These two different definitions speak volumes about the global order, and how Third World really receives the short end of the stick in wealth inequality.

"The Census Bureau defines an individual as poor if his or her family income falls below certain specified income thresholds. These thresholds vary by family size. In 2006, a family of four was deemed poor if its annual income fell below $20,615; a family of three was deemed poor if annual income was below $16,079. There are a number of problems with the Census Bureau's poverty figures: Census undercounts income, ignores assets accumulated in prior years, and disregards non-cash welfare such as food stamps and public housing in its official count of income. However,
the most important problem with Census figures is that, even if a family's income falls below the official poverty thresholds, the family's actual living conditions are likely to be far higher than the image most Americans have in mind when they hear the word "poverty."\[123\]

What do poor people in the First World have?\[124\]

- Forty-three percent of all poor households actually own their own homes. The average home owned by persons classified as poor by the Census Bureau is a three-bedroom house with one-and-a-half baths, a garage, and a porch or patio.
- Eighty percent of poor households have air conditioning. By contrast, in 1970, only 36 percent of the entire U.S. population enjoyed air conditioning.
- Only 6 percent of poor households are overcrowded. More than two-thirds have more than two rooms per person.
- The average poor American has more living space than the average individual living in Paris, London, Vienna, Athens, and other cities throughout Europe. (These comparisons are to the average citizens in foreign countries, not to those classified as poor.)
- Nearly three-quarters of poor households own a car; 31 percent own two or more cars.
- Ninety-seven percent of poor households have a color television; over half own two or more color televisions.
- Seventy-eight percent have a VCR or DVD player; 62 percent have cable or satellite TV reception.
- Eighty-nine percent own microwave ovens, more than half have a stereo, and more than a third have an automatic dishwasher.

When this study was originally published, First Worldists reacted with a great deal of outrage. They insisted that the study was a
lie, or that it didn't matter. However, Third Worldists think it's important when we consider what is poor globally.

What does it mean to be poor in the Third World? It means not having clean water to drink. It means no employment or welfare. It means having no safe place to go. It means going without food constantly. It means having no health care. It means dying from malaria. It means dying decades earlier than your First World counterpart.

What is poor in the First World is absolutely incomparable to what is poor in the Third World. But, if you ask First Worldists, they claim it's the same because they're "in the same class position." If we adhere to the hundred and fifty year old definition of class, then you could make such a claim. We don't live under such conditions anymore. The world is not the same as it was. The global distribution of wealth is no longer as it once was. It is nonsense to consider First World people to be as potentially revolutionary as Third World people.

Now consider this: Marx predicted that revolution would come from the industrial working class of the advanced capitalist nations (Germany and Britain at the time.) Is that what happened? No, revolution came from the more backward countries, many of whom hadn't even reached capitalism yet. (In fact, Germany went into fascism rather than revolution during crisis.) All of our experience with revolution, wealth inequality, and class has shown us different from what Marx predicted. This is not to say he was wrong in advocating revolution. It means it didn't come about the way he predicted it would. Marx predicted that countries would level out in wealth between them, creating a great polarization between rich and poor in each country - to the level of immiseration. No, that wealth polarized globally.

The bottom line is: wealth inequality is intimately tied to revolutionary potential. First Worldists don't want to see that.
They just insist that First World people do have a significant potential, when all experience tells us the opposite. They live in a state of denial. Mostly they just say, "that's not what Marx said." Can such people demonstrate that Marx was correct in his theory? Third Worldists can demonstrate that their theory is correct. Our theory is based off of what did happen. We have adjusted theory that not only explains why revolution didn't happen in the way Marx said it would; but also how to build it today.
Chapter 7
First Worldist Consciousness
The First Worldist Idea

First Worldists have a very particular mindset that runs counter to what Marxists are supposed to have. Marxism is a science, an ever evolving set of theories. Since the death of Mao Zedong, there has been no serious attempts by Marxists to update the theory according to the new material conditions and historical experience. Third Worldists are the only ones to have done so. It should be very obvious that building revolution has failed in the advanced countries, let alone the First World. Marx predicted that it would be the advanced industrialized countries of Europe, with a developed working class - that would be the ones to lead the way in proletarian revolution. It's clear to see that this never happened. Even within Europe, it was Russia, possibly the most backward country that was the one to carry out revolution.

Frederick Engels was one of the first to notice that the advanced nations were not only failing to achieve a revolution, but losing revolutionary potential as a result of the benefits of imperialism.

"Do not on any account whatever let yourself be deluded into thinking there is a real proletarian movement going on here..."

Participation in the domination of the world market was and is the basis of the political nullity of the English workers. The tail of the bourgeoisie in the economic exploitation of this monopoly but nevertheless sharing in its advantages, politically they are naturally the tail of the "great Liberal Party," which for its part pays them small attentions, recognises trade unions and strikes as legitimate factors, has relinquished the fight for an unlimited working day and has given the mass of better placed workers the vote."125

From there revolution was achieved by China, Korea, Vietnam, and Cuba. The Eastern Block was different in that it was created by the Soviets as opposed to a revolution like the former
countries. This doesn't mean they were bad, it means that they came about in a different way.

China, Korea, Vietnam, and Cuba had their own bottom up revolution as opposed to having the superpower Soviet Union make it for them while occupied during World War 2. These countries that achieved revolution themselves, were the opposite of what America is. These countries were agrarian, victims of imperialism, underdeveloped, and had the worst of conditions where revolution was the only answer. These were the most brutal and dark places in the world where the greatest crimes of imperialism and capitalism took place. This actually contradicts a good portion of what Marx predicted would happen. Does this mean that Marxism is wrong? No, it means that it didn't happen exactly as Marx had theorized. If we stick to the spirit of the theory and apply the new information and material conditions, we see that it doesn't violate the science of revolution at all.

If this idea that the advanced nations are not the source of revolutionary potential can be accepted by First Worldists, then why can't the logical end result of it be accepted as well? While few Marxists would actually deny this history, they would deny that the First World has lost its potential for revolution. How can they claim this? If history and experience have already shown us the opposite, why do they think it isn't true when it's applied to them? Is there something unique about America that they feel makes them exempt from all experience? When asking this question, I've not gotten any answer other than "workers are exploited, so that means we have revolutionary potential." I've never heard a First Worldist address this reality.

The reason for this, I think, lies in the very mentality of the First Worldist. Marx gave us a definition of what a worker is, and what exploitation is. If someone fits into that definition they consider themselves to be proletarian. If we really look at how
wealth is divided today we see that First World workers are nowhere near what Marx described as the immiserated workers. This reality isn't acknowledged. Marxists in the First World identify as the working class as Marx described. They're technically not the capitalist so therefore they must be the oppressed and exploited masses. They are perceiving themselves to be in a particular situation that they are not in. They perceive themselves to be in a class position and material conditions they're not.

First Worldists have been raised by on the idea that they're the victims of capitalism by the theory that was handed down to them. They have entered a mindset that tells them that they are what Marx described, even though they don't fit it. Marxism is not a science in the First World, it is an identity. That is why we have very poor theory, or none at all being produced by First Worldist groups. That is why we have so many Marxists that are kids running around with Soviet gear on. It's why we have swaths of Marxists posting art and pictures of guerrilla fighters instead of actually fighting. This is why we have Marxist groups that just repeat the classic works and producing nothing new. This is why we have people talking about how they're so revolutionary and how anyone who disagrees with them is not. These people hold Marxism as something they can identify with, not actually do. It's something they take in as a counterculture to the mainstream bourgeois life. They dress up, use certain words, and respond emotionally when someone challenges them on it. Just like identity politics. It is not a science of changing the world to them, it's an identity they've taken on to fill a gap caused by alienation. It's not a real thing to them. It's not a real life and death struggle for survival as it is for people in the Third World.

If this wasn't true, then we'd see First Worldists making revolution and not just posturing on the internet. They don't have a class consciousness, they have a class identity that gives
them comfort, something to identify with. With the identity comes the perception that they are the truly wrenched of the Earth, that have nothing to lose but their chains. They believe that they are the revolutionary proletariat because that is the image they are trying to fill for their identity. This is role playing for them, not something they want to achieve.

**It's All Taken Personally**
One of the problems First Worldists have in correctly identifying who has revolutionary potential or not, is their own ego. Self-perception plays a huge role in how First Worldists see First World people. When they look at the population of the U.S. they see themselves reflected in it because they're the same class. Their identity is tied to the movements and fluctuations of the population. When some legislation is passed, which harms the "working class" of the U.S., they take it personally because they see themselves as the same group of people. Have no doubt they are the same group, they are there same class. They have a lot in common. They exist in the same society, they confront the same material conditions, often living in the same neighbourhoods; and they confront the same system from the same class position.

The error they make is that they assume that they have the same consciousness as well. This is just not true. The First Worldist knows that revolution is the only answer. The average First Worlder does not know this, and in fact refuses to accept this. Just because the First Worldist comes to this realization, does not mean that the rest of the U.S. "working class" does, or will, as well. First Worldists take the dogmatic interpretation of Marxist revolutionary theory, and assume that because they recognise that revolution is necessary, that the "masses" will eventually join them. This is not so. Just because the First
Worldist sees that revolution is necessary does not mean that the First World "masses" will as well.

In revolutionary theory the vanguard is supposed to lead the masses to revolution. In reality, we see that there are circumstances in which the masses won't follow the vanguard for a myriad of reasons. Sometimes the vanguard isn't appealing to their class interest even if they think they are. In other instances they're almost completely disconnected from the masses like the FARC is. Historically, there have been vanguards who appealed to the wrong group, like Wang Ming in pre-revolutionary China. The vanguard party is not infallible, and is certainly capable of making errors. Mao said not to blame the people, but to blame the party when the struggle is not successful. This is correct, the party has misidentified who has revolutionary potential and who does not. This is not blaming the people, this is blaming the party for not correctly understanding the objective situation in which they find themselves in and creating a proper theory correspondingly.

When you analyze the lack of revolutionary potential among the First World "masses", First Worldists take it personally. They take it as a personal attack on them. They take it personally because they tie their identity to those same people. They make an incorrect assumption of having a united class consciousness which they do not. Just because you're in the same class as them, does not mean that they think the same as you do; nor does it mean your analysis is correct. Just because you're in the same class as them, does not mean that you automatically understand their consciousness and have put forward a proper analysis of it. If the history of the U.S. shows us anything, it shows us that American Marxists have failed to analyze it with accuracy. In over a hundred years of organizing they have yet to carry out anything of any substance. Nor have they been able to achieve any significant organization.
The First Worldist ties his identity to the "working class" of the population. They understand a common class interest with the other "workers" around them. This does not mean the inverse is automatically true. Just because the First Worldist claims he is ready to go out and fight a revolution does not mean that the rest of his class is as well. Even if you're ready to go out and do revolution that does not mean that the U.S. population is willing to go out and follow you. There is a complete disconnect between First Worldist theory and the consciousness of the people of the First World.

The theory that has been handed down to us from the giants of Marxism tells us that wage labourers are the exploited class. Thus, First Worldists identify themselves personally with this definition of class. When global class divisions change, and our position within that global class structure changes, we must acknowledge it. To be told that you are no longer the "lower and deeper" section of the proletariat is taken as offensive by First Worldists. We have been taught as working First World people that we are the victims of capitalism. When information comes along that challenges that historically held analysis, First Worldists react with anger and denunciation. First Worldists don't want to be told that they're not the wretched of the Earth anymore. They have tied brutal exploitation and oppression to their identity. When that level of exploitation and oppression changes, they continue to operate with the assumption that it hasn't changed. They insist that it is still there because that is what their theory holds. A First World ten dollar an hour wage earner in an apartment on "the wrong side of the tracks" is not qualitatively the same level as a Ghanaian worker who earns 1.48$ USD a day; who has difficulty finding clean water to drink. If you point this fact out to First Worldists they get offended.

Why do they get angry at this fact? They get angry because they have been given an identity via Marxist theory to believe that they are the wretched of the Earth. When reality and the motion
of global society disturbs this identity they become defensive. Their theory does not correspond to material reality anymore. Marxism has become an *identity* for First Worldists, not a revolutionary *science* as it is supposed to be. Just as challenging religious notions are met with angry denunciation, First Worldism does as well. This is the same with all identity politics, when it is challenged with facts and information it is met with anger, denial, and accusations of siding with the enemy.

When we look at the global distribution of wealth, we can clearly see that we are far more wealthy than those in the Third World. What we make in two hours is more than what they can make in a week and a half. This is certainly more than a quantitative difference, it has qualitative effect as well. This is particularly true when it comes to an analysis of where that wealth *comes from*, as opposed to simply who has it. We certainly have to acknowledge that class and wealth division is not the same as it was during Marx, Lenin, or Mao's times. If these men correctly analyzed the changing world with their theories, why should we assume that such change has suddenly ceased?

A criticism of First World people is taken personally by First Worldists, because they see themselves as the "masses" and share in their material conditions. Therefore, a criticism against them is criticism against the First Worldist as well. Doing this is unscientific and unbecoming of a Marxist. As Marxists we're supposed to be scientific and take in the information presented to us. With that information we form a social theory corresponding to the spirit as well as the scientific practise of Marxism. Being personally offended by information is not acceptable. As Marxists we are supposed to put aside our personal feeling when it comes to theoretical work and focus on the facts and how to create a theory according to them. We do not dismiss information because we don't like it, this is what religion does. Religion asks us to be close minded and only accept what has been predetermined to be "correct". If you
refuse to accept that the "working class" in the First World has a significant privileged global class position, this is exactly what you are doing.

**Marxism as Identity Not Science**

I once asked myself why First Worldists were so committed to denying their lack of revolutionary potential, and their historical failure to build that potential. First Worldists often just ignore the fact that America has never been revolutionary. Incorrectly, some point to the Revolutionary War and claim it's proof that it is possible. However, we're talking about class revolution, not bourgeois revolution. Americans have shown no inclination towards revolution since the Revolutionary War. Even during the civil rights movement and the spirit of the '60s there was not a potential for it. There was a potential for great racial violence in defense of civil rights, but by no means was it Marxist revolution.

There has never been a time when revolution could have happened. Not even during the 1930s when the U.S. was at its worst. The desire to overthrow the system was not there. Today we don't even see a desire to overthrow the system on a class basis. Plenty of Americans are running around saying the system needs to be overthrown in order to get rid of a socialism that doesn't even exist. Others are calling for it to be overthrown on the basis of racist theory. Those who actually recognise that there are problems between classes aren't calling for revolution, only reform. Those who see a class problem in America, still believe in capitalism. Just because there are extremely small fringe political groups that are anti-capitalist doesn't mean that the mainstream of those who identify class as a problem are supportive of class revolution. First Worldists project their own conclusion of revolution onto those who still believe in capitalism, but only recognise that there is a problem. Even if
First Worldists think they're revolutionary, it doesn't mean that First World people are.

Both First Worldist and Third Worldist Marxists are capable of being scientific about Marxism. Scientific contributions to Marxist theory have come along and communists have accepted them as correct. Lenin and Mao (and others) have made great contributions to theory that have been incorporated. But why are they willing to in some cases and not others?

If we follow the traditional dogmatic interpretation of Marx's writings, we would conclude that Palestine is not revolutionary. Technically, according to the dogmatic ideas of exploitation and class, Palestine is a parasitic nation. It virtually has no industry and lives almost entirely off aid provided by the U.N. and other counties. These people would be considered lumpen proletariat by traditional Marxist theory. This means they have no revolutionary potential because they're not exploited as they don't actually produce. Of course, to claim that Palestinians are leaches is insulting and flies in the face of their very real revolutionary potential. They do try to organize against their conditions to a degree that First Worlders can only dream of. First Worldists break from this definition of lumpen proletariat because it is incorrect to describe the material reality of Palestine and its people. So why aren't First Worldists denouncing the Palestinians as worthless lumpen wretches as orthodox Marxist theory would have them do? Because the theory Marx put down about the lumpen doesn't not correspond to the material reality of today in Palestine. Does that Mean Marx was wrong? No, it means the theory was correct given the conditions of his day. The day of the 1850s European industrial societies, not the post-2000 Middle East. First Worldists are entirely opportunistic.

Clearly, First Worldists have broken with dogma when it comes to Palestine because the theory is out of date and they're willing
to acknowledge this and change it. They're willing to be scientific about that.

In a proper analysis many First Worldists might respond that there has been a dramatic decrease in manufacturing in the First World. By that fact alone the huge decrease in the production of value would make the First World lumpen. Therefore, if Palestine is unproductive and still revolutionary then so are First World people. On the other hand, they cannot claim to experience the oppression and exploitation that Third Worlders do. So, are they really the definition of lumpen then? No, they're not. They're largely unproductive when it comes to value generation, but they also receive the benefits of imperialism. In a world where 12% of the population uses 95% of the world's clean water, they can't claim to be oppressed and exploited like the Third World is. So, if they're relatively unproductive, but also have all the benefits of value extraction from others; what does that make them? It makes them Lumpen bourgeoisie.

"In Maoism Third-Worldism, we have a term, the Lumpenbourgeoisie that describes the First World “working class”. This word was coined by Prairie Fire a member of the Leading light Communist Organization. [...] This situation makes them net appropriators of value. In a sense, they exploit Third World workers because they receive the value that they generated in a way similar (but not the same) as how the bourgeoisie steal value from the working class. As the bourgeoisie does not contribute to the creation of value, and merely take what the other workers create, First World people take more than they have generated."  

If First Worldists are willing to be scientific when it comes to Palestine and other places, why are they so unwilling to be
scientific when it comes to the First World? For First Worldists Marxism is an identity not a science.

Why are First Worldists the one's running around with Soviet flags? Why are they the ones making Facebook groups, but actually doing nothing? Why is it First Worldists are the ones picking fights and wrecking each other over line differences rather than struggling over them? There is no debate or struggle over political line in the First World. The reason is because there is no Marxist movement in the U.S. There are isolated small groups of no more than twenty all claiming to be the vanguard of the revolution that isn't happening. There is no public struggle over line because no one is actually interested in doing it. Whenever someone challenges another person's ideas it immediately degenerates into name calling and making up accusations about each other. In other cases, both sides play oppression Olympics by trying to show who is more oppressed and thus somehow therefore correct. Any challenge to a group's particular line is an affront to their image, to them personally and their identity as Marxists. This is why "you're not a real Marxist" is the most common phrase thrown around in these situations.

Whenever an incident happens, such as with the fairly recent events in Baltimore; Marxists immediately got out and attempted to exaggerate it. In 2015, a riot took place over the refusal of the government to charge a police officer with the murder of Freddie Gray. As soon as this riot started, Marxists went out and started claiming that this was a revolutionary act. Others proclaimed it was an act of class consciousness. Some First Worldists went around with Facebook cover photos showing an image of a panther with the words "People's Republic of Baltimore". What happened in Baltimore was a violent emotional reaction to a very real injustice that is constantly being committed against the Black public. The people rioting in the street were angry, they were not doing revolution
or having a moment of "spontaneous class consciousness". First Worldists are eager to twist events into something they want them to be. Riots can occur within a revolution, but they are not revolution in themselves. They don't want to look at them with a critical eye. They want to believe them to be outbursts of class struggle so they can claim revolutionary potential.

Almost nothing has been put forward by First Worldists as to why revolution has failed to materialise. In fact, the most common claim (not argument) has been that there hasn't been enough organizing. They can't even devise a theory as to why they've failed. Communists have been trying to organize in the U.S. for over a hundred years. Organization has been tried relentlessly. The problem lies with the unscientific approach they take. In a hundred years, First Worldists have tried the same thing over and over again with the same result. If what you're doing isn't working, then obviously you have to go back to the drawing board and come up with a new strategy and theory. First Worldists don't do this, they just do the same thing over and over again with the same result. They identify as a revolutionary group with potential, they don't have a scientific theory for it. This is about identifying as proletariat not a proletarian science.

As further evidence of this I refer to a term that some First Worldists use. They describe the U.S. as a Fourth World country. There are other definitions of Fourth World, but I'm speaking specifically to this use of the word. This is not an official position that has any solid theory behind it; it's just a term some First Worldists throw around to feign a proletarian position. The claim holds that the Fourth World is a First World country that has Third World living conditions. The idea is utter nonsense and completely detached from reality. You cannot claim that people in the U.S. live at the level of the Third World. You can find pockets of immense poverty, but you cannot say that the U.S. is a Fourth World country. The reason why people would come up
with such a ridiculous theory is the need to be seen as the proletariat. They identify as Marxists so therefore they must be proletarian. When reality doesn't match their identity, they invent a way to see themselves as proletarian.

Look at First Worldists when they argue revolutionary strategy. They actually argue for things that are not revolutionary, as in they wouldn't bring revolution. A big thing for First Worldists is starting worker cooperatives and forming urban communes. These in themselves are not bad things. They are only bad so far as First Worldists are doing them instead of making revolution. Communes and worker collectives don't challenge capitalism, that's why they're legal to do. They know the "masses" of the U.S. population are not on their side and won't follow them into a violent conflict. They do these peaceful means of organizing instead of fighting. Violence won't work because First World people are not willing to fight. What First Worldists do is take these non-violent means and declare them to be doing revolution. For them looking like revolutionaries is more important than actually doing revolution. It's an identity to them not a science of changing the world.

Watch how First Worldists react when you question the revolutionary potential of the First World. Often times, they get agitated for merely suggesting that living standards are too high for revolution. If you point out how there has never been anything close to a revolutionary situation in the U.S., they get angry. Essentially you're not allowed to even ask these questions without offending them. When you do so, they react as though you just spit in their face. You shouldn't react this way when your theory is questioned. They get mad because you've offended their identity as opposed to unscientific thinking. If you point out the lack of revolutionary potential they take it personally. They get so angry on a personal level when you suggest that the First World doesn't have revolutionary
potential; and that it historically has failed to produce revolution. It's their identity not a science.

**American Exceptionalism**

One of the most insidious aspects of American society is the social mentality: "American Exceptionalism." Essentially, the idea is that there is some kind of virtue to the American people that places them above others in the world. They perceive themselves as somehow better or superior to others. Americans are raised to believe that they have some inherent quality about them that justifies, no less demands that they be a major force in the world. This same mentality is what has justified all the horrors of the system as well. They are not only forgiven for committing these crimes, they are glorified and often duty bound to commit them. Often it is directly linked to the concept of Manifest Destiny by Andrew Jackson-style Democrats.132

Largely this stems from the foundation of the country itself. America was founded on certain principles of democracy that in theory placed them as separate and unique from the rest of the world. Coming out of the Revolutionary War the U.S. proclaimed itself to be a new type of country, "a truly free" country, blazing the way for a modern democracy that others should follow if they wanted to be free. Of course, the claim is rather dubious when we consider the substance of representative democracy, often not a real democracy at all. Historically, we also know that the act that brought true democracy first was the Paris Commune.

America by its founding definition has a right to a superior position in the world. They are therefore justified in forcing themselves into a "leadership" role in the world. In reality, it's nothing more than a justification for imperialism and the theft of land, causing swathes of people to become subservient to American interests. The definition of American Exceptionalism
can vary depending on who you ask. Different people have conceived of the term differently depending on how they see the country. Of course, this is made subject to the person's particular political and economic outlook on history, and America's role in it.

Here is an example from Ian Tyrrell, Emeritus Professor of History in Australia:

"In its classic forms, American exceptionalism refers to the special character of the United States as a uniquely free nation based on democratic ideals and personal liberty. Sometimes this special character is inferred from the nature of American political institutions founded in the 1776-89 period—the declaration of independence (1776), revolution (1776-83), constitution (1787) etc. Thus the “revolution” and its aftermath freeing the US from British control are important in ideas of American exceptionalism. But often the political differences are said to be underpinned by material differences brought about by the wealth/resources of the United States, sometimes seen as a direct product of the freedom of the American people, but by others as the product of the inheritance of the North American continent’s abundant resources. This is the frontier version of the theory, and this and the ideas of social mobility and immigrant assimilation are closely tied to this set of ideas of American material prosperity. Many aspects of American history may be left out or distorted in the traditional narratives—particularly the histories of Amerindian peoples and the contribution of other ethnic groups that preceded the Anglo-Americans, e.g. Hispanics. Race and slavery are seen as tragic exceptions, and the abolition of the latter was viewed
as a partial resolution, encompassed in Lincoln’s idea of a “new birth of freedom” in the Gettysburg Address.”

Others attribute the actual term American Exceptionalism to, oddly enough, former Soviet leader Joseph Stalin. One claim says that Stalin used the term to criticize the Jay Lovestone, a faction of the American Communist Party. (Interestingly, it has a semi-Third Worldist origin in a statement that the U.S. proletariat didn't want a revolution.) Stalin, in his criticism was pointing to their belief that the U.S. was exempt from the Marxist laws of historical development. This belief came about according to Stalin, "thanks to its natural resources, industrial capacity, and absence of rigid class distinctions". According to the story, this appeared in a letter to Lovestone from Stalin when he informed the Soviet leader that in the year 1929 that the American proletariat wasn't interested in revolution. As we can see this has turned out to be historically accurate. I should note that I've been unable to find this quote anywhere in Stalin's collected works, so I think the quote should be taken with a grain of salt.

The term, I think, as do many others, originates from French writer Alexis de Tocqueville, who used the term in his 1835/1840 work, *Democracy in America*:

"The position of the Americans is therefore quite exceptional, and it may be believed that no democratic people will ever be placed in a similar one. Their strictly Puritanical origin, their exclusively commercial habits, even the country they inhabit, which seems to divert their minds from the pursuit of science, literature, and the arts, the proximity of Europe, which allows them to neglect these pursuits without relapsing into barbarism, a thousand special causes, of which I have only been able to point out the most important, have singularly concurred to fix the mind of the American upon purely practical objects. His passions, his wants, his education,
and everything about him seem to unite in drawing the native of the United States earthward; his religion alone bids him turn, from time to time, a transient and distracted glance to heaven. Let us cease, then, to view all democratic nations under the example of the American people."\textsuperscript{135}

Regardless of its origin, its manifestation has been very clear: a superiority complex. America has a sense of superiority which created this Exceptionalism. All throughout history, Americans have proclaimed themselves to be the one true beacon of freedom, even going so far as to proclaim that they're the only ones who have freedom. This can be most evident in the right wing conservative discussion in the media. Often criticisms of the U.S. can be dismissed by merely claiming that it is the most free country in the world. We see this with the pro-war crowd as well. The troops and the war cannot be wrong because America can't be wrong. "I am patriotic American thus I cannot be wrong because my country is the greatest in the world." This sense of self-superiority has justified all the horrors that the country has committed. They truly believe that they're the only correct ones, thus everyone else is automatically wrong.

The Iraq War was a good example of this as both conservatives and liberals essentially defended the war. Because America is right and everyone else is wrong, anyone who disagrees with them must be going against freedom and democracy which makes them an enemy. It is a fact that the Iraq War was based on a total lie. There can be no question about this now. Let's look at some of the justifications made for the Iraq War that have been supported by liberals and conservatives.

Justification: "Defeated a regime that developed and used weapons of mass destruction, that harbored and supported terrorists, committed outrageous human rights abuses, and defied the just demands of the United Nations and the world."\textsuperscript{136}
There is no question that Iraq used chemical weapons on the Kurdish people. It should be noted however that they did so with the support of the United States. If Iraq is condemned to invasion for this, the U.S. should follow in kind. Despite protestations to the contrary, Iraq did allow weapons inspectors into the country “without conditions” on September 17th, 2002. Instead of acknowledging this the U.S. simply ignored it and declared, "...that there is nothing to talk about and warns that the Iraqis are simply stalling. The Bush administration continues to press the Security Council to approve a new UN resolution calling for Iraq to give weapons inspectors unfettered access and authorizing the use of force if Iraq does not comply."\(^{137}\) Iraq was found to possess an "al Samoud 2 missile program," announced on February 14th, 2003. On February 27th a few weeks later Iraq agreed to dismantle the weapons. George W. Bush then created the Iraq Survey Group, which concluded in a report on October 6th, 2004 that, "Saddam Hussein did not possess weapons of mass destruction."\(^{138}\) It was also determined in 2005 by the CIA that their investigation had “gone as far as feasible” finding no weapons of mass destruction.\(^{139}\)

As for the claim of support for terrorism, the evidence is in one part dubious, and the other is false. The only "terrorist groups" that the U.S. could provide evidence of were organizations and people dedicated to defending Palestine from Israel\(^{140}\), which I would not count as terrorist groups; the Israeli government is the terrorist group. In the 1980s, he sheltered the Kurdish Workers Party, which also should not be counted as a terrorist group given their defense of the Kurdish people against repression. The others included the support for anti-Iranian Mujahideen-e Khalq in the 1990s.\(^{141}\) At the time of the accusations made by the U.S. of supporting terrorism, Iraq didn't appear to be involved in it.

The other aspect of Saddam Hussein's supposed connection to terrorism was his accused association with Al-Qaeda. The
Pentagon determined that there was no connection between Al-Qaeda and Iraq. "The report released by the Joint Forces Command five years after the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq said it found no "smoking gun" after reviewing about 600,000 Iraqi documents captured in the invasion and looking at interviews of key Iraqi leadership held by the United States, Pentagon officials said."\(^{142}\) As a final blow to the claim, the 9/11 Commission determined that there couldn't have been a connection between Al-Qaeda and Saddam Hussein. To the contrary, they were enemies:

"In my judgment, Saddam assessed Usama bin Ladin and al-Qaida as a threat rather than a potential partner to be exploited to attack the United States. Bin Ladin wanted to attack Iraq after it occupied Kuwait in 1990 rather than have the Saudi government depend on foreign military forces. Several captured al-Qaida operatives have said Usama refused to consider working for or with Saddam, according to press accounts. Saddam would have understood that after Usama had realized his ambition to remove U.S. forces from Arabia and eliminate the Al Sa`ud and other ruling families in the Gulf, that he would have been the next target. The threat would have appeared particularly risky to Saddam, given the modest indicators of a revival in personal piety and Islamist dress among Iraqi Sunnis in the last decade. He certainly suspected Saudi Arabia of encouraging Wahhabi pietism and practices among Iraq's Sunni Arabs and Bin Ladin's loyalists would have been suspect of similar anti-regime activities."\(^{143}\)

Despite the reasons for the invasion having been false, the U.S. public continued to see themselves as threatened by Iraq and in possession of the moral right to invade the nation, which ended up killing a million and a half people. A study by the Program on
Maoism-Third Worldism

International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) at the University of Maryland determined that 60 percent of those they polled held at least one of the following misconceptions:\(^{144}\):

- 49 percent believed that the United States had found evidence that Iraq was working closely with al-Qaeda;
- 22 percent believed that actual weapons of mass destruction had been found in Iraq;
- 23 percent believed that world public opinion favored the United States going to war with Iraq.

What relevance is this? The American public has a victim complex in which they see themselves as being glorious and virtuous people who are only doing "what is best" for everyone. They have a self-perceived right to determine who is a dictator and what the world's policy should be. There is an engrained victimhood in the American people who always see themselves as an oppressed people, regardless of how privileged they are, regardless of how much power they possess. Immigrants coming over to escape poverty, it's an "invasion". Countries not bowing to their will and serving their interests are an "Axis of Evil". Disagreeing with their invasions of countries on phony pre-texts make them "enemies". Even when there is no enemy, they blame other Americans with different political opinions, or that the government is out to get them. Despite all their hoarding of wealth, their most privileged position in the world, they still see themselves as the global poor.

This where First Worldism comes in. Despite all the proof to the contrary, First Worldists, especially Americans, believe they are victims of imperialism. Imperialism has been the primary contradiction since the time of Lenin. That truth has only grown in strength since that time. With a previously mentioned 72:1 wealth disparity, First Worldists cannot deny that they benefit from imperialism. Some do and they'll go so far as to quote Lenin on it. What they won't admit, however, is that the First
World is being bought off by that wealth. We return to the same phenomena: First Worldists will admit that the New Deal killed the revolutionary potential of American "workers", yet they still maintain that First World people are potentially revolutionary. When asked for a defense of this they still claim there are poor people in America.

Definitely there are poor people in America. A quick drive through any Native American reservation can confirm this. Migrant workers have some of the lowest levels of material living in the global North. The problem arises when First Worldists apply this to all workers. They don't say that this is true for all "workers," but they do have it as an assumption in their theory. When you ask them for the examples of poverty in America, they point to these exceptions to the rule as proof of a larger poverty. They continue to propound that exploitation is happening en masse and that the oppression is great. The theory they put forward does have all of the "working class" as an exploited proletariat. So in substance they are going by the premise that all "workers" are proletarians at the level of oppression and exploitation. They really do believe that Third World and First World people are on the same level.

In fact First Worldists exaggerate the poverty level of First World people in order to keep this perception of revolutionary potential. 4.3% of all wage workers in the U.S. are at or below the federal minimum wage. Yes, that statistic is correct. It doesn't even include people who receive overtime pay, tips, or commissions, only the actual hourly wage they report. We hear about how "everyone" is on minimum wage, yet it represents a very small portion of wage earning workers. The Federal poverty line for the mainland United States for a single person is $11,670. Three billion people, that is to say almost half of the global population, live with less than $2 dollars per day or less $730 a year. More than a billion people live with less than a
dollar per day.\textsuperscript{148} 20\% of the global population owns 90\% of the world's wealth.\textsuperscript{149}

For First Worldists to declare that they need more while claiming to be in the same class as the global poor is nonsense. First Worldists acknowledge that there's a benefit to living in the First World, but they only "gain a bit."\textsuperscript{150} Often they claim that material conditions don't mean much. Consider this when we acknowledge the fact that 99\% of all First Worldist Marxist \textit{activism} is writing blogs on the internet and making Facebook groups. Meanwhile, in the Third World there are numerous Marxist groups who have been physically \textit{fighting and dying} for decades making revolution. Third World people risk death doing labour organizing. Here it's done by an upper-middle class college graduate. In the First World, getting a raise in the minimum wage is as simple as voting for the Democratic Party, a mainstream bourgeois party.\textsuperscript{151} These two levels of wealth and revolutionary activity are absolutely incomparable.

If we were to level out the global wealth what would it look like? This was put best by the Leading Light Communist Organization. A long quote yes, but it gives a very good definition:

"A global, socialist distribution of the world’s wealth implies a distribution that approaches egalitarianism or a distribution where the only inequalities that exist are ones that benefit the proletariat and most oppressed segments of the global population. These distribution principles, taken together, can be described as roughly, reasonably egalitarian \textit{vis-a-vis} the current world economy.\textsuperscript{152} The question that every serious Marxist must ask is whether people in the United States, and First World peoples generally, benefit or lose out under a socialist distribution of the world’s income. If the incomes of the First World working class, like the incomes of imperialist bourgeoisie, are so inflated that
they need to be lowered under a socialist distribution, then there is no meaningful sense in which the First World working class is exploited. And, if, like the capitalists of the imperialist countries, the First World working class does not benefit under such a socialist distribution, then there is no reason to consider them part of the revolutionary subject, as part of the proletariat.

"Virtually all First World peoples fall within the top 20 percent of global income. Most of the world’s richest 20 percent are First World peoples. Almost every person in the United States, for example, falls within the top 15 percent. A person in the United States at the so-called “poverty line” is at the richest 13 percent globally. The top 20 percent, which includes the entire First World, accounts for three-quarters of world income. This leaves only one-quarter to be distributed to the bottom 80 percent in, mostly, the Third World.

"The current share of First World peoples is already much larger than what would be entailed by a rough egalitarian distribution. With the gap between the wealthy countries and the poor countries as large as it is, it is simply not realistically possible to increase the share of the First World working class without lowering the share of Third World peoples. [...]"

"First Worldist revisionists, like other imperialists generally, contend that First World peoples deserve more than their current share of the world’s resources. Even though overt white supremacy is now seen as uncouth, similar assumptions underlie all variants of First Worldism. First Worldists assume in a religious way that people in the United States, and First World peoples generally, should have more and that Third
World peoples should have less. Because if one upholds the former, then one is committed to latter. To significantly raise the distribution in one part of the causal nexus of the world economy requires that the distribution be lowered elsewhere. It is simply impossible to maintain or significantly raise the standard of living for 300 million people in the United States without enforcing poverty elsewhere, in the Third World. Similarly, it is impossible to significantly increase the standard of living of roughly five billion people in the Third World without lowering the incomes of the remaining First World peoples. Failure to acknowledge this fact is pure utopianism, not Marxism. [...]"\(^{154}\)

Lenin already came across this phenomenon in an earlier form.

"It was Lenin who criticized the German and French social democrats when they supported the war efforts of their imperialist homelands in World War 1. The revisionists placed their own peoples, their own working class, ahead of the global proletariat by doing so. Lenin, by contrast, advocated the policy of revolutionary defeatism. Lenin sought the defeat of the Czarist empire in the hope that a defeat for his imperialist homeland could lead to a revolutionary situation. Contrary to Lenin, the revisionists of the Second International were the social imperialists and social fascists of their day. They were socialist in name, but in reality, they were imperialists. Today, First Worldism is the main form of social imperialism and social fascism. First Worldists may use Marxist and socialist rhetoric, but, in reality, they seek the advance the interests of their populations at the expense of the vast majority of humanity."\(^{155}\)
First Worldists despite all their privileges and massing of global wealth still consider themselves to be the lower class of the world. They still consider themselves in the same class as people who don't have clean water to drink. They live so well off the suffering of the Third World; so very clearly they do, and yet they still deny it. "It doesn't mean anything," It's "just a bit", "material conditions don't matter that much", they say. Their words absolutely fly in the face of the reality around them. First Worldists want to believe that they are the global oppressed; that they are the victims. In truth, they are global beneficiaries of imperialism. Now keep this in mind when you see them calling themselves revolutionaries while not engaging in revolution.

Keep this in mind where you hear First Worldists defending the imperialist troops calling them "victims" of the system. Yet, in the same breath, they'll turn around and denounce the police for working for the oppressors at home. The role of the troops is to oppress class globally via mass killings in the millions. To side with them is to side with the oppressor. But the agents of the class oppression at home are the ones we shouldn't be allying with. First Worldists love their privilege theory politics, so long as you completely ignore First World privilege. Once you start bringing that up they react in the same manner as racists who deny White privilege: angry denunciations and accusations of being self-hating.

In the current situation we only have to look at how the system reacts to class struggle. In the Third World a labour activist fears for his life. In the First World when a group goes on strike a portion of the media attacks them, and has a huge percentage of the population at the same class level attack them. First Worldists respond by saying "it's false consciousness", we just have to rally people together. Clearly people are not rallying together. These people don't identify by class, they have no class consciousness. Just because a First Worldist sees that there
should be a collective class consciousness, does not mean that they have a class consciousness; or are capable of building one. First Worldists rely on base assumptions that no longer correspond to their material conditions. People in the First World want what's good for their own society, not the rest of the world. They only want for themselves.

First World people don't want a whole new system, they want the one they have "fixed". The same goes for First Worldists. They want their middle-class restored, that three tiered system back to the way it was. First World people aren't looking for something new. They're looking back to the way things were, not forward to something new, something better. Just because the First Worldist wants something better doesn't mean the First Worlde does.

Sure, but tell us again how First World people are potentially revolutionary.
Chapter 8
Identity Politics:
The Death of Marxism
The Spectre of Identity
There is a spectre haunting Marxism - the spectre of identity politics. All the powers of reaction have entered into an unholy alliance to force this spectre on us: liberalism and social democrats, tumblr and the Democratic Party, social justice warriors and First Worldists.

Where is the party in the radical left that has not been decried as ableist by its opponents in power? Where is the opposition that has not hurled back the branding reproach of transphobia, against the more advanced opposition parties, as well as against its liberal adversaries?

Two things result from this fact:

I. Identity politics is already acknowledged by all reactionary powers to be itself a power.

II. It is high time that Communists should openly, in the face of the whole world, publish their views, their aims, their tendencies, and reject this identity politics nonsense with a manifesto of the party itself. (Well, again, because they seem to have forgotten it.)

The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of privilege.

A Gap in Consciousness
In 1848, revolutionary theorist Karl Marx wrote the Communist Manifesto. In it, he detailed the class contradictions that have given motion and change to societies. The contradiction between the property owning class and the working class appeared as the two sides struggled over the production of the wealth of society. In the struggle for control of the means of production and the social wealth, the feudal landlords, the
aristocracy were eventually overthrown and replaced with a new class: the bourgeoisie. Marx said that there was an increasing antagonism between that new ruling class and its subjects the working class. As this antagonism became more acute, it would give rise to greater and greater class conflict eventually causing the downfall of the bourgeoisie. Once this happened the working class would be in a position to revolutionize society to the highest known form of social organization, communism. The poor of the world would be in a position where they could reclaim all the wealth they had generated. A truly better society based on cooperation, common struggle, and common ownership of the means by which society produced its needs.

But, he didn’t take thin privilege into account did he?

Identity politics is a disease that is quickly killing Marxism. Right now it is a wholly First World illness. As First World people have lost their revolutionary potential due to their privileged global class position, identity politics has stepped in to fill the void. As the proletarian class identity began to disappear in America, people's individual identities took its place. As the spoils of imperialism became more beneficial, making First World people more and more comfortable, their class consciousness disappeared. What's the point of picking up a gun against the capitalist class when you can just nag your local Democratic representative into an increase in the minimum wage? When people lose their shared class identity, they will pick up another one in its place. Capitalism requires people to have an identity outside of one that would be a threat to its order. This is why capitalism is always constructing new ones, producing new subcultures, creating any divide possible to keep the working class from uniting.

At one time we had a near unified working class where unions had so much power that it took the capitalists hiring goons to
come out and attack us. We used to organize so that it took police brutality to break up a simple non-violent strike. Today we have nothing even close to that. Now we have people deliberately voting against unions in bourgeois parliamentarianism. Class consciousness is so weak that we have "workers" openly allying with the bourgeois against other workers based on the most ridiculous ideas. Ideas that sometimes border on conspiracy theories. Lower sections of workers in the First World are given a separate identity from the middle class. They now see each other as enemies. Middle class people swallow the poison that they are the real economic strength of the country. They're taught that the poor are just leeching off of them, and that the so-called one percent are robbing them. We have politicians that go on about the virtue of the middle class while they openly serve the financial aristocracy. What is mind blowing is that the middle class actually buys it. The middle class is touted as "proof" that capitalism is a place where anyone can succeed. What we see is the greatness of capitalism's ability to divide people. They've created the material conditions to produce contradictions among the "working class" itself. In a manner of speaking, they've created two "working class" identities. Maybe even more.

(I find it rather ironic that First Worldists will acknowledge a contradiction between the lower and middle class, but not one between the First and Third World. If a wealth divide between the lower and middle class in the First World is significant, why isn't the one between the First and Third World, which is even greater, also significant?)

**What is Identity?**

Historically, one has had an identity by seeing themselves in relation to the Other. How did a hunter know he was a hunter?
Because he wasn't a gatherer. How did a gatherer know they were a gatherer? Because they weren't a hunter. Our identities are almost entirely based on understanding ourselves in relation to something that is not us. Our identity is defined as much by what it is as what it is not, its relationship to something else. That oppositeness often defines that which we are, and determines much of what our identity is. Traditionally, a man fulfills a man's role because he is not a woman. A woman fulfills a woman's role because she is not a man. Identities are kind of like organic relationships in dialectical terms.

"...we will say that a relation between two or more entities is an organic relation if that relation determines, at least partly, the nature of the things that are related. The relation between workers and capitalists is an important example of this kind of behavior. You can’t be a capitalist without exploiting labor. You can’t be a member of the working class unless some capitalist exploits you. The relationship between capital and labor is essential for the capitalist to be a capitalist, and for the worker to be a member of the working class. It is thus an organic relation, and we say that labor and capital are organically related."¹⁵⁶

Identity largely comes out of a relationship between two things. There is always a thing and its Other. Here is a good example of how identities are constructed. White supremacy is the idea that White people are superior to all others. They have a White identity. They claim that they are trying to preserve that White identity from all manner of "degeneration" that is perpetuated by other races. However, if non-White people ceased to exist, there would no longer be a White identity. White identity can only exist so long as there is something that is not White. Before White nationalism we just had nationalism. Each group of White people by country had their own individual national identity accordingly.
First Nations people didn’t always see themselves as the indigenous population of the Americas. Before settlers came along they understood each other as individual tribes. After a period of colonization they began to understand themselves in relation to their occupiers. First Nations no longer purely saw themselves as each having a tribal identity. They began to build a collective indigenous identity in opposition to the colonizers. There was no First Nations identity until there were non-indigenous people. As colonization and the resulting violence increased, their individual tribal identities ceased to have as much meaning as their collective identity as First Nations. The identity of these people changed as the contradiction between First Nations and non-First Nations became more antagonistic.

Importantly, we need to understand how our identity is shaped by the world around us. Base and superstructure give a good explanation of this. The way in which we relate to each other, which is known as the Superstructure, is largely determined by our economic system, which is known as The Base. How we organize and produce the commodities of our society go on to shape our social relations. That is, how we relate to each other in the production of society's goods sets the stage for how we relate to each other outside production as well.

To put it in Marx's own words:

"In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces.

"The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real basis on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite form of social consciousness."
"The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual life process in general.

"It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness.

"At a certain stage in their development the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or – what is but a legal expression for the same thing – the property relations within which they have been at work hitherto.

"From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into fetters. Then begins an epoch of social revolution.

"With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed.

"In considering such transformations, a distinction should always be made between the material transformation of the material conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, aesthetic or philosophical – in short ideological – forms in which men become conscious of the conflict and fight it out.

"... We do not judge a period of transformation by its consciousness; on the contrary this consciousness must itself be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the existing conflicts between the social productive forces and the relations of production."
"In broad outlines Asiatic, ancient, feudal, and modern bourgeois modes of production can be designated as progressive epochs in the economic foundation of society."\textsuperscript{157}

Today, we have lost our collective class interest. We don't generally see ourselves as a class that is in contradiction to another. People see a society where rich people are just taking too much. The average person sees the economic elite as just being unfair. In their eyes the greed of the one percent has ruined what was already perfect. An industrialized middle class, a golden era of capitalism that once existed in the First World. They do not scientifically understand why capitalism had done what it has. They view it merely as the acts of some unethical people acting within capitalism. Not the result of the contradictions of capitalism itself. The system must constantly seek to create lower wages and lower standards of living. Via the many economic phenomena of capitalism, we are in the state we are in. This is the very nature of class contradiction. We as Marxists understand this, but the "working class" of the First World as a whole does not. They only see it as certain people acting outside the bounds of good conscience. They don't see their class interest in antagonism with another, because they no longer have that class identity.

Instead, the people see a national interest. We understand a collective identity of our individual countries. Class consciousness across borders has disappeared. There once was a good deal of international organization. Since our respective wealth levels have increased, and we lost our revolutionary potential; we started looking elsewhere for an identity. Today we have a collective interest in oppressing the Third World for our own benefit.
Social Alienation
The most inhumane aspect of capitalism is its ability to alienate people from each other. When social relations are replaced by commodity relations, we dehumanize each other. At one point in history, we all lived in harmony with each other and with nature. But something came along and changed all of that. That thing that changed was the invention of private property. In each prevailing mode of production there are definite, concrete social relations that are formed. The relations of production are the dominating effect on our social relations. Again, we return to the idea of the base and superstructure. For Marxists it is the act of labour, the production of society's goods which determines our social relations. Meaning we understand ourselves in relation to others and the world around us.

“Let us suppose that we had carried out production as human beings. Each of us would have in two ways affirmed himself and the other person. 1) In my production I would have objectified my individuality, its specific character, and therefore enjoyed not only an individual manifestation of my life during the activity, but also when looking at the object I would have the individual pleasure of knowing my personality to be objective, visible to the senses and hence a power beyond all doubt. 2) In your enjoyment or use of my product I would have the direct enjoyment both of being conscious of having satisfied a human need by my work, that is, of having objectified man’s essential nature, and of having thus created an object corresponding to the need of another man’s essential nature. ... Our products would be so many mirrors in which we saw reflected our essential nature.”

In the act of production, we express ourselves. Our own productivity is a very key element of our being. It is the expression of our actions, and consciousness. The commod-
ification of our labour, being something that we sell to a capitalist for a wage, is the act of removing ourselves from the production of society's goods. What we produce is no longer a contribution to society that we make, it is now a product alien to ourselves that becomes lost in the functioning of the market. We become alienated from the product we produce. It is no longer a part of ourselves that we give to society as a whole, but the private property of the capitalist with which he can do with as he pleases. Our labour that contributes to each other's lives in an infinite number of ways becomes a thing which is no longer us, or our interaction with others. The very act of exchange in the market separates us from our common identity as human beings. Instead of an interaction between two people, we have dehumanized commodity exchange.

The product of our labour enters the market where control of it is lost. It becomes dominated by the laws of the market itself.

“... with commodities. ... it is a definite social relation between men, that assumes, in their eyes, the fantastic form of a relation between things. In order, therefore, to find an analogy, we must have recourse to the mist-enveloped regions of the religious world. In that world the productions of the human brain appear as independent beings endowed with life, and entering into relation both with one another and the human race. So it is in the world of commodities with the products of men's hands. This I call the Fetishism which attaches itself to the products of labour, so soon as they are produced as commodities, and which is therefore inseparable from the production of commodities. This Fetishism of commodities has its origin, as the foregoing analysis has already shown, in the peculiar social character of the labour that produces them.”
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When we go to the store we are confronted by an endless number of commodities. We are not confronted by the human beings which participated in their creation, we are confronted by a commodity. We no longer see each other, we see a commodity exchange. We never see the effort or the person that created a particular commodity. Their labour, effort, human essence is something alien to us, we no longer experience or confront. In capitalism, people do not confront each other, people confront products. Our relations between people, become relations between things. The cashier behind the counter is no longer a person we know as a person in our community. They are a largely faceless worker that we give a sum of money too for a product. That person is no longer a person, but an act in the process of transferring ownership of a commodity.

The greater the degree of the development of capitalism, the greater the degree of alienation we face. We are now in a period where there is very little human labour applied in some manufacturing processes. We are developing to a point where the human element is almost removed from the production of society's needs. The globalization of the labour process has had a huge impact on alienation. The worker who produces what we consume isn't even a person who possibly works down the street that we run into from time to time. They are now a faceless person on the other side of the world that we have a socially constructed, materially enforced prejudice against. Not only do we not see that worker, we don't even see their continent.

I think it is very clear from this process that we become disconnected from each other. We begin to - not even see each other anymore. In the advanced capitalist nations where the development of capitalism is to the highest degree, we see the very worst effects of it. In the First World, particularly The United States and Japan, we have people who have become totally disconnected from people entirely. Any social interaction
has become a consequence of living in the same community as other people. Human interaction is no longer the functioning of life, but a nuisance that occurs within it. From this phenomena of disconnection from other human beings, we can see the causes of many mental illnesses. Not all mental illnesses of course, but some of them, yes. In many cases it exacerbates them. Alienation is probably the largest cause of mental illness.

**Liberal Individualism**

When one looks at the identity politics crowd and witnesses their actions, what you see is a hyper focus on the self. This is not uncommon for non-Marxist ideologies and movements. This is, however, a sin when it comes to revolutionary science. It is unacceptable for those who claim to be involved in revolutionary politics to engage in such anti-scientific ideas.

A key aspect of this is the removal of material conditions of the power structures that exist, and the corresponding social relations. For example: radical feminism says that all men have power over women by virtue of being male. How correct is this in light of the global economic and social order? Can we say that a Thai rubber farmer who out of necessity ends up addicted to 'yaba' methamphetamines, has power over a rich White woman in the U.S.? Such an idea is nonsense. There is a growing epidemic of Thai rubber farmers becoming addicted to methamphetamines in order to work their crops at night, and seek labour employment during the day.

In this very real social order, we cannot claim that the Third World farmer wields social power over the First World rich woman. She has an astronomically greater living standard than the farmer. Yet, the radical feminist idea (in this case) has seen only the individuals and the single case of relation: a man and a woman. A man does hold a power position over a woman, but only if we assume all other relations are equal. Which they are...
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not. It does not see the rest of the material conditions which clearly exist. Identity politics sees things only in isolation as they refer to one's self.

The same is true of all other such politics. Transgender activists openly ignore the wider world around them. These activists refuse to see the power dynamic between men and women when they theorize about their own position. They don't see how there can be a violation of women's spaces because there's nothing outside of them and their identity. Male fetishization of women and trans-women are different. One is seen as normal, while the other is often seen as a repulsive, and is often carried out with anonymity. Such sexual relations are often carried out in secret. The man in many cases carries this attraction with social stigmatized shame. It also ignores the oppression and experience of homosexuals. Trans-women insist that lesbians engage in sexual relations with them. If they don't then they're denounced as "transphobic." This basically denies the entire basis for lesbianism, and attempts to deny the right of lesbians to not want to have sex with someone. Anyone can refuse to have sex with anyone for any reason. It doesn't matter if it offends you or someone else. All people have a right to say no. Any questioning of that is tantamount to advocating rape.

What we don't see is a real analysis of transgender in the context of the real class and material relations that exist. A real analysis has not been put forward, only liberal individualist ones. When anyone tries to offer such an analysis they are viciously attacked as "transphobic," and are accused of wanting transgender people to commit suicide. (This is not an exaggeration.) I expect this kind of behaviour from liberals, but not from other Marxists.

One of the keys of Marxism is understanding how things exist within a system. We do not view relations in an isolated way, like bourgeois economic fundamentalists do. (So-called anarcho-
capitalists.) We see wage labour in the context of a system of exchange. Those exchanges in turn affect the wage labour. In any system, there are mutually influencing forces. This also extends to other forms of oppression, such as a person's sex, sexual orientation, race, etc. Identity politics perceives each of these separately in their own isolation. It does not see them in the context of a system of contradictions.

In instances where someone has pointed this anti-scientific approach out, they are personally attacked. Anyone who disagrees with the reactionary liberal individualism is instantly denounced as a hate-monger. If a Third Worldist points out how imperialism (global class) is the primary contradiction - we're attacked as being "economic dogmatists", and selfish for supposedly placing ourselves before trans-people. This doesn't even make sense. We clearly place the global poor, of whom die in the tens of millions every year before ourselves.

If there is one thing we have seen, it's the narcissistic nature of identity politics (a.k.a. Social Justice Warriors). Increasingly, we see people arguing over social media - in competition to see who is the most underprivileged in order to win a "debate" over an issue. (I use quotation marks because they're more akin to discussions.) This demonstrates that the identity politics crowd is unable to look beyond themselves and their real (and perceived) oppression. We don't see any genuine theory anymore because people are focused on themselves, as victims, not as liberators. They cannot see anyone who is less privileged than themselves. They do not see global class, how a system functions, or a path to liberation - for this very reason.

In general, we see a lot of individualist, victim complex from Americans in abundance. This is a phenomena that affects the First World, but there is a an extreme version of it in the United States. The American Mind - the consciousness - is based on the idea of victimhood and being the underdog. Regardless of the
size of the empire, its genocidal beginnings, and privileged position in the world - it remains a country that is psychologically conditioned to see itself as "the little guy", the underdog that is striving to overcome a disadvantaged position.

This phenomena exists no matter the person's political stripe. Americans genuinely have the mentality that they are the victims of the global order. On the one side, we have right wing conservative idea that the "whole world is against us." They really believe that the rest of the world is conspiring against them. Another way it manifests itself is in its rugged adherence to right wing libertarianism. So many of these White middle class First World people truly believe they are victims of the global order. A copy of Atlas Shrugged can be found in their hands as they talk about how the government is a fascist monstrosity because they have to pay taxes. The core of the ideology is that the individual is special, unique, and important above all else. The individual is the smallest minority. As Ayn Rand says, "The smallest minority on earth is the individual. Those who deny individual rights cannot claim to be defenders of minorities." They really believe that they themselves are the oppressed minority. They see themselves as oppressed victims despite the fact the revel in the wealth of the global one percent. This victimhood is a delusion. So-called anarcho-capitalism promotes the same nonsense. Each person would be their own billionaire with maximum freedom, if only the state was removed as an obstacle. From the left to the right this perception of victimhood runs through all people. Identity politics and right wing libertarianism are two sides of the same victim complex.

This hyper perception of self as the ultimate victim explains a lot of the reactionary actions of liberals and Marxists in the First World today. Tumblr users who find something they disagree with carry out vicious personal attack campaigns. They go to the degree of exposing other people's identities and personal information. Traditionally this is called doing "pig work," the
work of the police. But now it's the common accepted practise. Often, such transgender activists will doxx a radical feminist who is gender questioning. Usually they hand that information over to Men's Rights Activists for harassment. This shows that a path to liberation is worth less than their own petty feelings, and desire to hurt people who disagree with them. Even if it means placing a woman in danger from misogynists. Especially if they claim to be women themselves.

Individualism is at the core of identity politics, focusing on one's identity and not the larger existing material conditions. It is no surprise to me that it is such a profound force in First World Marxism. One that refuses to acknowledge that contradictions have changed, and that the world itself changes. It is anti-science, it is anti-Marxist.

**It Leads No One Nowhere**

If we're going to critically look at First Worldism today, we have to ask ourselves who is going to follow the message. In the U.S. today we have a "Maoism" that espouses identity politics over that of class struggle. These groups have proclaimed themselves the champions of gender identity, disability, etc. at the expense of class analysis. They are people who would rather fight over who should use what washroom, and actually go so far as to threaten violence over it, than even honestly discuss class contradiction. At this same time they also claim to stand for anti-racism. A lot of Marxists jumped on the Black Lives Matter bandwagon. What is significant here is that these "Maoists" claim to be the true leaders of Black liberation in America.

Frankly, such ideology cannot lead anyone anywhere. The problem is that these "Maoists" are completely disconnected from the American people, let alone the global masses. In truth, they're all bound up in the same college activist circles, working in an echo chamber. This can most clearly be seen in their
complete inability to lead the Black population of the U.S. The Black population doesn't ally with Marxism. It allies with anti-racist liberalism. Marxists have been shunned from the Black Lives Matter movement. Marxists in Austin, Texas under the different names were barred by Black Lives Matter from being able to attend their protests.\textsuperscript{162} Even the Bob Avakin RCP has been rejected by BLM protests.\textsuperscript{163} Communists are not welcome in the BLM movement.

These same "Maoists" claim to be speaking for people of colour in the U.S. But no one will listen to them. Imagine you're a Black person who has suffered injury, false arrest, etc. You have this movement, albeit a liberal sellout one, to stand up for your rights. Now imagine that some self-proclaimed revolutionary leader of a college campus with a rich family comes up and starts acting like they know how to liberate you. But, as soon as you start to speak, they start calling you cis male oppressor. They demand that you respect their identity of whatever they are. Then they tell you how you're evil because you're a man, and an oppressor yourself. Demands for safe spaces are made, feelings are needed to be protected. They'll start preaching how you have to start wearing women's clothes and announcing themselves to be gender outlaws.

Do you honestly think any oppressed Black people are going to follow that kind of political line? Do you think they're going to follow those people? Why would they follow a group that keeps attacking them based on things that have nothing to do with police violence against Black people? They wouldn't, and that's the point. No one is going to follow that message when they're being killed by the police. How is a racial liberation movement supposed to succeed based on an oppression of 3.8% of the population?\textsuperscript{164} No to mention that the activism is pretty much limited to privileged White college kids. No one wants to follow them, let alone Black victims of police violence.
The same is absolutely true for workers. The "working class" in America today wants nothing to do with communists. They outright reject us at every turn. they do not want revolution, they want concessions for the capitalists to improve their living standards. If we're honest, we'll note that they have been against the communist message for decades. Over and over again communists have tried to reach leadership in unions to no success. They have run for office getting absolutely nowhere. No, Kashama Sawant the social democrat doesn't count, she wasn't offering revolution, only reform. That reform message sells quite well, while ours does not.

The rise of Bernie Sanders and Jeremy Corbyn is a product of the desire for reform and not revolution. Today the people of the First World doesn't even know what socialism is. The people who oppose Sanders, do so because they think he's a socialist. The people who support Sanders, do so because they think he is one. The truth is that he is not. *Yet, people on both sides, think he is.* That is the most disturbing fact of all. A lot of communists are claiming that socialism is no longer a dirty word, and that people are discussing the idea once again. This claim is false. They're only talking about it because they think socialism is social democracy. This is not talk of revolution, this is not talk revolutionary ideology, this is not revolutionary potential.

In this situation, it frankly doesn't matter if the working class in America needs revolution or not, they refuse to do it. No one wants to follow these so-called "Maoists." Most trans activists don't want to follow them, and they're only 3.8% of the population. On what basis can they claim that they can lead the Black, Latino, and woman demographics towards revolution? They only think they can because they exist in an online and college activist echo chamber. When they step out into the real word, they get rejected.
What I find really ironic here is the completely hypocritical nature of these First World "Maoists". They try to claim revolution based on gender identity, while foregoing class analysis. At the same time, they turn around and attack Third Worldists for supposedly not properly analyzing class. They're complete and utter hypocrites that have shunned revolutionary science for identity. They began rejecting class analysis fifty years ago.

Pounding your fist denouncing 96.2% of the population as "evil" cis people, will not build a revolutionary movement. The reality of it is in front of their eyes, no one wants to follow them, it will lead nowhere.

Primary and Secondary Contradictions
It has long been held that there are primary and secondary contradictions in society. All of society is made up of a collection of them. these contradictions and their antagonistic relationships are what give rise to motion and changes within society. This is one of most fundamental and basic ideas of Marxism, and how the materialist conception of history has shaped the world we live in. There can be no denying this without rejecting Marxism altogether.

"As opposed to the metaphysical world outlook, the world outlook of materialist dialectics holds that in order to understand the development of a thing we should study it internally and in its relations with other things; in other words, the development of things should be seen as their internal and necessary self-movement, while each thing in its movement is interrelated with and interacts on the things around it. The fundamental cause of the development of a thing is not external but internal; it lies in the contradictoriness within the thing. There is internal contradiction in every
single thing, hence its motion and development. Contradictoriness within a thing is the fundamental cause of its development, while its interrelations and interactions with other things are secondary causes.”

Some organizations proclaim that there is no primary contradiction, instead they see all contradictions as equal. To them the fight against all forms of oppression are equal to that of imperialism. They are not claiming that imperialism is unimportant, they are claiming that sexism, homophobia, racism and transphobia are equal to imperialism. Those who believe this claim, believe that all these aspects are a part of fighting for liberation, which they indeed are. To them the struggle against imperialism goes hand in hand with the liberation of various minority groups. While this is the end goal of revolution, they not on par with imperialism. They believe that by putting imperialism first it means ignoring other issues like women's rights. There is a reason why they think this. They have claimed that other Marxist groups have gone soft and neglected women's rights and the rights of various minority groups. Depending on what organization they are referring to this may be true.

What they are getting wrong is that the fight against imperialism already has such secondary contradictions in its view to be dealt with. These other issues are a part of the struggle. In no sense according to Marxist and even Marxist-Leninist-Maoist theory are they to be ignored. Just because some groups may or may not be ignoring them doesn't justify placing all contradictions with the same importance. Maoism already holds that the fight of such various groups is a part of the anti-imperialist struggle.

During the battle for the liberation of China from imperialism and capitalism, the Communist Party of China made it important that women be liberated while the war was going on. Women left their families and joined the communists to avoid arranged
marriages. Some men joined the communists so that they could get married. In that time if you couldn't pay a dowry for a wife, you were not going to be able to get married. Women were granted the ability to file for divorce and keep custody of children. During the redistribution of land in the course of land reform during the war, feudal landlords were thrown off their property and women for the first time were being offered ownership of it. Prostitution became virtually non-existent in such areas because women would rather till their own land and own their own means of production. Very clearly in the history of Marxist revolutionary struggle there has been the liberation of such oppressions while the struggle was taking place. This idea that including these other struggles along with anti-imperialism is a new thing is simply preposterous.

There is a very clear reactionary element in removing imperialism as the primary contradiction. If by their own logic not having sexism, homophobia, etc. as primary, up front and equally important to imperialism, it means it isn't being done; then not having imperialism as primary must mean it is being ignored. If we take their ideology as true this is where it leads us to.

From a tactical and logical standpoint imperialism must be the primary contradiction. Without achieving anti-imperialist struggle, anti-capitalist struggle cannot happen. If anti-capitalist revolution does not take place, then the struggle against sexism, homophobia, racism, transphobia etc. cannot be achieved. There can be no abolishment of these other forms of oppression unless the society is transformed into one that makes it possible. You cannot build the new society free of "the old evils" unless you lay the foundation and have the space in which to do it. Without this place in which to build the new society the greatest of efforts in the rights of various minorities and women will be fruitless as they will never materialize.
This (in truth) First Worldist line of placing all struggles equal to that of imperialism removes dialectics from Marxist theory and replaces it with intersectionality. This entirely flies in the face of Marxist theory and rejects the philosophic and scientific power of dialectics. Dialectical materialism forms the structure of Marxism as a revolutionary science. To remove this is to purge the skeletal structure of Marxism. This intersectionality acts a tool of the reactionary postmodernist mindset of social justice warriors. While all things interact, they do not see how different identities and material forces can contradict and more importantly, mutually influence each other. Removing this, it shackles the hands of the Marxist analysis reducing it to an unscientific view.

This view held by people who don't hold the idea of a single primary contradiction see the problem as one lump of balled up string, crisscrossing back through itself over and over. Their tactic of treating all contradictions as equally important is like pulling on all the string that is on the surface of the ball at once. This will only make the ball tighter, not undo it. Intersectionality sees just this, one ball that must be tugged on from all sides in order to be undone. With dialectics we see the ball of string and unravel the knot, pulling on the appropriate piece through the correct one, resolving the contradictions until we are left with one piece of string in a straight line. Dialectics, not postmodernism, is a science of social change that can provide us with a course of action to resolve the problem. To chose this all contradictions as equal, is essentially intersectionality, or to simply hit out in all directions.

When one sees the plan as attacking from all sides at once they end up engaging in opportunism. It is impossible to literally attack all issues simultaneously, particularly if you're a small group in the First World. They'll end up attacking whatever issue they like, or think they have an advantage at, they will strike at whatever is easiest for them. This opportunism makes up the
anarchist struggle, they too see all problems as being relatively equal and must be attacked all at once. This is why anarchists engage in nonsense such as cross dressing as a form of struggle, breaking windows, veganism, forming communes in the imperialist core. Nothing here threatens capitalism or imperialism. This is the essence of opportunism, to think valid all methods of struggle when many are fruitless. The strategy of undoing the binds of oppression is lost in favour of whatever struggle best fits the schedule and lifestyle of the First Worlder, whatever is convenient for them. Or whatever the flavour of the week is.

This line of thinking is nothing new. Seeing all contradictions as one lump like intersectionality is not new territory. This kind of thinking has been propounded by the New Left, Herbert Marcuse and people like Michel Foucault. They are not being original in anyway.

The effect is presenting the First Worlder with methods of "struggle" that aren't struggle at all. Capitalism isn't abolished by engaging in veganism. It isn't destroyed with gender identity blogs on tumblr and other social media. Going around and smashing windows at a protest isn't going to collapse the system. Going "off the grid" in communes isn't going to bring down imperialism by not engaging in the economy. Given this, we often end up with people who don't tug on a single piece of string at all let alone an incorrect one or many of them. Imperialism is defeated by a concentrated effort resisting it, not activism like a chicken with its head cut off.

To liberate all peoples of the world capitalism must come to an end. It can only be defeated by destroying imperialism. There is no reason why we can't begin to end racial, gender, national, etc. oppression through the anti-imperialist struggle. But without the primary goal of abolishing capitalism, all those efforts will be for nothing, and their goals cannot be reached.
Without this central task accomplished there will be liberation for no one.

**Anti-Revolutionary**
The case has been made that identity politics is inherently anti-revolutionary. It distracts from the real struggle to fight non-revolutionary struggles. Identity politics places people's feelings over revolutionary science. One fights the phenomena that offend them, not the correct scientific path to end all oppressions. Liberation is achieved by ending the system that causes oppression, not liberal struggles for concessions from it. The system must be torn down and built anew. We must not cooperate with our oppressors to create a more comfortable capitalism. We need fighting, not protesting. We need building from the ground up, not small cosmetic renovations.

We must adhere to correct struggle, not merely pander to the flavour of the week. We must not jump on any bandwagon which makes noise. We must be on our own and steer it correctly. These identity politics are not about total liberation, they are individualist oriented non-struggles. The LGBT movement is about getting concessions from the capitalist class. It is not about *destroying* the capitalist class. You will not have equality under capitalism. We must guide the masses with revolutionary science, not people's individual perceptions of themselves.

Only revolutionary science can bring an end to all oppressions. Problems are solved only by proper investigation. If there is to be equality among the oppressed groups, we must achieve an elimination of poverty, inequality, and the destruction of a system *causes* these problems to begin with. Identity politics is not interested in science. It is concerned only with making noise and demanding those concessions.
Is liberal feminism revolutionary? Of course not. Not only does it pander to patriarchy, it explicitly rejects violent revolution. It is necessary to carry out violent revolution if there is to be any real change, let alone equality. Does that mean we reject feminism? No, it means we reject the reactionary concept of it. We reject liberal feminism because it is useless for real struggle. We must also reject other identity politics for their anti-revolutionary ways that don't bring revolution.

We must reject this reactionary way of politics if we are to use science and make revolution. Terrible deviations, and mistakes are made when we unquestioningly take up the banner of any group. For example, one so-called Third Worldist group openly defended a pedophile simply because people questioned his identity as a child. When Paul “Stefonknee” Wolscht came out as identifying as a child, it was heavily criticized. He claims he, “fluidly moves between her six-year-old self and her adult self, in addition to her male and female identities.”\(^166\) He used a fetish site to find a couple that would allow him to carry out his sexual fantasies of being a six year old girl being raped.\(^167\) This man was rightfully attacked for his pedophilic urges, as well as his history of physical and emotional abuse of his now ex-wife, and children. When this was criticized, a known so-called Third Worldist group came to his defense because he also identifies as a woman. The entire sexualisation of childhood was invisible in their eyes. They claimed all criticism of him was "transphobic." This is a direct rejection of rightful criticism, investigation, and science.

Take some time to peruse the activities of people involved in identity politics. We constantly see people revealing personal information about their personal lives in order to "live up to" a particular identity. The one who is perceived as correct, is the one who can identify as the subject to the greatest degree. No theory is presented, it's merely a contest to see who can claim to be oppressed the most, real or imagined. It forces people to give
their own personal narrative and experience, rather than discuss theory. People attack each other based on such identities, they do not struggle over the correct political line. "That's wrong. I'm Black and LGBT," is not line struggle. If someone proposes a theory and they're White, they're automatically assumed to be wrong. Science would reject such nonsense. Are Marx and Lenin wrong because they're cis White males? This anti-science nonsense happens constantly.

All kinds of dangerous personal information is placed out in public. If this were a revolutionary struggle, such actions would get people killed by state agents. Anything that volunteers information to the bourgeois state is outright reactionary. Instead, they reveal as much about their personal lives as possible to garner sympathy, as a method of gaining credibility in identity politics circles. Read their literature, there is no theory, only appeals to emotion.

Such circles of politics engage in outright pig work. Trans rights groups often reveal the personal information of radical feminists who oppose their line. They knowingly and deliberately place these women's lives in danger by making it available to MRAs, fascists, and other oppressive groups. This outright wrecks groups and people that contribute to struggle. This is what police agents do to wreck political groups. Anyone who engages in such activity is nothing less than a police agent.

Finally, it sabotages revolutionary struggle. We know that imperialism is the primary contradiction. When identity politics struggles, it gives a narrow nationalist view. It concentrates only on the problems of First World people. They struggle only for the oppression of First World people. They demand concessions from the capitalist class, not an end to imperialism that carries that same oppression out on Third World people at astronomically higher numbers. They reject fighting imperialism that kills tens of millions of people a year. They do this because
they're only concerned with themselves and their identity, not the revolutionary science necessary to end all oppressions.

Often, identity politics groups carry out wrecking activity against anti-imperialist groups because they disagree slightly on some smaller issue. Such groups denounce anti-imperialist groups, calling them all manner of names, make all kinds of accusations - simply because they have a slight disagreement on a subject. When they're in the same group, they do even worse. They try to get people kicked out over disagreements. No one has done anything wrong, they merely disagree over line. These internal debates usually turn into horror shows of people accusing each other of things rather than discussing that line. This ends up sabotaging anti-imperialist struggle.

One of my biggest criticisms of the now defunct NCP-LC has been their opportunism. They refused to support both Syria and the DPRK because of real and perceived transphobia, and homophobia. Yet, at the same time, they support Hamas in their struggle against the Israeli occupation of Palestine. Are we to believe that Hamas isn't homophobic and transphobic? Of course they are, they're highly influenced by Islam. They've even carried out killings against homosexual Palestinians. Why the double standard? Why refuse to defend Syria and the DPRK from imperialism, but support Hamas? Because supporting Israel is popular. It's not as popular to support Syria, and it's not popular to support the DPRK. This opportunism was directly the result of identity politics.

If you are not supporting the Third World in throwing off the shackles of imperialism, you are outright supporting imperialism. You don't have to like a country, you only have to defend their right to self-determination. If imperialism is the primary contradiction, according to both Lenin and Mao - to reject it is outright reactionary.
Why do they do this? Because they don't care about Third World people. They don't care about Third World suffering. The victims of imperialism are nothing to them. They may claim otherwise, but their actions clearly demonstrate the opposite. Of course they don't care about imperialism, they benefit from it. It's not in their interest to fight against it. They have the benefits of the First World, they're just lacking the little bit more they lose out on for being a marginalized group. They can afford to be complacent and not engage in actual revolution. This also ties into how First World people are reactionary.
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