

# AVANT!

## THE ANTIQUES OF HISTORY



DECEMBER 2025  
VOLUME II

*Avant!* is a communist journal focused on the ability of the proletariat to abolish its own condition. Drawing from a various pool of ideological influences, we seek to ruthlessly critique all forms of mediation.



## Contents

<b>Foreword</b> .....	4
<b>ACT I</b> .....	6
<b>Marx's Severed Head</b> .....	7
<b>ACT II</b> .....	23
<b>Critique of the Florence Program: On Democracy &amp; Mediation</b> .....	24
<b>Black Nativism: On the Confines of a Race Politic</b> .....	41
<b>ACT III</b> .....	64
<b>On Protest As Spectacle</b> .....	65
<b>Revolutionary Semantics</b> .....	74
<b>Accelerate?</b> .....	97
<b>Epilogue</b> .....	105

# Foreword

This project was born at the death of the Palestine Solidarity Movement and student movement of our generation. Initially student organizers equipped with the great Communist ideologies of the last century, it was in struggle that we found glaring contradictions in our methodology. In our carefully crafted, antiquated ideology we saw the birthmark of liberalism, which bled into every fibre of our being. In name communist, we had yet to discover the true meaning of abolition, to push beyond the mediations of both Communist thought and everyday life.

The following works consider a variety of topics within the context of ongoing mass movements and mobilizations in the latter half of 2025: These include the anti-ICE and community self-defense movements, campaigns in our workplaces and housing, as well as the bleak reproduction of day-to-day life. The first section of this work, '*The Slow Burn of History*', serves as a modern manifesto for communists. It addresses the degeneration of the Marxists, especially as they implement the limits of historical ideology in the process of history. We also discuss the plethora of tactical errors this leads to, especially in the context of proletarian interaction. We continue these themes with the second section, '*Critique of Ideology*', which includes our findings on

popular mediators of all kinds, especially democracy, nationalism, and racialism. We break with a final section, ‘Notes on Spectacular Activism’, which launches a modern criticism at the tactics many ideologues employ: These include protesting, mediatory language and sloganeering, as well as individual acts of terror.

The purpose of this work is to provide communists with a thoughtful critique of much that exists, exchange critiques, and sharpen our tools. We hope our work from this period is helpful in this regard, and continues to challenge those in our movement who struggle fearlessly. In these times of social decay, we can only say there is a kernel of communisation everywhere. The workers are brimming with contempt as much as apathy, and genuinely have the potential to abolish their own slavery. The role of the communist, then, is to simply project and amplify, to heighten the contradiction, to struggle amidst workers and raise the banner high. This task is tedious, sickening, treacherous and damaging, but it is also a beautiful insight into a world that may yet exist.

At that, we welcome you to Volume II of *Avant!*.

# ACT I

*The Slow Burn of History*

## Marx's Severed Head

A flagrant misunderstanding of our revolutionary tradition has seen Marxism codified into a historical ideology; This error has enclosed historical-*political* and historical-*economic* (the realms of bourgeois science and allocation) speculations and passed them off as eternal truths. Instead of changing the world, the overwhelming majority of Marxists now seek only to interpret it, to identify objects as they *currently* exist. To commit what Marx himself considered pseudoscientific analysis in his own critique of political-economy. In essence: To end history in the age of liberalism.

Likewise, the Marxists constitute the most outwardly reactionary elements of the communist left. In the United States, their representatives spend their time sandwiched between parliamentary reformism, spectacular protesting, class collaboration, and chasing Anarchist shadows. Through building their Parties and organizations external to the movement of communisation itself, these mediators have warranted themselves a precious role in making revolution. This of course has come at the cost of revolution in practice. Their philosophy simply pools together transient clumps of activists, and/or divides the proletariat along liberal-bourgeois lines. Just like Bernstein and the bourgeois democrats sought the

death of revolutionary social democracy, Marx's own followers have sought his swift decapitation.

Thus, it becomes almost impossible for any communist -*that is, any subject of capitalist alienation who is conscious of the real existing movement for communisation-* to earnestly call themselves a Marxist. In order to properly address these issues with the relevant currents of such a diverse tradition, we will discuss the philosophical content of leading Marxists and their recent discrepancies in action. We speak of many tendencies here: The DSA's concoction of reform and revolution, Leninist-inspired PSL, Leninist-role playing FRSO, and the Maoists and libertarian communists of varying cliques and tendencies. In these organizations we have analyzed and sometimes even collaborated with "Democratic Socialists", "Orthodox Marxists", "Marxist-Leninists", "Marxist-Leninist-Maoists", "Gonzaloites", "Councilists", and "Autonomists". While there are various refutations of these historical tendencies, this article seeks to understand how they live and interact today.

## **Political Enthusiasm**

Of any communist, it seems that the Marxist is always the most enthusiastic to engage in bourgeois politics. Outside of the Leftist Maoists and

Gonzaloites (the more fringe of the general Marxist canon), each and every Marxist has tried and failed to penetrate this bourgeois apparatus. Whereas they conduct trench warfare and fight for mere inches on one another, this struggle is situated on a mountain of scraps. The DSA and Orthodox may be most guilty of this, but likewise Leninists cling to the illusion that running their programs in the realm of politics produces revolutionary potential in the platforming of demands. We emphasize that this cannot be any further from the truth. For example, glance around at how the Leninists, Trotskyists, and hardcore Stalinists hold their candles to the flame. Nowhere do any of these groups call for Communism, but for an enlightened welfare state and the virtue of Man. The very *moment* one limits their work to the scope of this bourgeois science, is the moment communism cannot possibly bear its own weight. Communism and liberalism are incompatible, and liberal ideas of moving the masses likewise.

But what of the momentum of successful Marxist electoral campaigns today? Do they not present our best opportunities yet to connect to the masses? Simply put, no. The movements of Zohran and DSA's allies represent the pinnacle of anyone from Bernstein to the Roosevelts to Mussolini. To be clear, we can have our own feelings regarding conditions potentially bettering for the proletariat. But whether

a cookie or a crumb, Zohran, for example, has won his campaign due to the contradictions of capitalism propelling him forward. Of course New York City is unaffordable: Rent is infamously astronomical, food costs are rising still, and transport is not cheap. This is the real contradiction of capitalist life slowly grinding away at its own children, its inputs to production. This increases the feverish pitch of communisation, but also signals the loosening of the leash. With this comes the widening palate of the bourgeoisie and the befriending of the petit-bourgeoisie, possibly the most reactionary base in society. These groups will serve as allies to the *political* campaign in some respects, as many have done with charming Zohran. Demands for small businesses are even made in his own program! This contradiction is all fine, as it is only a contradiction in name: Together, the petit-bourgeoisie and social democrats are the true stopgaps to Communism. Historically these two have taken it on themselves to beat the *life* out of the communist movement, insofar as to turn around and ask their bourgeois masters for acceptance. This goes for any social democrat, from NYC to Minneapolis and so on.

The rest of the bourgeoisie may fear Marxists in office, yet this is precisely because they fail to study Marx or his contemporaries. For them, a 2% raise in taxes is the culmination of the real movement, of

communisation in final form. If they were truly aware of an imminent revolutionary threat, they would raise taxes on themselves tenfold. So we can laugh at their childishness, but turn our noses up at these thetic practices. The sad tale is that this is not a trend of Democratic Socialists, but again of the majority of contemporary Marxist organizations. They adopted Marx's *political* opinions at the time of writing the first edition of the Manifesto (i.e. raising taxes), and subsequently left the theoretical model to rot.

Of course, the language of bourgeois politics is more than holding a program to the light or partaking in an election to seek concessions. It is a violent strain of thought that has found its way in Marxist theorizing and understanding of the world (see our work on Multipolarity for a more complete analysis). Every Marxist is an *allocator* of an absurd-typically nationalist-bent. By allocation we mean to take existing capitalist relations and diagnose the problem at distribution, not production itself. In this Marxists use a *political* understanding to sharpen their weapons and shape their campaigns. They will be the first to ask for fairness for entire peripheral State apparatuses and mystifying their proletariat, for better trade deals, for more diplomacy, and representation. They will instruct themselves on class struggle through the lens of geopolitics and

devil's advocacy of a lesser bourgeoisie (BRICS). None of these questions have to do with making war with the international bourgeoisie, but strengthening alliances on the false premise that our only option is collaboration!

## **Economics & Allocation**

If the favored action of the Marxist is political, the favored language is economic. If you handed them the world today, they would promptly *re-allocate* the existing system and leave its functioning as is. We have discussed this extensively but from the wider-reaching tendencies. Yet be it any flavor of Marxism, even councilists or autonomists, and this typically stands. How so?

This is all due to the understanding many Marxists have of history: As a process of *linear development*. The idea that progress is pushing inevitability, and that the cycles of history always push us to a new epoch of development, a higher plane. If the revered Stalin was to be correct, the capitalist mode of production can be *utilized* to push forward *socialist* production. If not Stalin but Pannekoek, and it is the workers who should directly observe their own misery through the implementation of workers' calculated management. This still rests on measuring productivity and various schemes of increasing productivity through coercion. If not

Stalin not Pannekoek but Negri, and it is the workers who both should find glory in their own identity as worker, and strive to have autonomy over their localized poverty. Similar to the councilists, this is ultimately a new form of management. A more palatable one? Of course. But revolution breaks here yet.

We say this, writing with affinity for the questions Pannekoek and Negri have raised as well as their contributions to the communist movement: To synthesize the communist movement as a movement to manage capitalism is an error, precisely because new management does not break capitalist socialization. Similar to the errors of Stalin, we can call these forms of *developmentalism* or *stageism*, two of the primary enemies of the communist movement yet two critical elements of the Marxist canon. Let us continue.

Developmentalists may hold the belief that history is a process of economic development, but they stretch this to include the claim that the modern capitalist economy simply requires a *higher stage* of development for socialism. This can typically be contextualized in the praise of China's great "modernization" or any other supposed region which has not undergone "sufficient" development for socialism. Likewise, stageism simply implies the

existence of unique and *linear* historical stages of development, furthering the claim that from feudalism to early capitalism to late capitalism, we will finally arrive at socialism. To contend with these ideas seriously is just as reasonable as to submit to the Abrahamic God. Regardless, we address them both with their very liberal birthmarks.

The Stalinists and their offspring are the most rugged of developmentalists, this is true. They assumed they could develop the Soviet Union into Communism, they were proved to be wrong, and their ideas bounced around the globe as they took root in the minds of peripheral bourgeoisies and intelligentsias. Seize a nation, nationalize as one pleases, and modernize to a new socialist age. Now China and “Dengism”, or “Maoist Thought” is the rage. Yet this is the same exact deficiency that was found in Stalin’s project: A belief in the progress of humanity through defined stages, and that progress was implied through modernizing. Meanwhile the Chinese bourgeoisie launches even more attacks on the proletariat, both domestic and international. All in the name of developmentalism, it has become apparent that increasing economic output and efficiency does not breed a working class revolution.

The councilists and libertarian Marxists are more rigorous in their approach and earnest in class

struggle. Recognizing the excesses of Russia's bureaucratic nightmare, they have opted for a stage of Communism closer to the ground. But this is still yet a belief in a mostly linear transition and needless prolonging of capitalism, should it not last forevermore. The historical step "up" to toppling management and placing the workers at the seat is all too much similar to the Bolsheviks' theses. They argue the workers' liberation must be made through war with the bourgeoisie. We argue that war must be made with the entire mode of production, with the inputs of the mode of production-such as the workers, abolishing themselves as workers in immediacy. The mere fulfillment of capitalism's contradiction without fomenting extra steps. These views are not reconcilable as long as workerism, Stalinism, or any "ism" clings to the real movement.

We refer back to the introduction and implication that Marxists wish to "end history" in the age of liberalism here: They wish to imbue in the world the preceding Enlightenment notion that progress is not only necessary, but guaranteed. This is a thoughtful notion that attempts to make sense out of the history of humanity, but this does not make it less utopian. Stalin surmises the working masses will inevitably smash capitalism, Deng claims that the modern nation will give birth to true socialism; We cannot always be so sure. At every moment, our allegiance

can only be with the working class and its immediate victory.

## **Marxists in Action**

In our time and place, the Marxists are more likely to be at the services of the State than of the proletariat. Elections are one thing, peace-policing is another. At the advent of a wave of energy, they are in vests, hoping to quell the rage. It is their everlasting wish to bottle up the rage and save it for when they have prescribed it best fit. When this epoch never presents itself, they never admit defeat, but change the definition of success. These experiences are based on both Chicago's Leninist-NGO marriage, the "Coalition Against the Trump Agenda", and PSL's own marches. These actions will draw anywhere from hundreds to thousands of people, feature platitudes of "fighting back" and "getting organized" before a masturbatory claim that these showings in themselves are a success. While these protests celebrated progressive culture in the downtown Loop, neighborhoods continued to be ravaged by federal agents. These bubble-like alternative realities are nauseating and deceptive.

While these claims may feel too broad to be applicable to the many tendencies of Marxism, they are assurably in the nature of the dominant positions we are reviewing today. The Democratic Socialists,

Orthodox, and Leninists are the first victims of their own ineptitude. Parroting Enlightenment ideals of progress and fairness, they have limited their own action to the accumulation of capital. While endearingly, the Maoists and Gonzaloites preach a gospel of “mass work”, they are still abject friends of accumulation and resolute nationalists, the basis of many an intellectual poverty. Their work thus consists of rousing “nationally-oppressed” communities on the basis of their identity or race, rather than from their potential to communise. They’ll next proceed with a push for civil rights for these nationalities on varying grounds. Likewise with the “less radical” variants of Marxism, they shoot themselves in the foot in a push for a fairer allocation of resources.

In a similar vein, the Marxists engage with trade unionism at an industrial level but only go so far as to jostle for the reins. In a city like Chicago, absolutely brimming with union activity (relative to the rest of the country), there is a completely compartmentalized trade union movement. Union representatives and ardent socialists meet with the bourgeoisie, haggle over the price of their members, and both will claim they have won a tremendous victory. Meanwhile the more critical Marxists devoid of hedge fund backing (see: PSL) will pine for a workers’ trade union movement. While romantic,

this action is still the inverse of linear stageist philosophy and we cannot parse out a movement bent on reinforcing wage slavery. **The workers do not yearn for work.**

The many ways these groups act in relation to the proletariat is that of a teacher mistreating the learning of a student. By assuming the proletariat does not have the ability to abolish itself without canonised Marxist ideology, these revolutionaries dumb down, or altogether alter the most radical of the canon: The content of capitalism itself. For the proletariat, this places Communism on a political-economic-ideological mantle with liberalism, or conservative liberalism, of Democrats and Republicans. Something to be tried and tested within the confines of liberal democracy, and dispensed with after each experiment inevitably goes haywire. Instead of vying for the proletarian's attention with a "new" ideological communism, perhaps we should just reject ideological communism in favor of Communism itself?

## **Dismembering Class Against the Wishes of Marxists**

As per our work on the topic of ICE: Should the Marxists or other degenerations of liberalism triumph, we will be doomed to haggle over the price

of our damnation. To scientifically allocate our share of life, our time of death, always evading the cause.

The bourgeoisie is international, yet communisation is not a thought. It is a historical process inherent in our social tension now. This does not mean it is inevitable. Only the international working class, in a movement of abolishing itself, can fulfill this decisively. Thus, we say not “Long Live the Workers”, but “Abolish Work”. We seek to leave behind our miseries and sorrows in the Old World, to revolt *and* communise.

## **Refutations of Anarchism's Value System**

If not a historical Marxism, it is many a Communist's pivot to Anarchism which can be just as troubling. To be transparent, we find ourselves sympathetic to Anarchism in the same way we might be of councilism or autonomism. We recognize its historical vindication in the errors of Marxism-Leninism, and especially with the rise of the Stalinists and Maoists. We recognize its place on the cutting edge of tactical approaches in America and worldwide, and its contributions as an ideology in imbuing these approaches with sufficient leverage to combat the State. Yet, when we recognize its relevance as a value system and historical ideology,

we must also address its shortcomings. Like Marxists, Anarchists have fashioned-sometimes an even more obvious-*historical* ideology. Tracing back their rich heritage centuries, they also cling to the ideological burden that comes with these tactical innovations. We can refer to these as Anti-Authoritarianism, Freedom, Human Rights, Liberty, Justice, and so on.

Most Anarchists remain committed to these values, and our intent is for these values to be dissected at once. We critique the usage of *any* value system for studying history. Even if we happen to agree that “authoritarianism” genuinely relates to something harmful, or deem it necessary to fight for a society with more “freedom” or “liberty”. These values are not eternal but transient manifestations of class society at a given time. What constitutes “Human Rights” at one point may be the right to conduct a diabolical chattel slavery, or have ownership over their spouse. Likewise, we must recognize that even if values *were* less malleable, they are not the movers of history. Rather it is the basis of class society, and the contradictions which lead to conflict, collapse, and revolution. Since some Anarchists do not seem necessarily interested in the observation of *class* society, they tend to roam about in declassed movements which treat each one as a *human* rather than a Marxist would a *worker*. This is ironically a

closer conception to what a communised society could look like, but it forgets one thing: We are not yet occupants of a communist society. We recognize this philosophical slide as very much an equivalent to the Marxist's stageist-utopian vision.

Whereas many Anarchist-dominated movements are *declassed*, or void of class content, whereas we seek a violent abolition of class, or class movement to abolish classes. The former is subject to the most intense of bourgeois co-option: Our Anarchist friends know this well. Yet even still, the liberals successfully sink their teeth into the trove of values Anarchists offer. Where they mainly come to differ (the State), they still resemble themselves on the topics of liberty, human rights, and freedom. In a crowd you couldn't pick these two out; If the liberal is feeling dangerous, they'll even throw on the bloc to match. In the end the sea of reaction will split open to brutalize and detain the Anarchist, and the movement will be left in a repressed mess.

It is not the fact that Anarchists have failed on which we rest our criticism: We are a historical tradition of failures. Rather, it is the basis of their activism which draws it out. On this basis they have made great analysis about the role of the State and coercion, and the necessity to do away with it at once. But because these were conducted on ideological lines, they could

not see this for the half-baked equation that it is. Namely, the forces that have led to the rise of the State, and the forces that have taken part in its maintenance. They have left these forces unaddressed in popular movements where class struggle is most eminent. In practice, it shelves communism itself for a debate on moral righteousness amongst class enemies.

We analyze these similarities between Marxists and Anarchists because they both fall along ideological lines. Yet what is needed is the embrace of communism, with the content of communism: Neither program or ideology will do. Tactically astute and more apt for confronting the State, Anarchist contributions cannot be overlooked. Yet as we must break free of the Marxists' liberalism to revolt, we must of the Anarchists' to communise.

# ACT II

*Critique of Ideology*

# **Critique of the Florence Program: On Democracy & Mediation**

In the aftermath of the most recent convention of the Democratic Socialists of America (DSA), the organization stands in a precarious situation. Conflicts between the “Left” and “Right” of the DSA threaten to dismantle, or at the least disrupt, the current activities of the organization. However much the Left and Right disagree on issues, such as Palestine, the American national question, etc., they have found themselves united in the *meditation* of class conflict instead of its escalation. Many are familiar with “the largest socialist organization in the country” (in their own words), and many more will certainly become more familiar with their name following the primary election of Zohran Mamdani for NYC mayor and other minor campaigns, such as those of Omar Fateh. This is where both wings of the DSA unite together into a single organization that has seemingly shifted its dedication towards putting up candidates for public office.

If this everlong, and ultimately futile, quest to obtain any modicum of political power was only sought after by the liberal elements of the DSA, we would

have nothing to say as we are not liberals nor have any interest in opining on what tactics and strategies liberals take. Our issue comes when some of the most ardent defenders and proponents of electoralism are coming from the “Communist” camp of the DSA, those of the neo-Kautskyite *Marxist Unity Group* or the post-Trotskyist *Bread and Roses* (just to name a few). We have prepared some criticisms of a draft program written by *Marxist Unity Group* called *The Florence Program*, and while this specific draft program is slightly out of date (written in February 2025) it still retains the core essence of the ideology we seek to critique. In fact, in its content the Florence Program surmises a large proportion of the errors within not only the Right and Left of DSA. This critique is larger than just the Florence Program itself, larger than even Marxist Unity Group and the DSA as a whole. It is an attack leveled at the idealism that has permeated and entrenched itself into the Left. This program is not unique in its use of mediation, it is however just one of the most comprehensive in its analysis and practice.

## **The Florence Program:**

The preamble of the Program serves as a, mainly, inoffensive retelling of the history of American Capitalism, where most of the contents are either agreeable or simply not worth arguing over.

However, there still remains a large amount of contradictions in their writings that we take pause with and have comments on.

Paragraph One: *“Capitalism is a failed system. The capitalist class has unleashed misery on the workers of the world, turning to environmental devastation, militarized policing, mass incarceration, wars of genocide and conquest, and radicalization of existing forms of social domination, all in the pursuit of profits.”*

Is Capitalism a failed system? When we examine the reasoning laid out in the Program they cite the moral failings of Capital: Alienation and misery of workers, environmental destruction, militarized police, etc. However, these issues listed are the products of Capitalism, not its goal. If Capitalism has failed, then we must assume that the goal of Capital is the creation of a libertine utopia free of conflict, but that is not the goal of Capital. Marxist Unity Group even correctly identifies the actual purpose of Capital further on.

In Paragraph Two: *“Capitalism transforms or abolishes all existing social structures to serve the production of surplus-value, the root of the ruling classes’ incomes of profit, interest, and rent... capitalism concentrates increasing capital in fewer hands, crosses every national border, subsumes*

*every aspect of society into one vast market..."*

The true goal of Capital is the accumulation of private property and the extraction of surplus value in the form of profit, even Marxist Unity Group admits. Now that we recognize the purpose of Capitalism, can we truly classify it as a failed system? We answer this question in the negative.

In fact, through analyzing the conditions of the present epoch, we can ascertain that currently Capitalism is at its peak (as of now) and it is inarguably the most successful it has ever been since the very first joint-stock venture companies were founded in England and Holland.

1. Capital has spread itself internationally, finally overthrowing the last vestiges and remnants of the old order of agrarianism and manorialism, and in its stead has hoisted up the banner of wage-labor and private property.
2. Capital has extended itself past the material realm, where transactions and the gears of the economy no longer need to turn in the world we exist in. The digitization of the economy has allowed for the proliferation of fictitious finance capital, which was once housed in only a few countries.

3. Capital has co-opted the struggle against itself and deemed it in its own terms, in the process infecting nearly all of its detractors with the language of their oppressors. Its final victory culminated in the complete valorization of class and work by the “Communist” and Socialist Left, such that the warriors against Capital inadvertently became the most ardent defenders of its social relations.

In Paragraph 9: *The workers' movement has arisen from the struggle of workers to improve their conditions against the interests of their bosses, landlords, and rulers through demands that only partially address their domination under capitalism. These struggles and the collective organizations that wage them—trade-unions, cooperatives, mutual aid societies, and at the highest level, the political party—hold the secret to reconstructing a world without a ruling class and an exploited class: the democratic control of society by the people whose labor creates it.*

Marxist Unity Group correctly identifies that the reformist positions and platforms held by the currently existing workers' organs do not adequately address the issues of Capitalism and only seek to alleviate the results of the mode of production. However, the Group immediately contradicts

themselves and posits that it is the same toothless and defanged reformist organizations that will lead us to the future that they are incapable of even envisioning. The Group claims that these institutions hold “the secret” to “reconstructing a world” in a, hopefully, brighter and better image, and cites their role in the current social order; however, it is in their linguistics that we draw our criticism and where they show their own misunderstanding of Communism and our goals.

1. The usage of “the secret” implies that these reformist trade unions hold the sole, or at least a great deal of, authority by which we can build a sense of “dual power” (a delusion in its own right, however that is a topic for another time). This is a far cry from merely recognizing the potential progressive nature of these institutions, such as when Engels surmised that “nationalization may provide a hint” for socialization, but quickly clarified it was not the end of the matter, rather the beginning. Marxist Unity Group seems to misunderstand this premise.
2. “Reconstructing” is also a curious word choice to use. When a building burns down and it is reconstructed, it would be the assumption that the same, or a similar enough, building

would be built in its stead. As was the case for the historical era of “Reconstruction” in American history, where the country was undergoing massive social change, but that the country was still decidedly going to be rebuilt in a similar image of itself before the war. It is interesting that they would use this phrasing instead of just clarifying that they wish to construct an entirely new society. It begs the question if they even have the political desire or imagination to construct a different society.

Outside of their linguistic issues, their logic itself and conception of these organizations is detached from reality. Trade unions, cooperatives, and mutual aid societies do not hold some special key that unlocks communization, in fact it is the opposite. These organizations can only exist under the current social relations of Capitalism, and we will run through their faults briefly.

- Trade Unions: Unions themselves, as stated outright by Marxist Unity Group, only seek to alleviate the effects of Capital, not to revolt against it. The express purpose of a union is strictly to engage in direct collaboration and mediation with the boss and management, such that class is directly reaffirmed by their

actions. Through their struggle for “bread and butter” issues they affirm the role of the proletariat as wage earners, just this time slightly better paid.

- Cooperatives: Co-ops certainly provide an alternative to traditional wage-labor, however this alternative is simply to turn the worker into an owner. Similar to unions, co-ops only help quell the symptoms of Capital and reinforce the current social order.
- Mutual Aid: This one is perhaps the worst example Marxist Unity Group could've picked. Mutual aid essentially acts as charity which is in itself nowhere near revolutionary.

All of these are very brief overviews and we do not seek to hope that this suffices as a full, in-depth critique of these forms of organization, but just to introduce the criticisms.

The debate surrounding the role and usage of political parties is still yet raging. While we are often critical of the actions and organizational form of the Party, we are neutral in regards to the usage of the party form as a tool in the class struggle. However, we certainly disagree with Marxist Unity Group’s claim that the Party is the “highest level” of the class struggle. The highest level of the class struggle is the

Revolution. Could the party form be active in the revolutionary struggle and even prove itself useful? Of course! Is it the deciding factor leading the Revolution? Of course not! The Group falls short to defend its position in the necessity of the party form and desperately clings to the “historical validity” of the role of the Party all while failing to critically examine its role through the history of the class struggle.

In Paragraph 10: “*Only socialism, the project of universal human emancipation led by the working class, can overcome such adversity.*”

This is where the Marxist Unity Group completely breaks from any relation to the works of Marx and should erase his name and etch in those of Robespierre, Saint-Just, and Danton. Socialism, a term which has become altogether meaningless in its application, is assuredly not the “project of universal human emancipation” as the Group claims, and it is for the following reasons:

1. Communism is not for the universal emancipation of mankind, it is the specific liberation of the proletariat from the realm of class society. This line of logic is more Jacobin than it is Marxist, and it is this attitude that has already been critiqued and noted for nearly 150 years. In *Socialism: Utopian and*

*Scientific*, Engels remarks on the sloganering that the liberal thinkers of the French Enlightenment would use in their demands for revolution, and how these phrases found themselves into the proto-Communist thinkers.

2. To posit that we, as Communists, seek *universal emancipation of humanity* is built on the notion that, in some manner, the bourgeoisie is limited in their expression under the reign of Capital. This is a patently absurd idea as the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie (and even some of the higher segments of the proletarian class) are living the most luxurious lives anyone could live in human history, both materially and psychologically. Meanwhile, the international proletariat languishes away in the Tartarus that is wage-labor and employment.

Also in Paragraph 10: *In short, we must merge socialism with the workers' movement. As this merger develops, so too will the farsightedness, confidence, and organization of the working class that enables their emergence as the hegemonic class of society. Working class victory in this struggle—the conquest of political power—is propelled by the formation and practice of the socialist party.*

To claim that Socialism and Communism must be *merged with the workers' movement* highlights a disastrous flaw in the psyche of Marxist Unity Group. In our first journal, *Reflections on the Student Movement*, we discussed a glaring issue in the way organizations position themselves as foreign to the workers' and that they must encircle the proletariat and get them to accept the Party. When in reality, there is but one true movement and that is Communism. Communism *is*, by definition, the definitive workers' movement as it advocates for the proletariat's self abolition and its immediate freedom from the wedges of class society. Marxist Unity Group falls into the same trap that we've previously highlighted. They see themselves as being alien to the current proletarian population and, as we explored previously, will necessarily lead to a tactic of organization that further alienates them from the very class they seek to speak for.

Furthermore, the victory of the proletariat is not predicated on a *conquest of political power*, but rather on its abolition. The Communist Revolution is a revolt not simply against the Capitalist class, but against all its tools, including: the State and Politics. Politics is the dominion of the bourgeoisie. It is one of their most nefarious tools in its quest of societal domination against the proletariat. As well, the final victory of the proletariat is not *propelled* by the

formation of the Party, but in the everyday spontaneous struggle of all workers across the world.

In Paragraph 11: *The working class must lead the battle to sweep away this political order and establish a truly democratic republic, freeing the workers of the world from the chains of American imperialism, and setting the stage for the working class to lead a socialist transformation of our society.*

A common motif found among many Communist sects and creeds, not strictly that of Marxist Unity Group's, is that we do not live in a “democratic society”, and that our goal as Communists must then be to establish this “truly democratic republic”. What all these groups fail to understand is that we do indeed live under a democracy, a true one at that. In previous articles we have outlined that democracy and, by extension, the democratic republic are both intrinsically tied to bourgeois society. For brevity's we will not go fully in depth on this matter (currently), but democracy is the ultimate and final mediation the bourgeois class cedes to the proletariat

In Paragraph 12: *Through this process, the special role of the state standing above society withers away and, as the revolution expands*

*internationally, national divisions and inequalities between peoples are eliminated.*

A State is not an entity that often allows itself to be *withered away*, in most regards. The State, in its essence, is the *mediator* of class conflict, such that it was historically used by one class to prop up its own economic and social interests over others, but also that in the contemporary Capitalist era the State, as a tool, is used directly by the Capitalist class to smooth over class antagonisms and pacify the proletariat. Even if we are to “smash the ready made State machinery” and build up a “new state”, that State would still take the role as the mediator of class conflict. It would not simply exist to combat against the remnants of the defeated Capitalist class, as Leninists would argue, but it would exist to take its place and only transfer political power from the bourgeoisie to the proletariat. A mere transfership of power will only result in the continuing of capitalistic relations as we have seen time and time again in the experiments of old, such as the Soviet Union and even the CNT-FAI’s tenure over the Spanish Republic. Wherever the State exists, so do capitalistic relations. They are as inseparable as the bond between a mother and her child.

In Paragraph 13: *Proceeding from these principles, the Democratic Socialists of America unites around*

*a strategy of class independence from the capitalist Democratic and Republican Parties, the development of independent working class organizations to a critical mass, and struggling for consistent democracy throughout all spheres of society. In so doing, we first demand a people's constitutional convention elected by universal, equal, and direct suffrage to establish a democratic republic that allows for the political rule of the working class*

It seems Marxist Unity Group can only conceive of a revolution in the terms of a national democratic one. Do they not know that we have already had several? Did 1789, 1820, 1866, 1870, 1919, and 1965 not all usher in this democratic republic that they seek? Do we exist in some alternate reality in which the right to vote does not exist? This obsession with *democracy* seeks to do nothing but to defang the Communist movement and pivot our fight towards mediating the class struggle instead of intensifying it.

After this long preamble, Marxist Unity Group finally unleashes their demands and they are underwhelming to say the least. The first 15 demands are what we can call *State Building Demands*, as in they exist to be implemented by a new “Democratic Republic” upon its arrival and to grant it legitimacy.

Many of these are demands that either A). already exist, or B). can very feasibly exist under the current economic and social system. Perhaps their most ludicrous demand is the renaming of the “House of Representatives” to the “People’s House of Representatives”, and then vesting all of the legislative power in it. Their plan for government still has the same 3 branches of government that currently exist, albeit with a neutered executive (the President is to be replaced with the new *Executive Council*). All in all, these demands are feckless and, most, can be waived as utter nonsense that wouldn’t even have been seen as radical in the time of the Founding Fathers.

The secondary set of demands are focused less on *State Building* and are rather “immediate measures” to be implemented, and then these are followed by a set of international demands. Again, as said above, many of these “immediate” demands can be satisfied by the Capitalist mode of production, and currently are around the world. Take for example, the call for a standard 32 hour work week. Instead of offering up a negative critique, let us offer a positive one instead and show what we would rather call for. In place of the establishment of a 32 hour work week, we would call for the immediate cessation of the commodity based economy. In one fell swoop we would end the undignified and slave-

like practice that is “work”. In its stead we would create the volunteer economy, where we live by the principle “from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs”.

Many of these demands show a glaring flaw in the thought process of Marxist Unity Group: they either are unwilling to succeed in class victory, or they simply don’t want to. Take for example *Demand 8: Periodic suppression of public and private debts owed by workers*. Can we get more arbitrary and abstract than this? Many would point at us and laugh off our critiques as abstract, but they cannot even decide whether they want to eliminate debt or not! What kind of socialist society would allow for the existence of private debts? Certainly not one we would like to live under. Many would look at these demands and our critiques and say “these are immediate demands! We can still work towards the abolition of Capital!”, but under this framework we simply can’t. Even in the event that we do wrestle political control through the barrel of the gun we cannot even conceive of a different world. We cannot imagine abolishing the present state of things. In that sense this program is the ultimate mediation! It placates the class antagonisms faced by the working class by offering it mere scraps at the table. Higher wages, access to medicine, the right to vote. Are we so sheepish that we would meekly accept this? While

these are mere issues with a single program, it is a symptom of a greater wound. The Left cannot dare to dream of a new society, so it does not. As such we fall into the same pitfalls theorists and activists did 50, 100, and 150 years ago. We are thus condemning the real movement to the same destruction of the past, because our vision itself is a mere reflection of that very past. It seems long gone are the days where the (self appointed) representatives of the proletariat look to storm the Gates of Heaven, now they merely want to take Saint Peter's seat.

# **Black Nativism: On the Confines of a Race Politic**

*“The task of history, therefore, once the world beyond the truth has disappeared,*

*is to establish the truth of this world” - Karl Marx*

## **Understanding Race**

As communists, we are primarily concerned with how classes form, interact, and struggle against one another. “History” is simply the accumulation of these struggles and how they develop, with contradictory elements leading to new social syntheses. How the classes express themselves amidst contradiction, then, is important for a qualitative understanding of fomenting class struggle, what tactics to embrace, and in what manner we must carry the banner of communism forward. Yet, it often becomes strenuous to identify what is an expression of genuine class consciousness, in comparison to oppressed classes simply mimicking the slurred drawl of bourgeois reaction. In a time of American decline this language becomes all the more delirious; Reactionaries have proven they can grasp onto the most radical of ideas and defang them, of course after stabbing the

communist movement with their sharpest ideological edge.

With this in mind, we draw our attention to the content of the racial politic: That is, the question of race, its relevance to communist organizing and the task of immediate communisation. The communist-activist space has spiraled into drastically different views on this topic. So much so that a “non-radical” bystander could be forgiven for mistaking this flurry of debate as one that doesn’t quite all gather under the communist masthead. And depending on who you ask, the genuine communists are only the few who wholeheartedly embrace race, or only the few who reject any notion of its existence, or better yet, the majority of communists who only have some vaguely important notion of race as an equivalent to class or other identities, not a fleshed out politic or rejection thereof. For as contentious as this debate is—especially in the United States—we feel that it is also fairly straightforward. Race, in its very essence, is an *idea* arising out of historical contradictions, one that has transcended its own immaterial nature by its imposition on material society. As Marx states on this phenomenon:

*“The weapon of criticism cannot, of course, replace criticism by weapons, material force must be overthrown by material force; but theory also*

*becomes a material force as soon as it has gripped the masses. Theory is capable of gripping the masses as soon as it demonstrates ad hominem, and it demonstrates ad hominem as soon as it becomes radical. To be radical is to grasp the root of the matter. But for man the root is man himself. The evident proof of the radicalism of German theory, and hence of its practical energy, is that it proceeds from a resolute positive abolition of religion. The criticism of religion ends with the teaching that man is the highest being for man, hence with the categorical imperative to overthrow all relations in which man is a debased, enslaved forsaken, desppicable being.”*

As such, race can be considered a nonreal analysis of social relationships: In existence it is a kaleidoscopic view of class society and development, and typically one that is limited to a previous historical consciousness of man, which misses the juncture at which the communist movement has arrived. Take the stereotypical European conquistador or mercenary of the 16th century, who is contracted out to plunder the riches of the New World. They travel great lengths, perhaps to come upon a Native tribal community, only to gather their form of social relations as more “primitive” due to the differing use of labor as well as the distribution of goods and value. Whether they knew it, the European was

attempting to-informed by their knowledge of European social relations-assess the basis of class society within this tribal community. However, due to the history of consciousness before them, they can only come to the conclusion that this social hierarchy, culture, and distribution of the Earth is a product of genetic-cultural potential. Regarding the tribal community as backwards due to its lack of resemblance with European society, the European can only make a shallow phenotypical judgement of his own species. While we understand solely phenotypical variations in nature do not exemplify differing species, many a time man has weaponized alternative geospatial development in making conclusions based on these variations.

With the existence of eugenics, race science, and the centuries of recent developments in regards to social-racial hierarchy, we can conclude that racialist pseudoscience has been bled material. The imposition of race as a social category into industrial life, i.e. chattel slavery, the subsequent segregation of American social life and labor (including the labor market, trade unions, etc.) and the effects of deindustrialization on redlined communities, has made it a material social phenomenon which we will account for in the following section.

When our fellow communists debate race, they pine for its relevance to class. For the racialists it burns class, and for many of our comrades it is a pseudoscience. The latter position is correct on the ideological basis of race, for we are discussing an *idea* which is a metaphysical, improper understanding of social relationships. However, this position misses the codification of race into social relationships. Meanwhile, the former often misses the historical purpose of race science: As a distorted insight *on* class, it has been codified *within* class, forever tied to it. It is not something apart from class altogether, but always a means to analyze social relationships from a reactionary lens. It is a categorized race system which has placed, for example, Black and White workers on altogether different rungs of the social ladder. This is an aspect of labor value studies as a whole, and ultimately is only most relevant when understanding both groups' relation to the means of production.

The question is of course not whether race exists, but its relevance and if it can be reconciled. In an age of declining standards for all American workers (real wages, health, debt, safety, etc.) do the Black workers and the White workers find any similar footing? And of course, what is the current battleground between communism and reaction, and how are these groups responding to their own protagonization?

## **Labor Value & Race in the Mid-2020s**

In J. Sakai's defining work '*Settlers*', the author comes to the conclusion that laboring American Whites and Blacks have never been class allies, citing the formulaic tendency of the former to ally with the bourgeoisie against the latter. Furthermore, they find the White "Euro-Amerikans" constitute the vast majority of the bourgeoisie, petit-bourgeoisie, and labor aristocracy, thus being overwhelming non-proletarian. We disagree with their understandings of class, labor, and labor value here, but any communist can contend with this: Through extending their own lifeforce, the American bourgeoisie and petit-bourgeoisie have feverishly dealt out concessions to the White workers. Many of these concessions have been likewise weapons pointed at the Black workers: We can point to the myriad of segregated workplaces, unions, neighborhoods, towns, and entire cities.

In 2025, this relationship extends through a reflection on each group's share of social life. Let us look foremost at class. While there is no data accurately describing the total nature of the US population's class structure, we can work with income levels, employment, and small business ownership to understand these factors. As a baseline, the US population in 2024 was roughly

57.5% White (not including those of Hispanic or Latino origin), and 13.7% Black. Studies that can trace small business ownership (enterprises with sub-500 employees) find that roughly 85% are majority White-owned, whereas only 3% are on the part of Black Americans. Furthermore, in 2024 the median household income for Whites was roughly \$92,000, while Black households made about 60% of that figure at \$56,290. They were also the only racial group to see a decrease in gross household income-not even accounting for inflation- at a rate of 3.3% between 2023-2024. In this same time period, Whites saw no marginal decrease, and Asian (\$121,700) and Hispanic (\$70,950) households saw 5.1 and 5.5% increases in household income, respectively. Black Americans over 16 also held an unemployment rate of 7.8% compared to the national average of 4.6%, while 16.4% of Black families fell under the poverty line, almost double that of the national standard at 8.5%. It is thus apparent that of any major racial group in America, Blacks continue to hold the least labor value per capita, and likewise contain the largest proletariat per capita. This last study extends outward to access to healthcare and educational attainment (specifically undergraduate degree attainment), correlating in a lower lifespan and limit to professional/white collar work for Black workers as

a whole. We can also get into the myriad of statistics on anywhere from segregation to gun violence to proximity to pollution: These all remain linear with the Black population bearing a much more extensive burden than any other group, especially Whites.

Regarding the weaponization of labor value to reconstitute its own position, it is important to be said that across the country, union membership as a whole is not a particularly *white* phenomenon. Black Americans 16 and older are now unionized at the highest clip of any racial group, still at a limp 11.8%, compared to a paltry 9.6% for Whites, and 8.5% for both Latinos and Asians, respectively. At the same time, a relative lack of access to white collar work or any formative training means that the most robust and enriching union structures are still exclusionary, and Black workers are still relegated to menial service labor with far less compensation. Even some traditional, disproportionately Black trades have suffered. The pinnacle of trade unionism in Chicago, the Chicago Teachers Union, has seen an astonishing decline in Black public school teachers in just 10 years, as they have plummeted from 50% to 20% of the teaching workforce. Likewise, more “blue collar” trades all report relatively vast occupational segregation; As of 2021 most Black union membership was limited largely to various transit unions. Thus, even as Black workers are more likely

to enter a union, the entry to membership is still reliant on their relatively little training received. We could regurgitate federal statistics further, but at this time the case seems to be clear with little objection.

As struggles against value accelerate and undermine the capitalist world in longer crises, many Black workers are relegated to the most meagre of social lives. They are afforded almost no safety net, and are seeing declining conditions at the quickest rate compared to other racial groups. This makes the Black workers prone to combust at any moment, particularly with the onset of even deeper crises. At the same time, there is a power vacuum in the cities and deindustrial near hinterland, where liberal strongholds are proving not so strong. As the communist movement fails to show its own muscle, the main threat to working class abolition is yet another story of allocationist demands. On these grounds which we will study in the next section, we can only say this feature of Marxism, liberalism, and fascism is the primary enemy of the proletariat. With an urgency we must resist any attempt to carve up capital, as an all too familiar language is sinking itself amongst the Black proletariat.

## **Contending with Black Nativism**

It's a sour Wednesday morning, and I'm in my car, driving home a handful of radical Black trade

unionists. These proletarians were, and are to this day, some of the most resilient, advanced, and militant members of the American working class. A daily life compounded by capitalist misery on the edge of society, I had grown to admire their tenacity and raw strength amidst the decay. In these friends, I am convinced that there exists the ability for the working class to abolish itself.

We had just finished an action, berating various Chicago Aldermen for being beholden to capital, opening up their communities to private finance and enriching themselves in the process, while leaving thousands of Black workers in Section-8 Public Housing's most miserable conditions. It was a self-indulgent action, but for these unionists it had been meaningful to finally see the power in City Hall that had been so keen on working in darkness in their redlined and poverty-stricken neighborhood. Of course, that is how Chicago politics have always worked. Outside of the mayoral debates and pageantry in the heart of the city, the far-Southside, Chicago's very own hinterland, is auctioned off every few years to private developers and the most debased of capitalists. Aldermen and neighborhood councils here usher in a wave of neoliberal development in the name of jobs, safety, and economic integrity. When the rug pulls and the jobs either amount to \$16.50 at an Amazon warehouse or simply an empty

plot of land, there is no organized opposition to rally against the entire process. Federal funds and grants paid for by taxpayers wind up missing or utilized dubiously by shadowy developers. Unemployment skyrockets, leading to more bouts of drug usage and supposedly random acts of violence, symptomatic of the rollercoaster to nowhere. Outside of a few uncomfortable moments, the Aldermanic machine will continue, and the working class will either grow nihilistic or revolutionary, if they cannot scrape together the means to leave Chicago's outskirts altogether. Even if they seek revolt here, there are no faces to direct their pain. The private equity firm in California that bought up their housing project is not planning a visit to the property anytime soon, only intending to collect millions in annual revenue from the Feds to reward them for their safekeeping. Everything is dubious, everything is cloaked in fraud and sick mystery.

As the ride from Chicago's Loop to its border with Indiana came to an end, we continued to rattle off our woes at the system. The topic, as always, breached the territory of the federal government. My unionist friends, politically conscious and full of stories to tell, frequently railed against it to no end; This of course was no problem for me. Joining in, I recounted how capital's crisis only evoked more

terroristic measures on part of Chicago, Illinois, and DC.

“And these fucking pigs in the government, what they don’t give to these slumlords they give to immigration!”

I went on for a minute recounting how American tax dollars went directly back into the very tools of our demise, accumulation and allocation, when I realized I was being met with a car full of blank stares. After a moment of quiet, one of the younger unionists, roughly 30 years old, responded.

“Yeah, that’s right. But personally I don’t like all that money going to the immigrants up in Roseland” (the predominantly Black neighborhood directly north). “It’s a lot for their housing, not ours.”

One by one, other folks chimed in, echoing the same sentiment until we broached the topic of ICE itself. For my friends, they held strong beliefs that corrupt Democrats were siphoning money off to illegal Mexican or Puerto Rican immigrants, and that the federal government had every right to deport them all. I pushed back on the mutual bond of labor, the enslavement the migrants face in relation to the menial service and logistical work the unionists undertook to feed their families. I let them out of the car, and before a last slam of the door against the

light drizzle of the rain, the middle-aged woman who sat in my passenger seat shot me an exasperated glance.

“These politicians are doing everything for everyone besides us.”

In many aspects of this, she was right. This woman, I will call her R, lived in the Roseland and West Pullman neighborhoods all of her life. She grew up hearing stories about the glory days of Roseland, its commercial district packed to the brim with flashing lights, businesses, and children chasing each other through the street. In her childhood, through the late 70s, 80s, and early 90s, the decay had been immortalized in an avalanche of foreclosures, empty businesses, gang expansion and unemployment. Her own apartment complex, which had been close to 80% White until the late 70s, quickly became 100% Black, and the site of a string of murders and drug dealing activity. In truth her community is more newsworthy than its ever been, of course all for the wrong reasons. Outside of the housing, it doesn’t take much of a walk through the vacancies and abandoned buildings-turned trap houses to see what she’s talking about. Today there are but a handful of remaining businesses and Baptist or Evangelical storefront churches in the area, with everything else boarded up or caving in.

After I said goodbye to her and walked through the housing project, sitting in the living rooms of other union members and discussing life, the curiosity of the earlier conversation gnawed at me. I began to ask these friends about ICE activity, including the murder of Silverio Villegas-Gonzalez. I expected natural apathy at a political question not overtly implicating Black workers, but was surprised to find a rage bubbling over in each unit I visited. In conversations with about 20-25 active union organizers and local agitators, friends that I looked up to and admired, support for ICE was unanimous, with only 2 having even neutral opinions on the matter. For some, the question was of Mayor Brandon Johnson and his inability to look after Black people. Others were concerned with the hotels and motels housing migrants, especially in nearby Roseland. Another predominant fear was the lack of safety in the area, and the proposition Trump made of sending the National Guard to clean up crime. Despite concerns about the allocation of wealth, all felt ICE was legitimate in its force, and were not concerned about the explosion of federal funding if it meant less migrants would be in Chicago or the United States, as well as criminals in general. The mangled string of ideology that I managed to tie together from each member, their life story, and local history of the area can adequately be described

as Black nationalism turned Black nativism. Or, if we are to be correct, an ongoing decay of nationalist sentiment leading to its most likely offspring: Allocationist nativism and subservience to the American bourgeoisie. Let us continue.

Once considered a bastion of radical politics, it has been roughly a half century since the epoch of Black nationalism and the Black power movements. Following its bloody dismemberment on part of the police State and numerous extrajudicial killings of movement leaders and youth, Black Power today feels like a relic of a bygone era. Its sentiment is still popular among activists, but any real movement for a Black nation has seemingly been wiped out by COINTELPRO. Which is why it is all the more surprising that its remnants have found an unlikely home with the conservative bourgeoisie, manifesting itself in opposition to the recent liberal-democratic anti-ICE movement.

The anti-ICE movement is an agglomeration of things: Class interests, political consequences regarding the correction of capital's labor quota, and racial and nationalist conflict. As the contradictions of capitalism buckle, the cheap labor of migrants is both systematically eradicated and glorified. The bourgeoisie of various industries grow shaky, fearing for their bottom lines, and will attack or sustain the

migrant on this basis. Thus it is no surprise that ultimately, opportunists seeking to protect the bourgeois right to domestic extraction promise a return to status-quo American civic nationalism. This return entails no reform, but rather codifies the conditions prevalent so far this century: Growing poverty, alienation, and slavery. For the Black worker, this also guarantees the White supremacy of the State and American society at large.

Who else more than the Black worker would be incensed by this very proposition? A chasm of cries to “return to normal” by liberals and the Black liberal capitalist see the Black worker at the absolute bottom of the social hierarchy, pressed into the most menial, degrading, and alienating of labor. Migrants continue to meet the inexhaustible needs of the bourgeoisie, and in exchange many will climb higher than the Black working class within a generation or two. Correspondingly, we have outlined the circumstances on which the Black workers hold the least labor value in American society, and the introduction of undocumented workers who-through no fault of their own-further drive down the value of Black labor. What’s left is a moral, racial, and national crisis in which Blacks and migrants are posed to engage in struggle against one another, both subjected to the degradation of value. Liberals only cough up a solidarity politic, choosing not to fan

flames of class war but ask folks to be kind to one another. Communists, however, understand that the subject of Black and migrant misery is simultaneously the source of their potential allyship: Only workers themselves, as those that hold all of the labor power in society, have the ability to abolish their own codification as workers. In light of this, the bourgeoisie has decided to enlist class collaborators and racialists in an absurd nativist program.

As Black bourgeois, petit-bourgeois, and workers lead all racial demographics in Democratic support (83% of Black voters cast ballots for Kamala Harris over Donald Trump in 2024, 93% for Democrats in the House in 2022, 92% for Biden over Trump in 2020, 92% for Democrats in the House in 2018, 91% for Clinton over Trump in 2016, etc etc.), both liberals and leftists have taken for granted Black consciousness. In place of communists building strength, many Black communities are sandwiched between useless NGOs, class collaborators, and abjectly dour political representation, all manifestations of their being left to the devices of bourgeois and local petit-bourgeois nonsense. Many times we White workers fail to notice these developments: After all, even the Black rulers tend to twist their lies in the language of racial liberation, love and freedom.

All the same it makes for a dubious solution for the liberation of the Black proletariat. There is yet to be any evidence that Black capitalism, Black liberalism, or Black parliamentary language has granted even a degree of liberation for any proletarians. Thus while these industrial and local heroes prop themselves up-with the language of the Democratic stronghold in hand-Black workers draw away from this politic. When they do, they open themselves up to revolutionary sentiment. But as with any social vacancy, this also leaves room for the Right to swoop in if antagonized on the wrong line. Case in point: Race & Nation.

Black Power movements have sought to liberate the Black Race and Nation in what they identified as a land of settler-oppressors. The bourgeoisie, meanwhile, only has to perpetuate a fractional view of this national outline. In wake of the neoliberal order, the illegal migrant now represents a new generation of “settlers”, painted in a caricature as all nativist programs have done in the past. Using economic-allocative language (When will the resources be distributed to *my* group?), nativist campaigns appeal to the cold economic logic of supply and demand. In there is the kernel of truth that capital requires the influx of labor to drive down the cost of production. For communities having already faced collapse, it is then relatively easy to

instill fear of an ever steeper decline on the horizon. It's already there.

For my unionist friends, the most advanced section of the proletariat, they are ready to abolish capitalism in one swoop. But in this quest the question of resource distribution and racial history remains, flagrantly waiting to be broached by the opportune. Instead of communist protagonization on the prospect of wage abolition, it is both the bourgeoisie and much of the communist Left advocating vaguely for Black power and Black national interests. There can only be so much room for both, as they directly implicate each other. The abolition of the wage system implies the dissolving of the State apparatuses which upheld accumulation, while the construction of a Black ethnosestate directly implicates the movement of migrants and their enslavement, as any and all nations will have allocationist demands. While most Leftists can agree that Black nationalism is surely an improvement on the conditions of today, this fails to approach the working class with any communist rhetoric or language. If we are to believe the workers and everyday people genuinely have the power to abolish work, we cannot at the same time point towards an intermediary stage of development where allocation prevails, where the workers fight each other for a declining pile of scraps.

Let us revisit the language of nationalism. The onboarding strategies of right-wing conspiracist groups like 'Chicago Flips Red', referencing the desire to turn Chicago into a Republican stronghold, have capitalized on this, often using progressive racial-nationalist rhetoric, slyly coating their American nationalism in a streak of Blackness. Utilizing immigration as a trigger point for the decline of American capitalism, CFR represents the conservative bourgeoisie's willingness to incorporate Black people into a new, cosmopolitan American nationalism. This thesis can be seen in the decline of White supremacism after 2017's infamous Charlottesville 'Unite the Right' Rally. Following the violent congregation of the far-right, more mainstream, palatable reactionaries took the chance to prosecute and sever ties with their racialist co-conspirators. In the wake of this, many far-right groups rebranded as nativist, nationalist types. The Proud Boys are one example of a group that is certainly racist, but ultimately prioritizing the Nation over the White race (perhaps to build power and pivot back to racism later, but who can be sure).

In this pivot, some of the far-right are finally courting Black American support for the National project, and it is beginning to seep into the trade unions and progressive organizations while their

collaborationist leaders cry for a return to normal. Now, just as many great revolutionaries have waved the flag of allocationist nationalism, the far-right does the same. They, not the Democrat liberal, appear here as great cosmopolitan reformers, arguing that there *is* a place for Black America within America. It is the Democrats who want a continued reign of terror in Black neighborhoods, a continued lack of resources, a prolonging of wage slavery and sorrow. The Democratic establishment, with the great trade unions in tow, can only bow to normalcy to avoid their own contradictory nature. This allows new Rightists to weaponize economic backslide, health, education, and safety issues to prove these points.

What is important to understand is that, even in the midst of a 10 point swing towards Donald Trump, the far-right has still failed to mobilize anything material in Chicago's Black community. There is no movement. They hold little material power outside rhetoric. But we cannot underestimate them, on the fact that they have managed to capture the attention of alienated workers who are otherwise waging their own battle for survival against slumlords and the bourgeoisie. Circulation of their material has begun in its infancy. The task of communists at this moment is to emphasize our own *strength*, and illuminate the folly of allocative struggle. This can

only be done with a physical presence and desire to cultivate communal relationships. Theories of what this may look like are to be thoroughly dissected, experimented on, and so forth. But we must retire the banner of race and nationalism just as we have of reform. This does not mean to pretend race is not bled material, but to emphasize the radical shattering of class and all of its transgressions.

## **Conclusion**

While the bourgeoisie capitalizes on the common anxiety of allocation, the crux of this issue is always value. Value is the price of one's being and penance for their consciousness. And it is still exceptionally clear that the Black workers have the most fraught relationship to value, on the understanding that their life force is bargained for on the most absolute cheap. Likewise, the remaining effects of chattel slavery and the ongoing bribes of the White working class have resulted in an American proletariat whose value has been codified by color, and which has often failed its historical mission. It has only led the more reactionary elements to further entrench themselves in genocide, slavery, imperialism, and colonialism.

To ignore these stark contrasts is to ignore the ongoing bribes of the conservative bourgeoisie toward the Black workers, which is really no bribe at all and rather a defined calculation. All the same we

must understand what impedes us: It is both the White supremacy of the nationalist anti-ICE movement, and the defensive racial-allocationist demands of the conservative bourgeoisie. In these contradictions the struggle for communism is as obvious as ever, as we must no longer attempt to play progressive bourgeois against one another. We must no longer envelope and tolerate any ideology of States and borders.

The workers' vices are those of their movement masters: Nationalism, Statism, Allocationism, Justice and Fairness and Moralism. They will only scream and cheer on the side of "either" bourgeoisie as they continue to wade in nihilist misery. In this time we can only raise to them a possibility of abolition and *all* the movement entails. We are workers against work, and in this sacrilege we have discovered that no idea is truly holy.

# ACT III

*Notes on Spectacular Activism*

## On Protest As Spectacle

Protesting tugs at the heart of the imagination of all classes, and for the proletarian it is the culmination of unrealized dreams and an alienated subject. Protesting is everything and nothing: It is the promise of action while demanding inaction, an inexorable mold of doing, of seeking and becoming something else other than what one was. In other words, it is an emotional connection that is not materially consequential.

Protesting, as class antagonisms well, occurs when some mass take on vocal action; This is not exceptional by its own measure. Whenever the social relation is picked at like a scab, there is always some action being done by the warring classes. However, when this action is isolated into a single category of examination, is compartmentalized into a right unto itself and into an action unto itself, it serves as the golden birthmark of capitalist democracy. Severed by capitalist spectacle and the transfer of lived experience onto images, protesting itself becomes separate from the action of *doing*. Rather it is the admittance that nothing is to be done. Therefore, protesting is not a neutral development or excuse, but a wholly reactionary concept with a shoddy foundation for both the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. This foundation leads to dreadful

confusion and false truths that fool both classes, but insofar as it is a capitalist product and right, it has largely been weaponized by the capitalists at the proletariat's expense. Furthermore, while the act of protesting is a general reaction to capitalist contradiction and can be accompanied by a variety of factors outside of itself (strikes, armed insurrection, sabotage, looting), the protest as an *event* is none of these things. It exists not as the spontaneous uprising of the proletariat or of the students, but as an isolating mediation between the masses and capital. And a spectacular one at that!

We will proceed to examine this mediation through the conditions that give rise to its existence: Namely, the unrest of the masses, the tasks of Communists/organizers/activists during this unrest, and the means of presenting the spectacle to the masses.

First, let us briefly press on the conditions that make protest possible on a mass scale. As Communists, we understand this simply to be the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and proletariat, as well as the corresponding alienation that governs and fractures the workers' lives. But we must understand these features are natural to capitalist relations and integral to their reproduction; We do not cause them nor do we facilitate their development as organizers

or spectacular agitators. These exist outside ourselves, our work, and our respective ideology. Thus it is not a matter of growing and sustaining a mass susceptible to our ideology or our work, as much as it is communicating what is *really* happening and offering a point for unrest to coalesce. To puncture all ideology thoroughly.

The prospect of the protest appears here, not to sever alienation at the source nor to provide any action of doing. Rather, it is birthed as the *thought* of struggle by organizers. By thought, we refer to the imposition of a set of ideas and values on the class struggle itself, into an *ideology* separate from social relationships. This ideology serves as a mediated concept from class struggle in its inception, seeking to bridge the relation between the mass of workers and the organizer, activist, or intellectual. The ideology can be “revolutionary” or “liberal”, this is not especially important when in relation to the protest. Both result in a similar world-building from the purveyor, which denotes this new reality as the only way to remain true to whichever specified cause.

This is not a social relation itself, just an observation, and eventually a thesis developed into a *thought*. And this thought has a tendency to prioritize itself, through sheer compulsion, in order to justify its own existence. It must reach some sort of consensus, no

matter how minute or minuscule, or just as it was conceived it will perish. And for the purveyor, it is unconsciously the death of ideas which is the point of primacy, not the break in the social relation we all despise.

However lofty, inevitably ideology must brush with the ground. When it does-and comes into genesis physically with the bourgeoisie-it is a prison from which only partial truths of the class struggle can form. It seeks to validate class struggle only through its own lens, or most often to do away with it altogether. This idealism causes the separation of the protest from its initial social content. First as thought, but now with a second division as the voyeur of action. When such spectacular events are formed, the ideology-State relationship presents a controlled environment with preset expectations. As such one protests not to act, but to watch as history unfolds before them. While tempting, they cannot construct an action outside of the event; The subject can only view and interpret through the gaze of ideology. As this phenomenon expands to greater subjects and the protest justifies its own existence, it ironically betrays the very action it was constructed to view. The uncontrolled action that is the cause of the protest has been isolated and reduced to spectacle. Robbed of its spontaneity and vibrance, the action is treated as an uncanny outlier from a

different society. One that will remain foreign until it is inexplicably sorted out by the delegates of Empire. All action is criticized, all viewership glorified, and the protest is the final form of this fetishization. A new reality is formed, separate from classes, from struggle, and from society as a whole.

When this fetishism grows noticeable, there is very obviously a detachment from the struggle, from the real, in favor of ideology and optical abstraction. But ideological mediation is only ideological, it cannot confound the real completely. A real relation still exists, there is still struggle to be waged in some form, wrestling with ideals as it must. As such the protest requires *real* mediation, to anchor irregularities and create a moral spectacle outside of present society, outside of reality. What is this real mediation, and what does it look like?

It is the marshals, the liaisons, the organizers, it is the speakers, the leading NGOs and nonprofits, the trade unions and their affiliates as well as elected officials and their coalitions. It is the swathes of these that serve as a protracted arm of the State, ready and capable of dipping all eyes into a political program and optical comfort. For the sake of simplicity we can classify these into several groups: Rhetorical mediators (implementation of programs and slogans to the protest), internal mediators (the

marshals, liaisons, and self-policing culture that sprout from organization), and State mediators (the police, military, media and so on).

Rhetorical devices serve as the agents of ideology, of the vision of class struggle through the eyes of its absence. Their purpose is as the original line of defense, for their images are the images on which mass protest takes form. Slogans are everywhere, reiterated all at once, directing subjects from their subservience to capital to an ideological concept they find agreeable in their present state. The rhetoric further perverts and fetishizes the uncontrolled action which presents the cause of *thought*. Thus, rhetorical success is practically confirmed with all protests. Should this not be enough, the internal mediators activate themselves abruptly. They coordinate with State thugs on a permissible event program and utilize their own authority to keep the masses' shape. Through militant self-policing, they identify agitators, Communist or Anarchist, and alienate them from the rest of the protesting mass to ensure obedience to the rhetorical and therefore the optical illusions of moral grandeur. The State, through messages of violence and fear, will of course do the rest. But it is the protest in its own form that takes it to the level of the State, justifying itself by suppressing dissent, suppressing the class struggle itself. When all are present, the protest is a carefully

constructed message of immediate democratic aims. As it grows its own consciousness throughout the duration of its lifespan, it dreams of nothing more than respect from the bourgeoisie, sacrificing more and more of its original content to do so. Eating away at itself, the young protest may completely be cannibalized if left to its own devices. But if its origin is so entralling, so spectacular that it offers masses a remote alternative to illusion, the protest can subsist on its own life force some time longer. Through its very own servants, it will mass build across class lines until class ceases to exist, thoroughly abolished by and replaced by a pan-class morality and framework.

This is a 4th mediation which arguably triumphs all others: Time. Under capitalism everything is a race against time, including leisure time. What the masses do for pleasure wholly matters, and thus the protest itself is a cost to them and the capitalist system (whereas they could be contributing to social product through commodities). They must get some reward out of it, whether it is merely satisfaction or a false flag of revolutionary fervor. The masses are thus excited and anxious, awaiting something to happen to prove their gamble correct. The protest already knows it will never provide this, its ideologists even more so, but it does all it can to present real stakes to show an image of seriousness.

Whether the decision to “take” a street or the sporadic random arrests to keep the mobs at bay, illusions of power and vibrancy keep mass energy in line but activated. They are led to feel independent of everything, unwittingly trapped in a falser reality than ever before. The closer they get to the edge of action and viewership, the further into constructed spectacle they plummet.

This real mediation becomes a supreme spectacle of mass energy, where all solutions to the world become obvious and present. Joy and justice are eternal; Ideas are everywhere just as in relation to the class struggle they are nowhere. Everything can be won, not through struggle but due to the mass being stripped of its class agency. After all, this is a *mass* struggle, and the mass struggle in protest is in favor of the unity of *everything* as long as resistance remains allegorical. We stress this to the highest degree: With a collection of every class, every idea is pronounced, expounded upon, provided in bits and pieces. But only as a voyeur to history. Should action be taken, should any subject do *anything*, this is a breach of the empty platitudes provided by the organizers and harnessed by the collection of mass that forms the demonstration. Even a hapless individual action threatens this balance. This is why the protest acts as the solvent to the class struggle, of any accord or variety.

Many Communists mistake these pitfalls as tendencies of liberal protesting alone. But the protests of Communists are just as shameful for they attempt to really peel back the mysticism of capitalist life. Here, they bellow insults at the police, call for a glorious triumph of the working class, and urge its agency in its own liberation. Their rhetorical defense is still just a false flag. Just as Leninists seek to operate the same machinery that facilitates capitalist reproduction in the State, they play with bourgeois tools while they wait for the revolution to be made. Due to the rhetorical confusion, Leninist protest has to overcompensate with an even more rigid internal mediation. The Communists in their lowly standing become more punishing than the liberals, dividing and conquering the masses while offering up agitators to the elements as “traitors from the outside.”

Even the Communist protest is just an experience and a means to process life, to view it in its fullness, still divorced from the act of doing. In the next section, we will consider what it means to protest in the midst of the Communist spectacular.

# Revolutionary Semantics

Protests often have the intended consequence of assailing an attendee's senses. There's the monotonous droning of, an often all too small, megaphone haphazardly clinged to the belt of a scrawny Organizer. Faintly one can make out the lull of a kettle bell or drum struck just ever-so-slightly off beat that it induces a sensory nightmare. Party organizations and NGOs dissect what momentum has grown to insert their own rhetoric, complete with heady speeches and a lengthy pamphlet which you will throw in the trash shortly after the scene has disbanded. All of these and more bless a gracious viewer who sifts through rubbish, hoping to find something worthwhile; This is a barren and hostile environment, littered with plastic and debris.

However, nothing at a protest is more mind numbing and intellectually jarring than the abysmal sloganeering which cloaks the mechanisms which define life. And like a broken record, these chants are repeated ad nauseum until they are burned into memory, satirical soundbites which loop in the brain well after the event has died. Furthermore, nearly all of the Parties involved in this spectacle seem to have no stake in revolutionary action or activity, thus to fuel their revolutionary itch they "muster up their courage" to stand on the side of a street or

intersection and hurl their chants like spells at any passerby that is unfortunate enough to be in their vicinity.

Now, whether we have issues with these ideological vagrants of the Left propping themselves up on a busy intersection is not the purpose of this article (See the aforementioned piece for more). Today, we draw our issue in the specific *content* of these slogans and chants and what their language reveals about their aims and methods. Tactics aside, it is the content itself that seeks a departure from class struggle into something else altogether. Organizers will draw in the masses off the energy of the real movement, and leave them with nothing but a moral set of values. This itself is violence, violence waged against the working masses in the hopes of nullifying them before they take the chance to resist. Before the worker can reassemble life they are confronted by these values, which please them by offering an alternative reality where the clinical life remains holy. Thus these values must be dissected and taken apart, semantic or otherwise. Let us examine a few grotesque examples:

*“Protesting is not a Crime! Justice for the [group of arrested activists]!”*

At first glance you may say: “What’s wrong with this? All I hear is calls for justice against an unjust state.”, and that is precisely where we draw our issue. Moralistic claims such as these are alien to Communism, as was demonstrated heavily in Marx’s work *Poverty of Philosophy*. The statement above acts functionally identical to that of Proudhon’s claim that “Property is theft”, in that it is objectively incorrect in its analysis of the present situation. Let us examine this slogan piecemeal before looking at it in its totality.

### 1. “*Protesting is not a Crime!*”

An utterly false statement on its face. While in America there exists minimal protections for the “right” to protest and assemble, the State consistently throws off its sheepskin of “civil rights” to gnaw its true fangs. Many of the tactics taken by protestors across the U.S. are indeed illegal under U.S. law. It is illegal to block highways. It is illegal to impede traffic. It is illegal to even use amplified sound in some areas! Nearly every stage of a protest is full of many micro-actions that are often very much illegal, and this is by design! The Bourgeois

State wants you, the hopeful proletariat, to believe that it can use the very mechanism of state power to reform the system by limiting the spontaneous power of action in the streets and workplace. We can see that this call is not only factually incorrect, but in its core messaging it seeks to integrate itself into the system! By claiming that they are not acting illegally they believe that they are granted some special privilege to continue their acts. It is a foolish and childish mistake.

## 2. *Justice for the [group of arrested activists]!"*

Calls for “Justice” are utterly meaningless and devoid of Communist sympathies because whose “Justice” are we seeking out? One may say: “We are seeking justice for our bereaved comrades who were valiantly assaulted in the class struggle.” Very well, but who is to deliver this “Justice”? Is this holy “Justice” to be rained down on the aggrieving pigs by the Communists themselves? Of course the answer to that is “No”, so then, again, who is to deliver this “Justice” we seek? We see that the only entity that could possibly right this wrong is not the Proletarian class at large, but rather the Capitalist State itself! What logic is this? The State has already dispensed

its justice! You ask me what “Justice” looks like and I’ll show you. Justice looks like an army of pigs descending upon the streets, cracking their batons at anyone they see. Justice looks like the bullet that every pig fires at an unarmed black teen. Justice is the blood that runs down the streets and into the gutters after every vicious attack upon those of our class. You see, this is the justice you cling to so rapidly. The State will never right this wrong, because by all legal definitions no wrong has been committed!

3. *“Protesting is not a Crime! Justice for the [group of arrested activists]!”*

Now we see the true nature of this slogan. It is not a harmless cry of anger, but is the carefully articulated response designed by the State to mediate and pacify the Proletariat once again. This is not to say those that call for justice are class enemies, but that they are both mistaken and misguided in their approach for retribution. Justice will not come from the halls of the courts, but from the barrel of the rifle, as it rings out the last shot in our final battle. It is to say that we must cease with these calls that show our adherence to liberalism and the State. We must

throw off the veil of mediation and dawn the cloak of insurrection. Embrace the illegalism they cast upon us! In this matter the State is correct! What we do is illegal precisely because we have no wish, want, or desire to exist under the State or its so-called justice anymore!

Let's sort through another common slogan found in recent protests:

*“Hands off Iran! [Or any country our State is currently aggressive towards]”*

Again, at first glance this phrase may seem innocuous, or even positive. What could possibly be the issue with being anti-war? Well, is this phrase necessarily anti-war? We would answer this question in the negative. Even if the slogan was reformatted to say *“No war with Iran!”* we would still find issues with it. Under its current makeup, the slogan does little to show genuine internationalist sympathies with the proletariat of Iran, all it does is show allegiance to a foreign state rather than the United States. No state is worthy of defense or support. The correct position to hold in this matter

is to agitate against both the American and Iranian states, as no state is innocent under the Capitalist Imperialist system. All states are the aggressors and the international proletariat are their victims.

After reading this, you may believe that our argument here is purely a semantic one. That our goal here is to create a “Pure Communism”, but that is not the case. We merely seek to truthfully represent the tenets of Communism as it exists as a real movement to abolish what exists. As it stands, these linguistic deviations serve little to do but act as lip service for the State and Capitalism. They take moments of unrest and convert them into ideas easily rehabilitated by liberalism, and thus by nurturing sects of the bourgeoisie. This is not simply a matter of semantics, but of rhetoric. When a proletarian that is burgeoning in class consciousness and sympathetic to Communism is approached with these slogans and liberal ideas their revolutionary potential is effectively neutered. That is why we must be precise and cautious with our language, and show genuine discipline in these moments where conditions are deteriorating. It has real and tangible results on our practice.

Unfortunately in environments predicated on a spoken or unspoken Democratic Centralism, there is either little debate on rhetoric, or it is actively

discouraged. To question leading ideas is mischaracterized as idealist itself, a bitter irony considering the role of the activists' mediatory ideas in building these movements. When we criticize ideas and especially these ideas, we are not-necessarily-criticizing those that struggle for them; We are certainly not criticizing the rank-and-file. We are criticizing the bourgeoisie, and the idealists with their head in the clouds of righteousness. They claim not to want to draw out debate on immaterial issues, but when they so graciously welcome bourgeois ideas into the movement, these ideas materialize in the most violent of ways. To criticize before, during, or after a critical moment is imperative.

The following section includes a small encyclopedic analysis of some of the most present language in movements with Communist presence today. We provide alternative slogans not because we are master sloganers, but rather to hint at a more revolutionary direction that language can be taken. As it stands, movement language either hinges on humanity and the rights of man, concessionary rhetoric, lawfullness, and other diversions which stifle a clear understanding of each issue. What we hope to incite is not a laundry list of our own slogans, but to encourage Communists to critically examine the slogans they struggle under and for.

## **Alternative Slogans and Their Reasoning**

Original Slogan:

*“Protesting is not a Crime! Justice for the [group of arrested activists]!”*

Amended Slogan:

*“Abolish the Courts! Tear down the Prisons!”*

Reasoning: Stated above. Legality is morality and morality is legality, i.e. the supremacy of liberalism.

Original Slogan:

*“Hands off Iran!”*

Amended Slogan:

*“No War but Class War!”*

Reasoning: Stated above.

The proletariat have no nation or incentive to defend their State rulers. States and the Capitalist class trap workers inside their nations and keep them held hostage. When we, as Communists, choose sides between Capitalists we grant legitimacy to their cause, whether that be tacit or explicit. By cheerleading for one imperialist power over another

we effectively mediate the class conflict that is happening abroad in the minds of the domestic proletariat. The most recent wave of escalations between the United States and Iran have done little, except exacerbate the suffering of the Iranian proletariat, but to justify, and solidify, the existence of the Iranian State and ruling class. Our goal is to always escalate the class struggle to its highest level, the international revolution. We must thoroughly reject any war, but the class war.

Original Slogan:

*“Fight for 15!”*

Amended Slogan:

*“Abolish Wages!”*

Reasoning:

Many Communists create an arbitrary distinction between the supposed “immediate” struggle and “end goals”. While well meaning in their attempts to alleviate the suffering of those around us they misunderstand what the Communist tactic is. Class struggle is not a moralistic claim, or a simple tactic to be used and then abandoned when needed. Class struggle is the driver of history, to deny the role of

the real struggle in the current movement is to deny Communism altogether.

Not to mention that wages are the tools of the Capitalist class. Serfdom, and the peasantry, was eradicated by the creation of the wage labor system. By attaching our aims to the tools and framework of the Capitalist mode of production we do nothing but assert and affirm our class position instead of denying it.

Original Slogan:

*“No Human is Illegal”*

Amended Slogan:

*“No Borders, No Nations!”*

Reasoning:

As we have discussed in our previous article, *In the Midst of ICE: Against Protesting & the Allure of Nothing*, we discussed the issue of inserting ourselves in the intra-class fighting of the bourgeoisie. Our support for those proletarians that are shouldered with the “undocumented” label must lie concretely in their dignity as humans and our assault must be against the very bourgeois legal system itself. Our criticisms of the legalistic and moralistic rhetoric found in the first section of this

article stand here as well. To read further on this specific issue we recommend reading our article, *In the Midst of ICE: Against Protesting & the Allure of Nothing*, in its totality.

Original Slogan:

*“Housing is a Human Right!”*

Amended Slogan:

*“Communal Housing for All!”*

Reasoning:

Human rights trace their existence to the beginning of bourgeois philosophy. To speak of rights presupposes the question of who/what will enforce and protect that right, and that responsibility falls upon the State. As we have demonstrated and said (as well as can be found in numerous other Communist works) many times now, the State is the vessel of class society. As long as the State remains, so does class. As long as class exists, so do the miserable and alienated lives of the proletariat remain. We must also look at what type of housing we are demanding. Well it is certainly true that any housing is better than no housing, the revolutionary viewpoint necessitates that we must end the current housing system, of large swaths of single family

homes, that breeds alienation and replace it with communal housing.

Original Slogan:

*“Freeze the Rent!”*

Amended Slogan:

*“Cancel all Rents!”*

Reasoning:

A similar argument to those of increasing wages, calling for a mere freezing of rents represents a temporary halt in the progression of the deteriorating quality of life the proletariat faces. It is not necessary to repeat the same line of argumentation twice; however, it is important to note that the primary call of campaigns surrounding access to housing and rents should be centered on the decommodification of housing and the ability to live.

Original Slogan:

*“It’s Time to Get Organized” (As seen with National PSL)*

### Reasoning:

This slogan doesn't require amending, simply the end of its use for it grossly misunderstands social organization. To put it mildly, at points of crisis we seek the dissolution of every tangible class form, of the social relationship of labor, and so on. This means that there is no "time to get organized" as much as there are more and less tangible moments to strike at capital.

Yet at every social inflection point there is a Marxist group shouting at the masses to "Get Organized!", which is usually a feeble attempt to draw away a few unsuspecting recruits into an activist and/or book club adjacent environment. They do this as inherent opportunists: What they really mean is to get organized with *us* and our *programming*, which is the only real program and the only really revolutionary program that can transform social relations. As if the proletariat needs to be pampered with source material for a movement to become "real".

All we see here is a bleak departure from any notion of action or movement. "Getting Organized" just means to hyper fetishize structure and growing memberships, neither of which correlate with the overthrow of capitalism nor provide the platform for capital's death. When a struggle is to be won or lost,

and a group's rallying cry is one of sublime organization, we see an ambitious SPD with a kernel of their capacity.

Original Slogan:

*“Keep the Promise” (As seen with United Auto Workers)*

Amended Slogan:

*“We Demand Nothing But the World”*

The bourgeoisie do not make concessions, they make concessions as fit which are ultimately subject to a falling rate of profit. The righteousness of capitalists is a cheap appeal, albeit one that is well ingrained in union circles.

Original Slogan:

*“March for Humanity” (As seen with National PSL)*

Amended Slogan:

*“March for Workers’ Liberation”*

Reasoning:

A march for humanity could be led by absolutely anyone from PSL to the Democratic and Republican

Parties. Furthermore, if class is the distinction on which these claims of human rights are made, then it is class against class that we will abolish such notions.

Original Slogan:

*“No Money for Massacres” (As seen with National DSA)*

(Money for the State, just not this one specific tragedy)

Amended Slogan:

*“Abolish the State, Abolish Capitalism”*

Reasoning:

Only an ingrained ideologue could look at a history of State-sanctioned genocides over the entirety of its existence, isolate it to one time period and as one variable to be contained, and contrast it to other forms of public expenditure.

There is frankly one correct way to approach the question of “money for massacres”, and it is not in the maintenance of a parasitic capitalist life form.

Original Slogan:

*“Abolish ICE” (As seen everywhere)*

Amended Slogan:

*“Abolish the State, Abolish Capitalism”*

Reasoning:

The American State has overseen some of the most calculating genocides, atrocities, and wars in human history, much of which it has dealt with on its own soil. This regime has consolidated itself like no other Empire in history, and it has done so for centuries without the existence of ICE. Thus when critiquing its use of force, why do we isolate ICE as a historical phenomenon? It is an inflection point undoubtedly, but it is the product of an incredibly cyclical spiral of nativist campaigns, deportation efforts, and maintaining hegemonic capital. ICE is a norm, a product of an entire ethos and employment of life. And in the context of our contributors, we have seen first hand how this derailment aids liberal entryist mystique. Any hope of struggle is ceased, because this slogan substitutes an existential threat for a medication that is easy to stomach.

Original Slogan:

*“Unions Uniting so Families Keep Thriving” (As seen with Teamsters)*

Amended Slogan:

*“Abolish Labor For a Liberated Life”*

Reasoning:

One of the greatest achievements of the union bureaucracy in this country is that they have managed to still convince masses of people that they are guiding an upward trend. The unions are not only subject to little criticism, but in fact they are subject to no public criticism even when they undergo the underwriting of contemporary history. Families have not thrived this century! But we are to believe them insofar that when we sign their cards, they will lead us to this new imagination.

The unions fear an employment of life that is not predicated on wage labor, so they paint over the cracks left by capitalist education, media, and superstructure.

Original Slogan:

*“Defend Pilsen: Stop the TIF Expansion” (As seen with Residents Against TIF Expansion)*

Amended Slogan:

*“Liberate Pilsen: Fight Capital”*

Gentrification is a perfect microcosm for those defense movements that go so wrong. This is precisely because the term and understanding of gentrification itself is bourgeois! Just as we attack the use of life under wage labor, we attack the use of land under State, finance, and so on. But in the case of labor we are not satisfied with a return to higher real wages or a step towards workplace parity. No, we seek the evolution of our collective life to something greater, more liberating. The same must be said for gentrification then in that we must resist staking a claim on gentrification, as if what? The petit-bourgeoisie are the base of support we seek to build our platform on? As if poverty, caste, and segregation are anymore desirable?

We must resist this tendency.

Original Slogan:

*“It is Right to Rebel/Resist” (As seen with Maoists, FRSO, SDS)*

Amended Slogan:

*“Abolish Rights, Abolish Classes”*

### Reasoning:

As we have previously stated, ad nauseum, rights are inextricably tied to the bourgeois system. Since we have discussed this at length we see no reason to relitigate the issue at large, however we will still discuss the peculiarities of this phrase. No State has allowed this “Right to Rebel” in practical terms. Philosophers and Leaders have opined and made gestures towards this “right”, such as Locke and Jefferson to even Lenin, but in practice this right has never materialized. In America, the “right of succession” was shot down with the Civil War and rebellions were quashed in Indian Country. Out of all the rights that “exist:”, this one is the most insane.

### Original Slogan:

*“No Justice, No Peace!”*

### Amended Slogan:

*“We Seek Neither Justice or Peace: Only Liberation”*

### Reasoning:

Justice is a fluid and slanted judgement. It holds no truth to its claims, and as such there should be a staunch rejection of empty promises. What is justice can only be defined by the justice system, and thus

we observe this slogan as another which leaves a sour taste in our mouths.

Peace is likewise a virtue so exalted as it is hollow. We cannot come to define peace as anything other than passivity, and as such we view peace as reactionary. Any peace we seek can only come in the abolition of classes, i.e. not under capitalism nor its justice system. Yet even then this supposed peace can only come at the end of the bitter struggle that will undoubtedly leave bloodshed and destruction around the world. Thus, we seek no justice, and no peace.

Original Slogan:

*“Arrest Killer Cops!”*

Amended Slogan:

*“Abolish Police & the State”*

Reasoning:

Arresting killer cops implies the supremacy of the justice system. As we discussed above, this is empty and reactionary. Furthermore, this slogan also implies the existence of good cops within the State system, therefore relying on a juxtaposition of morality within the State itself.

As much as one may enjoy a moral witch-hunt of such capacity, we simply don't share in this hilarity. The bourgeoisie can purge its forces' ranks every 4 years, and we would still be left in crisis.

There are no good nor bad police officers, and there is no divine nor inspired justice. Abolition -the absence of any being at all-is thus what we are left with.

Original Slogan:

*“Protect Academic Freedom”*

Amended Slogan:

*“Return Education to Life!”*

Reasoning:

When not institutionalized or severed from life, education as an *action* can be incredibly valuable. That is, we are proponents of education as a process of engaging with life itself, and through those interactions forming comprehensive knowledge. Or rather, when *learning* ceases to be reduced to education.

We are not proponents of the State's monopoly on this process, its institutionalization, and reduction to beautifying labor power. As such there is a need to return education to its intentional use: Learning and life.

Original Slogan:

*“#ShutDownNation, Boycott Israel, Defund Israel, Stop Supplying Weapons to Israel, etc.” (As seen with the BDS Movement)*

Amended Slogan:

*“To Free Palestine, Free the Working Class”*

Reasoning:

The various economic attempts to punish Israel (as discussed in our first piece, *“The Student Psyche in Political Crisis”*) are entirely hapless. Throwing one's weight behind such a movement is not viable due to the appeals toward both the petit-bourgeoisie, the bourgeoisie proper, and so on. Any one of the “popular” slogans listed are slogans utilized by the bourgeoisie to protect itself from criticism or examination during this movement. The truth is that should Palestine be liberated, it can only come with the liberation of the international working class. Thus we seek not economic reallocation but a war on economics itself.

# Accelerate?

## 3 Feet on the Pedal

Capital is reeling. In its death throes it has the opportunity to not just unseat the fabric of class society, but to destroy the Earth we inhabit. Speaking frankly, the latter seems more likely to happen. Even if we are to throw off the shackles of Capital its vices have permanently scarred this planet, its rot seeped so thoroughly deep. Climate Scientists have long agreed that we are past the point of no return. Our strategies are no longer preventative, but are questions of how we even survive the incoming fallout. The worst part: most, or at least many, people acknowledge this.

What separates the Left and the Right is a matter of action, not observation. The Dissident Right (Anti-Liberal Right) and the Far Left (Anarchists and Communists) both can offer a sort of descriptive writeup of society and its ills, where they break is the prescriptive role of action and solution. However, there is one action where dissident factions find themselves tactically united on: Accelerationism.

Accelerationism, for those not in the know, is the broad range of ideas, tactics, and strategies that

advocate for the hastening, *or acceleration*, of the material conditions. Oftentimes this presents itself as keeping dismal living conditions or making them worse, usually through acts of indiscriminate or targeted terror. Tactics such as these are found across history, regardless of time and place. Currently, accelerationism is found most common in right wing spaces. Groups such as AtomWaffen and The Base seek to ferment a racial war through terroristic means. Mike Ma writes his thinly veiled fetish novels pretending to be political theory. Militias train for “The Great Reset”. Similarly on the left, groups engage in targeted terror campaigns against the State, anarchists have their own writings, such as *Desert*. Looking at the past, even the Narodniks represented a form of proto-accelerationism. What unites these people in their strategies is one thing: alienation.

One of Capital’s most pernicious evils it inflicts upon society is the widespread alienation that is thrust onto humanity. Marx, as well as a multitude of writers since him, has already described capitalist alienation at length, so I’ll save myself the effort of relitigating his words. If we examine accelerationist and terroristic means, one of the subconscious goals is the hijacking of the *Spectacle* (Re: Debord). In the spectacle-ist and capitalist economy, attention is just as meaningful of a currency as the U.S. dollar.

Corporations vie for your every second of attention. Patents based on “consumer retention” are created everyday. Your algorithm is hand catered to keep you consuming for as long as possible (as well as in the most profitable way). It should be no surprise then that accelerationists do not carry out their terrorism anonymously. 17 year old white supremacists adorn their father’s AR-15 with the slogans of their movement. Attacks are livestreamed online with clips disseminated across social media. Every bomb that goes off is paired with a communique sent to every local and regional news station. The Spectacle is reinvented.

## **Hijacking the Spectacle**

Or is it? Terrorism does little to move the needle towards revolution or societal collapse. What terrorism does offer is attention. To the disaffected young man who is alienated from his labor, his family, humanity, and himself what better life can exist than to be “canonized” and venerated amongst the dozens of other alienated youth? Accelerationism is less of a coherent political ideology and more of the exasperated sigh of the oppressed (to bite off Marx). In one final act, they attempt to write the world in their image and wrestle control of the Spectacle. It’s similar to the way suicide allows one to end their life “on their own

terms". Ultimately, both terrorism and suicide are worthless acts. Any individual act to subvert the Spectacle will ultimately be reformatted into itself and become commodified. It also fails to notice that Capital doesn't need external acceleration to ramp up its contradictions. It's already headed on that path.

Even though terrorism offers up no real political strategy, one cannot help but notice the sort of *romantic* appeal it has. For a brief moment, whoever has carried out the attack protagonizes themselves. They are vilified and reviled; venerated and celebrated. Their slavish, cattle-like life is up-ended and their legacy is immortalized, for better or for worse. Who can blame them? Who wouldn't choose to burn bright like a gas-soaked fire, even if for only a moment? This is the true danger of accelerationist thought, it preys on the pre-existing decay of social cohesion. Whether consciously or not, the individual worker seeks to protagonize their meaningless and futile existence. The easiest way to achieve this is to play by the rules set out by society, that is to *hijack the spectacle*.

*"The spectacle presents itself simultaneously as all of society, as part of society, and as an instrument of unification. As a part of society it is specifically the sector which concentrates all gazing and all*

*consciousness. Due to the very fact that this sector is separate, it is the common ground of the deceived gaze and of false consciousness, and the unification it achieves is nothing but an official language of generalized separation.”*

Guy Debord, *Society of the Spectacle*

From birth, mankind is thrust into the world of communication. Babies are urged to utter their first words. When they grow up they are introduced to picture books, although recently electronics are substituting physical media. News, romance, entertainment, friendships, everything on this planet ruled by humanity is mediated through the lens of communication, and in our current technological landscape the digital world of the Spectacle has united our communications even more. At first glance it would seem that the globalization of the communication economy has given way to a more democratic world, but upon closer inspection the only victors in this outcome are of course those that have previously won the 18th, 19th, and 20th centuries: the bourgeoisie. It makes no difference to our overlords that there exists pockets of free, radical action online where information is disseminated openly. We use their very platforms to communicate our disdain for them, yet they have already made their dollar. In terms of

the question on accelerationism, every new terroristic campaign carried out has a direct, proportional relation to revenue earned. In fact there are already entire online industries dedicated to profiting off these “tragedies”!

When placed in the realm of conscious acts, accelerationism does little to actually accelerate. Racialized attacks against minorities only seek to alienate the dissident right from mainstream, normal conversation, on the other hand left wing terror only gives credence to the legitimacy of the state and allows for further repression and state terror. The only acceleration happening is the hegemony of the capitalist class. This is, of course, not to say that there is no place in our movement for violence, or even terroristic, tactics; it is to say that our intention and expectation with these should be different.

Accelerationism not only fails in its aims, but it also operates off the same teleological framework that it, supposedly, rivals. Examining the understanding of history that accelerationism puts up shows that it is merely the developmentalist worldview that most Marxists already subscribe to, simply inverted. Marxists, mainly those of the Leninist variety, already claim the stageist view of history. What is accelerationism if not flipping the role of the stageist

development on its head? In both cases the Marxist and the accelerationist both believe in the power of the proletariat to seize the reigns of history with their own hands. Regardless of the tactical and strategical differences, the teleology remains similar.

## **Now or Never**

Bordiga once said something to the effect of “Long Live the Butcher Hitler who works in spite of himself to bring about the proletarian revolution”. While his quote has been incessantly satirized by detractors, there exists a bit of truth to it. As the rate of profit falls to an unstable level, the bourgeoisie will employ ever more reactionary and cutthroat tactics. We can see this presently in America with cuts to the most basic of social security and welfare. Accelerationism’s most ardent warriors are not the Tiqqunists blowing up railways or the Pagan Neo-Nazi teenager who shoots up his school; but instead are the federal bureaucrats, liberal politicians, and architects of the current administration.

To this we have little to say but:

LONG LIVE THE  
BOURGEOISIE AND THEIR  
CLIQUE, WHO SO  
GRACIOUSLY WORK IN  
SPITE OF THEMSELVES TO  
BRING ABOUT THE  
PROLETARIAN  
REVOLUTION AND THE  
END OF CLASS SOCIETY!

## Epilogue

With each passing day, Capital's own contradictions give possible liberation. However, our moribund system is not content enough to let itself die, or at the very least pass on to the dustbin of history politely. Reaction is sharpening. While the “Communist” movement spends most of its energy relitigating our failed history, our class enemies adapt and shift their tactics every day.

This time last year, our own contradictions buckled under us. In the wake, we weren't sure if publishing *Avant!* would resolve these contradictions, or simply pile them higher. We were-rather ironically-surprised as communists to find the resolution in the very breath of working people, and in international proletarian struggle a new hope for the world to come.

There is a desire to cast off the sins of the past, and at that we express solidarity with our comrades around the world in building this new future.

This concludes Volume II of *Avant!*. All victory to the working class!