

# **THE CONCEPT OF PRACTICAL SUPPORT**

In some of the previous polemics I've written, the nature of the work has been more or less theoretical. In each of them, due to the unfortunate and ubiquitous presence of western leftoids, I find myself explaining how and why they're the greatest threat, not only to socialism, but to anti-imperialist causes as a whole. This is likely going to be a recurring theme in all of my writing as long as these people continue to debase socialism by convincing the masses that their reactionary, often idiosyncratic bastardizations can reasonably be called socialism. In most cases, these leftoids from the imperial core will lack any ideological knowledge and will have none of the correct lines, but this is not always the case. Some of them may put great effort into understanding not just communism, but the philosophy of Marxism, only to misinterpret everything they have read and pass judgement upon every anti-imperialist who isn't a complete troglodyte.

Unlike the common and utterly laughable western "leftist", these people are at least well-meaning, well-studied and wise to the ever-present rot of the (unknowingly) Frankfurt School-inspired George Soros "left". To begin, anti-imperialist governments must be supported, regardless of their ideology and regardless of whether or not they represent the proletariat. This is an important prerequisite to bear in mind due to the fact that the proletariat can only be given meaningful support when it exists in high enough numbers to possess revolutionary potential. What's important to note is that the proletariat essentially comes into existence after the

establishment of capitalism. As capitalism develops, an economy predicated on industry forms, increasing the need for the proletariat by the bourgeoisie hence causing the class to grow. As capitalism decays (the phase we are in now), one will notice that the bourgeoisie have essentially become vestigial and the proletariat is responsible for the entirety of production. It is at this point that the conditions necessary to form a dictatorship of the proletariat have been established.

It's not only that the productive forces must be developed in order to practice socialism, it's that the means of production themselves must become more advanced. After this takes place, the proletariat will come to realize that there is no further purpose in the existence of capitalism or the bourgeoisie. There have been points in history and there are points in economic development where it is sensible to retain the bourgeoisie because they genuinely do assist in production and facilitate economic advancement by developing the means of production. In essence, this is the bourgeoisie buying the ropes they will later use to hang themselves. The consequence is a proletariat that is stronger in numbers, fully responsible for operating the means of production and hence of extreme importance to the economy. As time and the economy progress the roles and levels of importance of both classes will drastically change. The relationship of the bourgeoisie to the proletariat will go from somewhat symbiotic to entirely parasitic. The proletariat will be able to apply pressure to the bourgeoisie first because the bourgeoisie needs it more than vice versa and also because the proletariat simply cannot be replaced. They will have a level of skill and importance to production that simply cannot be overlooked.

If it gets to the point that the proletariat is the only useful class due to its consequence to the economy, the destruction of capitalism and liquidation of oppressing

classes becomes an option. Before this takes place, the proletariat would not be able to achieve revolution either because they still require the help of the bourgeoisie, they lack numbers or both. As much as we are against capitalism and the continued existence of the bourgeoisie, it's not that they don't have their uses for a limited time.

There is a definitive order in which the economy and production must progress before any model becomes viable. It begins at primitive "communism", progresses to slavery, then feudalism, then progresses further to capitalism and finally begins the full progress to socialism upon the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is not optimal to skip steps and would require a more advanced method of production to be imported from elsewhere with the proletariat retaining control. However, this is damn near impossible and if attempting to do so, one stands to destroy the means of production. As communists, we must stand for and with the proletariat at all points which also means that unlike the "communists" of the global north or compradorist urbanites of the global south, we cannot encourage what is evidently suicidal to them.

I bring all of this up because our cause would be both disingenuous and chauvinistic if it we were to stand against the interests of the proletariat of the imperialized global south. While it is possible for some of these nations to begin the process of practicing socialism, others are forced to endure feudal survivals and severe underdevelopment due to their being plundered by the neoliberal bloc. For their sake especially, we must support them, not only in achieving industrialization, but in achieving adequate economic development in the first place. This means unabashed support for any anti-imperialist movement, ideology notwithstanding. While our goal is the emancipation of the proletariat and our

primary goal definitely is class struggle, it is vital that we understand that there are considerations to be made regarding the correct time to attempt revolution. In most countries, the proletariat have the adequate numbers, but lack the political power to do any real damage. This is because these countries are imperialized and the development of industry is stifled by the cosmopolitan bourgeoisie.

#### r/EuropeanSocialists - The Concept of Practical Support

If looking to liberate these proletarian workers by any means necessary as we should, we must look to national self-determination as a means of assisting them in class struggle. In these cases, an increase in production and development of the means of production is a prerequisite to a proletarian revolution and this vital step is impeded by the meddling of imperialists and other reactionary forces. There is great necessity in the proletariat becoming organized and powerful which cannot be done unless the service economy is scrapped in favor of an industrial economy which in turn cannot happen until the country itself is free from the theft and terrorism of the neoliberal bloc. In these cases, it becomes prudent to utilize a national bourgeois movement to defeat imperialism. Through a practical alliance between a national bourgeoisie and the proletariat, even a social democratic (not to be confused with the social fascism of the west) movement can be a viable intermediary to achieving socialism.

The consequences include the nation becoming self-sufficient, hence no longer in need of the handouts of the cosmopolitan bourgeoisie and the proletariat gaining a great deal of strength. I must stress that as it concerns these kinds of practical alliances, the workers' parties cannot under any circumstances become subservient to

the national bourgeoisie and that this alliance, however useful, is temporary on account of the economic model simply being a less exploitative version of capitalism. Because it is capitalism, it too will invariably trend towards monopoly and hence imperialism. The national bourgeoisie can and should be utilized for as long as they are useful, progressive and in opposition to imperialism. The moment this is no longer the case, the proletariat must move to dispose of them entirely.

Needless to say, the circumstances of countries being plundered by imperialism is desperate enough that it requires the utilization of the national bourgeoisie. This, however, is the more common scenario and you would be hard-pressed to find a comrade who rejects this kind of approach. Where matters become most complicated is when the circumstances are even more desperate due to the previously mentioned countries which are at the latter end of feudalism. Under these circumstances, bourgeois-democratic forces in favor of capitalism are actually progressive and must be supported. Though political illiterates like to derisively refer to this concept as “step-ism” and malign comrade Stalin, a bourgeois-democratic revolution and the establishment of capitalism is required for there to be a proletarian revolution. Every single revolutionary will agree to the fact that the proletariat is the class possessing true revolutionary potential, but the issue is that the reasons why are often taken for granted. I intend for there to be no condescension as I say this, but even Marxists who are worthy of respect sometimes do not understand the material conditions that cause revolutionary potential to manifest.

For one, it is a class’s necessity to the economy as a whole and its ability to depose oppressing classes without causing economic ruin. We should not take for granted that as capitalism decays, the bourgeoisie become utterly

antagonistic and ruinous to the proletariat hence rendering them useless. This same kind of dynamic has applied between the bourgeoisie and the landlords towards the latter end of feudalism and for better or worse, still does in countries with feudal survivals. This is because at these points, the bourgeoisie are primarily responsible for production and can increase productivity greatly, improving material conditions for everyone by disposing of the feudal lords. The issue in this kind of scenario is that, in the absence of a fully developed proletariat, you do not have any other classes that have revolutionary potential. At this point, there would be a peasant based society and sadly peasants do not have the ability to achieve revolution without the leadership of either the proletariat or the bourgeoisie. At best, there may be some revolts that can achieve moderate reforms, but this will not amount to the establishment of a new economic model. The role of a peasant is essential to society and remains so, but they lack access to the means of production.

Unlike the proletariat, they lack power and leverage. If the proletariat collectively decide to stop working, the economy collapses, making clear that the bourgeoisie needs the proletariat more than the reverse, if at all. The proletariat can afford to become completely independent of the bourgeoisie. The peasants, however, will inextricably be attached to their oppressors because to attempt revolution would be suicidal for the peasantry. This is why in Tsarist Russia, the peasantry called for a “good tsar” as opposed to the abolition of the monarchy altogether. Under these circumstances, but under any set of circumstances, he who produces is the potential revolutionary. In countries where the majority of the population is the peasantry, it is only possible for them to become capable of revolution by aligning with or becoming the proletariat. For better or worse, this means that a bourgeois-democratic revolution must succeed and

the peasantry must be assisted by the bourgeoisie in becoming proletarian.

## r/EuropeanSocialists - The Concept of Practical Support

One may counter that even in these kinds of countries, cities and industrial labor do exist, but under those circumstances, one runs the risk of disenfranchising the majority of the population which is still peasantry. It is possible to mitigate this concern by importing a more advanced method of production, but this is nigh impossible. Under these circumstances, no matter how progressive a country may be and how much its practices benefit those in the cities, the regime will not be able to hold power and the majority of the population could potentially be swayed into counter-revolution. Popular support too is essential to revolution and that is garnered exclusively by those in service to the productive forces. It is this alone that makes one capable of offering better conditions to the masses.

The viability of a revolution lies in its class's capacity for far greater production, the obsolescence of oppressing classes and its ability to uphold the will of the masses. Socialism is indeed the future and a noble pursuit, but to sabotage the efforts of anti-imperialists for whatever reason is to undermine the struggle of the proletariat. If organizing against them with no regard to the material conditions of the country, one runs the risk of throwing practical support behind imperialism. It is possible that an anti-imperialist is disagreeable ideologically, but in the absence of an alternative with political power and resources, the struggle almost certainly is going to result in a victory for the imperialists by default. Furthermore, to back anyone in opposition to the hegemony of the neoliberal bloc is wise on the grounds that the enemy of your enemy is your friend. Though this is the obvious

consideration due to the prospect of undermining imperialist power, there is also the indisputable fact that the loss of compradors makes the viability of a capitalist economy plummet and the retention of fascist regimes far less likely.

If a former comprador was to nationalize its economy, cease its subservience to foreign capital and refuse military assistance to the imperialist bloc, it is quite obvious that the oppressor countries would hemorrhage profits due to the former comprador's assets being out of reach, but they also would lose the ability to strongarm other countries in the area through military force. The only reason that one fascist party or another is able to maintain power in a country like the US, for example is because the profits of imperialist plunder sustain the jobs and standard of living of the labor aristocracy who are more than happy to sanction the ruin of the global south to advance their parasitism. In other words, absent imperialist plunder, it's not just that the fascists will no longer be able to placate their masses who constitute the labor aristocracy, it's also that the existence of the labor aristocracy itself becomes a major liability for the country as a whole.

The existence of industry is going to be the deciding factor regarding the success or failure of any economy. While the countries of the imperial core lack industry domestically, they sustain their service economies due to the industries of other countries being subjugated to their will. This is the only way that they would still have commodities to sell despite either not producing anything or only being involved at the latter end of any given production (while naturally pocketing most of the profits). If, for whatever reason, a regime change in a foreign country cuts off their supply to foreign labor and earth, sustaining a service economy and labor aristocracy both becomes increasingly suicidal. These kinds of events lay



the foundation for an industrial economy due to the need for domestic industry. As anti-imperialist forces of any kind grow stronger, the people living in the imperial core will be forced to admit that imperialism always causes economic and societal rot, there are diminishing returns and that absent an investment in self-sufficiency, their people will cease to exist. Only by crippling the economies of the imperial core will the majority become proletarian. Once this is the case, it stands to reason that the fascists would not be able to retain power due to their inherently antagonistic relationship to the proletariat. While it is possible to bribe the proletariat into supporting fascism if the country has compradors and if the promises of imperialists can be honored, without those conditions, the fascists are done and the masses will back whoever promotes industrialization, greater productivity and working class control, workplace democracy, etc. This means that the prospect of establishing a dictatorship of the proletariat will become more attractive in countries where the “chickens have come home to roost” as it concerns imperialism.

It is also extremely important to note that the diminishing returns of imperialism will extend to compradors who also operate on a service economy. The fascist regimes in these kinds of countries also would not be able to maintain power because they are not just political thieves in service to imperialists, they are political thieves plundering their own people. In the event that scum like this do have popular support, it's because they too consolidate power through the use of a labor aristocracy and are able to convince a sufficient number of people that selling out the nation will result in an increase in the standard of living. It is obvious that in these cases, the regime serves a minority of unproductives who are parasitic in relation to their own people, but there are sufficient returns for this kind of arrangement to continue. This kind of arrangement is

suicidal to whole nations.

It cannot be anything but suicidal to empower the labor aristocracy of a comprador country while still depending on the extraction of the proletariat's surplus labor. If countries within the imperial core trend towards industrialization, the suicidal nature of a comprador regime becomes immediately, as opposed to eventually apparent. These fascists already would struggle to maintain power, even if successfully bribing a portion of the proletariat and benefiting a cannibalistic minority, but if the returns to both cease to exist, there is no reason for the nation to tolerate their existence. In these situations too, the masses will choose industrialization and worker control which means that they will be on the path to choosing communism.

As with most things I write, the existence of the western "leftist" necessitates these concepts being stated. What is surreal albeit laughable is that there is a portion of them who would agree with every single theoretical matter as it concerns communism, but still give practical support to the enemies of socialism. These people are ultra-leftists who like to pretend to be Marxist-Leninist. While on the surface, they may have some of the correct anti-imperialist positions, they are invariably going to be against the interests of the Axis of Resistance as a whole. While genuine support for the PRC and DPRK is commendable and in the case of anyone from the west, indicative of some capacity for critical thought, it is not, nor will it ever be enough. For whatever reason, some of these same people who staunchly support socialist states will attack their allies such as the Russian Federation, Belarus and Iran just to name a few examples.

I should not have to tell anybody that each country has its own path to socialism and that as it concerns their own laws, their own values should be upheld. More

importantly though, we are not in a position where we can be selective with our allies. Some issues may exist within these progressive, anti-imperialist countries, but now is not the time to address them. As long as the hegemony of the US and NATO as a whole remains a threat, our priority must be protecting the sovereignty of the countries they seek to destroy. While these countries are not necessarily socialist, they are, at the very least, in staunch opposition to NATO's imperialism and constitute what is an anti-imperialist bloc. You can condemn countries like Russia and Iran all you'd like for whatever reason, but the masses of those countries will never be sympathetic to the moralizing and shallow criticisms of the western leftoid for one very important reason. The alternative is hell. It is possible for communists to come to power in these kinds of countries, but failing that and given that the regimes of these countries are deposed, it will only profit the imperialists. Absent these anti-imperialist governments, compradors will be placed by the neoliberal bloc, there will be privatization with the country effectively being divided among the cosmopolitan bourgeoisie and there will be even greater exploitation for the proletariat and peasantry.

There's the obvious consideration that there must be adequate economic development before attempting revolution, but in any event, the country cannot be put in the position of becoming a potential comprador. Furthermore, there is legitimately solidarity between these countries and those subjected to the vampirism of NATO. It is prudent to support them because they stand to provide infrastructure and an alternative to being forced into trading with the US. As any country in the Axis of Resistance grows in power, the global south nations as a whole will be increasingly independent of any business with imperialists and will undergo greater industrialization and economic development in their own right. It is fair to only critically support anti-imperialist

capitalist regimes, but whatever hurts the interests of the cosmopolitan bourgeoisie is extremely good for the proletariat anywhere.

Even if the countries in question are not as progressive as the PRC, they stand to promote industrialization and better business for imperialized countries which in effect, means they stand to create the conditions necessary for countries to become socialist. For practical purposes, diverting support away from the Axis of Resistance and undermining it in any way will cause more countries to trend towards compradorship. For all intents and purposes, those who organize against Putin, Lukashenko, Maduro, Assad, etc. are giving practical support to imperialists. If successful in destroying the only viable alternative to exploitation by imperialists, these “socialists” would effectively consolidate NATO’s position in perpetuity. These “leftists” are not only a sick joke, but ought to be chastised for being social fascists themselves. Glory to the Axis of Resistance.

*Aarif Firaas, 14/12/2021*



*If a MAC line is expressed, then it will be clarified. If not, the reader should consider the work expressing the views of the writer.*