



During the last two years,  
and economic mortar of the pillars  
y and show that they are a mere pantomime for 21

<sup>st</sup> century Marxism. In what follows, I will draw relevant connections and expose hidden entanglements, explaining why the radical left ideology inevitably leads to the expansion of the government sector and the stalling of economic development.

Recall that the ideas of classical Marxism were reflected in the following three predicaments:

- (i) one class (the bourgeoisie) possessed the means of production, which allowed it to expropriate another class (the proletariat),
- (ii) there was no social mobility and people were essentially bound to their assigned class from birth, and
- (iii) there was an internal contradiction within capitalism, which would one day lead to the collapse of the whole socio-economic system.

Let us examine each point in detail.

(i) The idea behind expropriation was engraved in the added value that the workers' labor created. Marx believed that any produced good had two major components: fixed and variable capital. Fixed capital included

ideology is based on the same premise and set to liberate everyone (even pre-pubescent minors) from the congenital bounds of their physique. The apologists of this theory argue that sex is irrelevant, and gender is completely arbitrary, unbounded by reality. Hence, anyone can self-identify as whoever they want since self-identification creates an ex-ante non-falsifiable statement bereft of an objective criterion. Reality has no meaning and cringes before narcissistic epos marveled by gender ideologists.

In Marxism, any person was also ex-ante locked into two classes – proletariat and bourgeoisie. The harsh truth of social reality of that time set these constraints, just as biological constraints are set for each person during their prenatal development. Contrary to Marxist vision, history has shown that capitalism had created the greatest opportunities for social mobility among all other socio-economic systems. Ironically, there has been a substantial decline in social mobility over the last half-century that coincided with the rising power of the state.

(iii) The third point depicts a parallel between the imminent destruction of capitalist private property and climate change. The left argues that the existing way of production leads to inexorable and insurmountable shifts in our planet's climate, which need to be tackled by restrictive policies. Setting aside the unsubstantiated claims that human activities are central to climate change and that reducing emissions in the developed world will have at best a minimal impact on the planet's environment (without accounting for the increased levels of poverty around the world it will cause), it is evident that clamoring for pending doom has a purpose of undermining the existing status-quo. It lays the foundation for the case of replacing capitalism with socialism and superseding markets with government.

Marx also believed that the capitalistic system was doomed due to its internal contradictions, and that this unavoidable demise was an indispensable prerequisite for the system's revamp. He warned that the knell of capitalist private property would sound, and expropriators would be expropriated. History has again proved him wrong by exploiting an incredible finesse of humans for adaptation, which has resulted in the inception of various ownership forms involving workers (e.g., shareholding capital). Such core virtues of capitalism as adaptation and innovation have indeed led capitalist-oriented countries to prosper, with extensive positive externalities generated for the rest of the world.

From the discussion above it follows that each element of the sacred triumvirate of contemporary radical left ideology is just a fetishized reincarnation of Marxist ideas adjusted to the strings of modern society by political somersaults. Recall that Marx's approach to history postulated that communism was the last formation for a society's transformation along the grand timeline. However, Marx realized that the chasm between capitalism and communism was too deep to make this transition feasible. Hence, he envisioned that there must be an intermediary formation – socialism – that would bridge the gap between capitalism and communism. The role of socialism was solely to expropriate the means of production from the bourgeois and exalt the government to become their holy keeper and guardian. After that, the government was supposed to disperse the means of production among its denizens. History reveals that the last stage of this transformation never occurred, partly because bureaucrats personifying each government promulgating a jubilant path toward communism were seduced by the power granted to them by socialism, inducing them to keep control of the means of production and using the latter to sustain their autocracy.

A steep rise in the power and role of the government in the US, which we have observed during recent years, is an epiphenomenon feature of radical left ideology. By drawing a map for society forged in de facto Marxist ideas, the left creates a need for the government to take over and

solve pervasive “injustices.” However, n.(v)-10(e)0( (i)-d (i)-y (r)32 (ve) 0Tw 0 Tw.1270Td[it i-4(e hv)-1