

ON THE TREACHERY OF THE DEMOCRATS

6/19/22

(Edited 4/6/23)

Over the last two decades, Democrats and big businesses alike have adopted popular attitudes towards progressivism and LGBT support, but in the wake of fascist reaction and imperial decline can this trend continue? We answer in the negative. We call this phenomenon of bourgeois rhetorical support "rainbow-capitalism" because it is rainbow-colored in words, but capitalist in deeds. We believe that this phenomenon does not represent legitimate support, but is rather a cynical attempt to tail the general attitude of the masses. In this case we believe this attitude — that is, support for LGBT — to be correct, but what should happen if this attitude changes? It is clear to us that opportunist political actors (in other words, all of them) will abandon LGBT support if it stops being expedient. Indeed, such trends already exist in small scale. As the Democrats continue to lose ground, as they continue courting the transient center, as they continue looking for scapegoats for their own failures, and as support for queers (predominantly transsexuals) becomes increasingly inexpedient to electoral campaigns, we may as well expect that they will throw us under the bus and become the party of “how dare you accuse us of supporting trannies! Actually, we hate them more than you!” Why are the Democrats losing ground? We identify four key reasons.

1. Although both of our establishment parties offer little material policy — although both of them rouse petty cultural grievances and peddle identity opportunism to rile their bases — reactionary identity politics that incentivizes division and rewards chauvinism will tend to win out under a reactionary class dictatorship. That is because ‘progressive’ identity politics divorced from class politics is alienating to those most politically engaged and materially aggrieved, and in lieu of material policy, resentment will win out over superficial calls for harmony, unity, inclusion, or CoExIsTeNcE. More to the point: regressive identity politics is more *authentic* in that it is not in contradiction with the capitalist system, while ‘progressive’ identity politics is necessarily hollow, shallow, and hypocritical; its purported goals are plainly incompatible with class society.
2. Only one of these parties, the Democrats, repeatedly promises material reform, and subsequently fails to deliver on it — the GOP’s only material promise is to lower taxes, a promise that they occasionally keep, even if occasionally only for the wealthy. When all promises for improved livelihoods fail again and again, when higher taxes frequently get squandered by incompetent and corrupt bureaucrats, it is hardly surprising that a politics of ‘just leave me alone’ (without any pretense for improvement) tends to win out.
3. Thirdly, the Democrats fail to make a compelling case for themselves or for bourgeois-democracy in general. Their largest deliverable promise is “at least we’re not Republicans!” which, as argued in the prior point, is hardly enough to convince a population in declining material conditions to support you. Moreover, it is not uncommon for liberals to make claims which amount to “we’d only be able to make progress if we could win a de-facto one party state,” but subsequently condemn

one-party states; rhetoric which further amounts to “we’d only be able establish progressive policy if [Democratic president] were a dictator,” but likewise condemn dictatorships. In the end all of this rhetoric leads to one conclusion: liberalism is a politics of failure, unable to fulfill its promises within the confines of bourgeois-democracy while refusing to go beyond such limitations. To make such an incompetent case for democracy only fuels the further radicalization of the masses towards fascism or communism, towards an anti-liberal politics of one kind or another (though, of course, we hope and push for Communism).

4. Finally, we condemn Democratic politicians for having no sense of *strategy*. As Sun Tzu once famously said, “Strategy without tactics is the slowest route to victory. **Tactics without strategy is the noise before defeat.**” Reactionaries and regressives have long-term schemes they work towards, even over decades, while Democrats and liberals have no vision. They wallow in spontaneity, reacting to this or that development, only focusing on the up-coming election. This is why Democratic victories in the short term are inevitably overturned by Republican victories in the long-term, why Democrats end up adopting the same economic and foreign policy (that being ‘neoliberalism’ and ‘neoconservatism’). They have tactics such as ‘lesser-evilism’ and the pretense that they are the final bulwark against fascism, tactics such as trying to guilt people into supporting them, and tactics like trying to hold material incentives hostage (but never delivering). What has all this accomplished? A mounting resentment which gave way to a superficially anti-establishment figure like Donald Trump who served as the public’s middle-finger to the reigning political order. The election of a crass, womanizing, celebrity can be seen as having served a similar purpose to the ‘mad’ Roman Emperor Caligula’s decision to appoint his horse Incitatus to the highest rank of the Republic – that is, a symbol of disrespect and institutional illegitimacy.

In the end, such supposed ‘allies’ are not only a liability for their strategic errors, in their bourgeois class allegiance, or their support for the capitalist-imperialist order, but *especially* in their propensity towards opportunism. Bourgeois political representatives only care for public opinion insofar as it helps maintain legitimacy and insofar as it does not threaten their class interests; they have no concern for the correctness of ideas, *only power*. As Marxists it is our duty and responsibility to build a movement that is based both on correct ideas and on a popular execution of them. Without both of these things, we will fail in either the short or the long term. Doing so compels us to put forth ideas even when they are unpopular – *especially* when they are unpopular – in order to pull the ‘Overton window’ towards a more revolutionary direction. As [Mao once taught us](#), one of the principal ways that liberalism is manifested is in an unprincipled peace, as a rejection of ideological struggle (especially within the party cadre, but also outside of it!). This necessarily puts us at odds with the electoral campaigns of establishment skills, for which we refuse to apologize. In fact, we welcome their slander and condemnation. Should they attack us as wreckers or “kremlin trolls” (or whatever), the further we will stand in demarcation from them and the stronger we will become. The more the bridge between Democrats and Republicans shrinks, the more both parties will become delegitimized; the more transparent the class interests of our duopolistic system becomes, the more people

will see through their identity opportunism. Such dishonesty and treachery can't last indefinitely and will not survive the scrutiny of the waking masses.