



**KENNESAW STATE  
UNIVERSITY**

COLES COLLEGE OF BUSINESS  
*Bagwell Center for the Study of Markets  
and Economic Opportunity*

# Commentary

**Title:**

*"The Sacred Triumvirate of Neo-Marxism"*

**Author(s):**

Alex Maslov  
Vanderbilt University  
Bagwell Center Affiliated Faculty

---

March 2023

During the last two years, after the radical left took over the White House, the world witnessed a panoply of phenomena occurring in the US that were hitherto unimaginable, including: defunding of police amidst skyrocketing crime, mutilation of minors at the whim of their inchoate psyche orchestrated by social contagion and a distorted K-12 ecosystem, and evisceration of energy independence in favor of progressive environmentalism. I am often asked by my overseas friends and colleagues about the purpose of this ostensible insanity. This note outlines my perception of the forces behind it.

The examples above are not coincidental and reflect on the three whales of the radical left agenda: critical race theory, gender ideology, and green energy. Clinical psychology has already linked each of these elements to obscured narcissism of a typical representative of the conforming ideology. I, on the other hand, would like to dive into the social and economic mortar of the pillars of radical left ideology 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 buildings, equipment, machinery, etc. Variable capital included physical labor of the proletariat, which would further be subdivided into socially necessary labor costs to produce the required product and compensated by a wage and the added value that would be expropriated by the capitalist. In Marx's vision, the added value, which was the propelling engine of capitalism, could only be produced by animate labor when coupled with the physical fixed capital provided by the bourgeoisie.

The idea that only one class possesses means of production, and can therefore exploit another class, reverberates with the contemporary notion of predominance of white males in all spheres of society. The left claims that the most fundamental institutions of American society have been created to maintain the dominance of white males in all aspects of life, and hence there is pervasive systematic racism everywhere. This notion echoes with the Marxist claim that there was a class of expropriators and expropriated, and that due to primitive accumulation of capital, the former possessed means of production allowing them to exploit the latter across all industries of that time. Notably, unlike evidenceless claims for the existence of systematic racism, the primitive accumulation of capital has indeed resulted in the inception of two separate classes with unequal opportunities.

(ii) The second point is a natural extension of class segregation. If a child was born to a proletariat family, there was no way for this child to become bourgeois. This mechanism did not work in the other direction as well. That is, Marxism did not allow any possibility for social mobility, and the only way of emancipation was hidden within a revolution. Radical gender

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, nowadays it is hard to reject the ostensible failure of Marxist ideas. Hence, socialists can no longer use arguments directly related to classical Marxism. Instead, they have found a way to obfuscate these ideas and concoct them under a different seasoning to be served as the main dish for generation Z, which can also be seen through the shifting rhetoric of prominent apologists of socialism.

Unlike other countercultures that have emerged and evanesced without causing much collateral damage, contemporary radical left ideology is grounded in Marxist ideas, which create an incentive for the government to adopt and propagate underlying noxious values defying the very essence of the categorical imperative inherited by modern civilization from the groundwork of the metaphysics of morals. When a counterculture penetrates the government, it becomes a de facto public religion, and each person or company needs to show its fealty lest to be canceled as a maverick. It is not a coincidence that so-called offices of equity, diversity, and inclusion grew by leaps and bounds – they are the temples institutionalizing new religion, and their henchmen act as omniscient priests of the medieval societies.

While Marxist ideas may sound attractive on paper, both theory and practice have proven the infeasibility of corresponding socio-economic structures, which led to utter impoverishment of the population and stagnation of economies inspired by communistic ideals. Dressing these concepts into fancy attire of neo-liberalism does not change their corrupt nature and decimating power. Unless radical left ideology is de-institutionalized into the rank of a counterculture, its pestilent grip enhanced and catalyzed by the government is bound to lead to social and economic decay of the whole western civilization with significant negative externalities for the rest of the world.