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PREFACE

Global capitalism is the politico-economic structure that subjects everything for its interests. It creates unimaginable poverty, ecological crisis, the ongoing pandemic, wars without end, and other horrors that humans can inflict against each other. Within this capitalist configuration, an idea and a political movement emerged that seeks to destroy the foundation of this system. Communism is this idea and political movement. The foundation of capitalism that they wanted to dismantle is private bourgeois property. In general, the Bolshevik revolution did destroy that foundation, but this was not enough. It only resulted in the eventual transformation of the party as the collectivized bourgeoisie with its authoritarian state apparatus. It transformed this bourgeois-liberal capitalism into state-run capitalism. The revolutionary class that was supposed to be emancipated, remained as they were in capitalism, producer of the means of subsistence and surplus-value. The eventual dissolution of the Soviet Union did not mean that the idea of communism is already dead. It should have been the perfect time to reassess the theoretical foundations of communism and test the ideas of Marx and others in their practical-idealistic form. The production and reproduction of capitalist social relations create everyday consciousness to all capitalist subjects, even to passionate communist revolutionaries. This is how ideology works. But the continuing havoc of global capitalism continues. The Left goes on with their same old traditions. They do not see that precisely
their unceasing failure is one of the conditions for capitalism and its state apparatus to have the capacity to reinvent itself. In Pandemic 2: Chronicles of a Time Lost, Slovenian-born philosopher and global thinker Slavoj Zizek said that capitalism is incapable of solving the Covid-19 crisis. In his more than a thousand-page book paradoxically called Less Than Nothing, he said that ‘really existing’ socialism failed because it was ultimately a subspecies of capitalism.

Can we utilize this Zizekian idea of communism, an idea that generates criticism both to capitalism and 20th-century communism to reinvent communism for it to revitalize its struggle against global capitalism?

To answer this question, I employed Critical Theory through the ideas of communism of Zizek. I started with capitalism’s totality. It manifests itself in the world of commodities. Commodities are everywhere and almost in everything. Commodification not only involves things that man uses but humanity herself is commodified. Then I elaborated the notion of the proletariat because she is the “commodified man” personified. The identification of the proletariat almost exclusively with factory workers is the prevailing idea inside the Left movement. I tried to show that the proletariat is the overwhelming majority in every industry. Capitalism, I claim is both producing employment and unemployment. And the unemployed, not only are included as members of the proletarian class, but looking at it objectively, they may play a significant role in the political struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. Therefore, as I tried to describe in quite a detailed fashion the various industries of capitalism and the sub-groups of the unemployed, it becomes evident that even without mentioning it, the proletariat is the class that almost everyone belongs to, except, as might be expected, the bourgeoisie.
Then I mustered the audacity to question Marx and Engels’ Communist Manifesto. I also tried to imagine what will happen to the economic categories in Marx’s Capital in communism. My objective was to identify what is lacking in Marx that may explain the Left’s unending failure. I think I succeeded, although in a very superficial manner, in trying to locate what was missing in Marx’s theory. It was not enough to transform bourgeois property into public property, but this transformation must stop commodity production itself. Commodity production is this self-perpetuating character of capitalist production. Then it led to further elucidation of the metamorphosis of commodity production to the production of human needs. Another idea is the double negation of the communist revolution. Communism must not only negate the bourgeois class but the proletariat herself. Marx only emphasized the dissolution of the bourgeoisie but failed to relate this dissolution to the proletariat’s self-negation. Absolutely, the significant reduction of working hours is fundamental for communism. This reduction must result from the conscious expansion of the workers’ free time. Expanding free time is at the same time reducing time for production. Essentially, this is the process of the self-negation of the proletariat. I also tried to put forward an idea that directly links reform and revolution. They are directly linked with each other because both are communistic. A communist campaign for higher wages is directly involved with the communist expansion of political power. Communist reform becomes revolutionary. Concomitantly, the notion of revolution also changes. The communist revolution, instead of it being a sudden, external, and most often a violent event, becomes an internal transformative process and possibly less violent.

I concluded by transforming the concepts I think Marx missed into political possibilities. That is why I expounded on the immediate aims Marx and Engels enumerated in the Communist Manifesto and tried to claim the probability of the impossible in the communist struggle for political power and Man’s eventual freedom.
Marx's description of factory work creates no illusion about the status of freedom in capitalism. In Capital, he said that “factory work... confiscates every atom of freedom, both bodily and in intellectual activity.” And I think Marx made clear that the only way to freedom is ultimately to destroy capitalism. These words of his in Capital will cast no doubt, “the knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated.” And to signify who are those experiencing this unfreedom, Marx and Engels summons the subject of the revolution in their famous lines in the Communist Manifesto and urges them to fight, “the proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.”

Today is the time for philosophy because it is the age of declining freedom. But the prevailing capitalist structure is necessitating this unfreedom. And for philosophy to become what it is, communism should become philosophy.
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INTRODUCTION

Undoubtedly, the totality of the world politico-economic system is capitalism. This totality of capitalism dominates the whole human society. Capitalism imposes itself not only in the political and economic sphere, but also in the cultural, educational, and ideological dimensions of human life. These ever-expanding commodification of everything, these production, and reproduction of capitalist human relations, these processes of bourgeoisification and proletarianization of human society amidst the continuing backwardness and barbaric human conditions of the majority of the global population are some of the features of the global capitalist system.

Capitalism is global. The international character of production, circulation, and distribution of capital is already been a factual but ever-becoming process since the 16th century. Cotton was the best-selling commodity in Marx’s time and today it is the crudest of them all: crude oil. This capitalist globalization must be navigated not only from the

4 Ibid.
production of commodities but in its total process. From the extraction of raw materials, commodity production, transportation, distribution, and circulation. The conversion of commodities into money is only the time where Value, in Marx’s terms, became Value as such. So this means that the transformation of commodities into money is Capitalism\(^7\). And this activity in itself is essentially capitalist. Therefore, capitalism is not only a particular signification of first world countries such as the United States, Germany, France, Great Britain and other countries of Europe and some rich countries in Asia like Japan, China, and other similarly developed nations. It is not just the busy streets of New York, London, and Beijing. We must also include the shanties of urban Manila\(^8\) and the countryside of Ifugao\(^9\) and many other third-world countries to picture the global character of capitalism.

With this inescapable totality, capitalism penetrates Man’s Being and Essence. As everything around her is commodified, she becomes a commodity\(^10\). Capitalism tends to transform the overwhelming majority into a non-propertied class: a proletariat or a proletariat in the waiting and a ‘permanently’ unemployed proletariat. In a capitalist society, it is readily accepted that everybody must be productive. We are pressured to think about our professional careers as early as possible. I recall my eldest son’s graduation rites from his pre-elementary education. All of them were asked individually on-stage what they want to become when they grow up. My son answered that he wants to be a wrestler.

---


Everybody just joyously laughed at his answer. Of course, more than half of his classmates want to become doctors. He was, at that time, the only wrestler. This form of self-identification and self-branding is intrinsic in capitalism. It is like we are freely choosing what kind of slaves we want to be\(^1\). Therefore, this capitalist commodification of Man’s Being and Becoming is the source of his Unfreedom\(^2\).

The only antithesis to capitalism is communism. This is the only road to freedom precisely because capitalism is the modern form of slavery. But the communist revolution in Russia, although had a promising start, only refashioned commodification\(^3\). The commodification process became state-owned and the state reinvented itself to become the primal institution for state capitalism that necessitated dictatorship and authoritarianism. Therefore, communism in the 20\(^{th}\) century was not a negation to capitalism but generated another form of capitalism. Part of my task is to locate what 20th-century communism was able to negate, what the revolution retained in capitalism that it was supposed to abolish, and what it abolished that it was supposed to retain and develop.

In general, what happened in the Russian revolution and afterward are just symptoms of the Left as a whole. That is why we should be “arrogant” enough to question the leaders of the Left that they revere. The Left’s branding of itself as Marxist and Leninist and others is what I think is part of the problem. The conceptualization for the struggle for communism must not be constrained but freed. Although Communists must acknowledge the contribution of their leaders, it is befitting for communists to use the arms of criticism as Marx would say, to further the Communist cause for Freedom. We will now question some concepts that Marx himself developed and identify what he missed. This “forbidden”

\(^1\) Marx, *Capital: Vol.1*, 644, Adobe PDF eBook.
\(^2\) Ibid.
act of criticism is necessary. By unearthing obstacles, the process of solving this specific struggle for freedom will be attempted to be clarified.

From this identification of weaknesses, understanding, and reconceptualization of communism at a level at least on how it relates to human needs, general rights, and freedom, I will attempt to reconceptualize the notion of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the bourgeois state, and violence and non-violence.

From these brief analyses, we would go on to the concept of the communist revolution itself. We will attempt to understand the process of the revolution at the theoretical level. From this theoretical clarification, we can deduce its practical application more or less. Democracy in capitalism must be utilized, enhanced, and developed for the revolution. As the proletariat acquires power, democracy, formerly as a champion for the bourgeois right of property and the ever-expanding right to sell labor-power, will become the champion of public property and the de-commodification of everything. Therefore, the electoral struggle, the right to free speech, the right to assembly, the general strike, the formation of Communist Workers’ Councils, the publication of various newspapers and journals, the utilization of the internet and social media and various online platforms, philosophical education and skills development, etc. should be maximized to the fullest. Freedom under capitalism must reach its ‘being.’ To reach this ‘being-ness,’ it must be connected to its ‘becoming.’ Reforms and Revolution are directly linked with each other. Of course, contradictions against the bourgeois state and class must be explained straightforwardly because as Mao vividly said, “Revolution is not a dinner party”

---

To summarize, I will discuss freedom and un-freedom in capitalism. I will identify what are the core features of capitalism which necessitate the conditions of being un-free. Identification of these capitalist features will equip us to identify what was retained in communism. From this identification of features of capitalism in communism, we will locate the theoretical framework of these capitalist features in communism in some works of Marx. This criticism of Marx will enable us to theoretically criticize the Left as a whole. Then will go straight to the general strategy of acquiring power. To put it succinctly, I will prove that to heighten the struggle for freedom, a communist revolution is necessary.

TOTALITY OF CAPITALISM

Why do we say that capitalism is the totality of everything that exists? Capitalism, in its current form, is the global totality not just in its economic and political form, but the whole contours of the aspects of human life. But let us locate what specific form in the economic aspect of human life dominates the characteristics of all aspects of human daily survival. It is this form that makes everything in a literal sense, capitalistic.

COMMODIFICATION OF EVERYTHING

It is the concept of the commodity form that Karl Marx introduced in his seminal work, Capital. Now, we know what a commodity is. Or do we? What makes a commodity a commodity? What characteristics are important to a commodity that lead us to the conclusion that it is a commodity? With the same point, how can we say that a certain commodity has been de-commodified?

One obvious characteristic is that commodities are products of human labor. But there are products of human labor that are not commodities since they are not exchanged in the market. The market referred to here is the mechanism that regulates the value of the commodity. And the market needs something to put a price on the commodity, the practical expression of value. And this something is money. But money, to take it historically, has emerged even before capitalism. What is the difference between money, in its pre-capitalist notion and money in capitalism? Money in pre-capitalism sustains the "natural" unequal human class relations. It is because the only class that is legitimate to have lots of money are those with the nobility. In capitalism, class relations in themselves are dependent on money. This means that a member of the bourgeoisie, once bankrupt and out of money is no longer part of the bourgeois class. To be fair, although quite seldom, we can also imagine that a member of the proletarian class, in some form of miracle or innovation gained lots of money, and utilized it to acquire property and profit, has recruited himself into the bourgeois class. Therefore, the distinguishing feature of money in capitalism is not just the traditional medium of exchange but it is the commodity that the bourgeoisie needs to exact profit to retain itself as a bourgeois. This profit enables the capitalist to expand and develop production, accumulate more property, and in consequence, exact more profit. This profit, as it expands the property of the bourgeoisie, renders more people to be propertyless. Thus, as it enriches itself, it results in the pauperization of the many. To put it simply, the function of the commodity in capitalism is the quintessence of capitalism itself. But what then is the distinguishing feature that makes commodities as such? This infinite need for money, property, and profit requires at the same time an infinite production of commodities. This distinguishing feature of commodities is not a feature at all but the aim of capitalism: which is infinite production of commodities themselves. But these infinite production must lead to their transformation
into more money and more profit and then back to an expanded production of commodities. Therefore, the tendency of capitalism is to commodify everything.

To deepen our understanding of the necessity of capitalism’s need for infinite production and reproduction of commodities, we will discuss certain commodities to magnify this feature of infinity. To magnify is to make clear that this feature is inherent in capitalism itself.

Food for Thought

What is food? Food is a thing to eat. And why do we eat? Because we are hungry. And what causes this hunger? Because we need nutrients and vitamins to sustain the movement within our bodies. In essence, food is essential to our bodies and even to our being. Food is called nutritious because it contains a lot of nutrients that enable our organs to function properly. The relation between food and our bodily organs can be compared with oil and a vehicle. It needs food to function. But it needs refined oil to enable the vehicle to function properly. This means that the body needs nutritious food to function properly. Therefore, food has the same function as medicine. It preempts and cures diseases because it makes our bodily organs healthy. Therefore, food is medicine in itself.

Food consumption appears highly subjective. It always depends upon the capacity of a person to consume food. But then again, whatever one’s capacity, it must come to a

---

point that the person has reached the point of satiety. But this also means that food in itself provides to us the elements to make us sate.

Therefore the kind of food which needs the least intake, which has the most elements that make us satisfied and functional and it has a long-lasting satiable effect should be the best food for humans. And naturally, food that does not make you sick.

But in capitalism, food is a commodity just like everything. Capitalism does not care if the food it produces is highly nutritious or not, or healthy or not, as long as it produces infinite profit. Capitalism, for it to pursue its objective, will produce precisely the food that is the least nutritious, food that will make you hungry all the time, and you need to eat a fairly large amount of it to keep you relatively satisfied in the least amount of time. And since the food industry is dialectically connected to the medical industry, the food that capitalism generally produces is food that will make us sick.

Now let us locate what kinds of food that make us sick. For example, an ordinary Filipino meal is meat, with some vegetables and rice. Occasionally for some, for others it is a daily ritual, lunch and dinner are accompanied by soda. Breakfast of course is accompanied by the famous 3-in-1 coffee\(^\text{17}\). We should experiment at a theoretical level first so we can reify the logic of commodified food.

We must try to imagine eating these kinds of food separately and think about what kinds of food that we could not possibly eat without any other food combined with it but when combined with other food, it will certainly tempt you to eat more. Vegetables are the

unlikely addictive kind since you cannot imagine someone munching plates and plates of ampalaya\textsuperscript{18}. Meat like fried chicken, lechon kawali\textsuperscript{19}, sinigang na baboy\textsuperscript{20} and others signify some form of addiction but it is possible to eat them separately. Rice is the food that we could not imagine eating without anything combined with it. One cup of cooked white rice has 41.16 grams of carbohydrates\textsuperscript{21}. This means that rice is a commodity that requires a lot of it to feel full but keeps you hungry all the time. And eventually, as you get relatively older, it will make you sick.

Now let us go to sugar which is part of the coffee we drink (usually, even the cream or milk we add to our coffee has sugar in it), and the soda\textsuperscript{22} which is full of it. Can you imagine just drinking coffee without sweet cream and sugar? Yes, people drink just pure black coffee. Now, can you imagine just drinking sugar without coffee? Of course not. This means that sugar just like rice needs other food to make it appetizing to consume. So we conclude that sugar, carbohydrates, and other starchy substances in food are the elements that make food a successful commodity. It is addictive\textsuperscript{23}. You need to eat large amounts to be satisfied but you still stay hungry most of the time and it makes you sick.

But capitalism wants humans to be “addicts” at the earliest time possible. When do you think is the best time to be an addict? Right! Once you are born. Infant formula\textsuperscript{24} is addictive to infants because it has a wonder drug, that is, sugar. Breast milk, of course, is a human product designed for direct consumption. It has the lowest potential for profitability unless proven otherwise. Undoubtedly, even science under capitalism has acknowledged that breast milk is best. Infant formula then is “un-best.” Therefore, in capitalism, it is the best provider for the “un-best.”

Paradoxically, the usual diet that many doctors recommend is the low-fat diet\textsuperscript{25}. Fat became evil on its own. It is the usual suspect when a person had a heart attack after eating large amounts of prawns or roasted pig. But to locate the solution to health problems in food, we must locate it through the “problem” itself. In this category of food concerning health, the perceived problem: fat, is the solution\textsuperscript{26}. Instead of eating a low-fat diet, humans must eat a high-fat, low carb, and no sugar diet\textsuperscript{27}.

This will eventually change the nature of the saying in the Bible that Man cannot live on bread alone\textsuperscript{28} to man must not eat bread. Practically, this is a ketogenic diet\textsuperscript{29}. It mimics


\textsuperscript{29} Dr. Dinicolantonio and Dr. Mercola, \textit{Super Fuel}, 141-142, Apple book.
the diet of man from ten thousand years ago\textsuperscript{30}. This process of minimizing the commodification of food will not end commodification altogether but will provide sustainable strength to those who wish to end commodification.

But another thing that this diet can do is to lessen consumption. When we eat a high-fat diet, we are going to lessen our consumption of meat in the long run. Because the addictive content is gone, the need to eat meat all the time will lessen too. Therefore, the problem of inhumane treatment of animals like cows, pigs, and chickens will also be theoretically minimized. The animal rights activists point out that the solution to the problem of the mass slaughter of animals is by man abandoning his carnivorous diet. But as we said earlier, we find the solution to the problem itself. By eating mostly animals or animal fat, man will reduce eventually his consumption of meat.

But what is the significance of the commodification of food to humanity? Capitalism is bluntly saying to humans, if you want to eat to live, you must have money to pay for it. Those who do not have money, seek ways to have access to it. But those who cannot find ways must die. This is what capitalism is saying.

This system finds more value in food wastes than providing surplus food to people dying of hunger. But come to think of it, this system creates and recreates hunger, disasters, etc. to establish and expand the holy businesses of charity, besides the usual direct profit-making scheme. But for those who still can eat, one must eat the anti-capitalist

diet (ketogenic diet), and maybe this diet will manage to put more vitality into our brain\textsuperscript{31} to end this murderous system.

The Cure

As discussed above, the usual high-carb and low-fat diet will eventually make a lot of people sick or will immensely deteriorate the quality of everyday human life. Health care under capitalism is full of commodities and the care in itself is commodified. So what is the logic behind the success of pharmaceutical companies?\textsuperscript{32} What is its immanent requirement towards humanity that the industry imposes upon? The industry needs people to be permanently sick. Instead of trying to find a cure for the disease, it only tries to minimize the symptoms. And in minimizing these symptoms, creates other diseases which pave the way to multiple business opportunities for these giant pharmaceutical companies, hospitals, government, insurance companies, medical suppliers, and other related industries.

For example, the leading cause of mortality in the world\textsuperscript{33} and in the Philippines\textsuperscript{34} is Ischemic Heart disease. What is the common signifier of heart disease? Symptomatically, these are chest pains, etc. And what would any person do to check if you have a heart problem? Automatically, that concerned person will check your blood pressure. And what is the common medicine that lowers someone's blood pressure?

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{31} Berry, MD, \textit{Lies My Doctor Told Me}, 135-136, Apple Books.
\end{itemize}
Usually, Angiotensin Receptor Blockers or ARBs are used to lower blood pressure. And how do these kinds of medicine lower blood pressure? By temporarily relaxing the blood vessels to make blood flow more freely\textsuperscript{35}.

From this brief description, it is given that the cause of high blood pressure is due to the “unrelaxed state” of the blood vessels which hinders the freedom of blood to flow. So the culprit is this “unrelaxed state” of the blood vessels. This type of medicine “relaxes” them temporarily to make way for blood to flow. But this medicine is just a temporary fix. To appear in providing a cure to the disease, the patient needs to take the medicine almost permanently since it needs to treat the symptom temporarily but in a “permanent” manner. To put it simply, medicines are there to briefly provide relief to the symptoms but do not function to cure the disease.

This “unrelaxed state” of the blood vessels or what we may call inflammation does not just happen. It is a culmination of the daily intake of addictive food like rice, sugar, bread and other starchy substances. But capitalism “normalizes” this general human phenomenon where humans are supposed to get sick when they get old or have “regular” sickness that goes along with the seasons and the weather. The commodified healthcare system necessitates humans to be sick. To make humans permanently sick, a commodified food industry is necessary.

This commodification of healthcare in itself disallows a portion of humanity to receive this kind of healthcare. Those who have money can afford excellent health care

while those who could not afford it, have to accept the fact that they will receive the shittiest health care that there is. Usually, the institution that provides the shittiest health care comes from the government. At least here in the Philippines, this description is a fact³⁶.

Universal Health Care

Is state-funded health care de-commodified? Is the solution to health care is to be universally accessible, free, and excellent in service? Of course, from a private-controlled health care system and to be transformed as a state-owned system is a great improvement³⁷. It will make health care appear accessible for all. It will be part of the state’s function. But medicines, medical supplies, and the service in itself are commodified. We will be able to calculate all of these aspects into specific amounts of money. Then, this means that even if it is controlled by the state, it has limits on the state’s budget for healthcare. This means that universal healthcare is in itself limited because intrinsic to its operation is still the operation of commodities and capitalism in general.

For example, the government will approximate a certain amount of support for cancer patients. From this approximation plus contingency, the state will appropriate a specific amount. But there are more cancer patients than expected. Therefore, it is either some cancer patients will not receive any support or will not receive it immediately, or the totality of cancer patients will receive less support. The commodification of healthcare means the deprivation of this service to people.

It is therefore helpful if we identify the historical link between diseases and the human diet. Mortality as we all know is inherent to humans. But humans should not accept that they are destined to die dysfunctional because of these diseases. The process of dying is inherent to living. Dying should be just the exhaustion of our new cells to keep up with our human activity: new cells are no longer enough to make our organs functional. But being sick after decades of working is not an exciting way to go. Either you die of a heart attack or stroke, or being senile and being undead the rest of your life should not be accepted as “natural.”

Home Sweet Home

Homes are a place to rest. Sometimes it is also a place for work, gatherings, and recreation. It is also a place of struggle: the struggle between family members, between families, neighbors, and in between communities, and sometimes, it becomes a place of class struggles. Places of rest for humans in capitalism are commodified. And this commodification restricts the chances of many to get a home of their own. Proletarian families are either paying monthly rent or are living at the homes of their parents. Others are fortunate enough to have their "own homes." This incapacity for proletarian families to own a home is in stark contrast to the ability of bourgeois families to acquire property. They have houses at famous tourist spots, they have “farmhouses, townhouses, and

---


condo-units, etc. This ostensibly unlimited expansion of properties of the bourgeoisie necessitates the abolition of property from the many⁴⁰. If bourgeois families have lots of homes, many proletarian families are homeless.

Proletarian neighborhoods must become a place of class struggle. Not just struggles between the proletarians themselves but primarily as places of struggles against capitalism. So the cramped nature of proletarian homes that invokes hell to its inhabitants is transformed into a wide expanse of proletarian solidarity that appears temporarily, from time to time, a workers’ paradise⁴¹.

Capitalism creates inequality within human society but at the same time, it creates a semblance of equality within the proletariat. This appearance of equality manifests itself at proletarian communities. The notion of the slum⁴² where proletarian families are cramped together takes an appearance of an equal monstrosity of life under capitalism. A little bit better are those homes in affordable housing units where one house looks almost the same as the other. This aspect of egalitarianism under capitalism, which is demonstrated by the uniformity of proletarian homes, shatters almost any illusion of grandeur and offers only the timid acceptance of the "objective situation" by the day-to-

day struggle for survival. Or it may invoke the non-acceptance of this capitalist objectivity and the forceful acceptance of the objective situation by embracing the daily struggle for the dissolution of capitalism.

Desires and Necessities

Other commodities such as restaurant food, electricity, water service, clothing, shoes, accessories, etc. are, of course, appear limitless but accessibility is quite limited. A big part of the proletarian class can afford to buy a limited amount of these basic commodities or at least appear that they can afford to purchase them\(^\text{43}\). Others could not even buy the necessities such as food. That is why some of the poor in the Philippines scavenge left-over food and recook them and some even sell them to their fellow poor, where consumers know precisely that they are eating left-over food\(^\text{44}\). I even claim that some of these poor tend to look at themselves still fortunate because they know that someone external to them is doing much worse.

The “employed” member of the proletarian class can afford some of these basic commodities. But sometimes this desire to regularly purchase these commodities is not invoked by urgent need but is manufactured by the capitalist system itself. Advertisements function not only as a direct promotion for the commodity but they advertise human values and desires that you can get out of the commodity. For example, commercials about a fast-food restaurant and a big bottle of soda promote family bonding that creates an atmosphere of fun and joy within the family. Other commercials promise an idea of

\(^{43}\) Slavoj Zizek, “From Surplus Value to Surplus Enjoyment,” Ippolit Belinski, March 6, 2017, accessed May 14, 2021, 56:00 to 58:14, [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qB0m64u3N7M&t=1939s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qB0m64u3N7M&t=1939s).

\(^{44}\) Howard Johnson, “Would You Eat Recycled Landfill Meat?” *BBC News*, February 26, 2018, video, [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c7gDBVmgIRA](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c7gDBVmgIRA).
freedom that you can find in a car or a cell phone. Traditions such as Christmas, birthdays, and other occasions create a mechanized requirement to buy commodities. But many consumers of these products do know the fakery and acknowledge them as such but still, they do buy. It is like a self-propelling compulsion to consume. This self-acting compulsion to buy and consume is due to the intrinsic character of the capitalist subject itself. The habit of buying without really needing it is ingrained within the subject. The consumer of commodities is in itself a commodity.

Review of the Concept of Commodification

Commodification requires an endless production, distribution and sales of commodities to make continuous profit. Therefore, the essential performative elements which make a commodity a commodity are infinite production, distribution, and its sale. These elements must result into an ever-expanding profit. Public ownership in a strict sense transforms the ownership of capital from private to the state but maintains the infinite activities of capitalism. Initially when you look at this communist takeover of capital, it is like Marx’s category of centralization but an enormous centralization of capitals45.

THE CAPITALIST SUBJECT

The Proletariat

The capitalist subject is a commodity. The proletariat is the obvious capitalist subject that is commodified. It is this class that needs to sell herself as a commodity to be able to survive at the mercy of this system. Therefore, for the proletariat to live she must

---
become a commodity herself. But capitalism, even at its heyday of industrialization\(^{46}\), is only capable of employing a definite portion of the proletariat. Today, mechanization, computerization, labor-flexibility, and robotics\(^{47}\) and other similar labor-saving schemes are being constantly applied to factories and various places of work in all fields. This presupposes that capitalism creates employment and unemployment at the same time. Since the proletariat’s existence is precarious\(^{48}\), not only that she must commodify herself but reinvent and reclassify her commodification. Constant reinvention and renewal of skills are needed to survive labor competition.

Capitalism produces unemployment\(^{49}\). Objectively, the system necessitates itself to produce unemployed wives and husbands, scavengers, beggars, criminals, sex workers, and many others who are excluded. But this exclusion is part of the capitalist identity. It is simultaneously exclusion and inclusion within capitalism. Therefore, these people who are excluded are part of the proletariat. Some people who are part of the employed proletariat blame this excluded section of its subjective incapability. Sex workers are not born to be sex workers. The capitalist market in itself creates conditions for this work to be produced. The specific situation of the subject and the conditions which led the subject to be a sex worker does not only particularizes the situation but also universalizes the conditions of capitalism. In the Philippines, the often-told story that they came from the provinces and they were promised to have ‘proper’ jobs with decent salaries is the general

---


background. This is the peculiarity and at the same time the universality of the conditions. But more and more future sex workers know precisely that they are entering this work without qualms because they acknowledge that it is the only choice that they have. The capitalist chain imposes its will upon the proletariat. The proletariat willingly wears her chain\(^50\).

**Returning to the Notion of the Proletariat**

How does capital, this self-propelling mechanism to self-produce, see the proletariat? Who is the proletariat in the eyes of capital? Generally, for capital, everybody has the vulnerability to become a proletariat. If he or she is a bourgeoisie or a capitalist, then right now she is not a proletariat. To "define" what is a proletariat we must identify what it is not. We must identify what is her difference from the bourgeoisie. What then is the bourgeoisie? The bourgeoisie has properties that produce profit and can maintain and expand these properties to produce more profit. This is what the proletariat is lacking: this bourgeois property. It is this lack\(^51\) that identifies her as a proletariat.

Who fits this description of the proletariat? Practically everybody. These so-called "peasants," managers, factory employees, doctors, soldiers, government employees, government officials, professors, engineers, health workers, etc. Included in the proletariat are also those who are considered excluded: the unemployed. The parameters and intensity of exploitation to the employed proletariat are dependent on the numbers of the unemployed proletariat\(^52\).

---

\(^{50}\) An allusion to the communist manifesto’s nothing to lose but their chains


\(^{52}\) Marx, *Capital*, 797-798, Adobe PDF eBook.
But once any member of the proletariat acquires property that accumulates profit, then she is no longer a proletariat but a member of the bourgeoisie. Let us now test this idea by directly quoting several passages in Slavoj Zizek’s book in the Relevance of the Communist Manifesto. Zizek in turn, based this idea on “Gerald A. Cohen’s four features of the classic Marxist notion of the working-class: (1) it constitutes the majority in society; (2) it produces the wealth of society; (3) it consists of the exploited members of society; (4) its members are the needy people in society. When these four features are combined, they generate two further features: (5) the working class has nothing to lose from revolution; (6) the working class can and will engage in a revolutionary transformation of society.”

The proletariat are the immense majority based on the above definition. We should further elaborate the second feature. What is wealth in capitalism? Is it not money that was generated from profit? And where does profit comes from? Is it not from the sale of commodities? And who made this possible? Is it not the proletariat? But what about the unemployed? What is their contribution to the production of wealth? The employed worker was able to cope with work with the help of the unemployed. The intensity of productivity that is imposed on the employed is based upon the weight of the unemployed who can replace her. To put it simply, capitalist wealth is being produced and reproduced by the whole society. But is it true that once a capitalist engages himself with the production of commodities, is he no longer a capitalist? This is romanticizing labor itself. The answer is no. The bourgeois can do anything he wants. Even pretend he is a proletariat and engage himself with production. But still, he remains a bourgeois. The third feature gives

---
importance to exploitation. But again, all the employed members of the proletariat are directly exploited. But what about the unemployed? It has the same logic when we explained productivity. The unemployed proletariat provides the level of intensity of exploitation to the employed proletariat. Unemployment and the fierce competition among workers are already in itself exploitation. Exploitation because of their exclusion, of this imposition to the consciousness of the worker that she does not have what it takes to have a job, and the questioning of her subjective worth and so on. Is it not being excluded in itself is exploitation? Because retroactively, the employed proletariat managed to get her work because of those excluded from it. The fourth feature which describes the proletariat are supposed to be needy is very patronizing. I imagine a capitalist reprimanding his worker who recently acquired a home and telling her that she was not supposed to have a home because she is supposed to be needy. This is a great insult but at the same time partly true. An ever-increasing part of the proletariat are what we call needy. If we compare the employed proletariat in the Philippines to the Western European standard of living maybe we can even call almost all the Filipino employed proletariat needy. But the excluded unemployed and even some parts of the employed are really needy. What I mean is that they live their life meal by meal, and they struggle to survive daily. These people are part of the proletariat. The fifth feature which says the proletariat have nothing to lose has the same bourgeois prejudice to insult. But it has truth and untruth in it at the same time. What is supposed to be lost anyway? Marx does not mean it literally, that the proletariat do not have anything to lose. Many already have lost their lives for this "communist" cause. What I think Marx was saying is that the proletariat have no interest in the further development of capitalism. She remains a proletariat under any development of capitalism. That is why she will lose nothing except the society's imposition on her that she must remain a part of the working-class. The fact that when the proletariat is in the process of losing that "working-class" feature, she is on her way to freedom. The last
feature that talks about the proletariat's ability to change society and her implicit teleological function in society is a mistake. The ability to change society has to be learned and applied. When this false optimism is taken as true that the proletariat will someday take power, then the person who accepts this has the tendency not to do anything. Or he will do things like he did before but expects rather stupidly that something will change. These kinds of continuing activities of the Left within capitalism that do not change anything significant are tantamount to the Left's inclusion for the sustenance of the capitalist system itself.

I think that these so-called Marxist features of the proletariat are bourgeois impositions. Again, it is like hearing the bourgeois chastising the proletariat, "this is what you should be because if you wish to remain a proletariat you should be like this." The only feature I did agree to was the first, i.e., the proletariat is the majority. This is the proletariat's objective strength. It will always remain the majority under capitalism. But in certain ways, these 'imposed features' to the proletariat reflects within the proletariat its snobbish prejudices against each other, especially the employed proletariat against the unemployed and excluded. Many members of the former do not want to do anything with the latter. They call themselves middle class, intelligentsia, petty-bourgeois, professionals, working-class, middle peasants, skilled workers, and others to picture themselves more of a bourgeois than a proletariat. I chose the term proletariat rather than the working-class because the term working-class represents a performative type of depiction, that is, as an active worker under capitalism. The term itself creates an illusion of the impossibility of transcending capitalism. The term proletariat I claim is defined by
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its lack. If the bourgeoisie in the Marxist classic definition is the owner of the means of production, then the proletariat is the non-owner. To make the definition precise, I think the bourgeoisie is the owner of properties that produce and expand profit. From this definition is where we can base the proletariat. It is being a non-owner of these same properties. But these two classes within capitalism are not just in opposition with each other. They are complementing each other. The only way that the proletariat becomes an opposition is when she strives to end the system that she is inscribed into and transform it into communism. The future definition of the proletariat as the class that struggles for communism is a definition that will retroactively become true once it is already in the process of its becoming.

Constitutive Parts of the Proletariat and its Capitalist Function

The Factory

Management

It has been a tradition of Marxists to consider the workers directly engaged in production as the only members of the proletarian class inside the factory. Everybody else is bourgeois or an instrument of the bourgeois class. We will discuss the contours of the bourgeois class later on. But let us delve into these instruments. Instruments for what, for bourgeois interests? If interests for the bourgeois are weighed upon, then, what groups of people are instruments for bourgeois supremacy? These are precisely the workers

---

themselves who are directly engaged in production, who in this process itself produce and reproduce the social relations that maintain bourgeois supremacy\(^{59}\).

By discussing what we mean by class, in its economic sense, we could more or less estimate who are the members of the proletariat. We can identify that the operations manager, the general manager, and his subordinates down to supervisors and other staff, if not owning any means of property that creates and accumulates profit, are not part of the bourgeois class\(^{60}\). They are members of the proletariat. But why does the traditional Left consider these people as part of the bourgeois class? Especially those positions that give them the power to fire workers? I think trade-union organizing is part of the reason\(^{61}\). Trade union work gather the particular issues of the workers and bring out demands to immediately solve these issues at hand. By doing this process, the management will generally justify the policies, resist changes against them and punish the workers who participated in the trade union movement. But what is wrong with this picture? It is a picture, that we, the Left, have participated in a million times but we never learned anything. It is worse than Einstein's notion of stupidity. The Left knows that it will inevitably fail but still they do it\(^{62}\).

"But what else we can do? At least we did try to fight for our rights." This kind of acceptance of the limited option that the proletariat can do is part of the problem. The particularity of the issues of the workers in one factory is the basis of their universality. The inhumane working conditions, low salaries, small benefits, unjustified penalties, the pro-capitalist position of the labor department and the whole state, etc. are the usual issues that labor organizers are confronted with. But if the organizing act is to directly

---


\(^{60}\) Ibid., 248.


\(^{62}\) Ibid., 166-167.
confront the management and ask for specific demands, what generally happens? What forces and institutions that the workers of that specific factory are forced to contend with? It is the bourgeoisie who see every little demand, every request for amelioration, and every pittance of request as an act against his class rule. It is the bourgeoisie who is genuinely class conscious. For him, every economic struggle is absolutely a political struggle. That is why he calls all his comrades. He calls the police, the mayor, the department of labor, the church, and the unemployed to stop whatever the workers are doing.

Again, let us ask the question, "what else can we do?" Let us go back to the concept of the particularity of the workers' issues as the basis of their universality. The proletariat has only one advantage from the start: they are many. Expanding and politicizing the issue at hand is the immediate task of the proletarian revolutionary. By expanding the workers involved and by initiating proposals to the level of state apparatus she is engaged with. And at the same time the proletarian revolutionary must transform that specific level of the state by installing herself to the state through the process of democracy. At that point, the failure of the proletarian movement becomes not inevitable. Therefore, the general discussion to the proletariat that capitalism is the structure that maintains the status quo and the presentation of communism as the only solution is a task of every communist.

The particularization of the struggle inside the factory will create more enemies rather than friends. It will be a struggle on the one hand, between the bourgeoisie, his managers, supervisors and staff, and pro-management workers and on the other hand, against the pro-union workers and her allies. Its particularization creates isolation to the workers. The process of political division against the bourgeois class did not even begin. Proletarian class unity will never be accomplished if this method of particularization
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remains. That is why the proletariat must universalize her struggle. It should be a political struggle right from the beginning. From here, marks the beginning of the real class struggle of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. This principled division, at the same time, creates the possibility of the ever-increasing unity of the class. This is in itself is the start of achieving proletarian class victory.

Another reason for this identification of the factory management with the interests of the bourgeois class is the romanticizing of manual labor. This romanticizing creates a gap against those who use intellectual labor. Therefore, this creates an unnecessary contradiction. I think there is no such thing as purely manual and purely intellectual labor. In manual work, human workers still need to use their brains and think. The same with intellectual workers. They need to reflect their intellectual work in its manual form, for example doing paperwork, printing, classifying, typing, etc. Therefore, the division between them is unnecessary. What is necessary is their unity to fight the real enemy.

Another result of this romanticizing of labor is this fake solidarity with them. When you idealize labor and consequently the worker herself, you create a fantasy that it is natural for the worker to embrace the idea of Marxism or communism since this idea or ideology is for her interests. But when the working-class fails to embrace the communist idea, the communist himself blames the subjective consciousness of the working-class as so engrossed with capitalism that it could not escape. In other words, it is the working-class to blame. From time to time, the communist organization, whenever it feels frustrated with the working-class will redirect their organizing to “other classes” such as the students and ‘peasants’, teachers, and others. This will only result into more frustration. The difference now is that the natural ‘bourgeois outlook’ within these people could not be expunged. The communist does not reflect on his intrinsic failure. If he already reflected

---

64Ibid., 227, Adobe PDF eBook.
but it did not work, then she needs to reflect again. Maybe the problem is the parameters of reflection. He could not question the basis of his communism. He could not even question Marx himself. I claim the only way to pursue communism is to question Marx in the principle of communism.

Going back to what class do the managers of a factory belong to, it is clear as long as they do not own any property that creates and accumulates profit, they are members of the proletariat. Therefore, what part of the proletariat do they belong to? It is precisely their identification with capitalism. If they are called managers, then they are managers, but members of the proletariat.

Security Guards

If managers are considered members of the proletariat, why are there doubts about the class these security guards belong to? They will follow even ruthlessly the commands of their superiors, just like any other employee. It is their job to do so. We already attempted to make clear that all employees, especially the workers, function the way they do for the class interests of the bourgeoisie. So there is nothing special about security guards. Nothing special in the sense that they do what they are supposed to do for the benefit of capitalism.

But why do union organizers exclude them? Aside from their disqualification of being members of the union, I think another reason is that they are not in any way related to the production of commodities. They are just there standing and checking security. This is still related to the Left's romantic notion of labor. The sentimentalizing of the working-class creates an atmosphere of class discrimination within the proletarian class
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itself. The ‘unproductivity’ of their work must not be seen only in its negative light but the unproductivity itself is an avenue for the development of proletarian consciousness. Instead of branding them as our enemies, they can be our rich source of information and organic intellectuals\textsuperscript{66}.

Workers

Undoubtedly the workers are part of the proletariat. But there is nothing special about them that differentiates them from the other parts of the proletarian class. They, just like them do not own any property that creates and accumulates profit\textsuperscript{67}. Just like their comrades in the factory, the purpose of their activity inside the factory is essentially for the interests of the bourgeoisie and capitalism in general.

But even within these workers who directly participate in production, there is an intrinsic differentiation and hence discrimination against each other. Workers are divided into regular, contractual, casual, and even on-call employees\textsuperscript{68}. Paradoxically, this differentiation gets even worse by the formation of unions. Only regular employees can join a union. Even though some unions do fight for contractual employees to get them regularized, the unions by the act of demanding regularization, de facto accept the policy of contractual employment and only regular employees should be members of the union. But nothing is surprising about this because the union in itself is an organization that demands a better selling price for the worker. But this demand for betterment in isolation to the struggle for communism is bound to fail. It will fail because capitalism’s fuel for its


\textsuperscript{67} Marx, \textit{Capital}, 248, Adobe PDF eBook.

engine is the further intensification of labor exploitation, massive lay-offs especially with this ongoing pandemic crisis, inflation, and many others.

Without romanticizing labor, all employees are members of the proletariat. No specific group is special. All can become excellent communists and revolutionaries or not. Even the bourgeois class, in the strictest sense of the term, besides being our most abhorred enemy, would have the potential to transform their political outlook and eventually their economic status to that of the proletariat.\(^{69}\)

**Service Employees**

**Sales workers**

When we talk about sales, it is the endpoint where the capitalist was able to transform his commodities into money and surplus-value into profit. Sales is the commodity's becoming: money. Many factories, especially from developing countries have pre-orders. This means that global brands order their products through these factories. Most of these factories are located in China, and many parts of Asia. Today, in an ever-increasing fashion, it is not about producing your product and try to sell it at stores. Now global brands order their products from China and buy them at the cheapest price possible and distribute them to stores. What is funny in a way is the concept of the alienated\(^ {70} \) capitalist. The capitalist who organized production and gathered all the required workers and eventually produced the products ordered by the main capitalist is acting not a genuine

capitalist but just an employee of the global capitalist. Once the orders are finished and the capitalist was paid for his services, he no longer owns the commodities his workers produced. But anyway, let us go back to the topic. The sales clerk tries to sell the commodities in the store. He might get a commission after selling a commodity and at the same time receive a daily wage, others only receive a commission after-sales, like real-estate, and others only receive their daily wage. Their function to capitalism is crucial because they initiate a demand. It is by continuous selling is where capitalism is invoked to produce. And consequently, in the stoppage of sales, it retroactively stops production. Capitalism persists because it continues to sell. To put a stop to capitalism, communism must drastically minimize its selling capability by the de-commodification of the economy. The sales worker, wherever she is must be transformed from a hypnotizing selling machine of capitalism into an enthusiastic advocate of communist politics.

Call center

The call center industry provides more than a million jobs in the Philippines and claims more indirect jobs from it71. But why is it such stressful work? More than half regularly resign from the job72. First, the graveyard shift discourages you. Then, the never-ending calls that you receive especially if you are a service representative. That is why they term these continuous calls as toxic. Then, the multi-tasking. A call center agent often handles multiple issues and tasks. Then, the language barrier. Two Americans sometimes do not understand each other, even when they are talking face to face. But an American fast talker talking to a Filipino young adult creates a lot of miscommunication. But eventually,

72 Ibid.
they get better and even fast-talking Americans try to speak not as fast as they used to. But after getting a little bit better these Filipino agents resign. It is a job that exhausts you and bore you at the same time.

These employees are members of the proletariat. The training that they received, especially on how to communicate and articulate thoughts, is important for the communist process. Another advantage of having active communists within this group is that you are pretty sure that communist organizing becomes a 24-hour activity. But the point of organizing the proletariat is not to maintain this situation that they are in or just improve it but to destroy the basis of being what they are. A free call center agent is by being free from being a call center agent (that goes the same with other jobs).

Health Industry

The Doctor

The Doctor’s white uniform creates an appearance of purity of intentions. But essentially, the medical industry treats its doctors as his deeply esteemed servants. The medical industry, from the expertise of the doctor and the nurses that aid him or her, the medicines the doctor prescribes, the medical equipment and supplies, the clinics, the hospitals are all there to serve capitalism73. The patients are the willing customers who devour the prescribed medicines and prolong their life with the best health care possible if they can afford to or many just die out of sheer want without any money to spare. The
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medical industry is the business to alleviate symptoms of diseases and many times from this symptom alleviation, it creates diseases of its own. For example, a diabetic, who wolfs down a daily dose of various drugs and by being diabetic itself damages his kidneys. Then the patient is forced to do dialysis. Then, he will experience cardiac arrest. Then the patient just die. Of course, there are good stories too where patients are temporarily cured of cancer and all of that. But essentially, the industry's aim is for profit. Even government-run hospitals or healthcare facilities are profit-driven not in a direct manner but in an indirect way. The government needs medical supplies, medicines, etc. These supplies are privately owned by companies. They need to have these supplies regularly. Both government authorities and the capitalists awarded these contracts profit from these transactions. The handling of the Covid-19 pandemic demonstrates this profitability as clear as day. The solution to the pandemic became vaccine-dependent. Therefore those companies who have developed the vaccine against Covid-19 will immensely gain profit. Another way to profit is conscious over-supply. Many of the government's efforts to vaccinate its people is inefficient and slow and this slowness is due to the government's incapability. This incompetence will waste a lot of vaccines because they will get expired.

But let us go back again with our esteemed doctor. He or she might be a bourgeois-looking doctor with fancy clothes, sporting luxurious cars, and a mansion-like home. But


these properties cannot on their own create and accumulate profit. If the doctor does not own any self-valorizing property, then she has the same class as our factory worker: a proletariat.

Nurses and other health workers

Nurses are the vital help the patients and the doctors need. They need to follow the doctors' instructions and need to heed the patients' cries for help. Government-run hospitals especially those like in the Philippines where there are a limited number of nurses and other staff to absorb the needs of the patients, the nurses tend to be irritable. The combination of low pay, long working hours, and the never-ending arrival of sick patients, especially now during this pandemic are taking their toll. Well, at least now we cannot see their irritability because of the PPEs and face masks that they are wearing. At the same time, we lost the human touch, kindness, and reassurance coming from their faces. Many doctors and nurses died because of this pandemic. Capitalism will willingly sacrifice their lives for the sake of capitalism. The recognition that they are heroes and front liners of this pandemic has its patronizing effect. Doctors and nurses and other health workers are not willing martyrs for this pandemic. The system itself produced this pandemic and the consistent protection of governments to the capitalist system played a major factor in the government's pitiful response to Covid-19 that took many of their comrades' lives. The only way to minimize the effects of this pandemic is to begin the process of communism. That is why it is not only in their long-term interests that

communism is warranted but precisely because it provides immediate relief. The nurses and other health workers are a part of the proletarian class.

**Education**

**Educators**

Why does capitalism need education? Education is needed by capitalism for its subjects to function properly in all its fields. To be a factory worker today, capitalism requires you to read and write and have a sense of logic and reason. Of course, to be a lawyer, a doctor, and some other profession, capitalism imposes additional standards besides being able to read and write and think reasonably. The other reason is that education in itself is a commodity. Therefore, it creates levels of education that people could acquire and necessarily necessitates non-education. Some people can afford and have time and the passion and conditions that allow them to be continuously educated. But some conditions often shatter the subjective passion to get educated. Education is a necessity for capitalism and education is also capitalism within capitalism. But there are
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antagonisms within capitalist education that undermines the commodified character of
education. Education becomes knowledge. And that knowledge is against the
commodification of education itself. To put it simply, capitalist education creates the
elements for the creation of communist knowledge. This knowledge is to destroy
capitalism itself.

Let us go now to those who provide education. The owners of schools, universities,
and other educational institutions are generally part of the bourgeoisie. The state-owned
colleges and universities although are providing a certain degree of free education,
nonetheless participate in the commodification of it. The authority that leads these
educational institutions are functioning as capitalists. The “profit” from various transactions
is in the form of salaries, benefits, various perks, travels, besides the bribes that the official
gets from these transactions. Transactions such as the approval of textbooks, awarding
of contracts to a specific construction company, designing a curriculum for the interests of
a specific industry, imposing a research work that benefits a specific company, awarding
of honorary degrees to a certain politician, etc. But some honest officials do not do these
kinds of business. But still, commodification penetrates the system.

From the pre-elementary and elementary and secondary school teachers and their
principals up to the college professors, deans, and heads of the universities, they are
members of the proletariat as long as they do not meet the same bourgeois standard that
we are for the longest time saying. The Left's literal narrow interpretation of the proletarian
class deprives her of these educated forces. Even if they organize these educators
separately but treat them as bourgeois intellectuals, it will be radically different if you treat

84 Costas Douzinas and Slavoj Zizek, introduction to The Idea of Communism, ed. Costas Douzinas and
Slavoj Zizek (London and New York: Verso, 2010), viii to x.
85 Sergio Cárdenas, “Corruption in Education: A Review of the Literature”, researchgate.net, September
them the same with the factory workers and combine them, as much as possible, with all of the groups comprising the proletariat\textsuperscript{86}.

But how can we compare a professor to a factory worker\textsuperscript{87}, where the factory worker does her job for at least eight hours and repeats herself again and again. While a professor tries to educate her students and reinvents her form of teaching and its content to better educate her students. This may happen to certain professors but this does not happen a lot. Teaching the same thing, again and again, makes the work boring. Repetition is what is happening. That is why every job in capitalism tends to be boring, repetitive, and exhausting\textsuperscript{88}. You would like to separate yourself from your job the moment your office hours are over (but there are also exemptions). But yes, teachers, who are committed to educating their students are admirable. But what students need is knowledge. The knowledge that generates the will to be free.

Students

Why do students study? Well I do not know\textsuperscript{89}. My eldest son cried when he went to school for the first time. My youngest did not. But a conscious choice of what to study is only made in college or I think today at the latter years in high school and you are asked about the career path you will be taking. You are asked what do you want to be. Same question when my eldest son graduated from his pre-elementary education. But this time he would answer it "seriously." The students function as the customers of this educational

\textsuperscript{87} Marx, \textit{Capital}, 644, Adobe PDF eBook.
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institution. Whatever form of potential employment they will choose or form of slavery to be exact, it will surely be under the contours of capitalism. Students, as a majority of them are the future proletariat, take their class under their guardians or parents except those who already have economic independence from them. As we are only talking about senior high school students and college students, many do not even reach this stage of education. Education under capitalism is a form of competition where there are only a few openings. So this means, many are called to study elementary education but when you reach high school some of your friends are already missing. More could not enter the higher level of education\textsuperscript{90}. But even within those who have finished a degree, competition is utilized to limit the numbers. For example, lawyers. Many study law and do graduate but many do not pass the bar exams\textsuperscript{91}. Only a certain percentage passes every bar exam. The educational system allows and disallows you at the same time to finish the degree and make a career out of it. Going back again to the issue of class, students take the class of their guardians or parents. Since most of the parents are members of the proletariat, then they are considered proletariat as well. It is illogical for a student to have a different class from her parents since she is dependent upon them. It is absurd to say that the proletarian parents will have a petite bourgeois child once she enters senior high school or college. It will be funnier to instruct the parents to take down bourgeois supremacy\textsuperscript{92} and they should start with their own petite bourgeois\textsuperscript{93} child. Anyway, let us leave this
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absurdity and conclude that many students are indeed members of the proletariat and a few are part of the bourgeoisie.

**Government**

**Nationally Elected Officials**

The democratic form of government relatively allows its citizens to elect their state officials\(^{94}\) from the national level down to the city/municipality and village level. In other democratic forms, they vote for a certain political party at all levels. In the Philippines, most of the elected national, city, and municipal officials come from the elites or they are being supported by the elites\(^{95}\). The current president, Rodrigo Duterte, although he was a long-time mayor of Davao, a big city in the south of the Philippines broke the usual standard elitist tradition\(^{96}\). In his presidential campaign, he was able to capture some portions of the Left and the Right. But most importantly, he was able to rekindle the imagination of the poor to have hope again. I know because I was there. I did campaign for Duterte in our district and the poor were mesmerized by his campaign. I gave it time to fulfill his promises but that time never came. I was very disappointed. But this falling out certainly gave me valuable lessons not to fall for illusions within the capitalist system anymore but at the same time remaining critical to the Left's standard position. To be elected in a national position, huge electoral machinery and lots of money and logistics are required. That is why historically, every candidate for president in the Philippines is a representative

---


of a specific group of the bourgeois class. But it is not enough to classify the classes of nationally elected officials based on their economic status alone. We can appraise them more accurately by analyzing their political track record. We do not appraise these track records because we are trying to find out if they are working for bourgeois or proletarian interests. As of now, all politicians work for the interests of the bourgeoisie. The use of analyzing their track record is to find out what specific bourgeois group they are serving. Is it the financial sector? Are they the Chinese magnates? And many others. This information can be used to point out to the people what class does this specific political party serves and what policies did they implement to serve the interests of these capitalists. The absence of a communist opposition creates a form-based opposition. What do I mean by this? I mean the opposition only concentrates its attack against the leadership of the president, that is Duterte. It does not attack the conditions that led to this form of leadership, i.e., the conditions of capitalism. Another reason that all of the current nationally elected officials are bourgeois is that the current state is designed to carry out business and gives utmost importance to an elected national official's approval and signature. Every proposed program and project that involves billions of pesos requires approval from them. This makes them all prone not only to corruption but enables them to acquire and expand their properties for profit. Thus, they are bourgeois.

Locally Elected Officials

Most candidates for locally elected government positions in the Philippines rely heavily on money, machinery and intimidation to get themselves elected. Understandably, the

---

voting population gets sick and tired of platforms because they are rarely fulfilled; and even if these so-called platforms are fulfilled, their execution does not meet the people's expectations. It is like promising better healthcare by promising to develop the government hospital. But as it turns out, there was development indeed but that development aimed to transform parts of the hospital into semi-private wards to cater to paying patients. I think most of these elected officials are bourgeois in the economic sense and all of them are bourgeois in the political trajectory. We already know the bourgeois economic requirement but in politics, like the nationally elected officials, the non-existence of a communist opposition denies any communist proletarian political positioning. For example, nobody in the Senate or Congress argues that the pandemic is the result of human intrusion into nature, and that intrusion was necessary because of capitalism. And the inability of governments to put a stop to it is again because of capitalism. The communist proposal must be a nationally synchronized 14-day lockdown, with massive testing and mass vaccination and the preparation of all the requirements needed to make this achievable. For example the preparation and construction of new hospitals and make-shift hospitals, medical equipment, personnel, food distribution, etc. But no politician is advocating this. Therefore, the absence of communist politics suggests that all existing politics is necessarily bourgeois, at least, in the Philippine context.

Government employees

All government employees as long as they do not own property that creates profit and does not use their position in government to create profit out of it are members of the
proletariat. In the Philippines, the government employs one million seven hundred sixty-two thousand and three hundred one employees (1,762,301). Strategically, its numbers are already impressive. That is why to form a new proletarian movement, the government employees are important targets for recruitment. But what is the purpose of organizing these employees to the proletarian communist movement? Just like the proletariat in general the purpose of organizing is to transform the profit-driven commodified capitalist society into a communist ‘human need-driven society. This means that the government employees must transform existing government services as exemplary and efficient services for the needs of the proletariat. But to do that the proletariat must be organized as much as possible and must triumphantly elect her representatives to the state. In this way, organizing has a direct effect on politics. Without this direct relation, political work and organizing could not be sustained.

The Police

Can we even consider the police as part of the proletariat? The Philippine Left traditionally brand the institution as reactionary and this branding suggests a negative impression against all of its members. The state, in its current form, is bourgeois in character, and therefore a big part of the police’s function is to protect the state’s interests. The state’s imposed function to the police is to fight crime. Most crimes are economic.

---

Robberies, carjacking, kidnapping, possession, and distribution of illegal drugs, and many others. An organized criminal syndicate\textsuperscript{102} hugely profits from these illegal transactions. And a big part of their expenses is to bribe a whole structure of the police or incorporate them into the criminal operation itself. That is why we are not surprised that the proliferation of crime especially the illegal drug trade becomes expansive when the police themselves and politicians are involved with it. Since capitalism creates unemployment and poverty, it necessitates the existence of crime. And since the police’s function is to fight crime\textsuperscript{103}, even though the form of fighting is highly reactive or symptomatic, it is also within the police’s interest to maintain crime at its “regular” level to justify the police’s existence. But going back to the question, can we consider the police as part of the proletariat, we must first ask the question, who must consider them as part of the proletariat? Who are we to consider them? The traditional Communist, who plays as a big Other in the Lacanian sense, retroactively produces antagonisms within the proletariat itself. The members of the police are members of the proletariat as long as they do not have the property that creates profit and because they are government employees as well, do not use their position to produce a profit. This is not a moralistic requirement but a dogma that tries to objectify. But this objectivity nonetheless creates a moralistic injunction whenever this class status is violated. For example, imagine a member of the party was promoted to a high-ranking position in the police department, as soon as she got promoted, she immediately accepted bribes from criminal syndicates. The party then must investigate and must initiate the due process. If it was proven, I think the party must strip her of her party membership since she is no longer a member of the proletarian class.


Her class and consequently her acts are "non-proletarian." But of course, we can insert some good Christian values within the proletarian movement wherein rectification of this said act must be an option to reclaim membership.

Soldiers

The armed forces in the Philippines’ function are to quell armed rebellions against the state. And the other function is to protect it from its external enemy. But that external enemy is determined by the state and it does not mean being external to the state automatically makes you an enemy. For example, the Chinese government’s military occupation on contested lands. The Chinese state is not considered by the current Philippine state as enemies but friends and even masters in a certain level. And they might not even consider them external since their influence and power penetrates the country's internal affairs. That is why no external conflict is being waged by the armed forces except the International terrorist threat. The state only appears to be in "conflict" with the Chinese if political pressure is mounting. But what the armed forces are concentrating on are the internal enemies. In the Philippines, it is the Communist Party of the Philippines and its armed wing, the New People’s Army and the Abu Sayyaf, a Muslim secessionist group. It is within this quelling of the rebellions that its existence relies upon. And just like the police, these “war” activities impels the need to supply and re-supply. The supply of new handguns, rifles, and continuous supply of bullets and other

---


military gadgetry is a gigantic business. It is quite literal when they say that war is business\textsuperscript{108}. The soldiers just like the police are just one of the instruments of the state to further its interests. And its interests as of now coincides with the class interests of the bourgeoisie because the state leaders are themselves bourgeois. But that doesn't mean that the soldiers are bourgeois. They are mostly members of the proletariat.

**Construction Industry**

Construction work\textsuperscript{109} relies on the need to construct or reconstruct something. That is why most construction workers here in the Philippines do not have regular jobs. And if they have a job, many sleep at the construction site to save expenses going home daily, or the construction company he works at requires it. Usually, there is a contract between the client and the boss of the construction company. This contract should be agreed upon before construction begins. The usual content of the contract is the details of the construction project or what will they construct, how much will be the cost of the project, when will the construction begin and projected end, how much will be the payment and how will the owner pay the construction firm (in installments or a weekly or monthly basis) and materials to use, and other stuff about securing government regulation, etc. The boss of the construction company can lessen her expenses if the time duration is lessened. That is why it is in her interest that workers will sleep at the construction site and can start working on time. Many bosses lessen their expenses in safety, workers’ wages and


benefits, and others. Many big-time companies in the Philippines include construction in their itinerary of businesses because it provides enormous profits for the company especially if it is a government contract. Government construction contracts are in some sense quite regular because government officials need to construct as many projects as they can to acquire kickbacks in return\textsuperscript{110}. But elected government officials are not permanent that is why construction firms that were working before are usually not the ones chosen by the next. Engineers, architects, and other professionals involved in the construction business can be categorized as members of the proletariat unless they are bourgeois. Construction workers are generally members of the proletariat unless a capitalist kind of fun is construction work. But what to construct? Are these construction contracts correspond to human needs? Almost and always construction serves the interests of capitalism. For example, road repair. It has a "permanent" budget. Building of new roads to make traffic faster to those economic centers wherever they are. New housing projects, repair, and construction of government buildings, etc. These road repairs or even construction of new roads are rigged with corruption that the quality of the newly constructed road will inevitably need repairs again and eventually a new construction of it will take place. That is not just because of corruption but the volume of vehicles pass through that road. No significant study on how to make the road last to avoid repairs and reconstruction\textsuperscript{111}. And that is why government road repair and reconstruction are


continuous. In the Philippines, a centralized drainage system is non-existent\(^\text{112}\). No construction projects of this kind. Minimal construction of plastic roads to make roads more durable and partially solving at the same time the disposal of plastics\(^\text{113}\). If roads are made durable, there will be fewer opportunities for corruption. Those who have insider information on government projects will have the advantage of what business opportunity it will create. In the Philippines, road-widening projects will entail housing projects. It is because many people have houses on these roads to be widened. Once you have that information in advance you can do land speculation which is nearest to the construction project. Then you can buy that land cheap and sell it to the government at a high rate. But it can also ruin the speculator if that government project was canceled. But anyway our point here is that the construction industry relies heavily on the government’s planned projects\(^\text{114}\) where it will inevitably result in privately funded construction projects. It is not in any way a planned industry that serves the needs of people. It just follows the money.

**Mining Industry**

Mining is an important business for capitalism\(^\text{115}\). Many commodities have metal content in them such as cellphones, vehicles, laptops, and many others. That is why to


keep this industry going, continuous production and sale of these commodities are required. But mining in itself has a certain limit. The minerals inside a mountain or anywhere are not limitless. And to mine them, you have to destroy that part of the earth you mine. The miners must destroy the mountain itself to extract those minerals. That is why sustainable mining is just continuous destruction. As long as there are mountains to destroy and minerals to extract, then mining can be sustained. Sustained destruction of the earth is what mining is\(^{116}\). But mining is just a consequence of what capitalism necessitates. Look at Congo\(^{117}\) where many of the metals we utilize come from natural resources. It is a haven of profit for global capitalists and their partner Congolese warlords but it is worse than hell for its proletarian parents and children. Mining workers except those who profit from this industry are members of the proletariat. But the immediate stoppage of this industry should also be the aim of the mining workers themselves.

**Logging Industry**

Logging whether legal or illegal destroys forests and biodiversity and results in landslides and human deaths. But consumption of new furniture, wood for construction, paper for various paper products, and many more commodities are dependent on logging\(^{118}\). That is why where logging is legally permitted, whether selected logging or


clearing of all standing trees in a given area, soil erosion will happen and landslides should be expected. But consequences such as landslides, thousands die\textsuperscript{119} or even more when you add up all the previous landslides, and thousands of homeless do not matter to capitalism. Capitalism just needs us to consume, produce and consume again for its own sake. This is what matters to him. Those who do the logging are proletariat. Those who just profit from it are bourgeois. But the proletariat who is doing the cutting and other acts that ruin our environment must see to it that she will stop being what she is in the future.

Agriculture and the Food industry

In the Philippines, it is said it is mostly an agricultural country. Yes, this might be true but being agricultural does not mean it is un-capitalist. Agriculture and the food industry produce commodities. The commodification in itself is capitalism\textsuperscript{120}. Commodification and the increasing productivity of land to yield more commodities is what agricultural production is all about. More than fifty years ago, almost the same range of agricultural land can yield three times more today\textsuperscript{121}.

Those who do not own any land and work in the fields are members of the proletariat. Those who own or rent a small plot of land but do not accumulate profit from it are also members of the proletariat. The rest who own vast amounts of land and accumulate profit from it are landowners or landlords and therefore members of the bourgeoisie. Those companies who supply agricultural inputs are bourgeois. Milling companies who profit and

\begin{footnotesize}
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those who loan money to the farmers before the harvesting season and who at the same time impose cheap prices on their products and accumulate profit from them are also bourgeois.

Livestock production is the system where livestock is raised for meat, eggs, etc. with less land and cost with maximum profit. All of those who use this kind of intensive production and profit from it is bourgeois. Those who work for them are the proletariat. Those who own livestock but do not accumulate profit from it are also members of the proletariat.

Same with the fishing industry where the seas are dominated by the bourgeois-owned large fishing vessels and the proletarian fishermen who just own small to medium boats. Or they just do massive aquaculture to acquire horrendous profit.

In the first part where we talked about the commodification of food, this commodification itself created food that does not satisfy, is addictive, and is making us sick. And because of this intensive production and commodification, intrusion into animal habitat became necessary and infection from animal viruses becomes inevitable. This ongoing pandemic is a result of this massive intrusion of humans into animals. This intrusion is caused by the need to make a living. And to make a living, Man must commodify herself and her surroundings.

---

122 Ibid., 130-132.
Energy

What is energy? The strength and vitality required for sustained physical or mental activity\(^{127}\). This definition pertains to Man's need for energy to sustain her activity. For me, this means that man has inherent energy within her. To sustain this internal energy, she needs external things such as food, water, electricity, etc., and other energy sources that can sustain this internal energy. These external things have energy contained within them. At first, man's consumption of things that sustains his energy is directly related to her needs. As capitalism developed, human needs are just a pretext to consume these sources of energy\(^{128}\). The reason that these sources of energy are consumed is just to energize capitalism itself. The burning of fossil fuels is still the main source of energy. When we say that energy is directly linked to man's needs to sustain energy within her, but that source of energy that is being consumed creates abnormal heat that not only forces man to consume more energy but that energy that she has to consume if not stopped will destroy the man's need for energy itself. Thus capitalism is the process of man's negation. To prevent this negation, communism must do its utmost to present and apply an immediate program for the environment. An environment that has its "motherly" and "bitchy"\(^{129}\) qualities. Undoubtedly, this industry created trillions of dollars\(^{130}\) of wealth.


for its capitalists and maybe has created a relatively “good life” for its direct workers. But the consequence of the exploration and burning of these fossil fuels do not in any way amount to any justification. Just like the tobacco industry where they not only hidden the fact that smoking causes cancer and many other diseases but they even had the gall to make it appear that it makes you healthy. They are just like the oil magnates who undermine the science behind global warming. They make it appear that we do not have any choice or it is already “too late.” I hope communism will be on time, transcending its Filipino trait.

Banks

What are the functions of a bank? Its main functions are to accept money from those who want to deposit and lend money to those who are deemed qualified and capable to pay back the money with interests. Let us say a working man regularly deposits part of his salary to the bank. He expects that his money will eventually slightly grow with interest. The borrower may be a working man like him or a big multi-million dollar company. But once the borrower could not pay, the bank will take what it can to bring back the money

---

the borrower borrowed with interest. Thousands of transactions occur in the bank every
day and it generally has to do with deposits and loans and making substantial profit from
thousands of fees and interests\(^\text{137}\). From these transactions, the bank acquired properties
and invested her money in some profitable enterprises\(^\text{138}\). Thus the bank in itself becomes
not just an instrument of capitalism but a capitalist in itself. It is not only involved in these
transactions as an intermediary but an active agent of production, an investor, an institute
that acquires a wholesale of properties, and a lot more. That is why banks encourage
clients not only to become a depositor but become a borrower as well. She motivates you
to take a car loan, a housing loan, and whatever loan that you might get interested in so
that you will be tempted to acquire something that the bank thinks that you need. This is
the consumption for consumption’s sake. Of course, there are things that the client might
need but that is not the point. The bosses compel the bank workers to urge clients to take
a loan by imposing quotas and some are forced to do anything just to reach these sales
quotas\(^\text{139}\). But what is more infuriating here is that with these individual deposits of
ordinary citizens, multi-national companies can borrow money from these banks and are
allowed to pay with lower interests\(^\text{140}\). What is more tragic is that when the bank that
decided to put its money on a certain business went bankrupt, all the money goes bankrupt
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The bank will eventually close and just pay a certain amount to the depositor. But before that bank executives and owners will make sure that they will have themselves a hefty separation pay.

Other financial institutions function just like banks. Insurance companies just take your money and invest it elsewhere. What is the logic of insurance? It encourages you to save up money for education, for expenses in case of car accidents, for expenses in case you will get sick and be hospitalized, for funeral expenses when you die, and many more types of insurances. They profit by taking your money and investing it elsewhere. But when you do get sick or die or any other instances that the insurance promised that they will help you with, it will be very hard for you or your loved ones to acquire your insurance money, especially when you died earlier than expected or your hospital bills are quite expensive.

Buying stocks appears as if capitalism is opening its doors for people who have some money to spare but wants some profit from that money more than they get from the bank. But buying some stocks for example in Dunkin Donuts should take a minimum of more than a million dollars. But buying some stocks in Jollibee is relatively easier. But

---

that does not mean that you will profit from these minimal investments. Investment below
eight thousand pesos in Philippine money will only result in losses because of the fees
that that investment will incur. But even investing money around that amount or a little bit
more, it will take years and years to benefit from that invested money, your eight thousand
peso investment may become triple only after ten years. That is why veteran stockbrokers
are suggesting that money that you are willing to invest is money that you will not need.¹⁴⁷

What does this mean then? Companies are using the stock market scheme to use the
money of stockbrokers for their benefit. Those who have big investments gain. Those who
have minimal investments lose.

Banks and other financial institutions are direct representatives of what capitalism is
all about: money. That is why in a certain sense, capitalism identifies itself with a bank.
The general situation of the financial market is generally the general situation of capitalism.
If the stock market falls that creates a rippling effect on the financial market as a whole,
then it creates a crisis just like what happened in the 2007-2008 financial crisis. But what
is happening now in this pandemic is a deep economic crisis that slowed down the
movement of capital almost in every sector.¹⁴⁸ The only institution that the capitalists can
turn to in times of crisis is the state.¹⁴⁹ The state already gave its support to them at the
beginning of the pandemic.¹⁵⁰

Essentially, banks and other financial institutions create profit for their own sake. And
sometimes it even undermines the value of money to create profit out of this

¹⁴⁷“5,000 Capital sa Stock Market??(8K Rule) Buhay Stock Trader,” MoneyGrowersPH, April 28, 2020,
¹⁴⁹“Government Support and the Covid 19 Pandemic,” OECD Policy Responses to Corona Virus (Covid 19),
¹⁵⁰“Policy Responses to Covid 19,” International Monetary Fund, last modified May 7, 2021, accessed
undervaluing\textsuperscript{151}. But if we relate them to human needs they appear superfluous. Fundamentally, banks and money, by themselves are worth nothing.

**Entertainment Industry**

Man must indeed not only live on bread alone\textsuperscript{152}. He too must be entertained. To be entertained one must pay for it. Watching movies in theatres is a commodity that is proven that we can live without. Even before the pandemic, this business is already in its dying stage\textsuperscript{153}. Nevertheless, watching movies in theatres may resurrect\textsuperscript{154}. This commodity was made unavailable due to the pandemic. Allowing it will exponentially increase infections. Therefore, going to theatres in the pandemic context is not a human need. But even before the pandemic, economically it was quite expensive going to theatres, especially when your whole family will be watching with you. One movie ticket will cost about Php250\textsuperscript{155}. A large popcorn will cost about Php100. And a large soda is Php60\textsuperscript{156}. That will cost Php410 for each person. Imagine you are a family of four. That will cost Php1,640. And if you are going to eat out after eating those starchy and sugary food (because definitely, those kinds of food will make you hungry), this will cost you around Php800, if you are going to eat at

\textsuperscript{151} Singh, “The 2007-2008 Financial Crisis in Review.”
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a Jollibee fast food restaurant and you are to choose their 8 piece Family meal A\textsuperscript{157}. The sum will be Php2,440. That is quite a lot of money, especially for the proletariat. If you compare this to having a monthly subscription of Netflix (Premium is Php549/month) or HBO Go (Php149/month), and with the internet connection that goes along with it(Php1,999/month); and you may even add up the monthly payment for the new 50-inch Smart TV (Php1,999/monthly for 12 months) to get the 'movie-theater feel' that you crave for and the microwaved popcorins (Php300 for two pieces) you have with those two big 1.5 liters of Coke (Php140 for two bottles) and the same Jollibee Super-meal delivery (Php800), the sum will be Php5,787 for Netflix or Php5,387 for HBO Go (you just do your math when you want to change anything). This choice will be more expensive but practical. Nevertheless, you still have to pay.

In 2013, the number of feature films released around the world was 7,610 with India accounting for one-fifth of the total production\textsuperscript{158}. This is a lot of films! This film saturation dramatizes the overproduction of almost every commodity around the world. Films are produced because their makers are aspiring that it can get a share in the market and hoping that it will create profit for the producers of the film. To put it simply, films just like any commodity are being produced to make a profit. Does it have something to do about human needs? Of course, films do cater many human interests and it may appear that it was made to serve some human concern. But whatever human significance films may seem to evoke, its form and as well as its content only serve its purpose: to make a profit. Unless by making a profit this film's objective and the acts resulting from that objective want to do away with a profit in general.

Most of the top ten companies in the entertainment business are in the movies, internet providers, resorts, and casinos. What is funny and at the same time surprising is McDonald’s is included in the list. Maybe their food is really for entertainment purposes only\textsuperscript{159}.

This capitalist entertainment is supposed to unwind man from the pressures of capitalism. This unwinding is to prepare man to face his work under the capitalist constellation. But another way of looking at it is that man works (whatever he does for capitalism) to be entertained. But whatever is true, both the work and the unwinding creates tremendous profit for capitalism.

In general, all those who work for the entertainment industry and do not own any property that creates and accumulates profit are members of the proletariat. Even though movie stars appear glamorous and all of that, they are outshined by the dictates of bourgeois capital.

\textbf{Transportation}

The transportation industry can be described as companies that ships commodities from one place to another, delivers products right at the customer’s doorstep, railway companies, fast-moving jets, cab services, and the airline industry, mainly based on the top ten companies of transportation in the world \textsuperscript{160}. In the pandemic, one of those hardest hit companies within the transportation sector is the airlines industry\textsuperscript{161} and public


\textsuperscript{160} “World Top Transportation Companies List by Market Cap as on January 1\textsuperscript{st}, 2020,” \textit{Value}, accessed June 6, 2021, \url{https://www.value.today/world-top-companies/transportation}.

transportation\textsuperscript{162}. But in general, their recommendations for recovery are to adapt to the conditions generated by the pandemic. I think, for the transportation industry to go on the path of recovery, is not just about how the industry can adjust to the pandemic but on how the industry can offer its help to solve the pandemic. They should demand its immediate solution and be a part of it. There will be little encouragement for people to go to different places if the pandemic is still ongoing. But come to think of it why would they do that?

Even governments who should take it upon themselves to solve this pandemic do not even think outside the capitalist narrative. That is why even industries that are directly affected by this crisis, and the only way for these industries to recover is precisely by solving the pandemic, do not even appear that they have the desire to solve it more straightforwardly. They are just patiently forwarding analysis and recommendations to the state on how they can adapt to the pandemic.

The automobile industry, while in itself is a separate category\textsuperscript{163}, is the industry that produces cars, motorcycles, and other means of transport. These commodities appear to provide humanity the capability to be self-mobile. They can bring you to from one place to another as long as you have the skill to drive it and the capability to afford it. Similar to most commodities, these cars are being produced periodically with new features and technologies. The target market is always enticed to buy a new one so that they will discard their old one by selling it or trading it for the new one. And just like any commodity, these are being produced for profit’s sake.
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Arms Industry

This industry is directly not essential to man's need, i.e., war. The Top ten companies on Aerospace and Defense\textsuperscript{164} are generally companies that profit from war and the continuous threat of war in general. They are the same companies that became rich because of wars being waged\textsuperscript{165}. And they even manage to install war lobbyists\textsuperscript{166}. But this war-like consciousness is not only projected as an external enemy but is internalized\textsuperscript{167} as well. War is not only a being waged outside a country but it is internalized as a conflict between citizens, especially in the United States\textsuperscript{168}. But guns and rifles just like fighting jets and bombs produce a consciousness that directly cast a definitive character to humanity. We need guns and rifles to protect ourselves from the bad people in our community. Just like a country that needs to be capable of waging war to defeat evil governments around the world. There are no other commodities that directly profit
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from the destruction of other human beings than these commodities that promote war and violence.

**Sex industry**

If the war industry directly points out the profit-only objective of capitalism, the sex industry, especially those who are directly selling sex, clearly provides no illusion on the commodification of man in capitalism. No illusion because the sex worker subjects her own body to be commodified. The product is precisely her own body or it involves the sexual participation of her body. That is why undoubtedly, the sex industry commodifies the body of the proletariat itself.

To have a straightforward and no-nonsense definition of sex work and the sex industry, I will directly quote an author who has written about these same topics.

Sex work involves the exchange of sexual services, performances, or products for material compensation. It includes activities of direct physical contact between buyers and sellers (prostitution, lap dancing) as well as indirect sexual stimulation (pornography, telephone sex, live sex shows, erotic webcam performances). The sex industry refers to the workers, managers, owners, agencies, clubs, trade associations, and marketing involved in sexual commerce, both legal and illegal varieties.\(^{169}\)

---

In the Philippines, there are calls to legalize prostitution and recognize sex work as work\textsuperscript{170}. Both the Left and the Catholic Church oppose the calls for such legalization. The Left instead calls for its ‘decriminalization\textsuperscript{171}.’

Can we consider the sex worker as a proletariat? The mere doubtful appearance of this question creates an increasingly discriminatory treatment to the sex worker. Sex workers are part of the proletariat. The sex industry is a necessary business within capitalism and it produces and reproduces the same capitalist class relations: the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. To acknowledge the sex industry as necessary in capitalism necessitates recognition. And to be recognized, there is the need to be legalized for their immediate protection and demands. But for the sex worker to be free, sex in itself should be de-commodified.

\textbf{Illegal Drugs}

Just like any commodity, illegal drugs are produced, imported, sold wholesale, and retailed\textsuperscript{172}. It is precisely the political economy of illegal drugs that needs to be studied to put up an effective fight against it. If world governments want to substantially minimize the proliferation of illegal drugs, it has to locate the production source. It shows that Afghanistan and Myanmar dominate world heroin production and cocaine production is concentrated in Bolivia, Columbia, and Peru\textsuperscript{173}. It means that thousands and thousands
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of hectares in these countries are where opium and coca leaves are planted and harvested\textsuperscript{174}. And this means that the world governments are complicit in its production and only acts mostly at the retail stage of its distribution. The "politics" in the fight against drugs is the barrier to stopping it. And from this study of the political economy of illegal drugs I conclude that it is precisely the political economy in itself is the reason why illegal drugs persist.

But if we talk about illegal drugs, we could never ignore what is happening in the Philippines under President Rodrigo Duterte. Even foreigners are enticed to investigate what is going on in the drug war and would like to see it firsthand\textsuperscript{175}. The main focus of the government’s drug war is to produce as many bodies as possible and exact profit out of it\textsuperscript{176}.

But can we consider the illegal drug industry as an essential part of capitalism? I think yes because its rationality is in its existence\textsuperscript{177} within the capitalist constellation. But are these drug pushers part of the proletarian class? If they do not have properties that create and accumulate profit then they are. But do active sellers and buyers of illegal drugs can be effective organizers of the proletariat into a class, i.e., to unite the proletariat as a class by seizing political power from the bourgeoisie? I think not. Even though crime\textsuperscript{178} and illegal drugs are necessary entities within capitalism, the communist movement must not tolerate it within its ranks, especially these addictive and mind-altering drug substances. And practically, if she consciously recruits drug pushers within its ranks, the communist

\textsuperscript{174} Ibid.
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movement will be branded by the bourgeois state as a criminal organization selling drugs. This will abruptly end the movement itself. And besides, being “high\textsuperscript{179}” or “down\textsuperscript{180}” with drugs does not allow you to be physically and mentally capable to do practical-political and organizational work combined with theoretical and philosophical work that is required from a communist.

**Religion**

Maybe the reader will ask the reason for religion's inclusion in this list of capitalist industries and the constitutive proletariat within them. Religion appears as an organization or institution that generally advocates reverence to supernatural beings. It is also an existing organization under capitalism. With these general characteristics of religion, it becomes a business enterprise that sells deliverance and salvation. The Holy See\textsuperscript{181} which is the governing body of Vatican City is the one in charge of where the money the Catholics of the world goes. This economic institution despite being "holy" clearly manifests that the Catholic organization is indeed a capitalist entity. The same thing with Islam\textsuperscript{182}, where it may appear it imposes ethical standards on doing business, it is capitalist business all the same. Iglesia ni Cristo, an organized religion that originated from

---


the Philippines, is another religion that uses its membership to impose its influence on politics\textsuperscript{183} and generate enormous wealth from its members\textsuperscript{184} and from its undeniable political trade\textsuperscript{185}. But as we pointed out that religions are like salvation trading commercial centers. Its bourgeoisie is those who profit from the work of those who do the act of actual "salvation work." They are those who live comfortably at their expense and profit from it. The priests, nuns, pastors, and all of those who work directly for the church but do not profit from it are members of the proletariat. Those who profit from this "holy" business are the bourgeoisie.

**Small Businesses**

Small and medium enterprises represent 90\% of businesses and 50\% of employment worldwide\textsuperscript{186}. The categories of being micro, small, and medium depend upon the state-imposed minimum and the maximum number of employees and business revenues. It is the state who imposes the number of employees and revenue that allows these enterprises to be acknowledged as such\textsuperscript{187}. What is the relevance of these categories of enterprises when we talk about communism and the proletariat? Their relevance is the class constitution of these enterprises. There is no question that the workers of these enterprises are proletarians. But what about the owners? Are they bourgeois? Is their
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ownership enough to create and accumulate property that multiplies profit? Is the owner of a shop that sells motorcycle parts in the Philippines\textsuperscript{188} can be considered a bourgeois? Maybe some of them consider themselves bourgeois when comparing themselves to their workers but it does not matter. The omnipresent totality of capitalism imposes what you are in the capitalist market. If your current socio-economic situation fits that of a bourgeoisie then you are one but if not, then you are a proletariat. An owner of a small shop or business where most of their profit is transformed into consumption and at the same time revolving money needed to continue their business are mostly members of the proletariat. With this general description, they are the most vulnerable business owners when facing an economic crisis. Due to the pandemic, they had to reduce working hours for their employees or decrease wage payments and even terminated some of them to survive\textsuperscript{189}. Because most of them do not have enough savings, only a few of them could afford to operate for a month\textsuperscript{190}. This situation of small and medium business enterprises even before the pandemic shows that capitalism only serves the interests of the least number of people.\textsuperscript{191} Even within the realm of business, the majority of owners of which are not even part of the bourgeoisie.


\textsuperscript{190} Ibid., 27-29.

Water Industry

Water as natural as it is, is naturally commodified. Natural because water covers 71% of the earth’s surface. Naturally commodified because capitalism does seem to commodify everything. Our monthly water bill proves this point. Although capitalism modernized the way we can access water, meaning directly through faucets and bottled drinking water, and the World Health Organization even published a more than a 500-page guideline for the quality of drinking water193, it is still a fact that that 1.2 million die because of unsafe water each year, 666 million do not have access to an improved water source, and 2.1 billion do not have access to safe drinking water194. I think this is the way it is because those who do not have access to safe drinking water are the poorest, it is regarded unprofitable for companies to invest. Unquestionably water is a human need but capitalism does not care about that. As long as you can afford to have safe drinking water you can have one. If not then you run the risk of dying because you needed to live.

Like all natural resources, water is finite, especially freshwater. That is why corporations are treating water as oil of the 21st century and are increasingly acquiring water sources and their distribution on an exponential scale. In the global water services market, European corporations dominate. Another front of water privatization is the bottled water industry where Nestle dominates. They are securing around the world access to springs and groundwater supplies and immediately bottling them up and selling them at

extortionate prices\textsuperscript{196}. Another front is the bulk export of water from countries rich in water to regions that do not have enough water. Multinational corporations are gaining control of the sources of water to make sure that they will control the world’s thirst\textsuperscript{197}. In the Philippines, the company of Senator Villar increasingly monopolizes the water services distribution industry\textsuperscript{198} and appears being questioned by another Senator\textsuperscript{199}. This seemingly easily accessed commodity to some will be another costly commodity soon. But what happened to new technologies that render water potable\textsuperscript{200}? And what about that “old” technology that makes water from the earth’s sea and oceans to become fit for human consumption\textsuperscript{201}? I guess most of them are waiting for government or corporate support. But the real problem is capitalism. It commodifies everything. A technology that wants water to be free and accessible to all is impossible under capitalism. A technology that makes water accessible to some is possible as long as they pay for it.

**Electricity**

If water is commodified, obviously access to electricity is. And because of this commodification, despite this hi-tech age of the 21\textsuperscript{st} century, 940 million people still do not
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have access to electricity\textsuperscript{202}. Imagine that almost a billion people still live without electricity! No wonder that the world governments could not solve the pandemic. It is almost one hundred years since Lenin called for Russian electrification. He claimed in this speech that they cannot achieve communism without electrification\textsuperscript{203}. But just like access to drinking water, the commodification of access to electricity is the key characteristic why it necessitates no electricity to almost one billion people. And inherent to this necessity is the generation of billions and billions of dollars of profit for the industry of power generation\textsuperscript{204}. That is why opulence and want are inherent in capitalism.

There are various kinds of “sustainable technology\textsuperscript{205}” that can generate power and can be applied as an alternative to burning fossil fuels. But the problem with alternative technologies is that they should also be an alternative in providing profit for those who want to invest in sustainable technology. The alternative creates in itself its contradiction since it is also based on its self-commodification.

\textbf{Internet}

The transformation of communication, access to information and education, online entertainment, and various uses of the internet as a basic human need just like water and electricity. This is in itself an impressive development for human self-emancipation.

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
Emancipation in some sense because the fact that we need some entertainment to get by or our fascination to learn some new things and communicate and be online "friends" with people we do not know are transcending our everyday materiality of just surviving. By dreaming or thinking of a different life creates the possibility of that life to be created.

But at the same time, it created the exponential quantitative expansion of commodification. One can buy everything online and can be delivered to your doorstep. But as always the fact that this service is commodified necessitates lack to those who could not afford it. The capitalist system deprives not only a population of a country but groups of countries that are still outside the internet's range. Exempted is the country where the authority does not allow its citizens to access it\(^\text{206}\).

Needless to say, this commodification of the net will create enormous profit for those who are doing their business via the internet\(^\text{207}\) and to those who provide internet service\(^\text{208}\). This is at the same time the reason why there is no internet service in Eritrea\(^\text{209}\). The inability of the internet service to become a commodity in the likes of Eritrea persists. This means that almost nobody there can afford to access it or those who could pay are not enough to make it profitable so that investors can put up a company that will provide internet service. This deprivation of service is only natural to capitalism.


Non-Governmental Organizations

Now let us talk about non-governmental organizations. Why are they included? And why not? Just like any institution that exists today, every one of them is tied up with capitalism. It has to contend and struggle with life within the capitalist structure. But what is the notion of a non-governmental organization or an NGO? Traditionally, it is characterized as an organization not run by the government and at the same time not fueled to action by profit\textsuperscript{210}. But this characterization of an NGO does not mean that none of them are run by the government and controlled by big corporations. In reality, there are so many categories of NGOs that several of these categories are precisely NGOs being controlled by the government and corporations\textsuperscript{211}. That is why ranking within the NGO world itself creates its capitalist hierarchy. It measures the success of an NGO directly by its income generative capacity\textsuperscript{212} and its popularity\textsuperscript{213}. I think the necessary weakness of NGOs, in general, is precisely its non-governmental identity. They are indirectly and some directly aiding governments in their function in education, environment, infrastructure, nutrition, etc., and advocating and campaigning advocacies and policies. All of which are paradoxically governmental. To be an objective-driven member of one of these NGOs will certainly bring frustration since it is the government itself that needs governing. But to look at it in a capitalist framework and not in its 'idealistic' sentiment, NGOs exist to do what they can do for the sake of doing it. It means it is a capitalist enterprise. If you are an NGO advocating peace in a war-riddled country, that means for you to sustain your existence as an NGO advocate of peace, wars should continue. NGOs are in general mitigating the
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symptoms of the disease. For them to persist, they want the disease to continue so that they can keep on doing their symptom reduction activities.

The Unemployed

Capital investments that produce, transport, rent, etc. commodities create employment. In the maximization of this same created employment, capital produces unemployment. With the invention of new machines and their further improvement, along with the further efficiency of the labor force, some sections of these same labor force become unnecessary. To put it simply, capital uses employment to create unemployment. Unemployment is within capital itself. This means that capital creates unemployment. Thus, unemployed people are inherently produced by capitalism. Therefore, the unemployed are part of the proletariat.

But before we go forward on establishing that the unemployed are part of the proletariat, we must take into account how the present system deals with the problem of unemployment. Within capitalism, there are two currents in fighting unemployment, at least in Europe. The OECD current where the American way of free-market ideology imposes itself and the welfare state current where there is a regulation on profit and social safety is somewhat guaranteed. Through this welfare state current, a political discourse for the unemployed also emerged. These are the politics of the welfare state and collective action. The former generally wants to transform the unemployed to become employed and the latter hesitantly engages itself in collective action with the unions and asks for

substantive reforms. In the US there are also government programs for the unemployed. But essentially these programs are to make them suitable for employment. But what the unemployed demand is the ability of the government to create jobs\textsuperscript{216}. But this demand increasingly manifests itself as an impossibility to capitalism. The phenomenon of permanent unemployment is becoming a fact in developed countries. This permanently unemployed phenomenon creates within those unemployed a strong desire to stay unemployed and attempt to enjoy life as it is\textsuperscript{217}.

In 2019, 2.3 billion people out of 5.7 billion are out of the labor force. "Out of the labor force" is the term used by the International Labor Organization and it differentiates it from unemployment, which is estimated at 188 million in the same year\textsuperscript{218}. This same document says that 630 million workers live in extreme poverty\textsuperscript{219}. In 2020, 8.8 percent of global working hours were lost which is equivalent to 255 million full-time jobs\textsuperscript{220}. Also in the same year, 114 million jobs were lost\textsuperscript{221}. These overwhelming facts reiterate Marx's claim that the bourgeois could not even guarantee to the slave (the proletariat) that he will survive within his slavery\textsuperscript{222}. But it is not about the bourgeoisie's ability to give a guarantee to the proletariat but this non-guarantee, these crises that will inevitably happen and did happen are inherent to capitalism itself.
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Housewives and Stay-at-Home Dads

A housewife also known as a homemaker is the one who manages the home, she buys food and groceries, she cooks, she cleans the house, she sometimes even brings the children to school, she tutors her children, she gardens, she washes the clothes, hang them dry and fold them, and other domestic activities that need to be taken care of. But housewives are not considered employed. They do not directly produce surplus value for the capitalist. They are the ones who see to it that their husbands who are employed have that capacity to produce that surplus-value. And at the same time, she makes certain that the future replacement of her husband and herself will be taken care of. But as I said earlier, unemployment is produced by capitalism itself. Thus they are part of the proletariat. The totality of capitalism is further explained by the Social Reproduction Theory where it includes the development of the capacity of the worker to produce labor power. That means it includes the role of the housewife, the caregivers, etc. as part of the whole system. This theory also elaborates capitalism’s continuous commodification of everything and what we all experience is part of its integrated process to commodify. It is an attempt to understand the totality of capitalism. And the condition that a wife of a worker was able to become a housewife was not handed down by capitalism easily. The right to have a working-class family and a home for a proletarian wife to run was and even now continue being struggled for. And in rural areas where women are not only doing housework but

---


farm work as well are categorized as unemployed while their male counterparts who are doing the same farm work are categorized as employed\textsuperscript{225}. Within the bourgeois elite, the trend is to put a price to housework that raises the price of the soon to be divorced bourgeois wife. Thanks to the divorce lawyer who I am expecting will gain more profit from the stingy bourgeois future ex-husband\textsuperscript{226}. And within this profit-driven culture under capitalism, this ideology of commodification pervades even to those who struggle against the commodification of women themselves\textsuperscript{227}. But even when the “economic\textsuperscript{228} and political\textsuperscript{229} standing” of women has changed dramatically, in Rwanda their relations with men stays, in some sense, patriarchal\textsuperscript{230}. Although Social Reproduction Theory calls for a wider anti-systemic struggle\textsuperscript{231}, we also need a direct struggle for communism through political struggle by the idea and application of decommodification\textsuperscript{232}. And as capitalism develops, gender roles are also equalized. If more and more women are getting employed it also necessitates that men transform themselves as a stay at home dads\textsuperscript{233}. But this
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new role for men is not that easy to accept\textsuperscript{234} and sometimes it only plays as an alternative self-identification than just saying you are unemployed\textsuperscript{235}. These homemakers are part of the proletariat as long as they are not married to a bourgeois household.

Children and the Elderly

There are 1.9 billion children and they are 27\% of the population\textsuperscript{236}. 160 million children ages 5 to 17 are engaged in labor around the world and 79 millions of them work in hazardous conditions\textsuperscript{237}. All of these children are supposed to be unemployed\textsuperscript{238} but a significant portion of them are. The history of capitalism shows that proletarian children were considered cheap and useful to produce a profit that they did not hesitate to use to the fullest. The subjected children to strenuous labor do not see themselves as children and they accepted their situation as "natural\textsuperscript{239}". These dehumanized children may eventually become dehumanized parents\textsuperscript{240}. I think no matter how many resolutions the United Nations will pass against child labor\textsuperscript{241} I believe that capitalism, as long as it exists, will necessitate countries to remain backward in relation to advanced countries, and even portions of an industrialized country to remain underdeveloped. These will produce and
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reproduce poverty. Poverty breeds dehumanization. Children are always its numerous victims.

There is an interesting change in the world’s population. There are now more people over 64 than children younger than 5. This change has a significant impact on many industrialized countries. Old age is defined as the state of being near the end of one’s life. Another is, you are nearing or have surpassed human life expectancy. Lastly, old age is also defined as you are at the end of the human life cycle or in the last stage in the life processes of an individual. The last definition reminded me of Lenin’s definition of imperialism, i.e., moribund capitalism. All of these definitions of old age are quite brutal. They are no better even to the sarcastic Filipino insult, “Amoy bangkay ka na,” or you smell like death, an insult to an old person. No wonder that the American Psychological Association devised some “politically correct” terms to hide its negative notion. Here in the Philippines, we have the bourgeois politician Enrile that seems to transcend death. Filipinos produced a variety of hilarious memes about his old age. But Enrile is fortunate that he is a rich bourgeois “retired” politician. But in most countries, the number of people over 64 is increasing, and the number of children is decreasing.

---


244 “What is Old Age,” IGI Global: Publisher of Timely Knowledge, accessed June 27, 2021, https://www.igi-global.com/dictionary/old-age/62976.


many people who are getting older are at risk of getting poorer\textsuperscript{249}. The situation both of the children and the elderly says it all: nothing escapes the ravages of capitalism. The proletarian children if fortunate die at an old age as proletarians.

Persons with Disability

Over a billion people are living with some form of disability. This is about 15\% of the world's population and thus makes it the world's largest minority\textsuperscript{250}. Up to 190 million people, aged fifteen years and older are having significant difficulties to function\textsuperscript{251}. In countries with a life expectancy of over seventy years, individuals spend an average of eight years living with disabilities\textsuperscript{252}. Eighty percent of persons living with disabilities are found in developing countries\textsuperscript{253}. 386 million people of the world's working-age population are estimated to have some form of disability and unemployment within it is as high as 80\% in some countries\textsuperscript{254}.

These facts suggest that capitalism breeds disability\textsuperscript{255} as it breeds commodification and poverty. And if poverty is widespread, disability spreads with it.
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Disability will result in unemployment. But the most depressing is that disability will be experienced in your lifetime. Although this "fact" can be altered.\(^\text{256}\) Disabled persons are economically oppressed by capitalism because they are not included as objectified subjects to be exploited.\(^\text{257}\) The demand to be included so these disabled persons can be exploited is quite humbling. Others are projecting the antagonism as a conflict between able-bodied ideology against the disabled.\(^\text{258}\) The disabled must realize that the factors that create disability are inherent in capitalism and this demand to be included, subjects the disabled to be part of the system that breeds disability. The Left must make the best use of this exclusion so that the disabled will be included in the movement that puts a stop to this system that excludes.

**Prisoners**

A prisoner is a person who is deprived of liberty against his own will and usually serving a prison sentence or waiting for it.\(^\text{259}\) There are about over 11 million prisoners worldwide.\(^\text{260}\) The US tops the most number of prisoners in the world with over two million persons incarcerated. China is second with less than two million and the Philippines hits the 10th spot with more than 200,000 prisoners.\(^\text{261}\)

\(^{256}\) Dr. James Dinicolantonio and Dr. Jason Fung, *The Longevity Solution: Rediscovering Centuries-Old Secrets to a Healthy, Long Life* (Las Vegas: Victory Belt Publishing, 2019), Chapter 1,32-33, Apple Book.


The US Prison system is the largest, comprehensive, and most expensive prison system in the world\textsuperscript{262}. I think it is also the most profitable in terms of labor since, in 2001, US prisoners produced $1.8 billion worth of commodities\textsuperscript{263}. The US prison system is applied racism. No other institution manifests direct racial inequality in its most brutal manner. While Black American men only account for 8.3\% of the population, they make up 64.4\% of the population behind bars\textsuperscript{264}. And US prison labor system is characterized as a new form of slavery and transformed these prisoners into actual slaves\textsuperscript{265}. And what is completely paradoxical is that prisoners worked and got paid almost nothing when they were prisoners. But when they got out and applied to work for the same company and job that they worked for when they were inside, they would not even let them\textsuperscript{266}. But as the US prisons turned into a staggering $80 billion industry, it necessitates for capitalism to ensure that prisons are filled up\textsuperscript{267}.

Almost all of the prisoners are proletariat if they are not part of the bourgeois class\textsuperscript{268}. And it becomes a miracle that prisoners can establish a union to protect their rights\textsuperscript{269}. But what I think is equally important is that US prisoners must have some sort of political influence\textsuperscript{270} on how the state continues to incarcerate the proletariat, especially
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the non-whites. They must stop electing those who profit from mass incarceration and elect those who can stop profit in general.

Others

Other groups of the proletariat that are not included here whether employed or unemployed as long as they do not have the means to create and accumulate profit and consequently produce and reproduce the capitalist class relations are part of the proletarian class.

Returning to the Notion of the Proletariat 2

I think with all this discussion of industries, the proletariat constituted within them, and the groups of the unemployed with a fairly amount of facts and literature may demonstrate to the reader that the identity of the proletariat as a non-bourgeois is valid. This identity of being a non-owner of self-valorizing capital. And with this identity, I was able to further my claim that indeed the proletariat is the overwhelming majority, not just in the world as a whole but almost in every fragment of the world population such as continents, regions, countries, etc. The proletariat is identified by its lack. And this lack is its particularity. But this particular identity is her universality itself, i.e., the universality of being a non-bourgeois class. That is why the proletariat is the particular universal class.

The Bourgeoisie

The proletariat is not the only capitalist subject. The capitalists or the bourgeoisie are themselves subjects of capitalism although they appear as the masters of the system. But paradoxically, the system is in control of itself. But of course, the bourgeoisie is the one benefitting from this system as long as they stay as competitive capitalists. But to be competitive does not mean that capitalist greed should take over but the system itself necessitates greediness to stay competitive. This competitiveness then creates the conditions of capitalist oppression. To make oneself highly competitive one needs to dislodge periodically or when need be other capitalists and transform them from an owner of a company to a struggling proletariat. These former middle capitalists, if you can imagine, commanded hundreds of workers but were to be ripped off of their property. Then their sons and daughters instead of becoming heirs to the company became just job applicants to their formerly owned company. That may appear a tragedy but incomparable to the workers burning to death because the factory gates were closed.

Therefore, the commodification of everything, the infinite production, reproduction, and distribution of commodities; the transformation of Man himself into a commodity, where the proletariat is the one experiencing at the utmost this commodified capitalist identity, are some of the features that make capitalism the provider of "unfreedom" to humanity. Communism as a system supposed to oppose capitalism, which aims to
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achieve Man's Freedom, in its 20th-century application has generally failed. We have to locate within Marx the source of this failure, to identify and understand what failed.

“RUTHLESS CRITICISM 274” OF MARX

I never imagined myself criticizing Marx. I branded myself as a Marxist and a Leninist. But studying philosophy again in the university system 275 enabled me to discover things I do not know and things I know I did know but I got it wrong. It was the Slovenian philosopher Slavoj Zizek that enabled me to read critically Marx’s theory. Because in the past I considered Marx as the pure communist theoretician. He was untouchable. Watching tens and tens of videos of Zizek and other philosophers like him and reading some of his books created the conditions for me to attempt to criticize Marx within a communist lens.

AN ATTEMPT TO CRITICIZE THE COMMunist MANIFESTO

On Class Struggle

“The history of all hitherto existing society,” Marx and Engels said, “is the history of class struggles.” 276 What do these class struggles have that makes them class struggles?

275 It was Professor Hazel Marie Vitales of the Department of Philosophy in the College of Arts and Letters of the Polytechnic University of the Philippines who pointed me in the right direction. She mentioned Zizek in one of her numerous comments on my essay about Marx.
The class category is a socio-economic division of society. The differences of these divisions especially between the oppressor and the oppressed creates conditions for these class struggles. But how can we say that history is just a class struggle? I think classes within a given society not only struggle but they cooperate. That is why I think history does not only compose of class struggles but class cooperation, class collaboration, class extinction, and so on.

But again let us answer the question, why class struggles are called class struggles? Let Marx and Engels have the first attempt to answer the question. “But every class struggle is a political struggle,” they said. This definition of class struggle as a political struggle paradoxically creates both precision and confusion. Precision because it eliminates all ambiguities since the class struggle is a struggle to capture political power. Confusion because not all "class struggles" that are regarded as such are political struggles. For example, the proletariat's demand for higher wages to the bourgeois government. Does this amount to a class struggle? Can we say that this struggle is political? If this demand and struggle for higher wages are directly connected to the struggle for political power, then it can be considered a class struggle. But if it is not, then it is not a class struggle.

But why do classes struggle for political power? If we talk about contests or struggles for political power, we can say that the long history of capitalism is mostly a history of class struggle between factions of the bourgeoisie. These struggles between the factions of the bourgeoisie for political ascendancy are to capture all the benefits that one can have in seizing state power and at the same time maintaining and developing the role of the state under the capitalist constellation. Because we have defined the class struggle as a
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struggle for political power, the class struggle category does not aptly fit if the ones struggling for power belong to the same class. It is like the bourgeois class struggles within himself.

One may ask, but what about the Paris Commune, the Bolshevik revolution, and other communist revolutions? They are absolutely attempts of the proletariat to capture political power and yes they are what Marx and Engels call class struggles. But what about those struggles before the actual revolution itself? Are we to consider them as class struggles? I think we can regard them as class struggles as long as these struggles pave the way for the capture of political power. Therefore, we can conclude that in the era of capitalism, the class struggles between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat are few and exceptional and what dominated the struggle for political power is the struggle between the bourgeoisie themselves.

Class Identity

The identity of a class is always defined in its relation to another class. The existence of this class presupposes the existence of another class that it has relations to. But the existence of these specific classes as such also presupposes a dominant political and economic system that provided the bases for these classes to exist. And at the same time, this same dominant system necessitates the impossibility of previous classes of previous systems to exist except on the period of transition from one system to another. Undoubtedly, capitalism is the prevailing world economic system. And this system only creates the conditions for the existence of two classes and no other. These are the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.
As we said earlier that the relationship between classes is their identity themselves, we may conclude that the bourgeoisie is as such because there is a proletariat. And at the same time, the proletariat is what it is because of the bourgeoisie. Then in the 20th-century communism in Russia, in Eastern Europe, and in China where the proletariat remained as what they were in capitalism, i.e., producer of surplus-value, presupposes that a dominant bourgeoisie is still existing but in a different form. Lenin precisely defined it as state capitalism. The state bureaucracy and the party became the collectivized bourgeoisie that functions as the commander of planned production that accepts the surplus value created by the working class, distributes this profit according to its plan, etc. I think to have a real communist revolution, not only the dissolution of the bourgeoisie as a class is necessary but at the same time, the negation of the proletariat itself as the producer of surplus value and profit must take place.

Modern Bourgeois Society that has Sprouted from the Ruins of Feudal Society

Capitalism as the system of producing commodities became the dominant economic activity even before the downfall of the absolute monarchy in France. This means that capitalist economic activities became increasingly dominant within feudalism. But paradoxically, the capitalist class which are mostly traders and merchants, are isolated politically. The class that emerged supreme politically during the upheaval was not the capitalist class, but the educated, professional classes, especially lawyers who
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predominated among the deputies of the Third Estate\textsuperscript{281}. These professional classes that the Philippine Left call petty bourgeoisie are not yet spokespersons of the bourgeois class of commercial interests but a distinct "bourgeois" class that emerged within that time in France. It is these professional classes that led to the French revolution.

But I am not making an argument about the class character of the French revolution. I am arguing about how the modern bourgeois elements within feudalism created conditions that ruined the feudal establishment. Contrary to the teleological narrative that Marx creates in the emergence of modern bourgeois society, I claim that it was not just the objective conditions such as the financial crises that the French monarchy was experiencing and was forced to revive the Estates-General, but also the subjective utilization of these objective circumstances that provided the conditions for the monarchy's downfall.

Another argument I am making is that feudalism was destroyed because the element essential to it was annihilated. Without it, feudalism could not exist as such. But the eradication of this vital element also negated the essential character of the classes that existed within feudalism that made it possible to transition to capitalism. Not only the monarchy and nobility were negated in the process of the dismantling of feudalism but even the bourgeoisie, the professional classes, the proletariat, the peasants, and others were 'negated' as well. The privilege of blood is this negated element and all classes were 'negated' in their relation to this element.

The Economic Development of a Class Corresponds to its Political Advance\textsuperscript{282}
The experience of the bourgeois class in the French revolution again shows that this formulation did not happen as exactly as what this dictum suggests. We can claim that Marx was abstracting the history of the political ascendancy of the bourgeoisie and we must not fault him for this imprecision. Nevertheless, the economic development that benefited the commercial bourgeoisie both in the domestic and international trade\textsuperscript{283} did not mechanically make them popular to be elected as deputies. But they resorted to lobbying\textsuperscript{284} to pursue and protect their interests.

But this lobbying in itself presupposes that their economic development created conditions to lobby. Thus, this practice of lobbying results in a political advance of their class. In effect, Marx was right after all. But we must also see that there is a dialectical relation between economic and political power. Economic power can advance the bourgeoisie politically and at the same time holding political power advances the bourgeoisie economically. It works both ways. But how can we relate this to the proletariat's economic development which will lead to its political advance?

For the proletariat to seek her economic development without a direct link to her seizure of political power is just asking for a better price for her labor power. In short, she just wishes to remain a proletariat with just a better price. The form of economic development for the proletariat is lesser hours of work to advance the proletariat socially and politically. This type of economic development will indeed advance the proletariat politically.

\textit{From Naked, Shameless, Direct, Brutal Exploitation}\textsuperscript{285} to Ideological Illusions

\textsuperscript{283} Clay, \textit{The Oxford Handbook of the French Revolution}, 27, Adobe PDF eBook.
\textsuperscript{284} Ibid., 34, Adobe PDF eBook.
\textsuperscript{285} Marx and Engels, \textit{The Communist Manifesto}, 222, Adobe PDF eBook.
The necessity of ideological illusions does not mean to hide shameless exploitation. I claim this shameless exploitation is already accepted by the people. But we need these ideological illusions to get by this capitalist brutality. Just like the inevitability of getting sick when we get old. We kind of accept that after long years of making ends meet, we will just end up sick in our retirement age and die miserably. But Facebook, Instagram, or Twitter are there to make every sick moment of our life meaningful by being with our loved ones and friends and not forgetting to post it on our profile. Then we just die.

This acceptance is due to the absence of any viable alternative. But the continuation of capitalism will create conditions of its non-acceptability. And the Left must find ways to make itself the only feasible alternative.

Modern Bourgeois Private Property is NOT a Complete Expression of the System of Producing and Appropriating Products\(^{286}\)

I think to make the expression "more complete" we have to include capitalist productivity itself. It is this self-propelled machine to produce commodities to acquire profit that is missing. This is why Marx's theory only aims at the private character of the property and transforms it into state property. I think he failed to add capitalist productivity as part of capitalism's distinguishing feature. This is where surplus value is produced. The transformation of surplus-value to profit creates the tendency to expand production and consequently create conditions for capitalist social relations to be produced and reproduced.

That is why all the ten measures of the Communist Manifesto such as the abolition of property in land, abolition of the right of inheritance\(^{287}\), etc. only plan to undermine

\(^{286}\) Ibid., 235, Adobe PDF eBook.

\(^{287}\) Ibid., 243, Adobe PDF eBook.
specifically bourgeois property but paradoxically aims to unleash production by “increasing
the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible288.” Bourgeois property is indeed the
Manifesto’s aim to transform to state property. And 20th-century communism proved this
was possible. But it did not undermine the essence of capitalist productivity. The
Manifesto aimed to collectivize bourgeois property. And indeed it was collectivized. But
the proletariat remained the proletariat. And the new bourgeoisie showed himself in the
collectivized party and the state.

IMAGINING COMMUNISM IN MARX’S CAPITAL THROUGH MICHAEL HEINRICH’S
INTRODUCTION

Just the thought of reading the three-volume work of Capital will be a horrendous task
and what more to criticize it. But I could not essentially criticize Marx without Capital. It is
this work, this capitalist critique which he wanted to be known for and I think he would
have liked us to study so that through this critique of capitalism we can construct
communism by negating capitalism’s essential elements. I think I will do the next practical
thing for me to finish this paper. It is by attempting to criticize a book that serves as an
introduction to Marx’s three-volume work. It is this excellent book of Michael Heinrich’s “An
Introduction to the Three Volumes of Karl Marx’s Capital289.

What I will try to do in this critique is present anew some categories and ideas
presented in Capital without their “capitalistic elements.” What I mean is to present these
capitalist categories in their communistic constellation.

288 Ibid.
289 Michael Heinrich, An Introduction to the Three Volumes of Karl Marx’s Capital, trans. Alexander
Commodities and their use value and exchange value

How can we imagine commodities in a communist society? What elements are in capitalist commodities that must be negated to make them theoretically compatible with communism? First, in capitalism commodities are produced not for the sake of human essential needs but profit\(^{290}\). But many of these commodities including food are even contrary to man's needs, a topic I already discussed in the first part of this paper. So to transform commodities into commodities for human needs, what are the elements in commodities that should be negated to make this transformation possible? I guess it is profit. But profit I think in a certain sense is still needed so that commodities that serve human needs could be reproduced and expanded if need be. Profit in the private capitalist sense will be eradicated but I think this is not enough. It is the insane production and reproduction of commodities in capitalism that I think should be put to a stop. If commodities in communism are only for human needs, then commodities will be significantly reduced.

And what about use value and exchange value? Use-value is the usefulness of the commodity\(^{291}\). And the exchange value of a commodity is its monetary value in its old capitalistic sense. Definitely, only commodities that will serve human needs will be produced, and consequently, the usefulness and therefore the use-values of commodities will be held important. Nevertheless, money as an instrument to gain access to these commodities will also be produced. Money, in this initial role, serves a human need. Therefore, the exchangeability of commodities will remain.

\(^{290}\) Ibid., 33, Apple book.
\(^{291}\) Ibid., 86, Apple book.
Socially Necessary Labor Time

I think socially necessary labor time is an economic category that generally has the same meaning in capitalism and communism. Here is Marx’s definition:

Socially necessary labor-time is the labor-time required to produce any use-value under the conditions of production normal for a given society and with the average degree of skill and intensity of labor prevalent in that society (Capital, 1:129).\(^\text{292}\)

This definition of Marx will prevail even in communism. The development of socially necessary labor time that produces commodities for human needs must continue. What I mean by development is the time needed to produce a certain amount of commodities should decrease or the number of commodities produced in a certain time will increase. But this time, human needs are produced, all those capable will work, working hours will be drastically reduced by developing productivity and at the same time, by minimizing production itself.

Concrete Labor and Abstract Labor

Concrete labor is the specific labor that creates use-values and abstract labor is the qualitatively equal human labor that creates values\(^\text{293}\). They are both the same labor but capitalism tends to generalize all labor to create the condition of their exchangeability. In communism, the categories of concrete and abstract labor are maintained. Since the exchange of commodities will remain, these categories of labor will also remain.

\(^{292}\) Ibid., 94-95, Apple book.
\(^{293}\) Ibid., 107-108, Apple book.
In capitalism, this abstract labor is the basis of the minimum wage. A wage that ensures that the proletariat can live and reproduce. In communism, it is the full development of the proletariat (in its communist sense) as the basis for the minimum wage and therefore abstract labor that coincides with it. But labor in the abstract in communism is labor expended at its minimum. Communist society instead of prolonging working hours must minimize working hours to expand the proletariat and the people’s free time.

Value Objectivity

The value of commodities is only actualized once they are exchanged. To put it simply, value is objectified once the commodity is sold. What will be the character of this exchange in communism? It is almost the same. But production and distribution will be planned. This planned production and distribution should be efficient as possible. Shortages, as well as overproduction of commodities, must be avoided. But what will put perspective to this planned production is the behavior of the 'communist' market itself.

Money as the general form of value

Money as the general form of value of all commodities\textsuperscript{294} will remain in communism. But just like commodities its production and distribution are planned. Its function is to make the commodities that serve human needs easily accessible. All money forms that capitalism was using should be available except maybe credit cards. It is no longer logical to get something in advance and pay it later in communist society because the production of commodities is more or less planned and even the capacity of the people to buy it is

\textsuperscript{294} Ibid., 138-140, Apple book.
generally planned. Therefore, the credit card as a promise to pay instrument, as I am thinking right now, does not seem to fit in the communist picture.

Commodity Fetishism

In capitalism, the commodification of everything controls man himself. Her thinking, habits, plans for the future, everyday consciousness, and practical living is controlled. In communism, man and the people must take over. It is Man that must control her destiny. As we said earlier, human needs will be produced and working hours will be minimized. In addition, the communist state will create conditions for full transparency, democracy, and efficiency. State officials will institutionalize forceful punishment against state abuse, and economic planning must be efficient. This efficiency should be carried out in a ‘capitalistic sense’ such as quantities of commodities to produce, raw materials that we need to produce them, raw materials needed to import, machines we are able to produce, etc. etc. This commodity fetishism from capitalism will be transformed into a habit where man, relatively speaking, has control.

Money-Commodity-More Money, the Movement of Capital as Self-Valorizing Value

In communism, the state will create money primarily as an instrument of the people to make needs accessible. And at the same time, money still appears as a capitalist instrument when it is used to make transactions to non-communist countries. That is the only capitalist function that money should assume in communism. In producing these

\[295\] Ibid., 176, Apple book.
\[296\] Ibid., 200, Apple book.
needs, the planned economy must minimize production and in effect the proletariat’s working hours. The problem with 20th-century communism is that it also produced commodities at an expanded and intensified level. I think 20th-century communism is essentially a communist-controlled capitalism.

In its reinvented form, communism will allow the creation of surplus value from the proletariat for the sake of reproduction and expansion of the production of needs but paradoxically creating conditions in minimizing the labor time that produces this surplus-value. By minimizing working hours, the proletariat is also minimizing herself as a producer of surplus value and by doing that negates her former subjectivity as a producer of capitalist wealth. The communist state becomes initially a collectivized form of bourgeoisie as they plan production on a national scale. But immediately, they will only produce commodities that serve human needs and thus will limit the working hours. Capital as Self-Valorizing Value will become capital as a controlled valorizing value or Money-Commodity-Controlled More Money for human needs.

Proletariat, free in a Double-Sense, and their Labor-Power297

The proletariat in communism must be negated. I am not saying physically eliminating the proletariat or even the philosophical concept of her being should be negated. But her actual reason for being, that is to work for her subsistence and create a surplus value for the capitalist should be put an end to. Upon the proletariat's seizure of political power, the proletarian state will have to nationalize all means of production that are important for the production and distribution of human needs. Therefore, the bourgeoisie's standing as the owner of the means of production will be, in a relative manner, abolished. The proletarian

297 Ibid., 211-212 Apple book.
state will take over those means of production but not to replace the bourgeoisie and command the proletariat to do the same but revolutionize the basis of production itself. This time the point of production of needs is to provide for the people these needs as accessible as it can be and at the same time as we said earlier, significantly reducing the number of working hours or maybe even more logically the number of working days. Therefore, the proletariat that works for maybe two or three days a week, fully compensated with the needs that the proletarian economy can provide her and her family, ceases to be a proletariat in its capitalist framework not just because the bourgeoisie was made impossible but her subjectivity is relatively freed.

The proletariat's description as free in a double sense in capitalism is that they act as free proprietors of their labor power and they do not own any means of production to provide for their needs. In communism, the same more or less description is maintained except that maybe the proletarian state will develop some form of family and community ownership of some easily produced goods for subsistence. But giving some of the proletariat some substantial property of the means of production will only bring back capitalism. This should not be done.

The production and distribution of needs and the selection of what needs to produce will be carefully decided by the state and representatives of the people outside the state. The decision-making should be as practical and fast as possible. Afterward, the process of production and the quantity and quality of workers needed for this and that production must be carefully planned and effectively applied with the maximization of all the people that can work while significantly reducing working hours or days. Therefore, the labor power that the proletariat is forced to sell in capitalism will relatively be the same but this

298 Ibid.
time the repetitive work will be far shorter and compensation from it will be significantly better.

The Value of Labor Power

In Capital Marx said, "the value of labor power is the value of the means of subsistence necessary for the maintenance of its owner" \(^{299}\) and her reproduction. Now, what are these means of subsistence? Food, clothing, house, water, electricity, internet access, TV, basic appliances, computers, etc. In capitalism, only those who can afford all of these necessities can have access to these needs. These basic needs that capitalism more or less required us to have must not only be strived for in communism but even developed further. That is why the estimation of the value of the labor power in communism must be attuned to these needs that are produced by the proletarian economy. But communism will also rationalize the production of needs that capitalism kept on producing but are not essential for humanity. This addiction in consuming and buying commodities is also produced by the infinite production of goods by capitalism. Although the freedom of choice in communism will remain even in the choice of what kind of clothes to buy or shoes to wear, the production and distribution will be relatively rationalized. But this act of rationalization, in the course of revolution against capitalism, has become a habit. That is why it will only be institutionalized in communism.

Value of Labor

Marx said, "Labor creates value, but does not itself have value." \(^{300}\) This consciousness of the value of labor is generated in capitalism where a certain amount of wage is equal

\(^{299}\) Ibid., 217, Apple book.  
\(^{300}\) Ibid., 227, Apple book.
to a certain number of hours worked. This has been within the proletariat’s consciousness because of the transactions she has been dealing with capitalism all her life. Now will this absurd\textsuperscript{301} description of the value of labor remain in communism?

I think it will remain. Sometimes absurdities are essential. The proletarian state will require many proletarian workers to work for several hours in a two or three-day workweek. Some of the hours spent working is for the workers’ direct compensation and some hours of work are indirect compensation like the continuous reproduction and development of machinery in the factory where she is working, the retirement benefits for the future, funds for the elderly, and those who cannot work, etc. These are generally state funds to run a welfare state in its communist sense. But I think, this notion of the value of labor that will be generated in communism will create an impression of genuine compensation and may evoke a sense of responsibility to the worker.

**Constant Capital and Variable Capital**

Constant capital is the value of raw materials, tools, and machines the company uses. Variable capital is the value of labor power used. When a commodity is produced a certain amount of the value of the raw materials, tools and machines gets transferred to the commodity. But variable capital or labor power can generate new value. This is what Marx calls surplus value. In communism, constant capital will more or less remain. The need to develop machinery, tools, and access to sustainable raw materials should be continued in a needs-oriented economy. But variable capital will still create new value but will also be significantly diminished. By a needs-oriented economy, the policy of full employment and reduction of working hours, definitely the capitalist self-propelled thirst for surplus value

\textsuperscript{301} Ibid.
will be essentially deprived. But variable capital will still create new value and will remain as a practical economic category in communism.

Rate of Surplus Value

Capital's valorization results only from its variable component. The intensity of valorization can be measured by relating the surplus-value to the variable capital: Marx calls this quantity $s/v$ the rate of surplus-value\textsuperscript{302}. For example, iPhone. The total value of an iPhone is $999. Its constant capital is $370.89. Its variable capital is $24.55. The surplus-value is $603.56. The rate of surplus-value or also called the rate of exploitation is 2458%\textsuperscript{303}. To make it clear I added the variable capital and its surplus which is $603.56 that resulted in $628.11. Divide this amount into eight hours it will result in $78.51. This means that the workers' unpaid labor is even more than 7 hours. I divided this hourly rate into 60 minutes and the result was $1.308 per minute. It will take almost nineteen minutes for the worker to satisfy her means of subsistence before producing the rest of the 7 hours and 41 minutes for the surplus value for the capitalist. In communism, a significant reduction in the rate of exploitation will happen. Without a private capitalist, no private appropriation will happen. But the proletarian state may transform itself as the stand-in for the missing bourgeois. It may justify its appropriation by government services and expansion of production. That is why without full employment and conscious reduction of working hours, the proletariat remains to be exploited. For the proletariat to attain relatively authentic freedom, conditions must be created in communism for her de-proletarianization.

\textsuperscript{302} Ibid., 237, Apple book. \\
Heinrich said, “the length of the workday is given by the sum of necessary labor-time and surplus labor-time.” If we are going to cite the previous example of the iPhone, the given length of the workday is eight hours although most of those hours were spent producing surplus labor-time. Now let us use that precise example and imagine making iPhones in a communist context. For example, the proletarian state wishes to provide iPhones to all of its adult citizens in the Philippines. The adult population is about 63 million. In China, it takes 1,050,000 workers, working three shifts, to produce 1.5 million pieces of iPhones in just one day. In China, it will just take 42 days to provide iPhones for 63 million Filipinos. Since we are talking about a reinvented communism, we wish to make our iPhones and assemble them here. To lessen the working hours, the communist state will employ 2,100,000 workers to work in 4-hour shifts in one day. The wages will amount to $2,165,310,000. The constant capital needed to finance the production of these phones will amount to $23,366,070,000. Profit will be projected at 20 percent and that amounts to $5,106,276,000. Total value of the 63 million iPhones are $30,637,656,000. Divide this amount to 63 million and the result will be $486.312. To get the rate of surplus-value we need to divide the surplus by the wages. That will be a 235% rate of surplus value or rate of exploitation. Again to make it clear, we must divide the total wage to 63 million iPhones and we get $34.37 variable capital for every phone. The surplus-value

result will be $81.052 per phone. Surplus and variable capital amount to $115.422 per phone. We divide it by 4 hours of work and we get $28.855 per hour and then divide this again by 60, to get the minute rate and we get 0.480. It will get 51.14 minutes for the worker to meet her subsistence which is $24.55 and the rest of the three hours and 9 minutes goes to the state. In communism at least theoretically, we get the commodity price reduced, we were able to increase employment and decrease working hours, and got to significantly reduce the rate of exploitation.

Absolute and Relative Surplus Value

Marx mentioned that "Increasing the surplus-value and the rate of surplus-value by lengthening the workday as the production of absolute surplus-value." Although an eight-hour law is in place, workers are forced to render overtime because of low wages especially in countries like the Philippines. In communism, I think this objective to increase surplus value by lengthening the working day is inconceivable. What I could only think of that is possible is the immediate need for a certain commodity and the state requires the workers to voluntary lengthen their workday so that the state could accomplish its task for that said immediate need. For example, the rainy season came up earlier than expected. Certain commodities that the people need for this season should be produced immediately. There are other more examples that the communist state may ask its workers to lengthen their working day. But lengthening the working day to gain absolute surplus value? That only happens in capitalism.

Another term Marx refers to is "the enlargement of surplus-value and the rate of surplus-value through a decrease of necessary labor-time as the production of relative surplus value."

307 Heinrich, An Introduction, 244, Apple book.
surplus-value. First, the communist state must make the means of subsistence, if not free, at least very affordable. Communism must create policies that create conditions to de-commodify things especially means of subsistence. That is why this relative surplus-value is maintained and developed in communism but not following capitalism’s direction. The aim is precisely what it is: making food and other necessaries very inexpensive and highly accessible.

Heinrich explained that "the production of relative surplus-value implies, through an increase in the productivity of labor, a reduction in the value of means of subsistence and therefore a decrease in the value of labor-power." I think what Heinrich means here is the position of the proletariat within the capitalist structure is ever-becoming negligible. It is not true that the means of subsistence are getting cheaper, but the working hours devoted for those are getting smaller. The humbling status of the worker manifests itself if compared to the value of that robotic machine or even the commodity that she produces. A worker in some sense is much cheaper than an iPhone. But in communism, the development of the machine, tools, and equipment is compulsory. But its objective is not to make the work redundant but to make life easier for the worker and significantly reduce her working hours. Communism develops the machine to produce the needs of its people, reduce the working hours and expand the proletariat’s de-proletarianized free time.

308 Ibid., 245, Apple book.
309 Ibid., 247, Apple book.
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I disagree with Michael Heinrich's assertion that Marx's claim on the tendency of a growing industrial reserve army is strictly unsubstantiated. If relative surplus-value is the dominant form of raising productivity, then it logically follows that it necessitates permanently reducing the number of workers employed. Manifestation of this phenomenon of permanent or structural unemployment is not only apparent in the third world countries but my impression is that this term, structural unemployment was created not because of what was happening to undeveloped countries for decades and decades. But the term was generated specifically for developed countries that are experiencing this phenomenon. Maybe that is why Michael Heinrich dismisses this idea of Marx because he does not regard third-world countries as part of the global capitalist economy. Capital out there, he claims is non-profitable. But I assert that it is precisely this intended backward situation of most countries that makes global capital valorize. But let us imagine this category in its communist light. 20th-century communist policy on employment is full employment. Even in its state-capitalist horizon, communism regards full employment as one of its key achievements in contrast to capitalism. But in our reinvented idea of communism, full employment is guaranteed because precisely we are reducing working hours, producing commodities for human needs, and minimizing production in itself. And that results in the de-commodification of everything including the de-proletarianization of the proletariat. Communism that heightens productivity but at the

---

same time minimizing production creates a fully employed proletariat by significantly reducing her working time.

Immiseration

Marx concluded that “in proportion as capital accumulates, the situation of the worker, be his payment high or low, must grow worse. (Capital, 1:799)”\textsuperscript{315} Although this immiseration does not look worse in highly industrialized countries, whole continents and regions experience this brutal immiseration brought up by global capitalism. Many Marxist scholars say that Marx’s theory of immiseration is not apparent. But again, look at Africa, look at Latin America, look at South East Asia. There are plenty of “absolute” immiseration\textsuperscript{316}.

Communism, once globally victorious, will concentrate its effort to ensure that all humans have the basic material subsistence to live and survive with. As soon as she is nourished, man can struggle for freedom.

The Circuit of Capital\textsuperscript{317}

In communism, the proletarian state acts as the buyer of the means of production and labor power. And by buying these two elements, she transforms them into productive capital, presupposing that money was used to buy these elements. But within the process of production is where the rupture with capitalist production takes place. Instead of producing commodities that are infinitely consumed, the proletarian state chooses

\textsuperscript{315} Heinrich, \textit{An Introduction}, 306, Apple book.
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commodities that provide deliberate relative satisfaction and raw materials that can be sustained. But the result of this production process is essentially the same as the capitalist one. The capital commodity is valorized\(^{318}\).

The proletarian state then acts as a seller. But she sells them not to merchants but her lower state institutions. These lower state territories or local states act as buyers of these commodities. These state territories then after buying these commodities will immediately sell them and distribute them to various retail outlets. But the whole process of production and distribution must be developed to the point that commodities are easily produced and obtained. The transition from capitalism to communism is not a drastic event that a "revolution" shattered the capitalist system in one clean sweep but was able to transform the capitalistic elements into communism by introducing and institutionalizing communist elements in the production and distribution process. It is like there is already a communist way of buying and selling.

**The Turnover of Capital**

The turnover time of capital in communism will not wait for the entire capital advanced to be valorized. Since these commodities are essential for the people's needs, the people will immediately buy them and utilize these commodities. The proletarian state-created or produced a money-like instrument so that the people can easily buy these commodities produced by the state.

\(^{318}\text{Ibid., 311-312, Apple book.}\)
Planned production will not only presuppose capitals along with each other but ultimately will create one that is essential and dissolve one that is deemed non-essential. For example, food. What kinds of food production will the state engage in? Where can we get raw materials, etc.? One example of an industry to dissolve is the tobacco industry. Unless new findings will come up where tobacco smoke will not harm anyone’s health, the communist state must transition to dissolve decisively the tobacco industry. Correlated industries will be rationalized along with all professions that only thrived within the capitalist framework. Essentially, communism is in a better position to understand the overall picture of the total social capital since it is the system that plans the whole economic field.

Rate of Profit

In communism, the rate of profit will fall\textsuperscript{320}. The objective of communist profit is to continue the reproduction of such and such commodities as long as it is essential to the needs of the people. But even without profit (although I think it is improbable), money and profit in communism already lost their mystical power over men. Generally, communism is a non-profit economy in a capitalist sense but needs the funds to keep on producing these essentials.

But for the capitalist, the measure of valorization is indeed the rate of profit. Now let us see the formula of the rate of profit $s/(c + v)$. Let us again cite the production of Apple if indeed the rate of profit falls if profit is not the main objective of production. The surplus-
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value for Apple is $603.56. Constant capital is $370.89. Variable capital is $24.55 Sum of constant and variable capital is $395.44. So, we just divide 603.56 by 395.44. The result is 152.6 percent.

Now in a theoretically communist state in the Philippines, the constant capital stays the same and the variable capital is $34.37. Their sum is 405.26. The surplus is $81.052. So we divide the 81.052 by 405.26. It is a 20 percent rate of profit. Profit did fall.

Banks and Credit

I think the bank as a credit institution loses all its capitalist significance when communism will succeed in establishing its economy. I think the only role of the bank in communism is facilitating transactions between the communist states and capitalist companies. There will be times where there are commodities that we need but we could not produce them locally. Another is the habit of saving money. Traditions and habits last longer. And saving in a bank has become one of those. Maybe underground transactions can happen where a particular person has connections abroad and wants to invest her money elsewhere. All of these cases suggest that communism is not yet a global politico-economic system.

Crisis

A crisis in a capitalist economy is a situation where there are an enormous amount of goods that are no longer sellable. And there is no demand for these goods because they
cannot buy them. Since the commodity capital could not be transformed into money capital, the advanced capital is dismally valorized which results in a diminished accumulation. Mass unemployment and a significant reduction in consumption are the repercussions that further escalates the crisis\textsuperscript{321}.

Can this type of crisis happen in a communist society? I think it is impossible. First, commodities that communism produces are essentials. Second, the capacity to buy them is always there. Third, money again has no more magical powers to create a crisis. Even if there are tons of commodities that people do not want to buy, so what? Let them just expire. Production for those commodities will discontinue and new ones will emerge. Is it possible for communism not to provide the capacity for people to buy these commodities? Yes. But if this is so, then it is not communism. It is absolutely capitalism. Because money in capitalism is god. And communism does not need to have one.

\textit{Theory of Collapse}

Marx, as the author Michael Heinrich believes, never advocated that capitalism will self-destruct\textsuperscript{322}. He only indicated that capitalism creates tremendous barriers within itself because everything is for capital’s valorization\textsuperscript{323}. I also do not believe that a crisis however catastrophic will induce the masses of the proletariat to revolt and pave the way for communism. I agree with the author’s direct criticism against the Left where this theory of the collapse of capitalism serves as an excusatory function\textsuperscript{324}. Just like capitalism, I think the Left itself is her own barrier to her struggle for power.

\textsuperscript{321} Ibid., 402, Apple book.
\textsuperscript{322} Ibid., 419, Apple book.
\textsuperscript{323} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{324} Ibid., 424, Apple book.
The Trinity Formula\textsuperscript{325}

Capital, land, and wage labor are the ones that constitute this trinity formula formulated by Marx. They are sources of income for their owners\textsuperscript{326}. This continuing process of economic relations produces and reproduces these same relations. That is why the interest for capital, rent for land, and wage for labor power or labor\textsuperscript{327} is accepted as the way things are. They are accepted as reality and seldom questioned. This is how ideology functions. It is the acceptance of this everyday life.

One could not struggle against this ideology from without. It is within capitalism where communism can emerge. We could only combat this ideology of acceptance by the ideology of non-acceptance. In communism, I do not say that struggles and antagonisms are already absent. But in communism, at least theoretically, the levels of struggle and antagonisms have developed. Unlike in capitalism, where the struggle to survive is a daily battle. I believe in communism, the struggle can be ideological, political, economic and cultural and other aspects of various struggles. But since the element of unending pursuance of profit is substantially minimized, the false choice between capitalist productivity and benefits of the ‘proletariat’ will no longer be choices to be offered by the state but what additional benefit that the proletariat must have in case the proletarian state reaches its goal in developing the communist economy.

\textsuperscript{325} Ibid., 425-440, Apple book.
\textsuperscript{326} Ibid., 432, Apple book.
\textsuperscript{327} Ibid.
WHAT I THINK MARX MISSED

I do not claim any thoroughgoing study of Marx’s works. I am just an ordinary idiot who is stubbornly asking what’s going on?\textsuperscript{328} This led me to communism. But 20\textsuperscript{th}-century communism failed. Why did it fail? We have to locate the root of the failure in the theory itself. That is why for me, to be a Communist Marxist in its good sense, is to repeat Marx’s admonition, "ruthless criticism of all that exists."\textsuperscript{329} Today, this ruthless criticism should include his theory.

The Proletariat is a Non-owner of Capital

Although in Marx’s time a mixture of classes from feudalism was still existing, he saw the tendency of capitalism to simplify class antagonisms\textsuperscript{330}. But capitalism’s act of simplifying class antagonisms is not just to drive a significant number of the population propertyless and were forced to sell their labor. It is not this capacity to work that makes the proletariat a universal class but her lack. It is her being a non-bourgeois: a non-owner of capital. It is like coffee without cream\textsuperscript{331}. This lack is what makes the proletariat the universal class. That is why I claim the proletariat is the immense majority of the world’s population.

\textsuperscript{328} When I verbalize this question in my head, it is always in the tune of the 4 Non Blondes Song. 4 Non Blondes, “What’s Up?”, by Linda Perry, recorded 1992, Interscope, track 1 on Bigger, Better, Faster, More!, 1993, cassette.
\textsuperscript{330} Marx and Engels, The Communist Manifesto, 220, Adobe PDF eBook.
\textsuperscript{331} Zizek, Less Than Nothing, 2023, Apple eBook.
A Good Proletariat is a Non-Productive Proletariat

Marx already saw that the more the workers work, the more capital accumulates, the more her social status sink with capital\(^{332}\). It is not just private appropriation that produces and reproduces the capitalist social relations. It is this private appropriation combined with infinite productivity. I think this unleashing of productivity in communism is a mistake. It only produced and reproduced the bourgeoisie within the communist frame. And at the same time, this emphasis on productivity not only demanded the proletariat to remain as they were but even demanded to them to raise the level of their productivity. It is like a communist re-proletarianization. Transforming a bourgeois property into common property is not enough. Communism must significantly minimize production and significantly reduce working hours. Communism could only do that by de-commodification or by transforming the economy from a profit-oriented production, services, and distribution into a needs-oriented economy. And by doing that, communism not only creates the conditions for the impossibility of the emergence of the bourgeoisie but also of the proletariat.

Reform and Revolution

If labor is somehow romanticized in some of Marx’s works, the Marxist notion of revolution creates an atmosphere of a bloody battle and a swift and violent seizure of political power. The experiences of past revolutions precisely warrant this description of a violent overthrow of the powers that be. But the real revolutionary content of these revolutions is not the act of violent overthrow itself but the intervention of the revolutionary subject to change the very core of the everyday. In the French revolution, it is the self-

designation of the Third Estate as the National Assembly. In the Bolshevik revolution, it is the revolutionary demand of “All Power to the Soviets”. These events created the conditions for the revolution. These interventions of the revolutionary subject are precisely the ones that are revolutionary in themselves. That is why the act of the violent overthrow of the existing power is historically contingent and is not an eternal truth.

This idea then puts forward a political strategy that creates tension to the traditional Marxist differentiation of Reforms and Revolution. Again, it is precisely the intervention of the communists to the everyday that creates conditions for revolution. Reforms advocated by communists that are linked to the establishment of communism are revolutionary in themselves.

The ability to intervene in the everyday requires communists to hold political power. For communists to acquire power, they have to earn it. Communists can only prove what they say who they are if they dare to fight the bourgeoisie head-on. To do this, she must engage him politically. That is why Communists must participate in the electoral process. I mean communists must participate as communists, as advocates of communism, as revolutionaries. The experience of governance as communists by doing state intervention to the everyday, by the communist program of de-commodification within a commodified capitalist system will create conditions for the total seizure of political power on a national scale. Similar to the capitalist system where its daily economic transactions produce ideological acceptance of the system, our communist political and economic interventions of daily life will instill ideological consciousness of non-acceptance to the existing capitalist

---

system. At a global level, communists all over the world must coordinate and establish an international organization. Without this, the world could not be won.

To end this part on Marx, I would like to restate his 11th Thesis, although in a slightly different form: The philosophers need to interpret and reinterpret the world; and in the process of changing it, we must reinterpret it again.

CONCLUSION: THE ROAD TO POWER

In traditional Maoist jargon, especially in the Philippine Left, Theory is studied as a guide to action. But for a theory to serve as a guide to action, theory in itself resembles action or an abstraction of a particular practice that generates a status of universality. Therefore, theory can be defined as an abstraction of practice. Based on this theory, another theory will be generated that will suit the particular context of a given country or territory. This theory is no longer out of context to the said country but it was precisely contextualized to that given country or territory. Now what to do with this contextual theory? The knee-jerk reaction of the knee-jerk radicals is to execute this theory or immediately apply it into practice. But why not test this theory on what it promises to achieve hypothetically in the realm of the theory itself? Why not discuss these ideas as practical as possible by discussing them realistically as actual and practical ideas? And

---
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we must test these ideas 'till the end. We must let these ideas fight to the death by bringing them into the arena of theoretical discussion and debate.

In theory, the communist movement's success lies in its incessant struggle for power and the stubborn pursuance of its immediate aims and long-term goals. But the method of struggle and pursuance should be pre-designed conceptually based on the existing conditions, both generally and specifically with a matching crisp account of what might be bound to happen. In this manner, the revolutionary subjects are conscious of what they must achieve and are aware of the sacrifices that these achievements entail. With this business-like approach to the communist revolution, we can efficiently measure our achievements and weaknesses and amplify and promptly correct them respectively.

On the subject of the road to power, I remain a follower of Marx. I will attempt to expound on Marx and Engels’ formulation in the Communist Manifesto. Let us briefly quote Marx and Engels, “the immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all the other proletarian parties: formation of the proletariat into a class, the overthrow of the bourgeois supremacy, conquest of political power by the proletariat.”

FORMATION OF THE PROLETARIAT INTO A CLASS

What are the characteristics of this class-formation of the proletariat? Are we going to form them into a class so that they could have a better class standing within capitalism? Is it not the act of forming the proletariat into a class is the beginning of the proletariat's undermining of itself as a class under capitalism? These three immediate aims that Marx

---

and Engels enumerated could not be carried out separately. The act of formation should generate the beginning of the overthrow and conquest.

But let us answer the questions I just asked myself to make things clear. The first question is about the characteristics of this class formation. The character of this formation is precisely a political formation. We are forming a class that will politically engage the bourgeoisie. We are engaging him politically because we are to overthrow his rule. Therefore, we are transforming the proletariat into a revolutionary class.

The other question is asking if our aim in the formation of the proletariat into a class is to create a better life for them in capitalism. Our answers are Yes and No. Yes because the struggle to overthrow the bourgeoisie needs ever-growing members of the proletarian class to do a multitude of tasks for the revolution. To achieve that we need fewer working hours. For the proletariat to have fewer working hours, means that they are paid better and have access to necessities. No, because that does not mean that our aim is just to make things better within the capitalist setup. Our aim is to overthrow and conquer. But that is why we can effectively do better within capitalism because we are aiming to overthrow and conquest.

The third question asks if the class formation creates conditions for the proletariat to undermine herself within capitalism. What I mean undermining here is not consciously weakening the proletariat’s position but the beginning of the end of an exploited proletariat and the beginning of a reinvented revolutionary subject that is trying to do away with this exploitative relation. What is being undermined is her self-acceptance as an unprivileged class within capitalism and through the emancipatory struggle, she reinvents her subjectivity.
By making it clear that these immediate aims enumerated are not just aims interconnected with each other but are indivisible, we can now attempt to discuss them separately without disconnecting them from each other.

Again let us go back to the aim of formation of the proletariat into a class. When we say formation it invokes unity. And to materially establish unity we need an organization. This organization should have the potential to overthrow and conquer. The traditional organization that engages itself politically is a political party. This means that communists must reinvent the communist party. Is party formation or party-building amounts to class formation? What are the characteristics of this reinvented communist party? What are the attributes of the 20th-century communist party that should be dismissed and retained? What are the new elements that we need to infuse within the party to make it an effective weapon for these immediate aims?

Let us try to answer the questions posed. If we are talking about the attributes of a communist party that chose to be an illegal underground formation, then that attribute could not form the proletariat into a class. Practically to form the immense majority of the population as a class we need a legal operating political party to achieve this task. And to engage the bourgeois parties politically, we could not engage them through the channels of secrecy. Therefore a reinvented party must be a legal party that engages the bourgeois politically in an open manner.

Another element that Marx himself introduced is the party’s role as a vanguard. In Marx’s presentation, the communists are the elements who must lead these parties that
have mass working-class membership. But the Russian version of the party became relatively the universal concept of the communist party despite its peculiar Russian context. This led to an elitist formation of a communist party where the vanguard or the advanced elements are members of a single communist party while the proletarian masses are members of various working-class organizations such as trade unions, etc. This type of party formation I do believe will not aid in the formation of the proletariat as a class.

As we said earlier the act of forming the proletariat as a class is in itself a revolutionary act. Communism is immediately introduced as the aim of this class formation. But there are always elements within the mass party that will become leaders or vanguards in various tasks and revolutionary work. The party organization must create the capacity to develop comrades in any field of work as fast as possible. The formation of the proletariat as a class will be impossible without establishing a communist party with an ever-increasing mass membership and competent cadres within. Therefore the party retains its advanced elements within a mass proletarian party and both of these elements are the cause and proof of the other.

In addition to this persona of illegality, the armed struggle as the method of political seizure is another characteristic of the party, especially parties belonging to the Maoist tradition. In connection to the immediate aim of class formation, we again need to ask if this method contributes to it. Remember that we are still at the material expression of unity, a sense of class unity, its organization. And we concluded that the organization best suited for this immediate aim is the political party. It is the communist party that engages the
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bourgeoisie directly in the arena of politics. But if a communist party is directly engaging the bourgeois state in this armed form of struggle, then the subjective function of the party to lead the proletarian masses will focus on the building of its military capability to defeat the bourgeois state. All party tasks will serve directly or indirectly this armed struggle. But what is wrong with this description? Besides aiming to annihilate the armed component of the state where most of its members are proletarians, the party could never develop an open and ceaseless ideological and politico-economic struggle against the bourgeoisie if the armed form of struggle is pursued. What will happen is the opposite. The bourgeoisie will unceasingly pursue the party. This communist party will become ineffective in its struggle to seize political power from the bourgeoisie.

If the communist party is the material expression of this class unity, there should be a ‘spiritual’ expression that penetrates this materiality. It is this idea of communism. No longer fixated and limited to the works of Marx, Lenin, and others but an ever-broadening and deepening of the communist idea. But this appearance of eclecticism is its dogma. Its dogma is the conviction that this ongoing capitalist totality if left for itself will only create more and more catastrophes. Only the idea of communism and its application will somehow put a halt to this catastrophic inevitability. This ‘spirit’ of the idea of communism combined with the materiality of the organization of the communist party are the elements that will firmly establish the proletariat as a class.

OVERTHROW OF THE BOURGEOIS SUPREMACY

In capitalism, the bourgeois class reigns supreme. To overthrow the bourgeoisie, the proletariat must locate where the bourgeoisie is weakest and the proletariat when organized is strongest. Let us look at the places of work where the proletariat were mostly
organized. Most places of work are privately owned by the capitalists. It is precisely in those places where the power of the bourgeoisie is undisguised. It is simply his dominion. But for the proletariat, do places of work bring forth a potentiality to overthrow the power of the bourgeoisie?

In grassroots organizing, we mostly conduct our meetings with workers outside of the places of work. And usually, we do them in their communities. What does this mean about bourgeois supremacy? I am convinced that the economic sphere is the worst place to start any plan of overthrowing. It is not only the place where the bourgeoisie is strongest but it is also where the proletariat is weakest because you are only attempting to organize a fragment of the proletariat under a specific individual capitalist. And this fragment organizing will condition the quality of the 'spirit' of organizing. Certainly, this kind of organizing will only lead to a demand for a better price for the proletarian commodity.

If not the places of work, then where? It was clear that the safest place to start the work of organizing is within a workers' community because it is their 'territory.' But communities of the proletariat are a mixture of the various sub-groups within the proletarian class. Therefore, to organize the proletariat for the objective of overthrowing the bourgeoisie, we must start not in fragments of narrow economic interests of the proletariat but in fragments that produce a broader unity of the proletariat. It is in this sphere that I am convinced that the proletariat is strongest and the bourgeoisie is relatively weakest: it is the political sphere.

Why relatively weakest? Because the state, as the material expression of politics creates an illusion that it serves everybody and posits itself as an institute that exhibits neutrality and fairness. This fairness is even written within the charter of the state itself. If
we compare the political to the economic, the bourgeoisie, although even within this sphere it still has the gall to proclaim impartiality, is economically biased to its class interest. Another reason is that within the politics of liberal democracy, the proletariat as it seeks to organize itself as a class has the potential to contest the 'ownership' of the state by its periodical electoral process. This is where her sheer number should always be an advantage. The proletariat must not conceive the state as a finished reality that could only accommodate the ruling class. The state, just like any existing entity, is penetrable and is subject to change. Therefore, to overthrow bourgeois supremacy, the proletariat must overthrow it politically.

Again, let us ask the question how? The proletariat, in the process of establishing its communist party, must intervene in every political question. It must always present her communist viewpoint. At this juncture, it is applicable to turn to Lenin's Tribune and all the forms that can accentuate the task of political intervention against the bourgeoisie.

Urging his comrades to transcend their economism he writes, "..but a people's tribune who can respond to each and every manifestation of abuse of power and oppression, wherever it occurs, whatever stratum or class it concerns, who can generalize all these manifestations into one big picture of police violence and capitalist exploitation, who can use each small affair to set before everybody his socialist convictions and his democratic demands and to explain to each and all the world-historical significance of the liberation struggle of the proletariat."³⁴⁰

In today's social media, the proletariat can utilize an online newspaper, a blog, a podcast, a Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter account, a YouTube channel, and all other

³⁴⁰ Lih, Lenin Rediscovered, 746, Adobe PDF eBook.
sorts of social media platforms. But I still insist that a physical newspaper is paramount in sending the "good news" to the proletarian masses. Its regular publication and distribution, with its unending task of asking for various forms of contribution and news sources, is pivotal in shaping the revolutionary consciousness of the proletariat and at the same time undermining the political hegemony of the bourgeoisie. I do think that a regular publication of a communist newspaper against the existing capitalist order is another material expression of class struggle.

We are not saying that since the communist party is the most applicable organization to wage a political struggle against the bourgeoisie, it is the only organization that the proletariat will establish. Without a doubt, the establishment of the communist party will push forward the establishment of various forms of organization of the proletariat. Trade unions, neighborhood associations, organizations for the environment, feminist organizations, and so on and so on. All of these organizations can accelerate further the disintegration of bourgeois supremacy. And to again speed up this disintegration, the proletariat with her communist party and all organizations that side with her will utilize from time to time another material expression of the class struggle: the general strike.

But what all of these should result in? It must result in the political defeat of the bourgeoisie. The proletariat, through its communist party, must establish itself as a party that will participate in the elections. Upon the victory of any of its candidates, whether from a national position or even down to a village level position, the party, as a matter of the utmost importance, must do everything it can to apply what it stood for. She must make the state intervene to make life better for the proletariat. She must make the everyday change. She must impel the state to intervene in food production and distribution, in food prices, unemployment, health care, education, housing, land distribution, etc. And
whatever the outcome of these political struggles in the aspects of everyday living, the proletariat must not forget to say that things will be better if communists will take over. That is why the political program of the communist party must concern about everything and it must do all it can to make it applicable, up to date, and perfectly efficient. And to make things smoother, communists must have comrades and allies in every state department, office, or team. We are trying to make the impossible possible so we must do everything imaginable and execute it. For example, what is the communist program on employment, food production, etc.? What are her long-term goals and short-term goals? How are these short-term and long-term goals connected? What are the activities to achieve these short-term goals? Upon achieving the aims in the short term, what are the goals formerly in the long term that are now possible to be achieved on a short term basis? These are just a few questions that we must answer regularly to come up with an efficient program.

But there was a question regarding the attributes of the 20th-century communist party that we were not able to answer. I think it is better to answer that question in this section because first, that attribute is central to make the party an efficient organization of class struggle, and second because I forgot to answer it in the previous section. So retroactively, it is better to answer it now.

The question was, what attribute that was missing in those 20th-century communist parties that we should introduce in this reinvented party? I think we must apply full democracy. More democratic than democrats themselves. The party must be open to all criticisms and suggestions inside and outside the party. Its meetings must be open and can be accessed by anybody. Elections of the party functionaries should be elections and must be held in public. Official documents and other pertinent papers of the party should
be accessible. Why democracy is crucial to the party’s development? We mentioned earlier that the communist party is the material expression of class unity. The application of full democracy develops this class unity by legitimizing grounds for disunity. We could only unite in principle by the act of division. We are united in principle to fight the capitalist system but some methods of fighting are perceived as methods not to weaken the system but paradoxically allows the system to strengthen itself. We must allow ourselves to create these divisions to forge a more determined unity. This can be done by applying full democracy.

The Communist revolution is indeed the most radical rupture not only with traditional property relations but with the traditional human relations hammered out in capitalism. This reminds me of some passage in the Bible. It is a passage from Luke 14:26. It says, “If any man come to Me and hate not his father and mother, and wife and children, and brethren and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be My disciple.” I do believe, especially in the initial stages, this reinvented communist revolution will create an intensified amalgamation of antagonisms within the bourgeois world.

CONQUEST OF POLITICAL POWER BY THE PROLETARIAT

I imagine this aim, at the minimum, a national seizure of political power by the proletariat. This may take place as a culmination of the intensified political struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and as a result of the national electoral victory of the communist party combined with a general strike. I visualize millions of people

gathered in jubilation. But what is most important is in the morning after\textsuperscript{343} when life returns to normal and the communist party and the proletariat must do the daily tasks of the revolution.

But I think based on the narrative I have described earlier, the communist party, at the day of the national seizure, is not a party composed of petty amateurs who are dumbstruck at the power that they seized but they are already an experienced group of efficient communist bureaucrats, in the best sense of the term and are all set to expand their power at the national level and execute the ever-developing ideas of communism.

It is in the best interest of communism as a whole that when a communist movement was able to gain political victory, that a formal establishment of an international communist organization should immediately take place. The result of this organized international movement should be an efficiently planned communist take-over of political power from the bourgeoisie.

As I am trying to finish this paper, Hidilyn Diaz, became the first Filipino to ever win an Olympic gold medal. And I read an interesting article that explained how she and her team concocted a plan to defeat the Chinese rival. They played possum at the Asian championships (four months before the Olympics) to make it look like that she was out of her game so that the Chinese would be complacent and will not see Hidilyn as a principal contender\textsuperscript{344}. But still, it all boiled down to the subject's execution of the unpracticed plan.


and was victorious. This reminds me of a quote attributed from Napoleon, "L’audace, l’audace, toujours l’audace (audacity, audacity, always audacity)."  

How does this connect to the immediate aim of the communists? Communists I do think love plans to the hilt. But most of the time they love them because they are so ambiguous that they end up inapplicable or unreachable. Planning in itself must become an idealized practice. That is what happened to Hidilyn. But when it was her turn to carry the weight, it was pure audacity.

APPENDIX: THE TOTALITY OF THE PANDEMIC

The Covid-19 pandemic's global presence reflects uncannily the totality of capitalism. It is the bringer of accelerated death to millions and continuing. But the pandemic did not start out of nowhere. It is just a symptom of the capitalist disease. Since the onset of the pandemic, scientists were already expecting other pandemics that may arise because of the ecological disasters that are continuing in the world. China was the first country to get affected but it was able to put a stop to it significantly during the pandemic's first onslaught. The strong state approach of China, i.e., its immediate and effective

response against the pandemic should have been replicated to stop the virus from spreading. But most countries underestimated the virus's contagiousness and just ignored what was happening in China. This underestimation I claim was not accidental but a necessity to capitalism then, at the first year of the pandemic and up until now, where the pandemic is now vaccine dependent. A global response to the virus was appealed for but a profit-oriented capitalist response was the answer. Capitalism is all about the infinite movement of capital, of unending production, and reaping unimaginable amounts of profit. To effectively stop the spread of the virus, global capitalism must be literally, even though just temporarily, be stopped. But it did not. So the virus just goes on and just like capitalism, it reinvents herself by producing variants.

Slavoj Zizek has another upcoming book. It is aptly titled "Heaven in Disorder." The title is based on what Mao Tse Tung once said, “There is great disorder under heaven...the situation is excellent." These times of literal uncertainty, Communists must emerge battle-ready for the big fight against the bourgeoisie. We could not wait for the situation to get normal. This is already it. Another research paper published last year about the pandemic was recommending global actions against it. These recommendations are still

---

valid\textsuperscript{355}. But what are the conditions to make these recommendations possible? We must now equalize the struggle against the pandemic and capitalism. To effectively fight capitalism, the pandemic must stop. To put a stop to the pandemic, capitalism must be destroyed.
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