

References

[1] Walter D. Mignolo and Christopher Mattison, “Neither Capitalism nor Communism, but Decolonization: Interview with Walter Mignolo (Part I),” *Critical Legal Thinking* (blog), March 21, 2012, <https://criticallegalthinking.com/2012/03/21/neither-capitalism-nor-communism-but-decolonization-an-interview-with-walter-mignolo/>.

[2] Zeev Sternhell, *Neither Left Nor Right: Fascist Ideology in France*, trans. David Maisel (Princeton, New Jersey; Oxford, United Kingdom: Princeton University Press, 1986), p. 109.

[3] “So what does [Fanon] tell us about the final result? We learn that the newly independent states become sucked into the world market and fall prey to neocolonial domination. No sooner do they achieve political independence than what becomes manifest is their economic dependence. The old colonial powers as well as the superpowers step in to direct the affairs of the newly born nation. Independence turns out to be ‘an empty, fragile shell.’ Unable to provide the masses with the benefits that they expected from the struggle, the newly anointed leaders turn upon them and impose hierarchical social control often at the point of a gun. ‘Neocolonialism, this portrait suggests, is not simply a surreptitious recapture of national resources by external agents in the aftermath of flag independence. Neocolonialism is an internal state of affairs, the unmasked recolonization of human existence by the blackest of skins.’

“Here we have the limitations of the national bourgeoisie on full display. The African national bourgeoisie, like any bourgeoisie, wants to control the economy. However, unlike in the West, where the bourgeoisie came to political power through its control of productive resources, in Africa the colonial authorities denied the native bourgeoisie any such control. The native bourgeoisie therefore focuses on the kind of power that is more readily in reach—political power.

It has no experience running an economy. Upon independence it still lacks economic power,” Peter Hudis, *Frantz Fanon: Philosopher of the Barricades*, Revolutionary Lives (London, United Kingdom: Pluto Press, 2015), pp. 114-115.

[4] International Communist Current, “Nation or Class?” (International Communist Current, January 27, 2006), <https://en.internationalism.org/pamphlets/nationorclass>; Moishe Postone, “History and Helplessness: Mass Mobilization and Contemporary Forms of Anticapitalism,” *Public Culture* 18, no. 1 (2006): pp. 98-99, <https://doi.org/10.1215/08992363-18-1-93>.

[5] The historical tragedies of 20th century decolonization hold this lesson out. Every tragic failure in liberation is also a lesson, or an opportunity for the deepening of our sense of freedom. The self-destruction of the Bolshevik Revolution revealed the flaws that Marxism had accumulated—in particular, the trouble of maintaining a communist program, meeting the needs of all in a cohesive society, and developing the powers of self-emancipation. The bureaucratic-militarist outcome of the Algerian Revolution, for example, revealed the pitfalls of a ‘statist’ interpretation of socialism as a tool for decolonization, while the workers’ councils offered a deeper, more concrete vision of decoloniality. From the accumulation of failures, we refine and polish our sense of freedom into something concrete, practical, and real.

[6] Robert Biel, *Eurocentrism and the Communist Movement* (Montreal, Quebec: Kersplebedeb, 2015), pp. 16-18.

[7] Walter Rodney, “Marxism and African Liberation,” in *Decolonial Marxism: Essays from the Pan-African Revolution*, by Walter Rodney, ed. Asha Rodney et al. (London, United Kingdom; New York, New York: Verso Books, 2022), p. 45.

[8] Álvaro García Linera, “Indianismo and Marxism: The Missed Encounter of Two Revolutionary Principles,” trans. Richard Fidler, *Monthly Review Online*, January 31, 2008,

<https://mronline.org/2008/01/31/indianismo-and-marxism-the-missed-encounter-of-two-revolutionary-principles/>.

[9] “As the two varieties of anti-systemic movements have spread (the labour-socialist movements from a few strong states to all others, the nationalist movements from a few peripheral zones to everywhere else), the distinction between the two kinds of movement has become increasingly blurred. Labour-socialist movements have found that nationalist themes were central to their mobilization efforts and their exercise of state power. But nationalist movements have discovered the inverse. In order to mobilize effectively and govern, they had to canalize the concerns of the work-force for egalitarian restructuring. As the themes began to overlap heavily and the distinctive organizational forms tended to disappear or coalesce into a single structure, the strength of anti-systemic movements, especially as a worldwide collective whole, was dramatically increased,” Immanuel Wallerstein, *Historical Capitalism with Capitalist Civilization* (London, United Kingdom; New York, New York: Verso Books, 1996), p. 71.

[10] Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, trans. Richard Philcox (New York, New York: Grove Press, 2004), p. 5.

[11] “The greatness of Europe has lain in the width of the stage on which she has played her part, the strength of the foundations on which she has builded, and a natural, human ability no whit greater (if as great) than that of other days and races. In other words, the deeper reasons for the triumph of European civilization lie quite outside and beyond Europe,—back in the universal struggles of all mankind.

“Why, then, is Europe great? Because of the foundations which the mighty past have furnished her to build upon: the iron trade of ancient, black Africa, the religion and empire-building of yellow Asia, the art and science of the ‘dago’ Mediterranean shore, east, south, and west, as well

as north. And where she has builded securely upon this great past and learned from it she has gone forward to greater and more splendid human triumph; but where she has ignored this past and forgotten and sneered at it, she has shown the cloven hoof of poor, crucified humanity,—she has played, like other empires gone, the world fool!” W. E. B. Du Bois, “The Souls of White Folk,” in *Darkwater: Voices from Within the Veil* (Mineola, New York: Dover Publications, 1999), p. 23.

[12] Kevin B. Anderson, *Marx at the Margins: On Nationalism, Ethnicity, and Non-Western Societies* (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 2016), pp. 9-10.

[13] “In *real life* the International is composed of workers *divided* into oppressor and oppressed nations. *If its action is to be monistic*, its propaganda must *not* be the same for both. That is how we should regard the matter in the light of real (not Dühringian) “monism”, Marxist materialism,” Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, “Monism and Dualism,” in *A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism* (Marxists Internet Archive, 1916),

<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1916/carimarx/5.htm#v23pp64h-055>.

[14] Anderson, *Marx at the Margins*, pp. 172-173.

[15] “The general result of the struggle between capitalism and simple commodity production is this: after substituting commodity economy for natural economy, capital takes the place of simple commodity economy. Non-capitalist organisations provide a fertile soil for capitalism; more strictly: capital feeds on the ruins of such organisations, and although this non-capitalist *milieu* is indispensable for accumulation, the latter proceeds at the cost of this medium nevertheless, by eating it up. Historically, the accumulation of capital is a kind of metabolism between capitalist economy and those pre-capitalist methods of production without which it cannot go on and which, in this light, it corrodes and assimilates. Thus capital cannot accumulate

without the aid of non-capitalist organisations, nor, on the other hand, can it tolerate their continued existence side by side with itself. Only the continuous and progressive disintegration of non-capitalist organisations makes accumulation of capital possible.

“The premises which are postulated in Marx’s diagram of accumulation accordingly represent no more than the historical tendency of the movement of accumulation and its logical conclusion.

The accumulative process endeavours everywhere to substitute simple commodity economy for natural economy. Its ultimate aim, that is to say, is to establish the exclusive and universal domination of capitalist production in all countries and for all branches of industry,” Rosa Luxemburg, *The Accumulation of Capital*, trans. Agnes Schwarzchild (London, United Kingdom; New York, New York: Routledge Classics, 2003), p. 397.

[16] “Yet this argument does not lead anywhere. As soon as this final result is achieved—in theory, of course, because it can never actually happen —accumulation must come to a stop. The realisation and capitalisation of surplus value become impossible to accomplish. Just as soon as reality begins to correspond to Marx’s diagram of enlarged reproduction, the end of accumulation is in sight, it has reached its limits, and capitalist production is *in extremis*. For capital, the standstill of accumulation means that the development of the productive forces is arrested, and the collapse of capitalism follows inevitably, as an objective historical necessity. This is the reason for the contradictory behaviour of capitalism in the final stage of its historical career: imperialism,” Luxemburg, *The Accumulation of Capital*, pp. 397-398.

[17] “It was a great historical contribution of Rosa Luxemburg that she, in a conscious opposition to the distortions of these ‘neo-harmonists’ adhered to the basic lesson of *Capital* and sought to reinforce it with the proof that the continued development of capitalism encounters absolute economic limits.

“Frankly Luxemburg’s effort failed. According to her exposition, capitalism simply cannot exist without non-capitalist markets. If this line of reasoning were true, the breakdown tendency would have been a constant symptom of capitalism from its very inception, and it would be impossible to explain either periodic crises or the characteristic features of the latest stage of capitalism called ‘imperialism’. Yet Luxemburg herself had the feeling that the breakdown tendency and imperialism only appear at an advanced stage of accumulation and find their sole basis in this stage. ‘There is no doubt that the explanation for the economic roots of imperialism must be deduced from the laws of capital accumulation’ (Luxemburg, 1972, p. 61).

“However Luxemburg herself provided no such deduction and even made no attempt in this direction Her own deduction of the necessary downfall of capitalism is not rooted in the immanent laws of the accumulation process, but in the transcendental fact of an absence of non-capitalist markets. Luxemburg shifts the crucial problem of capitalism from the sphere of production to that of circulation. Hence the form in which she conducts her proof of the absolute economic limits to capitalism comes close to the idea that the end of capitalism is a distant prospect because the capitalisation of the non-capitalist countries is the task of centuries. Moreover, the collapse of the capitalist system is conceived in a mechanical fashion. Once capital rules the entire globe, the impossibility of capitalism will become evident. The result is to anticipate in theory a situation in which capitalism will be automatically destroyed, although we know that there are no absolutely hopeless situations. Luxemburg thus renders the theory of breakdown vulnerable to the charge of a quietist fatalism in which there is no room for the class struggle,” Henryk Grossman, *The Law of Accumulation and Breakdown of the Capitalist System: Being Also a Theory of Crises*, trans. Jairus Banaji (London, United Kingdom: Pluto Press, 1992), pp. 41-42.

[18] “What this reveals, on the other side, is the foolishness of those socialists (namely the French, who want to depict socialism as the realization of the ideals of *bourgeois* society articulated by the French revolution) who demonstrate that exchange and exchange value etc. are *originally* (in time) or *essentially* (in their adequate form) a system of universal freedom and equality, but that they have been perverted by money, capital, etc. Or, also, that history has so far failed in every attempt to implement them in their true manner, but that they have now, like Proudhon, discovered e.g. the real Jacob, and intend now to supply the genuine history of these relations in place of the fake. The proper reply to them is: that exchange value or, more precisely, the money system is in fact the system of equality and freedom, and that the disturbances which they encounter in the further development of the system are disturbances inherent in it, are merely the realization of *equality and freedom*, which prove to be inequality and unfreedom. It is just as pious as it is stupid to wish that exchange value would not develop into capital, nor labour which produces exchange value into wage labour. What divides these gentlemen from the bourgeois apologists is, on one side, their sensitivity to the contradictions included in the system; on the other, the utopian inability to grasp the necessary difference between the real and the ideal form of bourgeois society, which is the cause of their desire to undertake the superfluous business of realizing the ideal expression again, which is in fact only the inverted projection [*Lichtbild*] of this reality,” Karl Marx, *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy (Rough Draft)*, trans. Martin Nicolaus, Penguin Classics (New York, New York: Penguin Books in association with New Left Review, 1973), pp. 248-249.

[19] “From the commencement of the titanic American strife the workingmen of Europe felt instinctively that the star-spangled banner carried the destiny of their class. The contest for the territories which opened the dire epopee, was it not to decide whether the virgin soil of immense

tracts should be wedded to the labor of the emigrant or prostituted by the tramp of the slave driver?" Karl Marx, "Address of the International Working Men's Association to Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States of America" (Marxists Internet Archive, January 28, 1865), www.marxists.org/archive/marx/iwma/documents/1864/lincoln-letter.htm; "In *America* we have witnessed the conquest of Mexico and have rejoiced at it It is also an advance when a country which has hitherto been exclusively wrapped up in its own affairs, perpetually rent with civil wars, and completely hindered in its development, a country whose best prospect had been to become industrially subject to Britain — when such a country is forcibly drawn into the historical process. It is to the interest of its own development that Mexico will in future be placed under the tutelage of the United States. The evolution of the whole of America will profit by the fact that the United States, by the possession of California, obtains command of the Pacific. But again we ask: 'Who is going to profit immediately by the war?' The bourgeoisie alone. The North Americans acquire new regions in California and New Mexico for the creation of fresh capital, that is, for calling new bourgeois into being, and enriching those already in existence; for all capital created today flows into the hands of the bourgeoisie. And what about the proposed cut through the Tehuantepec isthmus? Who is likely to gain by that? Who else but the American shipping owners? Rule over the Pacific, who will gain by that but these same shipping owners? The new customers for the products of industry, customers who will come into being in the newly acquired territories — who will supply their needs? None other than the American manufacturers," Friedrich Engels, "The Movement of 1847" (History is a Weapon, January 23, 1848), <http://hiaw.org/defcon6/works/1848/01/23.html>.

[20] "As a result of the American Civil War and the accompanying cotton famine, the majority of the cotton workers of Lancashire were, as is well known, thrown out of work. Both from the

working class itself, and from other social strata, there arose a cry for state aid, or voluntary national subscriptions, in order to make possible the emigration of those who were 'redundant' to the English colonies or to the United States,” Karl Marx, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, trans. Ben Fowkes, vol. 1, 3 vols., Penguin Classics (New York, New York: Penguin Books in association with New Left Review, 1976), p. 720; “What a limited field the proletarian movement occupied at that time (December 1847) is most clearly shown by the last section: the position of the Communists in relation to the various opposition parties in various countries. Precisely Russia and the United States are missing here. It was the time when Russia constituted the last great reserve of all European reaction, when the United States absorbed the surplus proletarian forces of Europe through immigration. Both countries provided Europe with raw materials and were at the same time markets for the sale of its industrial products. Both were, therefore, in one way or another, pillars of the existing European system,” Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, “Preface to the 1882 Edition of The Communist Manifesto” (Marxists Internet Archive, 1882),

<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1848/communist-manifesto/preface.htm#preface-1882>.

[21] At the same time, Marx had a far more realistic assessment of settlers than some of his followers. While the final chapter of *Capital* (1867) only claimed to show that capital is the self-negation of private property through the example of capitalist struggle to expropriate settlers, some followers like Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt have portrayed petty settlers as a positive image of a revolutionary subject. To them, these settlers are an instance of the ‘multitude,’ a revolutionary subjectivity defined primarily by a democratic political ethos enabled by autonomy from the site of capital-production. Needless to say, this is quite a

reactionary assessment of settlers, significantly more complacent in settler mythology than Marx ever was. Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt, *Empire* (Cambridge, Massachusetts; London, England: Harvard University Press, 2000), pp. 167–172; Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire* (New York, New York: Penguin Books, 2004), pp. 247–249.

[22] Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, “General Characteristic of the Three Main Sections. The Homestead West,” in *New Data on the Laws Governing the Development of Capitalism in Agriculture: PART ONE—Capitalism and Agriculture in the United States of America* (Marxists Internet Archive, 1915), <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1915/newdev/1.htm#v22zz99h-019>.

[23] Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, “Russians and Negroes” (Marxists Internet Archive, February 1913), <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1913/feb/00b.htm>.

[24] “Competition becomes transformed into monopoly. The result is immense progress in the socialization of production. In particular, the process of technical invention and improvement becomes socialized.

“This is something quite different from the old free competition between manufacturers, scattered and out of touch with one another, and producing for an unknown market.

Concentration has reached the point at which it is possible to make an approximate estimate of all sources of raw materials (for example, the iron ore deposits) of a country and even, as we shall see, of several countries, or of the whole world. Not only are such estimates made, but these sources are captured by gigantic monopolist combines. An approximate estimate of the capacity of markets is also made, and the combines “divide” them up amongst themselves by agreement. Skilled labour is monopolized, the best engineers are engaged; the means of transport are captured: railways in America, shipping companies in Europe and America. Capitalism in its

imperialist stage leads right up to the most comprehensive socialization of production; it, so to speak, drags the capitalists, against their will and consciousness, into some sort of a new social order, a transitional one from complete free competition to complete socialization.

“Production becomes social, but appropriation remains private. The social means of production remain the private property of a few. The general framework of formally recognized free competition remains, but the yoke of a few monopolists on the rest of the population becomes a hundred times heavier, more burdensome and intolerable,” Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (Paris, France: Foreign Languages Press, 2020), pp. 22-23.

[25] Aníbal Quijano, “Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America,” *Nepantla: Views from the South* 1, no. 3 (2000): pp. 538-541.

[26] “Political economy confuses, on principle, two different kinds of private property, one of which rests on the labour of the producer himself, and the other on the exploitation of the labour of others. It forgets that the latter is not only the direct antithesis of the former, but grows on the former’s tomb and nowhere else,” Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 931.

[27] “We have seen that the expropriation of the mass of the people from the soil forms the basis of the capitalist mode of production. The essence of a free colony, on the contrary, consists in this, that the bulk of the soil is still public property, and every settler on it can therefore turn part of it into his private property and his individual means of production, without preventing later settlers from performing the same operation. This is the secret both of the prosperity of the colonies and of their cancerous affliction their resistance to the establishment of capital. 'Where land is very cheap and all men are free, where every one who so pleases can easily obtain a piece of land for himself, not only is labour very dear, as respects the labourer's share of the produce, but the difficulty is to obtain combined labour at any price,'” Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, pp. 934-935.

[28] Richard White, *The Republic for Which It Stands: The United States During Reconstruction and the Gilded Age, 1865-1896*, The Oxford History of the United States (New York, New York: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 104-105.

[29] Fred A. Shannon, *The Farmer's Last Frontier: Agriculture, 1860-1897* (New York, New York: Harper & Row, 1968), pp. 291-308.

[30] Shannon, *The Farmer's Last Frontier*, pp. 309-326.

[31] Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, "Displacement of Small by Big Enterprises. Quantity of Improved Land," in *New Data on the Laws Governing the Development of Capitalism in Agriculture: PART ONE—Capitalism and Agriculture in the United States of America*, by Vladimir Ilyich Lenin (Marxists Internet Archive, 1915),

<https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1915/newdev/8.htm#v22zz99h-048>.

[32] Lee J. Alston, "Farm Foreclosures in the United States During the Interwar Period," *The Journal of Economic History* 43, no. 4 (December 1983): 885–903.

[33] Zvi Griliches, "The Sources of Measured Productivity Growth: United States Agriculture, 1940-60," *Journal of Political Economy* 71, no. 4 (August 1963): pp. 338-340.

[34] Stefan Aune, *Indian Wars Everywhere: Colonial Violence and the Shadow Doctrines of Empire* (Oakland, California: University of California Press, 2023), p. 48; J. Sakai, *Settlers: The Mythology of the White Proletariat from Mayflower to Modern*, 4th ed. (Montreal, Quebec: Kersplebedeb, 2014), p. 383.

[35] Bradley G. Shreve, *Red Power Rising: The National Indian Youth Council and the Origins of Native Activism* (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 2011), p. 42.

[36] Karl Jacoby, *Shadows at Dawn: The Apache Massacre and the Violence of History* (New York, New York: Penguin Books, 2012).

[37] Stephen Kantrowitz, “White Supremacy, Settler Colonialism, and the Two Citizenships of the Fourteenth Amendment,” *The Journal of the Civil War Era* 10, no. 1 (March 2020): pp. 30-31, <https://doi.org/10.1353/cwe.2020.0002>.

[38] John Hayakawa Torok, “Reconstruction and Racial Nativism: Chinese Immigrants and the Debates on the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments and Civil Rights Laws,” *Asian Law Journal* 3, no. 55 (1996): p. 57; Martha Menchaca, “Chicano Indianism: A Historical Account of Racial Repression in the United States,” *American Ethnologist* 20, no. 3 (1993): p. 595.

[39] James N. Leiker, *Racial Borders: Black Soldiers along the Rio Grande* (College Station, Texas: Texas A&M University, 2002), pp. 64-65.

[40] With the distance of hindsight in exile, Kwame Nkrumah realized exactly this. Critiquing the ‘African Socialism’ which he himself had participated in the promotion of, he noted that “The myth of African socialism is used to deny the class struggle, and to obscure genuine socialist commitment. It is employed by those African leaders who are compelled—in the climate of the African Revolution—to proclaim socialist policies, but who are at the same time deeply committed to international capitalism, and who do not intend to promote genuine socialist economic development,” Kwame Nkrumah, *Class Struggle in Africa*, 1st ed. (New York, New York: International Publishers, 1970), p. 26.

[41] Clinton Rickard, *Fighting Tuscarora: The Autobiography of Chief Clinton Rickard*, ed. Barbara Graymont (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1973), p. 14.

[42] Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, “Imperialism and the Split in Socialism” (Marxists Internet Archive, October 1916), <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1916/oct/x01.htm>.

[43] Rickard, *Fighting Tuscarora*, p. 16.

[44] J. Sakai, "The Shock of Recognition: Looking at Hamerquist's Fascism & Anti-Fascism," in *Confronting Fascism: Discussion Documents for a Militant Movement*, by Don Hamerquist et al., 2nd ed. (Montreal, Quebec: Kersplebedeb, 2017), pp. 125-131.

[45] Aimé Césaire, *Discourse on Colonialism*, trans. Joan Pinkham (New York, New York: Monthly Review Press, 2001).

[46] Sakai, *Settlers*, p. 9.

[47] "Myth becomes enlightenment and nature mere objectivity. Human beings purchase the increase in their power with estrangement from that over which it is exerted. Enlightenment stands in the same relationship to things as the dictator to human beings. He knows them to the extent that he can manipulate them. The man of science knows things to the extent that he can make them. Their 'in-itself' becomes 'for him. In their transformation the essence of things is revealed as always the same, a substrate of domination. This identity constitutes the unity of nature. Neither it nor the unity of the subject was presupposed by magical incantation. The rites of the shaman were directed at the wind, the rain, the snake outside or the demon inside the sick person, not at materials or specimens. The spirit which practiced magic was not single or identical; it changed with the cult masks which represented the multiplicity of spirits. Magic is bloody untruth, but in it domination is not yet disclaimed by transforming itself into a pure truth underlying the world which it enslaves. The magician imitates demons; to frighten or placate them he makes intimidating or appeasing gestures. Although his task was impersonation he did not claim to be made in the image of the invisible power, as does civilized man, whose modest hunting ground then shrinks to the unified cosmos, in which nothing exists but prey. Only when made in such an image does man attain the identity of the self which cannot be lost in identification with the other but takes possession of itself once and for all as an impenetrable

mask. It is the identity of mind and its correlative, the unity of nature, which subdues the abundance of qualities. Nature, stripped of qualities, becomes the chaotic stuff of mere classification, and the all-powerful self becomes a mere having, an abstract identity. Magic implies specific representation. What is done to the spear, the hair, the name of the enemy, is also to befall his person; the sacrificial animal is slain in place of the god. The substitution which takes place in sacrifice marks a step toward discursive logic. Even though the hind which was offered up for the daughter, the lamb for the firstborn, necessarily still had qualities of its own, it already represented the genus. It manifested the arbitrariness of the specimen. But the sanctity of the *hie ct nunc*, the uniqueness of the chosen victim which coincides with its representative status, distinguishes it radically, makes it non-exchangeable even in the exchange. Science puts an end to this. In it there is no specific representation: something which is a sacrificial animal cannot be a god. Representation gives way to universal fungibility. An atom is smashed not as a representative but as a specimen of matter, and the rabbit suffering the torment of the laboratory is seen not as a representative but, mistakenly, as a mere exemplar. Because in functional science the differences are so fluid that everything is submerged in one and the same matter, the scientific object is petrified, whereas the rigid ritual of former times appears supple in its substitution of one thing for another. The world of magic still retained differences whose traces have vanished even in linguistic forms. The manifold affinities between existing things are supplanted by the single relationship between the subject who confers meaning and the meaningless object, between rational significance and its accidental bearer. At the magical stage dream and image were not regarded as mere signs of things but were linked to them by resemblance or name. The relationship was not one of intention but of kinship. Magic like science is concerned with ends, but it pursues them through mimesis, not through an increasing

distance from the object. It certainly is not founded on the ‘omnipotence of thought,’ which the primitive is supposed to impute to himself like the neurotic; there can be no ‘over-valuation of psychological acts’ in relation to reality where thought and reality are not radically distinguished. The ‘unshakable confidence in the possibility of controlling the world’ which Freud anachronistically attributes to magic applies only to the more realistic form of world domination achieved by the greater astuteness of science. The autonomy of thought in relation to objects, as manifested in the reality-adequacy of the Ego, was a prerequisite for the replacement of the localized practices of the medicine man by all-embracing industrial technology,” Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer, *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*, ed. Gunzelin Schmid Noerr, trans. Edmund Jephcott (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2002), pp. 6-7.

[48] “In all previous revolutions the mode of activity always remained unchanged and it was only a question of a different distribution of this activity, a new distribution of labour to other persons, whilst the communist revolution is directed against the hitherto existing mode of activity, does away with labour and abolishes the rule of all classes with the classes themselves, because it is carried through by the class which no longer counts as a class in society, which is not recognised as a class, and is in itself the expression of the dissolution of all classes, nationalities, etc., within present society[...].” Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *The German Ideology, Includes: Theses on Feuerbach and the Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy* (New York, New York: Prometheus Books, 1998), p. 86; “Labour is *not the source* of all wealth. *Nature* is just as much the source of use-values (and what else is material wealth?) as labour, which is itself only the expression of a natural power, human labour power.

“This line can be found in any children’s primer and is correct in so far as the *implication* is that labour requires certain means and materials. However a socialist programme cannot allow a

bourgeois phrase like this to conceal the very *circumstances* that give it some sense. Only in so far as man acts as the proprietor of nature, the primary source of all the means and materials of labour, and treats nature as his own from the outset, does his labour become the source of use-values, and hence of wealth. The bourgeoisie have very good reason to credit labour with *a supernatural generative power*; for it follows directly from the fact that nature is a precondition for labour, that a man who has no property other than his labour power must in all cultural and social circumstances be a slave to those who have become the owners of labour's material prerequisites. He can only work by permission, and hence live by permission," Karl Marx, "Critique of the Gotha Programme," in *Marx: Later Political Writings*, by Karl Marx, ed. Terrell Carver, Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought (New York, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 208-209.

[49] John Steinbeck, *The Grapes of Wrath* (New York, New York: Random House, 1939), pp. 315-316.

[50] Luther Standing Bear, *Land of the Spotted Eagle* (Lincoln, Nebraska; London, United Kingdom: University of Nebraska Press, 2006), p. 248.

[51] Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1, no. 1 (2012): p. 11.

[52] "When the black man, who has never felt as much a 'Negro' as he has under white domination, decides to prove his culture and act as a cultivated person, he realizes that history imposes on him a terrain already mapped out, that history sets him along a very precise path and that he is expected to demonstrate the existence of a 'Negro' culture.

"And it is all too true that the major responsibility for this racialization of thought, or at least the way it is applied, lies with the Europeans who have never stopped placing white culture in

opposition to the other noncultures. Colonialism did not think it worth its while denying one national culture after the other. Consequently the colonized's response was immediately continental in scope," Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, p. 150.

[53] Jonathan Raban, "My Holy War," *The New Yorker*, January 27, 2002, <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2002/02/04/my-holy-war>; Sayyid Qutb, *Milestones* (Chicago, Illinois: Kazi Publications, 2003), pp. 45-51.

[54] Sayed Khatab, "'Hakimiyyah' and 'Jahiliyyah' in the Thought of Sayyid Qutb," *Middle Eastern Studies* 38, no. 3 (July 2002): pp. 162-165.

[55] "The revolution means that the national will evolves along with social influence in accordance with times. So, why the will of today's upper class in today's state is regarded as the national will is because upper class is on the top of today's social influence. If we deny today's state because of this, we shall have to deny socialism that shall be the national will on the top of modern social influence by the same logic because it shall not express the national will. –Not only in Japan, most of today's socialists are pure individualists and think that a mission of socialism is to practice the French Revolution once more," Kita Ikki, "The Enlightening Movement of Socialism," in *A Discourse on the Theory of Japanese Constitution and Real Socialism*, by Kita Ikki, trans. Higuchi Shinya (Tokyo, Japan: Kokutairon, 2014), p. 2 <http://kokutairon.web.fc2.com/english-version.html>; "It was in the early summer of 1927 when I was reading Heidegger's *Zein und Seit* in Berlin that I first came to reflect on the problem of climate. I found myself intrigued by the attempt to treat the structure of man's existence in terms of time but I found it hard to see why, when time had thus been made to play a part in the structure of subjective existence, at the same juncture space also was not postulated as part of the basic structure of existence. Indeed it would be a mistake to allege that space is never taken into

account in Heidegger's thinking, for *Lebendige Natur* was given fresh life by the German Romantics, yet even so it tended to be almost obscured in the face of the strong glare to which time was exposed. I perceived that herein lay the limitations of Heidegger's work, for time not linked with space is not time in the true sense and Heidegger stopped short at this point because his *Dasein* was the *Dasein* of the individual only. He treated human existence as being the existence of a man. From the standpoint of the dual structure—both individual and social—of human existence, he did not advance beyond an abstraction of a single aspect. But it is only when human existence is treated in terms of its concrete duality that time and space are linked and that history also (which never appears fully in Heidegger) is first revealed in its true guise. And at the same time the connection between history and climate becomes evident.” Watsuji Tetsuro, *A Climate: A Philosophical Study*, trans. Geoffrey Bownas (Tokyo, Japan: Printing Bureau, Japanese Government, 1961), pp. V-vi.

[56] Mohammed Elnaïem, “Black Radicalism’s Complex Relationship with Japanese Empire,” *JSTOR Daily* (blog), July 18, 2018, <https://daily.jstor.org/black-radicalisms-complex-relationship-with-japanese-empire/>.

[57] Jie Zeng and Xiaolong Li, “Ideologies Underlying Language Policy and Planning in the Philippines,” *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* 10, no. 405 (2023), <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01911-8>.

[58] See Mikhail Bakunin, *Statism and Anarchy*, ed. and trans. Marshall Shatz, Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought (New York, New York: Cambridge University Press, n.d.); Ernst Niekisch, “Where We Stand,” trans. Bogumil (ARPLAN, 1926), <https://arplan.org/2020/08/03/ernst-niekisch-where-we-stand/>; Karl Otto Paetel, “The National Bolshevist Manifesto,” trans. Bogumil (ARPLAN, 1933),

<https://archive.org/details/PaetelNationalBolshevistManifesto/page/n7/mode/2up>; Alain de Benoist, *On Being a Pagan*, ed. Greg Johnson, trans. Jon Grahamm (Atlanta, Georgia: Ultra, 2004).

[59] Moses Hess, *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, trans. Meyer Waxman (New York, New York: Bloch publishing Company, 1918), p. 160.

[60] “You are being invited to help make history. That cannot frighten you, nor will you laugh at it. It is not in your accustomed line; it doesn't involve Africa, but a piece of Asia Minor, not Englishmen but Jews. But had this been on your path, you would have done it by now. How, then, do I happen to turn to you, since this is an out-of-the-way matter for you? How indeed? Because it is something colonial,” quoted in Stephen Halbrook, “The Class Origins of Zionist Ideology,” *Journal of Palestine Studies* 2, no. 1 (Autumn 1972), p. 86

<https://doi.org/10.2307/2535975>.

[61] Zeev Sternhell, *The Founding Myths of Israel: Nationalism, Socialism, and the Making of the Jewish State* (Princeton, New Jersey; Oxford, United Kingdom: Princeton University Press, 1999), pp. 47–51.

[62] Sternhell, *The Founding Myths of Israel*, pp. 153–177

[63] Philip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1999), pp. 21-22.

[64] Deloria, *Playing Indian*, pp. 51-52.

[65] “Let us decide not to imitate Europe and let us tense our muscles and our brains in a new direction. Let us endeavor to invent a man in full, something which Europe has been incapable of achieving.

“Two centuries ago, a former European colony took it into its head to catch up with Europe. It has been so successful that the United States of America has become a monster where the flaws, sickness, and inhumanity of Europe have reached frightening proportions,” Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, pp. 236-237.

[66] This lesson is particularly clear in looking at the reactionary tendencies of the *mizrahim*, West Asian and North African Jews, of Israel. The *mizrahi* settlers who back the fascistic ruling party Likud justify their choice through a rejection of paternalistic universalism and a rhetoric of Jewish authenticity. To them, Likud is the best vehicle to enact their Jewish indigeneity to the land exactly because of its uncompromisingly violent, genocidal ethno-nationalism. Peggy Cidor, “Why the Right-Wing Mizrahi Vote Is Misunderstood in Israel,” *Middle East Eye*, February 1, 2023, <https://www.middleeasteye.net/news/israel-why-right-wing-mizrahi-vote-misunderstood>.

[67] Laurence M. Hauptman, “The American Indian Federation and the Indian New Deal: A Reinterpretation,” *Pacific Historical Review* 52, no. 4 (November 1983): pp. 395-396, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3639073>.

[68] Héctor Orestes Aguilar, “Ese olvidado nazi mexicano de nombre José Vasconcelos,” *Istor: Revista de Historia Internacional* 8, no. 30 (2007): 148–57.

[69] George Manuel and Michael Posluns, *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality* (Minneapolis, Minnesota; London, United Kingdom: University of Minnesota Press, 2019), p. Xii.

[70] Guillermo Bonfil Batalla, *México Profundo: Reclaiming a Civilization*, trans. Philip A. Dennis (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 2010), pp. 53–57; Sebastian Usher, “Why Egypt Remains Reluctant to Open Rafah Crossing to Gaza,” *British Broadcasting Corporation News*, October 17, 2023, <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-67133675>.

[71] Walter Rodney, “Marxism as a Third World Ideology,” in *Decolonial Marxism*, p. 63.

[72] “[...]at the center of a system, that is, where the relations of production are more firmly entrenched, the development of the productive forces governed by these relations strengthens the cohesion of the whole system, while in the periphery, the inadequate development of the productive forces provides more flexibility, which explains the earlier revolutionary outcome,” Samir Amin, *Eurocentrism: Modernity, Religion, and Democracy, A Critique of Eurocentrism and Culturalism*, trans. Russell Moore and James Membrez, 2nd ed. (New York, New York: Monthly Review Press, 2009), p. 248.

[73] Joanne Rappaport, *The Politics of Memory: Native Historical Interpretation in the Colombian Andes* (Durham, North Carolina; London, United Kingdom: Duke University Press, 1998), pp. 144-148; Glen Sean Coulthard, “Once Were Maoists: Third World Currents in Fourth World Anti-Colonialism, Vancouver, 1967–1975,” in *Routledge Handbook of Critical Indigenous Studies*, ed. Brendan Hokowhitu et al., 1st ed. (New York, New York; London, United Kingdom: Routledge, 2020), 378–91.

[74] “Since red nationalism is essential to Indian/Metis liberation, it must be a spearhead force for the native movement, and must provide the machinery for educating the masses politically. Since the cultural awakening is only one stage of liberation, steps must be taken to ensure that the national consciousness will develop its political aspects as well. There is danger in nationalism if this transition is not made at the right time, because colonized people can quickly become involved in cultural nationalism, which is a move backward to further oppression. They must be on guard against bourgeois nationalism as well as cultural nationalism. Bourgeois nationalism, however, is easily recognized: it is simply a code of patriotism imposed by a ruling class through authoritarian officials and channels, such as the schools - it is a purely ritualistic and empty exercise, performed only because one is obligated to participate in displays of patriotism.

“Cultural nationalism is a reactionary nationalism that forms part of the ideology of imperialism. It is adopted by or imposed on Third World people in their colonized state and it involves the revival of indigenous native traditions and tribalism. Today, in our awakening, many Indians of Canada are returning to native religion and tribal rituals. The danger in this is that it might begin to sever any links with a progressive liberation ideology. The idea that a return to traditional Indian customs and worship will free us from the shackles of colonial domination is deceptive—a return to this kind of traditional worship is a reactionary move and leads to greater oppression, rather than to liberation. Cultural nationalism is more than behaving and believing as traditional Indians; it is a return to extreme separatism in the hope that colonial oppression will automatically go away. The emphasis is upon worship and the performance of ritual behavior, not upon politics and liberation. Because cultural nationalism insists on excluding political issues, Indians and Metis accept their colonized political conditions without challenging them. It perpetuates the racist idea of ‘Indians in their place’” and does not allow them to develop a radical consciousness or a reorganized culture that would be in harmony with liberation,” Howard Adams, *Prison of Grass: Canada from a Native Point of View*, 2nd ed. (Saskatoon, Canada: Fifth House Books, 1989), pp. 169-170.

[75] For examples of the consequences of crude ‘Third Worldism’ and authenticity ideology, see Loren Goldner, *Revolution, Defeat and Theoretical Underdevelopment: Russia, Turkey, Spain, Bolivia* (Leiden, South Holland; Boston, Massachusetts: Brill, 2016).

[76] “Race is not, as the racial nationalists claim, an immediate, natural peculiarity. Rather, it is a regression to nature as mere violence, to the hidebound particularism which, in the existing order, constitutes precisely the universal. Race today is the self-assertion of the bourgeois individual, integrated into the barbaric collective. The harmonious society to which the liberal

Jews declared their allegiance has finally been granted to them in the form of the national community. They believed that only anti-Semitism disfigured this order, which in reality cannot exist without disfiguring human beings. The persecution of the Jews, like any persecution, cannot be separated from that order. Its essence, however it may hide itself at times, is the violence which today is openly revealed,” Adorno and Horkheimer, *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, pp. 138–139.

[77] Orlando Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1982), pp. 4–7.

[78] Noel Ignatiev, “Whiteness and Class Struggle,” in *Treason to Whiteness Is Loyalty to Humanity*, by Noel Ignatiev, ed. Geert Dhondt, Zhandarka Kurti, and Jarrod Shanahan (London, United Kingdom; New York, New York: Verso Books, 2022), 268–75.

[79] Noel Ignatiev, “Notes on ‘Settlers’” (June 1996), pp. 1-3
<https://thecharnelhouse.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Noel-Ignatiev-Notes-on-Settlers.pdf>.

[80] Bruce Laurie, *Artisans into Workers: Labor in Nineteenth-Century America*, ed. Eric Foner (New York, New York: Noonday Press, 1989), pp. 211-220.

[81] Arturo Escobar, *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World* (Princeton, New Jersey; Oxford, United Kingdom: Princeton University Press, 1995), pp. 199-206.

[82] Aram Ziai, “The Ambivalence of Post-development: Between Reactionary Populism and Radical Democracy” 25, no. 6 (2004): 1045–60, <https://doi.org/10.1080/0143659042000256887>.

[83] Richard Wolin, *Heidegger in Ruins: Between Philosophy and Ideology* (New Haven, Connecticut; London, United Kingdom: Yale University Press, 2022), pp. 246-248.

[84] Wolin, *Heidegger in Ruins*, pp. 180-182.

[85] Maxwell Woods, “Decoloniality, Communitarity, and Anti-Semitism,” *Cultural Dynamics* 32, no. 4 (2020): 241–60, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0921374019856631>.

[86] Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double-Consciousness* (New York, New York; London, United Kingdom: Verso Books, 1993); Jonathan Derrick, “The Dissenters: Anti-Colonialism in France, c. 1900–40,” in *Promoting the Colonial Idea: Propaganda and Visions of Empire in France*, ed. Tony Chafer (New York, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 53–68; Priyamvada Gopal, *Insurgent Empire: Anticolonial Resistance and British Dissent* (New York, New York; London, United Kingdom: Verso Books, 2020); Fredrik Petersson, “Hub of the Anti-Imperialist Movement: The League against Imperialism and Berlin, 1927–1933,” *Hub of the Anti-Imperialist Movement, Interventions* 16, no. 1 (2014): 49–71, <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369801X.2013.776222>.

[87] “This form of ‘anti-capitalism,’ then, is based on a one-sided attack on the abstract. The abstract and concrete are not seen as constituting an antinomy where the real overcoming of the abstract - of the value dimension - involves the historical overcoming of the antinomy itself as well as each of its terms. Instead there is the one-sided attack on abstract Reason, abstract law or, on another level, money and finance capital. In this sense it is antinomically complementary to liberal thought, where the domination of the abstract remains unquestioned and the distinction between positive and critical reason is not made. The ‘anti-capitalist’ attack, however, does not remain limited to the attack against abstraction. Even the abstract dimension also appears materially. On the level of the capital fetish, it is not only the concrete side of the antimony which is naturalized and biologized. The manifest abstract dimension is also biologized - as the Jews. The opposition of the concrete material and the abstract becomes the racial opposition of the Arians and the Jews. Modern anti-Semitism involves a biologization of capitalism - which

itself is only understood in terms of its manifest abstract dimension - as International Jewry,”
Moishe Postone, “Anti-Semitism and National Socialism: Notes on the German Reaction to
‘Holocaust,’” *New German Critique*, no. 19 (Winter 1980): p. 112,
<https://doi.org/10.2307/487974>.

[88] “Objectified labour ceases to exist in a dead state as an external, indifferent form on the
substance , because it is itself again posited as a moment of living labour; as a relation of living
labour to itself in an objective material, as the objectivity of living labour (as means and end
[*Objekt*]) (the objective conditions of living labour). The transformation of the material by living
labour, by the realization of living labour in the material—a transformation which, as purpose,
determines labour and is its purposeful activation (a transformation which does not only posit the
form as external to the inanimate object, as a mere vanishing image of its material
consistency)—thus preserves the material in a definite form, and subjugates the transformation
of the material to the purpose of labour. Labour is the living, form-giving fire; it is the
transitoriness of things, their temporality, as their formation by living time,” Marx, *Grundrisse*,
pp. 360–361.

[89] “In fact, however, when the limited bourgeois form is stripped away, what is wealth other
than the universality of individual needs, capacities, pleasures, productive forces etc., created
through universal exchange? The full development of human mastery over the forces of nature,
those of so-called nature as well as of humanity's own nature? The absolute working out of his
creative potentialities, with no presupposition other than the previous historic development,
which makes this totality of development, i.e. the development of all human powers as such the
end in itself, not as measured on a *predetermined* yardstick? Where he does not reproduce

himself in one specificity, but produces his totality? Strives not to remain something he has become, but is in the absolute movement of becoming?” Marx, *Grundrisse*, p. 488.

[90] Luce Irigaray, *I Love to You: Sketch for a Felicity Within History*, trans. Alison Martin (New York, New York; London, United Kingdom: Routledge, 1996), pp. 23-26.