

# Critique of Anti-Imperialism



## Introduction

A trend common in circles ranging from Leftists to Nationalists is that of a fanatic adherence to anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism, something reflected by their propaganda and aesthetics. Citing overly moralistic reasons of “national liberation” and other utopian ideals held onto by Marxism and even weaponized by liberalism, they tend to neglect the utility of imperialism, particularly in its historic usage of economic developments/characteristics beneficial to the host nation - this by itself should already sway any self-respecting nationalist. And if we turn this on its head, through the evolution of productive forces in a given region, class antagonisms (will) intensify via the burgeoning of the proletarian class, which according to historical materialism, is one step closer to overturning the bourgeois mode of production.

# Critique of Anti-Imperialism

These people, the Leftists and so called “anti-imperialist nationalists”, tend to neglect the historic role which imperialism has played in fields outside of economics, namely the sphere of geopolitics and foreign policy. Leftist, who stan states like Maoist China and the Soviet Union, ignore the acts of imperialism committed by these states, from Stalin’s invasion of the Baltic states masked as a “military occupation” or his occupation of Bessarabia and war with Finland, to Mao’s invasion of the Indochinese peninsula and the various border disputes with the Soviet Union and India over so; called territorial claims. These acts are usually chalked up as not being instances of imperialism due to the definition laid forth by Lenin, which is heavily flawed, as I shall show in a moment.

I am going to critique anti-imperialism from a pro-imperialist standpoint, going into various instances of imperialism, explaining their advantages, and their theoretical origins and justification.

Before going into this any further, it is necessary to define imperialism first and foremost, as this is something which the Marxists or the left-nationalists will have a hard time coming to terms with if we do not address their misinterpretation of imperialism.

For the Marxists, their notion of imperialism comes from Vladimir Lenin. For Lenin, imperialism represents a specific historical stage whereby the flow of capital cannot be relegated to a particular nation-state, and flows outwards from the host, imperializing nation to nation in a considerably less dominant position with the aims of resource extraction and creating a financial monopoly in the various imperialized nations.

This definition of imperialism is very specific, and it serves no real purpose other than as a political tool; founded on »circular reasoning« as its intention. By this definition, any acts of aggression, military invasion or subversion is not “imperialism” unless the bourgeoisie does it, for only the bourgeoisie are able to export capital. It’s simply a tool used to defend proletarian states from criticism, nothing more, nothing less. In this context, it’s similar to how right wingers use anti-globalism as a tool of rhetoric and then proceed to do the same libertarian wishy-washy “Ayn Rand” free trade nonsense.

The definition of imperialism I will be pushing is any action performed by a particular group, be it religious, national, ethnic, racial, or even a class to increase the power projection of that specific group, be it through conquest, political subversion or anything to the likes of that. Giovanni Gentile in his book *Genesis and Structure of Society* described the aims of war and Imperialism as this:

“The enemy must be placed in a position in which he can no more offend; and he must recognize our will as his own. He must therefore survive to set the seal on our victory by his recognition. Thus War does not derive from an inhuman desire for solitude. The other people, with whom we disagree, are our collaborators; they play their part in the formation of that spiritual organization or patrimony which is our world. The cause of war is only dissent, and its end therefore is nothing but the conquest of this dissent”.

This is a much broader definition of imperialism, while Lenin’s definition fits under the bourgeoisie exporting capital to secure more capital for themselves. Using this definition, communists can’t escape being called out on acts of imperialism, as they dodge the bullet by shrieking Lenin’s nonsensical/bogus excuse.

# Critique of Anti-Imperialism

Besides Lenin's stance here, it's actually simply a consequentialist stance complaining about moralistic values when consequentialists themselves believe the ends justify the means. They therefore do not believe in morality because it's simply a product of the ruling class. Keith Woods did a good job pointing this out in his video debunking [Marxist Ethics](#). In fact, this is really just negation to have the high ground in terms of propaganda when engaging in politics. In other words it's all the same rhetoric.

## Why Support Imperialism?

Imperialism has seen the concentration and development of the productive forces numerous times throughout our history, especially the rise of modern industry and capital. In fact this isn't really just a human thing. Chimpanzees practice warfare and expansion just like humans. The Gombe Chimpanzee War is an excellent historical example. It was a phenomenon that was waged over resources, power and even territory by Chimpanzees. Goodall's research into this was published in the *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*.

[ 0:13 1:33 <https://youtu.be/s0kuMS-EATs> ]

I will now be quoting National Geographic explaining this;

“Do other animals go to war? Since our close relative the chimpanzee is often thought of as war-like, we took the question to Nicholas E. Newton-Fisher, a primate behavioral ecologist at the University of Kent.

Newton-Fisher says by email to National Geographic;

“It probably depends on the definition of war, there's good evidence that chimpanzees conduct deliberate raids on neighbouring communities, and that this can lead to annexation of territory. For instance, during a ten-year study of a chimp family in Uganda's Kibale National Park, the primates killed or injured 18 chimps from other groups and took over their land.”

So this means: Chimps Kill to Expand Territory.

What this teaches us is that our closest relative, the Chimpanzee, is capable of engaging in what we humans know as conflict. They're capable of premeditated genocide, murder and violence. The mental capacity to strategically plan genocide, murder and hurt. Capable of organizing into what we would call tribes.

[ Full clip <https://youtu.be/a7XuXi3mqYM> ]

## Critique of Anti-Imperialism

Richard Wrangham of Harvard University, the senior author of a new paper in The New York Times, called “Going Ape”, has long argued that Chimpanzee violence suggests a biological drive to war - deeply rooted in millions of years of human evolution. Chimpanzees are among humanity’s closest relatives by modern scientific standards. The current research delivers solid evidence from mainstream academia that Chimpanzees are violent by nature as are humans.

In fact, the tactics that the Chimpanzees use are strikingly similar to how Native Americans often engaged in warfare, along with hunter-gatherers and other primitive tribal people(s). Communal societies are well capable of escalation to all-out wars or annihilation between tribes. This principle of extermination is copied from Chimpanzees. Other tactics such as many members of one tribe ambushing an isolated member of a rival tribe.

In *Noble Savages: My Life Among Two Dangerous Tribes - The Yanomamö and The Anthropologists* by Napoleon A. Chagnon. Chagnon in the book goes on to describe how he learned about the Yanomami peoples' genealogy, violence and other cultural traits by participating in village life and rituals, collecting family and conflict histories, between 1964 to the late 1990s. Chagnon's central narrative focuses on how he applied the biologist E. O. Wilson's sociobiological theory of genealogy and violence among the Yanomami. Wilson posited that evolutionary processes shape social interactions like altruism and aggression.

Chagnon explains how he collected and analysed ethnographic data by finding statistical patterns between kinship and violence; reached conclusions on warfare in these societies such as abduction of women, ambushes, paedophilia, and genocide; this developed new questions about the impacts of violence on reproductive success; and repeated the process over decades of research. His book is an important contribution to the debates over the methods and theories used to understand humans in anthropology and evolutionary science. Such as our natural instinct towards warfare and violence.

Assistant anthropologist professor at University of Missouri in The College of Arts and Science, Robert Walker, said this in an interview on *Amazonian Tribal Warfare and Modern Violence*;

"The same reasons for revenge, honor, territory and jealousy over women. That fueled deadly conflicts in the Amazon. It continues to drive violence in today's world. Humans' evolutionary history of violent conflict among rival groups goes back to our primate ancestors. It takes a great deal of social training and institutional control to resist our instincts and solve disputes with words instead of weapons."

Walker examined records of 1,145 violent deaths in 44 societies in the Amazon River basin of South America by reviewing 11 previous anthropological studies. He analyzed the deaths on a case-by-case basis to determine what cultural factors influenced the body counts. Internal raids among tribes with similar languages and cultures were found to be more frequent, but with fewer fatalities, when compared to the less frequent, but deadlier, external raids on tribes of different/unknown language groups.

Walker says this;

## Critique of Anti-Imperialism

"Language and other cultural differences play a role in the 'clash of civilizations' that resulted in recent violence, such as the deadly attack on the U.S. embassy in Libya and the continuing war in Afghanistan."

Raids also sometimes involved kidnapping women. Chimpanzees occasionally also do this with females of different tribes. A similar number of women were kidnapped on average in both internal and external raids. Another aspect of Amazonian warfare was treachery, such as inviting a rival group to a feast and then slaughtering them after they got drunk or fell asleep. These attacks resulted in high levels of mortality, even genocide. It's even believed by some academics that in prehistoric warfare Neanderthals did this. Strange parallels can actually be found with the *Bible*. Particularly the story of King Jehu and his purges of the pagan worshippers in Israel. This is found in the 2nd Kings Chapter 10:18-27. Two things are to be noted here are:

- A. Jehu lied and deceived the Baal worshippers
- B. Jehu slaughtered every single one of them and destroyed their place of worship.

Walker continues;

"Revenge was necessary in historical intertribal warfare, just as in modern gang conflicts, because showing weakness would result in further attacks, that cycle of revenge could result in tribes eradicating each other."

Now this isn't completely an appeal to nature because humans obviously are capable of a degree of rational thought but it does also explain the irrational tendency and the human yearning to engage in expansion for the group. All of this however completely validates the theory of Generative Anthropology from academics like Eric Gans and Adam Katz. Both build off of René Girard's work in *Violence and The Sacred*.

The concept of mimetic desire in Girard's book forms the cornerstones of Generative Anthropology. Girard argues that human desire is essentially cultural or social in nature, and thus distinct from mere appetite, which is biological. Desire is therefore triangular in structure, an imitation of the desire of another. Desire leads to conflict, when two individuals attempt to possess the same object. In a group, this mimetic conflict typically escalates into a mimetic crisis which threatens the very existence of the group. This conflict is resolved by the scapegoat mechanism, in which the destructive energies of the group are purged through the violence directed towards a selected victim of the group.

This is the basis of Carl Schmitt's friend-enemy distinction. In *The Concept of The Political* Schmitt says this;

"The enemy is not merely any competitor or just any partner of a conflict in general. He is also not the private adversary whom one hates. An enemy exists only when, at least potentially, one fighting collectivity of people confronts a similar collectivity. The enemy is solely the public enemy, because everything that has a relationship to such a collectivity of men, particularly to a whole nation, becomes public by virtue of such a relationship."

# Critique of Anti-Imperialism

Girard, like Gans and Katz, both see the scapegoating mechanism as the origin of human culture and language. A good video that explains Generative Anthropology, the observation I made on Chimpanzees, and the state of nature is an old video by Neuroposter when he went by Trudilom. It's called the [Anti-Individualism History of a Social Species](#). Giovanni Gentile touches on this briefly in his book *Genesis and Structure of Society*;

“It is important to notice that from an external point of view the criterion of economic efficiency can be applied to the lower animals as well as man. The behavior of the lower animals is purposive and therefore ‘useful’; it is more immediately hedonistic. Their behavior is not free but mechanical, and in that sense necessary - which is what we mean by instinctive for ‘Instinct’ is rational behavior. The Analogy between the instinctive behavior of Brutes and the Utilitarian activity of man does not break down because intelligence is involved in the latter. Intelligence is not absent even in the actions of the lower animals.”

The European imperialization of Africa saw the systemic exploitation of the continent for its vast resources, which were untapped for centuries. These were all resources extracted by the Europeans and used to fuel formidable industrial centers and militaries. Which in turn allowed for more Imperialism, thus more development and more economic growth. Europeans left Africa with modern technology and infrastructure in the cities of several African nations, especially in the east, north and south, which required these leftover tools to finance their post-independence and further economic advancements.

Ethiopia, for example, had maintained independence for much longer than the other African nations and benefited significantly from trade with the Europeans. This allowed them to stay fairly modern for an African country because of European colonialism and imperialism. The Europeans were able to develop these industries and technologies, which the Ethiopian's utilized for their own use.

In South Africa, the British invested immensely into the gold and diamond mines of the region and built a great number of mines, roads, railroads and ports to finance the transport needed for these precious resources. As a result, South Africa is (or was after the chimpouts due to “riots”) one of the most modernized African nations in the entire continent due to decades of British reign and investment.

In the former French colonies, especially in the north, in Algeria and Morocco, the French invested heavily into these regions due to their strategic value and today, despite large disparities in wealth internally, Algeria remains the richest non island, African nation, and a regional economic power benefiting from their access to the Mediterranean sea and the rest of Africa. With the infrastructure, which the French built allowing them to extract significant amounts of oil and natural gas, which makes up their export-oriented economy.

The French colonization of west Africa saw prioritization by the French colonial authority to extract resources at an increasingly productive rate. Using their financing [funds?] from Europe, the colonies expanded their manufacturing of peanuts and cotton with gifts being given as a method of encouraging participation and competition within the colonial economy. In areas where vegetation can be grown, the French encouraged migration to other areas where wages can be made to contribute to the overall colonial economy.

# Critique of Anti-Imperialism

Many people like Adolf Hitler to Frederick Engels consider the genesis of civilization to be founded on slavery. Even most historians, even modern academics with a liberal bias will admit this when talking about western civilization.

[ <https://youtu.be/u3a9ZBZp0Xg> use full clip ]

Even Bruce Gilley, a professor of political science at Portland State University in *The Case for Colonialism* stated this. According to Gilley, colonialism was both objectively beneficial for the conquering and conquered nation. In the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy on the topic of colonialism in the section *Marxism and Leninism*, Marx admits that beneficial changes come from imperialism. These were positive social changes and progressive socioeconomic changes. Without imperialism which wouldn't have happened, either for a very long time or at all, without the influence of an imperializing power.

In *Mein Kampf* Hitler says this about Slavery;

“Without this possibility of using lower human beings, the Aryan would never have been able to take his first steps towards his future culture. It is certain that the first culture of humanity was based less on tamed animals than on the use of lower human beings.”

Continuing on Friedrich Engels in the *Origin of The Family, Private Property and The State*;

“For now slavery had also been invented. To the barbarian of the lower stage, a slave was valueless. Hence the treatment of defeated enemies by the American Indians was quite different from that at a higher stage. The men were killed or adopted as brothers into the tribe of the victors; the women were taken as wives or otherwise adopted with their surviving children. At this stage human labor-power still does not produce any considerable surplus over and above its maintenance costs. That was no longer the case after the introduction of cattle-breeding, metalworking, weaving and, lastly, agriculture. just as the wives whom it had formerly been so easy to obtain had now acquired an exchange value and were bought, so also with the forces of labor, particularly since the herds had definitely become family possessions. The family did not multiply as rapidly as the cattle. More people were needed to look after them; for this purpose use could be made of the enemies captured in war, who could also be bred just as easily as the cattle themselves”

This is also validated by Islam in the *Quran* and the *Hadith* as other religious text[s] (examples) besides the *Bible*. Civilization in this context is a nation that would project power. This obviously being something that can be traced back to almost every human race and culture. Slavery is automatically introduced in the rise of civilization. People are drawn to power. In order to gain this power, dominance must be presented. This is done by development with the control of resources inside territory. George Fritzhuage gives a brief explanation on this in *Sociology for the South, or the Failure of Free Society*;

“Domestic slavery in the Southern States has produced the same results in elevating the character of the master that it did in Greece and Rome.”

# Critique of Anti-Imperialism

Furthermore in *Civilization The Result of Compulsory Labor* by George Fitzhugh he says this; 1858

“Gentlemen: You permit the discussion of sociological and all other scientific questions in your columns, provided it be unattended with sectional or partisan spirit. I take advantage of your liberality to announce a very simple proposition, which, if true, will go very far to allay all sections of disrespect and ill feeling. No man or woman would produce by their own labor their fine clothes, fine equipage, costly furniture, and magnificent residences. The laborers who produce the luxuries of life never use or consume them. Part are produced by domestic slaves at the building of the master-far the large portion by free laborers, compelled by skill and capital and their own wants, to produce them for the skillful and rich. These laborers produce, by compulsory labor, luxuries for others, in order to procure necessities for themselves.

If property were in common, artificial wants would cease, compulsory labor would cease, and each man laboring to himself alone, would produce the merest necessities of life. But for compulsory labor all men would become savages. Now, compulsory labor is slavery, whether hunger, or cold, or nakedness, or the will of a master be the means of compulsion. Our language is defective, all languages are defective in having no word to define exactly and precisely the social status of laborers who are dependent on capitalists or property holders for employment and support.

Southerners and northerners, too, call it slavery to capital. This is correct, for slavery is a generic term, and includes every status of human subjection or dependence. But we need a term more definite and specific that shall distinguish slavery to capital from domestic slavery; for the latter is considered and felt to be degrading and disgraceful under all circumstances, whilst the former, though liable to abuse in dense populations is not, in its nature and essence, a stigma of inferiority. Sociology is a new science, and will require the invention of a great many new words.

Aristotle complained more than two thousand years ago that there were no words to express the social subjection of wives and children. There are none yet. Until invented, we are compelled to speak of slaves to capital, “slaves to parents,” and “slaves to husbands.” No sensible man will take exception to such necessary expressions. 1858”

This was the pinnacle that embodied the Pax Romana within the ancient Roman Empire. It was sustained by Roman imperialism, order, prosperous stability, hegemonial power and expansion. All of this being built on slavery as the genesis of its civilization as an empire. It fundamentally came down to the friend-enemy distinction of politics for group understanding whilst the Roman idea developed. Romans isolated their identity as long as their expansion was only set on central Italy, when this expansion became larger and required a bigger foundation, the central Italics united as the Latins against the Non-Latins.

This means violence and civilization are intertwined, to have one you must have the other. If we think beyond the well traversed world of theoretical conceptions, and assesses what civilization is, the conclusion follows. Civilization is a series of group negation. To have a group that can ensure mutual trust you must have an equal understanding of consequence by violence.



# Critique of Anti-Imperialism

To act in violation of this group consciousness is to act in defiance to civilization, and civilization has to reform in order to survive, thus we see the introduction of a moral violence as it serves the good aka the group. (A) just violence as it aids in removing wrong, and (a) proper violence as is sanctioned by all.

Slavery is this manifestation of structured violence, in the noble pursuit of mitigating future a-structural violence, impropriety, and wrong. The classical saying “Two wrongs don’t make a right.” may come to mind for many, when discussing the isolated individual, or regional particulars this may have some validity, but when the discussion of the near irreducible complexity of civilization is the subject at hand, I instead would posit, “What right does not encompass some wrong?”

Humanity whether viewed as a fallen angel, or risen apes will encompass some degree of immorality, to not condone a system because there will necessarily be immoral facets is folly. Civilization is indistinguishable, functionally speaking, from slavery. One cannot negate hierarchy, and to the degree one can, that is the worst variant of wrong. To have civilization is to have structure, to have structure is to have violence. Structured violence in productive name can, will, and should always be utilized to mitigate unstructured, societally corrosive violence.

Paraphrasing Richard Spencer here in that Africans have benefited from their experience with white supremacy. However slavery is not a permanent aspect of civilization. Slavery, despite being abolished in the old and new world existed to some limited degree in the French colonies in west Africa, in the form of servitude, in order to help with the further development of the colony. While questionable tactics were used in west Africa, they did help in the overall development of the colony and the extraction of raw resources, which concentrated the development of the productive forces.

Italian imperialism in World War 2 was done for the sake of acquiring new resources that Italy needed to industrialize, as Italy was behind most of Europe economically until the Marshall plan, they needed ways to secure the resources and funding necessary to actually fully industrialize and catch up to the west.

By focusing on expanding into the Balkan territories, which held vast deposits of raw resources like iron, carbon, and copper, as well as timber reserves and significant cattle herds which would have proved useful for creating livestock supplies. Italy would have been able to utilize these resources, which in the process would have developed the lands where the resources are being extracted from.

In Greece, Italy had plans to develop its underdeveloped steel industry immensely, which would have further allowed Italy to industrialize while also developing Greece, allowing them to benefit from increased trade and investment from a larger power.

Italian ambitions in Africa would have also resulted in increased investment in trade as they were to develop the regions to further finance their industrialization by extracting the vast rich resources of the African continent, providing further benefits to the overall development of the continent. Although a very controversial example of imperialism due to the more destructive nature of the undertaking, Japanese Imperialism would still have seen the heavy expansion and development of the subjugated lands.

## Critique of Anti-Imperialism

While the Imperial Japanese army was full of fanatics who were, xenophobic, and highly aggressive. It was not likely that they would have maintained full control of the occupied territories as a civilian government would have pressured the army to relinquish control. While the army was full, radical elements, the civilian government was not as radical and would have permitted the Japanese Zaibatsu to invest heavily into the untapped potential of China and east Asia to satisfy Japan's dire hunger for resources. Such as oil, iron, and copper, essentially all the resources needed to run a proper industrial economy, which Japan either lacked or had small knots of domestically.

Having the army terrorize the population and control the foreign resources would not have been a smart move. As they would have essentially destroyed a labor pool of millions and hindered the immense untapped potential in China, Indochina, and Indonesia. So therefore such an aggressive set up would not have been maintained.

What this means is that East Asian economies would be forcefully linked to the Japanese market, with Japan benefiting extremely from the influx of all the resources and income it needs to run its empire, while the subjugated peoples would have lived under the civilian governments subservient to Tokyo, which would have pumped billions of Yen into their economy for infrastructure and economic expansion projects.

It should be noted that in addition to the economic improvements with the creation of infrastructure by colonizers they also introduce social technologies (i.e. statecraft, economic systems, cultural norms) that are beneficial to the native populations of land which have been brought into the hegemony of the imperial state. These social technologies would likely never come to fruition under traditionally bound and underdeveloped native systems since the social technologies originate out of a different civilization and mode of thought.

Although it's common within history for conquering states to impose their culture upon and in other ways to treat the conquered peoples negatively, this doesn't necessarily need to be the case.

But it's not only good for building up the economic forces of a nation, it can also be its birth. One may think of America which as you know started as a colony. And for this reason people say America is "stolen land", but the problem here is all land is "stolen land". Let us look at the history of the birth of Germany. Pope Alexander III sanctioned the northern crusades. The northern crusades as you will see are not like those to the east. The Old Prussians were a pagan Baltic people making them targets for the crusades. Previously Konrad I of Masovia would try to take this land, but failed and failed to convert the Old Prussians.

Hermann von Salza was held in high esteem by the Holy Roman Emperor Frederick II and the pope. So the Teutonic Knights were set to take heathen land. They took Prussia and forced the Prussian people into a state of lesser citizenship and had their religion, language and history taken away. The Teutonic Knights were less successful with Lithuania and it was not wise to make enemies with Poland. Things went south for the Teutonic Knights after the Thirteen Years' War and much of Prussia became held in a personal union with Poland, thus making much of Prussia the land of Poland.

## Critique of Anti-Imperialism

The Teutonic Knights were not stopped, but the State of the Teutonic Order underwent a secularization period during the protestant reformation, becoming the Duchy of Prussia. This led to the transition into Brandenburg-Prussia. Frederick William got the Holy Roman Empire to elevate his Duchy to a kingdom. Now, we skip over Frederick William I who really created the heavily militaristic environment. After Frederick William I we get Frederick The Great who shows himself to be a great military genius and soon he took Silesia after the War of the Austrian Succession. And more importantly after the First Partition of Poland he could finally call himself "king of Prussia", as now he had all of it. The land that was Polish after the Thirteen Years' War was back into the hands of Frederick The Great. Now, there was a competition between Prussia and Austria for influence over the rest of Germany. After Frederick The Great the other two partitions of Poland occurred, giving Prussia all of Poland.

Much of this, like Poland, was lost after the Napoleonic Wars. After the Napoleonic Wars in the Congress of Vienna it was agreed that Prussia would gain back a lot of its land. Things were mostly peaceful for a time. However, most importantly a brilliant politician later began to rise on the scene known as Otto von Bismarck, and became Minister President of Prussia in 1862. After the Seven Weeks' War Prussia became the dominant power in Germany. Now, there was only one main thing getting in the way of unification of Germany. The Franco-Prussian War forced Austria to side with Prussia, soon ending the debate over German dualism, and the German Empire was proclaimed. Here we see a nation like many others being born out of imperialism, and reaching high levels of greatness.

Oswald Mosley in his book *Fascism: 100 Questions Asked and Answered*. Even has his own Fascist solution in the book to the subject of the Indian colony;

"Question number 84. What reforms would you substitute for the India Bill [Government of India Act 1935]?"

The retention of absolute power by the British Crown over all problems of Defence and Fiscal policy, to the extent necessary to finance defence and prevent the erection of trade barriers against Britain. The complete abolition of the Indian Tariff against British goods on the grounds that it is only just that some return should be made to Britain for all she has done for India. Factory legislation to abolish the vile industrial conditions in India which are a disgrace to British civilisation. A strong and advanced economic policy—irrigation, cooperative farming and marketing; the establishment of agricultural banks to break the grip of the money-lender on the Peasant. The establishment of a Corporate system in place of a western Democratic system built on occupational lines in the towns, and built up in the countryside, tier upon tier, to the central Authority from the traditional basis of the village Panchayat. Such a system is at once more in accord with Indian tradition and with modern western thought. In general, we should cease to argue with lawyers and enlist the services of genuine Indian patriots in the wide scope of a Corporate system designed to raise the condition of the Indian masses in a great new economic drive. Economic action is the surest antidote to political disorder. Thus, in the strength of Government, we go further than Conservative Diehards, but we couple with a strong government an economic policy far in advance of the concepts of any present Party."

Mosley was by no means an anti-colonialist or an anti-segregationist. He was a strong advocate for the retention of the British colonial empire for the sake of maintaining the United Kingdom's political

## Critique of Anti-Imperialism

strength and mutual autonomy within the British hegemony to not be reliant on outside powers even after the dissolution of the British Union of Fascists in 1940. But as it was made clear from the above excerpt, he was by no means an advocate for the needless abuse, oppression and capitalist exploitation of indigenous populations.

Mosley instead advocates the implementation of the same corporatist system in India that he advocates for in Britain to improve workers rights for Indians. Furthermore, he advocates for the incorporation of cultural institutions like the Panchayat into the corporatist system because it's both compatible with corporatism and respectful of the already existing Indian culture.

Many empires throughout history have without a doubt implemented brutal and subversive approaches when dealing with subjugated populations, sometimes less justifiably so than others. But having pointed out that imperialism can also be implemented in a manner which respects, protects and even improves the cultural traditions, social structures and wellbeing of subservient societies.

The moralist objections of 'oppression' and 'cultural genocide' made against imperialism are at the very least rendered disputable. There isn't an inherent inseparable requirement for imperialist states to practise extermination of out-groups. One cannot make a strong moral argument against imperialism when the nations subservient to the imperial power are legally treated more or less the same way the core population of the empire are, with the exception being that they constitute a different group and might face some segregation because of it.

An earlier form of imperialism would have been the early Ottoman incursions into Greece and the eventual capture of Constantinople. Greece was considered to be the Heartland of the entire empire and the Ottoman government knew this. Their capital was a converted Greek city, and many of their largest centers of trade bridged in. With major cities being populated by Greeks because of the dominance of Greeks in the center of the empire, such as Salonika and Izmir, Athens and the such. Greeks were treated very well under Ottoman rule, as they were given high positions and encouraged to migrate into the Ottoman cities.

While the Ottoman financing was directed to developing these poor cities and paying Greek officials heavily for their service. The Ottomans also subsidized Greek churches that were in Anatolia, allowing for religious freedom for the Greeks while Ottoman rule was harsher in the other areas of the Balkans, that was mainly because of the constant revolts in the regions and the need to push north towards Austria.

The Soviet Union also practiced its variation of imperialism and colonialism within eastern Europe and central Asia, which furthered the proletarian revolution by stabilizing the USSR and centralizing it into a national hegemony.

[ 12:32 to 13:09 <https://youtu.be/mTS7RVw9m7g>

In central Asia, Russian colonists were sent to populate the barren and vast lands to prevent the native populations from revolting by serving as a counter-balance to their influence, and in the Baltics, deportations occurred after WW2 to send in Russians for the same purpose. In addition to forming

## Critique of Anti-Imperialism

settler-colonies, the USSR also frequently invaded nations to exploit their resources to help with industrialization and the development of productive forces in the USSR itself.

The Soviet invasion of Finland, besides being motivated by wanting a security zone around Leningrad, was motivated by the shortage of copper, which they needed to produce the ammunition required by the quotas for the Third Five-Year Plan. The Invasion of the Baltics was also motivated by a similar need to gain access to more resources by having a proper port with access to the Baltic Sea all-year-round, as Leningrad was frozen for most of the year.

The USSR had a concentration of territorial blocs into a single economic-political unit with the exacerbation of imperialist antagonisms. COMECON was established by Stalin as a binding economic force between the Socialist states of eastern Europe, and later the Warsaw Pact to hold onto these vast territories. Not just for geopolitical opposition to the west but the economic factors for growth that made geopolitics possible.

This was touched on previously as imperialism increased the capacity for nations to develop their productive forces via industrialization. So too, does it develop the proletarian class of both the imperialist class and subjugated nations?

Because of how it helps in industrializing overall, it has a larger proletarian class via the construction of industrial centers and other modern machinery, which allow for the expansion of capital to wage labor. The introduction of large-scale capital and wage labor, or its expansion henceforth leads to the intensification of bureaucracy all around, which opens the roads to heights. In other words the establishment of a civilization of force, be it proletarian or aristocratic.

Thus revolutions later down the line are possible. An example of this in play was in the Kingdom of Italy, where they had a vanguard of the proletariat allied with big industrialists which led to the decline of the middle class in Italy. This eventually would have resulted in proletarian violence which would finish the fascist revolution. This was illustrated by the goals of Italian corporatism being similar to that of the Soviet Union programme which was in the Italian corporatist programme, stated in Fausto Pitigliani's book *The Italian Corporative State*;

“The transfer of control of capital from shareholders to the workers of the company.”

It was the use of this class collaboration in order to eliminate the distinction between employer and employee. This is even further put into practice during the Italian Social Republic, where the task of socializing companies was undertaken much further, as Mussolini said:

“The overcoming of socialism, not the dispersion, not the destruction of the socialist work. This is good to say on the occasion of the strike of the fascist unions. There's a historical continuity between socialism and fascism. I do say historical continuation. Fascism overcomes socialism but reaps the good fruits of socialists work. And according to its own law, when necessary this work continues.”

# Critique of Anti-Imperialism

## Nation Above All

I've listed plenty of examples of imperialism here and how it is beneficial for the projection of power for the nation and in some or most cases: the subject nation benefits from resources of the conquer, from the acquired territories or the territories themselves the subject nation benefits from industrialization to infrastructure thus it harness the untapped resources of a given territory they dwell in.

In order to further industrialize a proletarian nation, which has actualized in the state to further its goals by acquiring new territory, resources and the sort. The proletarian nations must take on the plutocratic nations via imperialism.

Such as the example of World War 2 with the Axis powers, made up of proletarian nations. Part of the reason that Italy and Germany had to ally during World War 2 was due to them both being proletarian nations and they, as a result, were inclined to ally with other proletarian nations to take on the various plutocracies, which would be geopolitically beneficial. Enrico Corradini explains this perfectly;

“We must start by recognizing the fact that there are proletarian nations, as well as proletarian classes; that is to say, There are nations whose living conditions are subject... to the way of life of other nations, just as classes are. Once this is realized, nationalism must insist firmly on this truth: Italy is, materially and morally, a proletarian nation.”

Headed by Germany and Italy taking on the plutocratic democracies such as Britain, America, and France. World War 2 is a good example of class struggle between nations just as Benito Mussolini said:

“We are fighting to impose a higher social justice. The others are fighting to maintain the privileges of caste and class. We are proletarian nations that rise up against the plutocrats. It can not endure the absurdity of artificially induced famines. They denounce the blatant failure of the system. I am more convinced than ever that the world can not get out of the dilemma: either Rome or Moscow.”

Imperialism in this context is used as an example of how it can be used to further one goals, geopolitically, and industrialize, but also touching on how it can be used to further one goals, geopolitically looking at the plutocratic nations on the other side of the coin, we can look at examples of France and Britain.

They furthered their hegemonies via imperialism throughout Africa and Asia. As I've explained, touching on another point earlier, they benefited from the various resources of the given regions in order to solidify the dichotomy of the proletarian nation versus plutocratic nations even further, and this force could be used to further, let's say a worker states, geopolitical position.

If you're going to say this worker state will eventually transition into socialism and thereafter communism, how will this emerge unless through the throes of imperialism?

# Critique of Anti-Imperialism

In order to build socialism you must commit imperialism to solidify one's geopolitical position and to industrialize through the productive forces built via imperialism.

A good example of this was when the Soviet Union committed various acts of imperialism to industrialize and solidify their geopolitical position. Though sadly for the Russians, the Soviet Union failed in this test simply due to the Americans' geopolitical dominance and hegemony. Which was built following the decline of the British empire after WW2. The Americans were just much stronger than the Soviet Union. As a result of the sudden dissolution of the Soviet Union it turned into the now commonly known Russian Federation. The Russian Federation is the product of the greatest geopolitical disaster in Russian history. All of its vast territory contracted, making it into a former shell of itself.

The overarching point by referencing the Soviet Union is to push forth the point that socialism or communism will emerge from a hegemony that gathers geopolitical dominance via imperialism and in order as a prerequisite to build socialism it requires a geopolitical foothold so the overlaying point is to imperialize or get imperialized.

All this did was simply add more validity to Mussolini's wisdom. This would explain why the Chinese have actually adopted Carl Schmitt. For Schmitt, politics is the only antithesis that can lead to justified combat, for the enemy threatens our very existence and our way of life. Hence, the political distinction of friend/enemy, essentially entails the possibility of war. Two passages from *The Concept of The Political* are worth quoting to understand Schmitt's treatment of war:

"War follows from enmity. War is the existential negation of the enemy. It is the most extreme consequence of enmity. It does not have to be common, normal, something ideal, or desirable. But it must nevertheless remain a real possibility for as long as the concept of the enemy remains valid"

"The friend, enemy, and combat concepts receive their real meaning precisely because they refer to the real possibility of physical killing. War follows from enmity. War is the existential negation of the enemy. War as the most extreme political means discloses the possibility which underlies every political idea, namely, the distinction of friend and enemy."

The two passages point to war as the outcome of the political antithesis between friend-enemy. For Schmitt, war was part of the point of politics;

"But as an ever-present possibility it is the leading presupposition which determines in a characteristic way human action and thinking and thereby creates a specifically political behaviour"

His descriptive claim that war could materialise is of vital importance in the analysis of Schmitt as an ordered thinker. Through the claim that war is a perpetual logical possibility resulting from a necessarily unavoidable political distinction, Schmitt is providing a modal argument. By that I mean that Schmitt is pointing to the possibility of conflict arising from a necessary condition of the political world. Through the recognition of this state of affairs, Schmitt then understands that war is a revelatory moment in a number of ways.

# Critique of Anti-Imperialism

Therefore war as with imperialism or colonialism is seen in how it benefits the nation i.e. power. The aspect of power here is fundamentally related to the group. This means to industrialize, to modernize, and to increase influence for the group.

Even Chimpanzees and barbaric peoples understand this whereas liberals, marxists, and many nationalists don't. You could probably argue a lot of them are dumber than Chimpanzees for this reason. Many of these people are simply trapped into the moralistic holdings of propaganda. This propaganda is of course pacifism.

Everything in politics is the friend-enemy distinction. It's about the history of power and it's centralization by the struggle of nations for supremacy. Supremacy is only secured by expansion and growth in the economy equaling geopolitical security. In *The Doctrine of Fascism* this is explained quite eloquently;

"The Fascist State expresses the will to exercise power and to command. Here the Roman tradition is embodied in a conception of strength. Imperial power, as understood by the Fascist doctrine, is not only territorial, or military, or commercial; it is also spiritual and ethical. An imperial nation, that is to say a nation which directly or indirectly is a leader of others, can exist without the need of conquering a single square mile of territory. Fascism sees in the imperialistic spirit -- i.e. in the tendency of nations to expand - a manifestation of their vitality. In the opposite tendency, which would limit their interests to the home country, it sees a symptom of decadence. Peoples who rise or arise are imperialistic; renunciation is characteristic of dying peoples."

The Chinese quite understand this in the modern context. That is why everything they do is motivated by the Chinese dream of national rejuvenation for the Chinese civilization. Furthermore, Carl Schmitt's hostility to liberalism as embodied in western political culture, governance, and ideology has spurred interest in his work in China. The Chinese feel that liberal thought doesn't help them understand the dynamics of Chinese life today or offer a model for the future.

Schmitt's analysis on the crisis of liberalism is a tool that helps not only give legitimacy to the CCP's one-party rule, but it's also an attempt to ground new forms of Chinese political agency in an anti-Western discourse. Xi Jinping is trying to revive the CCP's ideology as a vibrant bulwark of Chinese exceptionalism, to inculcate its citizens against western liberal democracy. Schmitt's thought is quite similar to Xi's overall ideological aims. Thus this has ensured that China's socialism has adopted Schmittian' discourse and has become common sense. Schmitt's relevance in China is not purely scholarly, but also on the social and geopolitical.

Schmitt's political theory is the tool that the CCP has utilized to redirect Chinese nationalistic aggression and social frustration to the will of the party. The CCP would merely make the friend-enemy distinction between dissidents, ethnic minorities, or those critical to CCP's rule such as the west. By entering the state of exception, as decided by Xi and the CCP, China can rally nationalistic sentiments on the promise of national glorification with the elimination of enemies and the initiation of homogeneity.



# Critique of Anti-Imperialism

This political system gives citizens an opportunity to unleash aggression, not at the state or citizens, but against those who wish to destroy their political and possibly sociocultural way of life. The Schmittian approach is a top-down revolution of everyday life aimed at the complete harmonization of the nation towards the will of the state.

Moreover liberal western governments, though they may disavow imperialism, totalitarianism, and nationalism. The west expands by exporting capital everywhere on the global stage. This is even done by military force if need be. The strategies used are on a policy of trade expansion and economic imperialism. Focusing on external ideological threats like illiberalism by military force outside. Internally by soft totalitarian institutional censorship of political dissidents. Further validating Schmitt on the political system of power in the process of centralization for the group by negation of another group.

[ <https://youtu.be/ty8S2B1SuBo> 0:00 to 1:18]

[ 1:21 to the end <https://t.me/c/1373254929/29580> ]

[ full clip <https://t.me/ZoltanousHNyt/3666> ]

As I have said before, the moralization against violence of groups is nothing more than a tool. This brings back the point that Lenin's view of anti-imperialism is just propaganda. Just as the morality behind it is to justify negation. Imperialism itself is inherently universal. This means when people like Alexander Dugin say this in *The Fourth Political Theory* in three quotations;

“Undoubtedly racism is the idea of unipolar globalization. It is based on the fact that Western, especially American, society equates its history and its values to universal law and artificially tries to construct a global society based on these local and historically specific values – democracy, the market, parliamentarianism, capitalism, individualism, human rights, and unlimited technological development.

These values are local, and globalization is trying to impose them onto all of humanity as something that is universal and taken for granted. This attempt implicitly argues that the values of all other peoples and cultures are imperfect, underdeveloped, and are subject to modernization and standardization based on the Western model.

Globalization is thus nothing more than a globally deployed model of Western European, or, rather, Anglo-Saxon ethnocentrism, which is the purest manifestation of racist ideology.”

“Globalisation is thus nothing more than a globally deployed model of Western European, or, rather, Anglo-Saxon ethnocentrism, which is the purest manifestation of racist ideology.”

“The very ideology of progress is racist in its structure. The assertion that the present is better and more fulfilling than the past, and continual assurances that the future will be even better than the present, are discriminations against the past and the present, as well as the humiliation of all those who lived in the past, an insult to the honour and dignity of our ancestors and those of others, and a violation of the rights of the dead.”

# Critique of Anti-Imperialism

Dugin's ethnopluralism through the means of civilization is really the projection of power from one State over others. The civilizational process is domination over others. Dugin sees conflict between states as an innate problem only if the aggressing state is seeking to impose liberal unipolarity and that the idea of civilizational spheres is true to an extent. Empire minimizes the divides that are present within these 'spheres'. The antagonisms begin at the height with the formation of ideology for the purpose of negation for an Empire. Something Dugin himself is guilty of like liberalism;

“The entirety of Russian history is a dialectical argument with the West and against Western culture, the struggle for upholding our own often only intuitively grasped Russian truth, our own messianic idea, and our own version of the ‘end of history’, no matter how it is expressed — through Muscovite Orthodoxy, Peter's secular empire, or the global Communist revolution. The brightest Russian minds clearly saw that the West was moving towards the abyss. Now, looking at where neoliberal economics and postmodern culture has led the world, we can be certain that this intuition, pushing generations of Russian people to search for alternatives, was completely justified.”

Continuing;

“It considers Western culture as a local and temporary phenomenon, and affirms a multiplicity of cultures and civilisations which coexist at different moments of a cycle. For Eurasianists, modernity is a phenomenon peculiar only to the West, while other cultures must divest these pretensions to the universality of Western civilization and build their societies on internal values. There is no single historical process; every nation has its own historical model, which moves in a different rhythm and at times in different directions...

The unitary episteme of modernity — including science, politics, culture and anthropology — is opposed by the multiplicity of epistemes, built on the foundations of each existing civilisation — the Eurasianist episteme for Russian civilisation, the Chinese for the Chinese, the Islamic for Islam, the Indian for the Indian, and so on. And only on these foundations, cleansed of Western-mandated epistemes, must long-term sociopolitical, cultural and economic projects be built.”

“The idea of a multi-polar world, where the poles will be as many as there are civilisations, allows one to propose to humanity a broad choice of cultural, paradigmatic, social and spiritual alternatives.”

These civilizational spheres don't exist to the same extent ethno pluralists like Dugin think they do. There might be cultural similarities, but the idea that nations will work together because of this alone is quite ridiculous because of differences in worldview (religion, ideology etc.) and divergence of state interests. The shi'ia vs sunni for an example is an excellent example. The sunni states tend to align with America while shi'ia and the secular arab states tend to align with Russia and China. Poland is a slavic nation that the Russians have tried to integrate but fundamentally differ on a catholic and orthodox core. Another example would be the balkan region in Europe. The Yugoslav peoples that live there basically speak the same language and have fairly similar cultures with minor differences stemming purely from religion, but are extremely unlikely to unite as a geopolitical civilizational force because of the historical conditions of group negation.

## Critique of Anti-Imperialism

Dugin and other 4th Political Theory followers, like the Liberals, like the Communists, and yes like the Fascists are engaging in tactical propaganda to mobilize the group. A Russian narod isn't that much different than German Lebensraum or the American hegemony. The apex of this in Anglo-American liberalism is found in what we call pacifism. This is rooted within liberalism as it seeks to abolish conflict i.e. the friend-enemy distinction which is a contradiction. Without it all social cohesion would break down. It is the basis of civilization. These objections to imperialism are anti-historical, anti-biological, anti-religious, anti-materialist, anti-civilization and anti-idealist. It's really just propaganda gaslighting.

Imperialism is the natural expression of power, the nation and the historical process of struggle. Pacifism is nothing more than a tool for liberalism. All pacifism does is put a mask on liberalism to hide its own imperialism. To stand against Imperialism in my view for this reason is simply insanity. The book *Offshoots of Liberalism: Pacifism* by Albert Weisbord gives a good brief summary of this;

“When middle classes turned to pacifism, the working classes turned to anti-militarism. Proletarian Anarchism, Syndicalism, and revolutionary Socialism turned violently against capitalist war. After all, these groups furnished the chief regiments of cannon fodder and feared warfare more than any other. Their anti-war activity was only part of the general struggle for emancipation of the working class.

None of these groups, however, could escape from theories of pacifism. They were not able to understand the laws of social dynamics. The Anarchists turned to Tolstoyan pacifism while they built dreams of mutual aid co-operatives, or they adopted the Liberal methods of individual objection. The Syndicalists proposed the general strike as a method of stopping war, as though the peaceful diluted economic action of their general strike could liquidate at the start the terrific concentrated political violence of war. The parliamentary Socialists adopted the theory that war can be stopped by the ballot-box and by theories of international cooperation and total disarmament. Later on, the degenerated Communists of the Stalinist variety would propose on the rostrum of the Disarmament Conferences the old pacifist utopia of universal disarmament as the “cure” for war.

Like Liberalism, all of these proletarian movements prove bankrupt in stopping the all-consuming development of militarism and war.”

Dugin when criticizing western imperialism, he believes that the west says it's culture and it's values are vastly superior to the rest of the world's civilizations. Thus it should be forced on the entire planet. Schmitt called this “universalization” and he basically said it's the most dangerous ideological stage that can be reached. A state will say we stand for human rights, and humanity. If you therefore oppose this then you are opposing humanity itself and must be destroyed in the name of peace and civility. However Schmitt and Dugin here are somewhat right but also wrong. The nature of politics is domination by any means as I've already explained historically, philosophically, and economically. Especially when the Eurasian civilization was built like the atlanticist civilization, all civilizations on genocide, slavery, to cultural supremacy.

# Critique of Anti-Imperialism

## Conclusions

Now that I have cleared up any questions in regards to my thoughts on imperialism. Hopefully this gave a good introductory course on why imperialism, colonialism, and war is necessary for socialism and beneficial all around for a nation-state. This is why I'm also a Nationalist. The term in this exclamation "Nationalist" is nothing more than a placeholder for a group that negates itself to an amount that they can still work together to defeat the outer collective which they negate stronger towards than their ingroup negations because of structural needs.

- A. As Humans our first drive is to secure our own material & biological needs.
- B. Some humans have the drive to want more than what is needed to survive by instinct and desire.
- C. Myth as in an understanding of us as an in-group by perception necessitates out-group negation.

Nation is a value used as its own self-validating object. Nationalism is good because it's the root of all existence. It's good because it's the representation of this negation, through struggles and victories. Imperialism for this reason is an urge for expansion, will to power, and collective consciousness. Conflict is the characteristics of a healthy civilization moreover imperialism is the vitality of nations. This would mean things like anti-genocide to war crime moralism are false. Anything else is declining, and therefore the final civilizational season of Faust. With that I'll end it with a quotation;

"The true International is imperialism, the domination of Faustian civilization, of the whole earth, by a single formative principle, not by appeasement and compromise but by conquest and annihilation." ~  
Oswald Spengler *Prussianism and Socialism*