

# Why the Marxists Always Win



By Cliff Kincaid

May 31, 2023

“I knew it was a good [debt] deal when I saw the lefties screaming.” With that foolish statement, former Director of the National Economic Council under Trump and current Fox Business host Larry Kudlow demonstrated his ignorance of how Marxists create “conflict” that benefits the expansion of government control over our lives.

Kudlow buys into the notion of “conflict” being proof that his position is the correct one, when the conflict is being staged to make people like him fall for the notion that the Marxists have lost the battle. In fact, they have already won the war.

The war, in this case, is more debt, thus expanding government and shrinking the private sector. This is what House Speaker Kevin McCarthy agreed to.

According to Marxists, the essence of economic life is struggle, as conflict develops, and “progress” is made. Practically speaking, this means the coming of an all-powerful government, known as the communist state. As they see it, we are now in the socialist phase, on the road to communism.

Even with the original Republican proposal, the Republicans had agreed to spend more money and go further into debt. But the McCarthy proposal is even more of a surrender, causing some conservatives under fire from over-taxed constituents to utter peeps of protest.

But these conservatives already voted to make McCarthy the

Speaker. They have been played as fools and now have egg all over their faces.

Because the Marxists are going through the motions of acting disappointed with the debt deal, it must be good, Kudlow says. He calls them “lefties” when they are far so far to the left that they are more accurately described as hard-core Marxists. And Marxists understand how to exploit conflict so their side prevails in the long run. That’s Marxist dialectics. And conservatives like Kudlow are falling for it.

Our book, [\*The Sword of Revolution and the Communist Apocalypse\*](#), explains how Marxist dialectics has been used by such figures as Barack Hussein Obama and confuses people about the nature and goals of communism.

The Democrats have learned a lot from Obama.

Consider Obamacare. It was sold by Obama as the “Affordable Care Act,” when it was based on what even the liberal “fact-checkers” admitted was the “lie of the year” – “If you like your health care, you can keep it.”

After he engineered the “fundamental transformation” of America, which included the socialized medicine scheme known as Obamacare, the debate moved even further to the left. Congressional Republicans failed to terminate this program under Trump, when then-Senator John McCain voted with the Democrats to save it.

Today, Republicans don’t even pretend to be opposed to this Obama-era program. Indeed, in 2022, Republicans didn’t run on the issue, even though it’s a major factor in the debt and spending problems and the massive expansion of government power we face today.

This is how government grows and debt rises to overcome the so-called “debt ceiling.”

House Speaker McCarthy should have insisted on repeal of Obamacare in his debt ceiling “negotiations.” But he negotiated on left-wing terms, a victory for the Marxists.

By framing the issue in terms favorable to the Marxists, the Marxists always win. First, they move the entire debate to the left. In this case, the issue was already framed in terms of expanding the debt. The debate should have been whether to let the federal government default, as former President Trump suggested. At this rate of spending, it’s going to come sooner or later.

Biden’s Treasury Department argued that “Failing to increase the debt limit would have catastrophic economic consequences.” Where is the proof? Increasing the debt limit in the past has already had catastrophic economic consequences.

We are told that the debt ceiling was created with “the good intention of constraining reckless spending,” as one writer put it. If it’s a true “debt ceiling,” why raise it? Why not, instead, mandate immediate spending cuts? That was the only legitimate option.

We are told that the U.S. government would “run out of money” unless the Congress passes a bill to raise the debt limit. The Wall Street Journal claims that McCarthy’s deal is raise the debt ceiling “in exchange for spending cuts.” But the cuts are only in the rate of growth of spending. Common sense tells you that raising the debt ceiling means more debt based on more spending.

You don’t have to be a financial genius to question this never-ending series of statements threatening an economic apocalypse.

Former President Trump had said, “I say to the Republicans out there – congressmen, senators – if they don’t give you massive cuts, you’re going to have to do a default. And I don’t believe they’re going to do a default because I think the

Democrats will absolutely cave, will absolutely cave because you don't want to have that happen. But it's better than what we're doing right now because we're spending money like drunken sailors."

But McCarthy did not follow Trump's advice. He caved, not the Democrats.

The Trump position was dismissed when it should have been a legitimate starting point for the debate. Indeed, some would argue that it would be wiser for the federal government to go through a default, in the same way that a bankruptcy allows a company to be re-organized, and that such an approach is needed with the bloated and out-of-control federal government.

Remember that, on top of the national debt of \$31 trillion, there is the matter of "unfunded liabilities," estimated at \$93.1 trillion or more.

The Treasury Department's own Financial Report of the United States Government [says](#) "The current fiscal path is unsustainable." Under these conditions, McCarthy has agreed to more debt and more spending.

The House should have held hearings on a default, analyzing how the money should be spent and for what constitutional purposes. Under these circumstances, the Constitution would dictate that spending on national defense would have to be a priority.

Since there's not enough money to spend on all the rest of the federal programs, unless new massive "progressive" taxes are implemented, we desperately need an alternative form of money that people can use for their own needs, bypassing the federal tax system.

To his credit, Florida Gov. Ron DeSantis has endorsed decentralized cryptocurrencies, over which the federal government has no control. By contrast, Biden favors a

centrally controlled digital currency through the Federal Reserve and his Securities and Exchange Commission has engineered a crackdown on the crypto sector.

“They want to get rid of crypto,” DeSantis [said](#) of Biden & Company. “They don’t like crypto because they can’t control crypto, so they want to put everything in a central bank digital currency.” This is what the regime is doing in Communist China, DeSantis noted.

What China is doing could be described as the next phase by the Marxists, as we move into full-blown communism, a “financial surveillance state, where they know every transaction that you’re making,” DeSantis warned.

It should be obvious by now that the federal government has too much control over our money, and that money is quickly losing its value. We need a new beginning, a new revolution, the kind waged by our Founding Fathers.

© 2023 Cliff Kincaid – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Cliff Kincaid: [kincaid@comcast.net](mailto:kincaid@comcast.net)

- Cliff Kincaid is president of America’s Survival, Inc. [usasurvival.org](http://usasurvival.org)