

Chapter 1 : Marx and Left Revolutionary Hegelianism | Mises Institute

The Revolutionary Left is the furthest point on the left-wing side of the political calendrierdelascience.com is generally considered to consist of three main beliefs: socialism, communism, and anarchism.

Franck Gaudichaud provides a brief introduction to this story “ still under construction ” and discusses it with University of Santiago USACH historian Igor Goicovic Donoso, specialist on the subject of political violence and an ex-militant of the MIR during the s. These militant youth finished in these years sidelining and even expelling in the majority of the old union leaders and the Trotskyist opposition including the historian Luis Vitale, the union leader Humberto Valenzuela and Oscar Weiss, who returned to the Socialist Party , considered a liability for the development of the party. With the election of Salvador Allende in and the return to legality thanks to a presidential amnesty , the MIR “ despite constituting an organization of only a few thousand militants ” converted itself into one of the principal organizations of the extraparliamentary revolutionary left, with a not insignificant impact within the popular movement, or at least among its most politicized fringes. But the leadership abroad had difficulty gauging the reality of the balance of forces, and they tended to underestimate the power of the junta and overestimate their own forces, without really consulting with the cadre milieu working on the ground and also without understanding the dynamics of reorganization underway within the popular classes. The human cost of those dark years was terrible and the political results of this orientation continue to be a subject of controversy between the old militants that survived, as well as among contemporary historians. The multiple internal conflicts and human dimensions, the lack of internal democracy and participation in decision making, as well as, obviously, the traumatic dimension of state terrorism more than militants were disappeared in the torture centers of the dictatorship or were executed in the street accentuated and deepened this gap and the organic crisis. And this is without counting the media use that can be made of the figure of his father by ex future? In order to return to this militant history, to think about the emancipations of the twenty-first century which have been influenced in a notable manner by the debates and struggles of the revolutionary left of the twentieth century, we speak with Igor Goicovic Donoso, University of Santiago USACH historian specializing in the subject of political violence and an ex-militant of the MIR from My initial formation, more cultural than political, was in the Socialist Party Almeyda. I was from a Socialist family and a region the Province of Choapa in which the Socialist Party had historically been the principal political force. But starting in , my participation as a member in the Socialist Party began to weaken. From that moment, I began to support the actions that the MIR comrades were developing through the Militias of Popular Resistance, fundamentally in the area of propaganda and agitation. In prison, I participated in the collective of Mirista prisoners and for a time it fell to me to assume the representation of the Organization of Political Prisoners OPP. Upon leaving prison, I returned to the university and they assigned me tasks of publicly representing the MIR. I was a student leader until During this period, I witnessed the division of the party. It also fell to me to witness the subsequent fragmentation of the organization. I was a militant in one of the microfractions of the MIR until At that time, a repressive situation in the south of Chile ended up disbanding the group I was in. As a historian, what are the principal stages and events in the trajectory of this party that you would highlight? I maintain that there were four basic periods in the history of the MIR, and that those periods suggest the existence of four distinct parties. The first step, from to , coincides with the stage of party formation in which the Trotskyist influence predominated. A second stage began with the Third Congress and extended up until the confrontation in Malloco October, In this stage the influence of the Castro-Guevarist tendency was settled, following the line of the collective leadership headed by Miguel, and the MIR contested the handling of the revolutionary process and later took up the organization of resistance to the dictatorship But this party, in my opinion, began to disappear with the fall of Miguel in combat and with the leadership subsequently leaving the country This resulted in an exodus of militants as much within Chile as into exile , and many of these cadres did not return as militants in the organization again. The third stage was initiated at the end of , with the different nuclei of party reconstruction, strengthened with Operation Return and extended with the recruitment of new

cadre; especially among youth, the urban poor, and underemployed or unemployed workers. And this, in my opinion, was a new party. This party was until the one that would endure the weight of the struggle against the dictatorship. The final stage, initiated by the internal crisis of , surprised the MIR in a situation of extreme weakness. The repressive blows had eroded its party structure and cut off the relationship of the party with the mass movement. After its founding, in which various revolutionary currents participated libertarian, Christian, Trotskyist, Socialist , the MIR seemed to center itself on a political-military strategy influenced by the Cuban experience. What were the central ideas and theoretical-ideological axes of this organization? But Miguel and that generation of revolutionaries always knew that the historical conditions of the revolutionary process in Chile, and, especially, the conditions of building the left, possessed particular conditions. The political-military thesis of the MIR, until , contemplated the accumulation of social, political and military forces for the deployment of an insurrectionary war of the masses. That is to say, the fundamental component of the strategic design was the workers and the people. This was understood as the deployment of forms of legal, semi-legal and illegal struggle in a context of open class conflict. The land takeovers, indigenous land recoveries, occupations of manufacturing centers, confrontations with the shock troops of the right and the Christian Democrats, and self-defense in the face of state violence are the greatest expression of the advances reached in this process -- advances that, in any case, were not sufficient. What kind of revolutionary party did the MIR represent? What do you think about this? Viewed from today, what were its principal difficulties or organic weaknesses during the Popular Unity and the dictatorship? I said it before: At least three MIRs exist, as well as a cultural continuity. From those three MIRs, two can be identified with the Mirista trajectory and legacy. One of these is the MIR led by Miguel, between and living on a couple of years more after his death. In that situation, the process of training professional cadres was more complex and the deficits when compared with the previous generations are more obvious. But, against the odds, the commitment and the revolutionary will measured up in situations significantly more harsh than those of the cycle. Probably today, in the current situation of political and social struggle, this model of organization and political leadership seems inappropriate. But the Leninist model of the party was the one available to the revolutionaries of the 60s, 70s and 80s. And to that party model we chose to enter: The legacy is very wide and can be observed in multiple dimensions: In that, there are several aspects that we can emphasize. Today, when the alternatives to capitalism are configured in a diffuse manner, many young people and many revolutionary organizations are returning to argue for the necessity of constructing socialism. What kind of socialism? And with regards to that, the Miristas and the Mirista program have a lot to say. On the other hand, the first generation of the Miristas and the one formed after that, in the struggle against the dictatorship, put forward a political example and an ethical challenge. It concerns generations of revolutionaries whose generosity and commitment led them to give their lives for their ideals, without asking anything in return. So far from the contemporary political class old or young , that makes of their career in public office a strategy of enrichment and power. The moral stature of those revolutionaries influences, without a doubt, in an important way the political attitude of anti-capitalist militants today. Many today, after moving along the roads of a sterile movement, accept that political organization, the political vanguard, constitute an irreplaceable element of every revolutionary process. That revolutionary organization, provided by a revolutionary strategy, that takes into account the particularities of a region Latin America and a country Chile , must construct itself from within the workers and the people. It must adjust itself to the new situation and historical context. That lesson of the dialectic of history, the MIR constructed with commitment, courage and self-sacrifice. The translation of the introduction to that version was made by Rocio Gajardo Fica. Dialectic of Chilean Popular Power. Lefts and Rights in the Chile of Pinochet , eds.

Chapter 2 : Revolutionary Left Radio by Revolutionary Left Radio on Apple Podcasts

The Revolutionary Left (French: Gauche révolutionnaire) is a Trotskyist political party in France, primarily based around northern French towns such as Rouen.

While this need is different in the various countries the overall nature of the struggle for Social Revolution and Socialist Revolution is very similar. The story of the revolutionary struggle in Latin America, since the twentieth-century, shows the necessity of such a Social Revolution and such a Socialist Revolution. For the Left of Latin America that struggle continues today. Indeed for the last century and a half every serious Socialist thinker and Left thinker has noted the need for social change and social revolution in Latin America – specifically the need for a Socialist Revolution. This need for social revolution and Socialism in Latin America is what gives the Left its particular power and its particular strength in Latin America. This is, of course, for reasons often outside the power of the Latin American Left itself – specifically the power of Capital and the Capitalist State in Latin America and the power of U.S. Yet if the Left in Latin America is to ever achieve the continent-wide Social Revolution and Socialist Revolution that Latin America needs then the Left will have to engage with the problems of making revolution and the problems of revolution and revolutionary strategy. The revolutionary struggle for Socialism in Latin America today is the product of both history and politics – both at the national level and the continental level. Particular in that it has to be adaptive to a number of different states and societies – from Mexico to Argentina, from Brazil to Venezuela, from Colombia to Peru. Universal in that it has to be a universal strategy for revolution and Socialist Revolution across the entire Continent of Central America and South America. Such factors mean that any Socialist struggle in Latin America also has to deal with a number of different histories and politics – especially in the case of the political organisation of the Left and of Socialists in the various states and countries of Latin America. All of these factors combine to make the revolutionary struggle for Socialism difficult in Latin America, but also vital for both historical and political reasons. The struggle in Latin America today, given the history of the nineteenth-century and the twentieth-century, has entered a vital phase since the turn of the century. This vital phase has also been shown by the fate and struggle of most of the great Socialist Revolutions and Left-Nationalist Revolutions which occurred in Latin America in the last century. Any political analysis for Social Revolution or Socialist Revolution in Latin America needs to deal with the reality of politics in Latin America and the legacy of politics in Latin America. The struggle for Socialism cannot succeed in Latin America without a political struggle for Socialism. The revolutionary struggle in Latin America has taken many forms over the last century. Today the revolutionary struggle in Latin America is primarily a political struggle and a social struggle. It is a political struggle and a social struggle because both are needed to achieve Socialism in Latin America – and both are vital. This basic fact is a constant of any Revolutionary Strategy for Latin America. There once was a time when the revolutionary struggle in Latin America relied on Guerilla Warfare and Guerilla Struggle. Today that is no longer the case. Today only political struggle can achieve a revolutionary struggle in Latin America. Except for a very few cases that type of guerilla struggle is no longer possible or profitable in Latin America. There is also the reality that except for a few cases, namely the Cuban Revolution of 1959, the Guerilla strategy was a failure and a disaster for Socialist Revolution in Latin America – one which resulted in counter-revolution and defeat. In Latin America today the revolutionary struggle for Socialism must rely on political struggles – and not military struggles. If the revolutionary struggle in Latin America is to succeed it must rely today on political struggles by the Working-Class of Latin America. The revolutionary struggle for Socialism in Latin America has to engage with the politics and history of Latin America. This has always been true and will continue to be true for the struggle in Latin America. The revolutionary struggle in Latin America has a rich tradition and a rich history – going back to the revolutions of the twentieth-century. The social struggle for Socialism in Latin America is more developed in certain places and areas in Latin American than others. This social reality is key to understanding the dynamic of the revolutionary struggle in Latin America – in that some areas are more politically advanced than others. This division of the Revolution in Latin America is another legacy of past

politics and past struggles in Latin America. For the revolutionary struggle in Latin America today it is vital to unite the working-class struggle in all these countries and to develop them towards Socialism itself. In the case of Venezuela, a key theatre of Social Revolution and Revolutionary Struggle in Latin America since the beginning of the Bolivarian Revolution in 1954, the Social Struggle there today is already beginning to enter a decisive phase. If the struggle for Socialism is to advance and develop in Latin America then there must be a struggle in all the countries of Latin America and all the societies of Latin America. There cannot be a successful Social Revolution in Latin America today unless the Left engages with the concrete realities of the struggle in Latin America today. Repeating the politics and history of the revolutionary struggles from the past, even from previous successes, is unlikely to achieve revolutionary victories in Latin America today. Instead it is vital to develop a revolutionary struggle and a revolutionary strategy for Latin America which acknowledges the realities of politics in Latin America itself today. These will be different in the different countries of Latin America. They will, though, all share in common the common need to develop a working-class struggle and a working-class politics as the heart of the revolutionary struggle for Socialism in Latin America. The particulars of revolutionary struggle in Latin America are different across Latin America today, but they all share in common the need for a common working-class struggle and a common working-class politics. For the Social Revolution and Socialist Revolution in Latin America today the Working-Class is at the centre of the struggle, both for revolutionary politics and for Socialism. All revolutionary struggles must contend with counter-revolution and counter-revolutionary struggles. Any struggle in Latin America will have to contend with these opponents and find ways of overcoming them. The recent reality of counter-revolution in Brazil, since 1964, and Venezuela, since 1954, shows how powerful the forces of Counter-Revolution remain in Latin America – at both a political level and a social level. The history and politics of counter-revolution and coups in Latin America, since the beginning of U.S. Imperialism in Latin America, has always been a threat to social progress and social revolution in Latin America – as the history of the twentieth-century in Latin America also shows. Recent events and older events in the history of Latin America also show the reality of what occurs when revolution fails in Latin American societies – the reality of Capitalist dictatorship and Military dictatorship. The working-class of Latin America cannot afford any further revolutionary failures. Imperialism is the ultimate foe of revolution in Latin America, and the foe of revolution anywhere in the world. Imperialism is a factor in any revolutionary strategy in Latin America today, as it has been a factor in any revolutionary strategy in Latin America. It is important to stress that the reality of any Revolution or Revolutionary Strategy in Latin America has to be thought of in relation to the reality of U.S. Imperialism in Latin America. Imperialism has always undermined the struggle for Socialism in Latin America, and across the World. The difficulties of the Cuban Revolution and the Bolivarian Revolution in Venezuela attest to this basic fact. Imperialism and its allies seek ways to overcome it, either by struggle or by solidarity with the struggle of the Working-Class in the United States itself. Imperialism is not confronted, head on, then there is no chance for the success of Social Revolution or Socialist Revolution in Latin America. This divide, specifically in Latin America, means that the Revolutionary Struggle in Latin America still needs to develop a Working-Class struggle and a Working-Class politics – specifically for political struggle and political development. This aspect of the struggle in Latin America is a hangover from the twentieth-century and a reminder of the social problems and social divides in Latin American society, yet it also shows the importance of having a Socialist politics of political development for the Latin American Left. If the Left is to advance in Latin America it will have to develop a Social aspect of its Socialist politics – one which can appeal to the poor farmers and poor workers of Latin America. Failure to develop such a politics will only delay a key aspect of the social struggle in Latin America – the unity between the working-class and the rural farmers. Without unity between the worker and the farmer there cannot be either Social Revolution or Socialist Revolution in Latin America. Indeed some of the best writers and thinkers on Socialist Revolution have either come from Latin America or have thought about the problems of Revolution in Latin America. This is because Latin America, itself, is a key theatre for the Socialist Revolutionary struggle of today. The thought of Che Guevara and Régis Debray instantly springs to mind whenever one thinks of the problems and politics of making Revolution in Latin America. Such Marxists and Socialists have always thought long and

hard about finding ways of making the Revolution in Latin America. If any strategy or politics for Revolution in Latin America is to be developed for today then it will probably require some aspect of the thought from the older Socialist thinkers of the twentieth-century and from the Socialist tradition in general. The struggle in Latin America shows the need for both political organisation and for social organisation. No victory for Socialism in Latin America can occur without such political organisation or social organisation without Socialist Parties and Socialist organisations. Latin America has a history and a tradition of such Socialist Parties and Socialist organisations. For the Left in Latin America today it is vital that the politics, tactics and struggles of such Parties are resurrected for the struggle today. The Socialist Revolution cannot be won, anywhere, without a Socialist Party. It is also a question that the Left in Latin America will have to think hard and long upon, given the reality of politics today in Latin America and the experience gained from the successes and failures of the revolutions of the twentieth-century. The nature of the revolutionary struggle in Latin America necessitates that the Left in Latin America think long and hard about the nature of the struggle, and how it connects to the international struggle for Socialism. Latin America, after all, is just one theatre of an international struggle for Socialism and this means that success or defeat there effects the struggle for Socialism everywhere else. The nature of American Imperialism in Latin America gives the social struggle a further reality and a further political problem. All this means that unity amongst the Left of Latin America is vital for any future success for the Left of Latin America today or in the near future. In many ways the nature of the struggle for Socialism in Latin America remains unchanged from what it was in the nineteenth or twentieth centuries in that the Left of Latin America has to struggle against both national and international foes, against both the Capitalists of Latin America and the Imperialism of the United States. All of this makes the social struggle and political struggle in Latin America difficult but not impossible. The struggle in Latin America continues today, and it will continue until victory and the victory of Socialism. Imperialism will, ultimately, require a Socialist Revolution in the United States itself. This proposition is a difficult one. It will, ultimately, depend on the ability of the American Left to fight for Socialism in the United States itself. It is likely that this will remain the case for any revolutionary struggle in the present century the twenty-first century.

Chapter 3 : Revolutionary Left Movement (Chile) | Revolvy

The Revolutionary Left in Italy. What follows is a loose account of the revolutionary Left in Italy. For understanding the very early days, there are a number of available sources (see the Note on page), some of which are available in this country.

An MP3 audio file of this chapter, narrated by Jeff Riggensbach, is available for download. Hegel was supposed to bring about the end of history, but now Hegel was dead, and history continued to march on. So if Hegel himself was not the final culmination of history, then perhaps the Prussian state of Friedrich Wilhelm III was not the final stage of history either. So reasoned groups of radical youth, who, during the last s and s in Germany and elsewhere, formed the movement of Young, or Left, Hegelians. Disillusioned in the Prussian state, the Young Hegelians proclaimed the inevitable coming apocalyptic revolution to destroy and transcend that state, a revolution that would really bring about the end of history in the form of national, or world, communism. One of the first and most influential of the Left Hegelians was a Pole, Count August Cieszkowski 94 who wrote in German and published in his Prolegomena to a Historiosophy. Cieszkowski brought to Hegelianism a new dialectic of history, a new variant of the three ages of man. The first age, the age of antiquity, was, for some reason, the age of emotion, the epoch of pure feeling, of no reflective thought, of elemental immediacy and unity with nature. The "spirit" was "in itself" an sich. The second age of mankind, the Christian era, stretching from the birth of Jesus to the death of the great Hegel, was the age of thought, of reflection, in which the "spirit" moved "toward itself," in the direction of abstraction and universality. But Christianity, the age of thought, was also an era of intolerable duality, of man separated from God, of spirit separated from matter, and thought from action. Finally, the third and culminating age, the coming age, heralded by Count Cieszkowski, was to be the age of action. In short, the third post-Hegelian age would be an age of practical action, in which the thought of both Christianity and of Hegel would be transcended and embodied into an act of will, a final revolution to overthrow and transcend existing institutions. For the term "practical action," Cieszkowski borrowed the Greek word praxis to summarize the new age, a term that would soon come to acquire virtually talismanic influence in Marxism. This final age of action would bring about, at long last, a blessed unity of thought and action, theory and praxis, spirit and matter, God and earth, and total "freedom. In a work published in French in Paris in , Cieszkowski also heralded the new class destined to become the leaders of the revolutionary society: Trentowski, who had published his work in Prussian-occupied Poznan. If not in theory, this dominance of Marxist movements and governments by a "new class" of intelligentsia has certainly been the history of Marxism in "praxis. Cieszkowski, however, was not destined to ride the wave of the future of revolutionary socialism. For he took the Christian messianic, rather than atheistic, path to the new society. In his massive unfinished work of , Our Father Ojczyzna , Cieszkowski maintained that the new age of revolutionary communism would be a third age, an age of the Holy Spirit shades of Joachimism! But at the time, the path of Christian messianism was not clearly destined to be a loser in the intra-socialist debate. Hegel is the new Christ bringing the word of truth to men. If Hegel had pantheized and elaborated the dialectic of Christian messianics, Marx now "stood Hegel on his head" by atheizing the dialectic, and resting it, not on mysticism or religion or "spirit" or the absolute idea or the world-mind, but on the supposedly solid and "scientific" foundation of philosophical materialism. In contrast to the Hegelian emphasis on "spirit," Marx would study the allegedly scientific laws of matter in some way operating through history. Marx, in short, took the dialectic and made it what we can call a "materialist dialectic of history. The concept was applied by Engels, who of the two founders was particularly interested in the natural sciences, to biology. In an ultra-Hegelian manner, logic and logical contradictions, or "negations," are hopelessly confused with the processes of reality. As a result of this negation of the negation we have gained the original barley corn 1 in a quantity ten, twenty, or thirty times larger. How could Marx find a "scientific" materialist replacement, newly grounded in the ineluctable "laws of history" that would explain the inevitability of the imminent apocalyptic transformation of the world into communism? It is one thing to base the prediction of a forthcoming Armageddon upon the Bible; it is quite another to deduce this event from

allegedly scientific laws. Setting forth the specifics of this engine of history was to occupy Karl Marx for the rest of his life. Although Marx found Feuerbach indispensable for adopting a thoroughgoing atheist and materialist positions, Marx soon found that Feuerbach had not gone nearly far enough. Even though Feuerbach was a philosophical communist, he basically believed that if man forswore religion, then his alienation from his self would be over. To Marx, religion was only one of the problems. The entire world of man the *Menschenwelt* was alienating, and had to be radically overthrown, root and branch. Only apocalyptic destruction of this world of man would permit true human nature to be realized. Only then would the existing "un-man" *Unmensch* truly become man *Mensch*. As Marx thundered in the fourth of his "theses on Feuerbach," "one must proceed to destroy [the] "earthly family" [as it is] "both in theory and in practice. The main problem comes in the private sphere, the market, or "civil society," in which un-man acts as an egoist, as a private person, treating others as means, and not collectively as masters of their fate. And in existing society, unfortunately, civil society is primary, while the state, or "political community," is secondary. Then real individual man will become a true and full "species being. And here, Marx harkened back to the call for total destruction that had animated his vision of the world in poems of his youth. Indeed, in a speech in London in , Marx was to give graphic and loving expression to this goal of his "praxis. All the houses of Europe are now marked with the mysterious red cross. History is the judge — its executioner the proletariat. As we have indicated above, Marx actually acquired his vision of the proletariat as the key to the communist revolution from the work of Lorenz von Stein, an enemy of socialism, who interpreted the socialist and communist movements as rationalizations of the class interests of the proletariat. The proletariat, the most "alienated" and allegedly "propertyless" class, would be the key. Marx had now worked out the outline of his secular messianic vision: But how specifically was this to be accomplished? Vision was not enough. What scientific laws of history could bring about this cherished goal? Fortunately, Marx had a crucial ingredient for his attempted solution close at hand: The class struggle along with historical materialism was to be an essential ingredient for the Marxian material dialectic. Trentowski, *The Relationship of Philosophy to Cybernetics* Poznan, , in which the author also coined the word "cybernetics" for the new, emerging form of rational social technology which would transform mankind. Billington, *Fire in the Minds of Men: Origins of the Revolutionary Faith* New York: Basic Books, , p. Princeton University Press, , pp. It is to Bauer that the world owes the terms "critical" and "criticism," which Marxists have long employed as endlessly repeated slogans ever since; e. Ludwig von Mises Institute, , p. Longmans, Green, , p. Marx to Engels, 16 Jan. *Regeneration Through Chaos* 2nd ed. Institute for Christian Economics, , pp.

The Revolutionary Left Movement (Spanish Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria, MIR) is a Chilean far-left political organization and former guerrilla organization founded on October 12,

Phoenix The regressive left is a complete divorce from original liberalism. It is an insult to it, a sickly bastardized ideology that has spread like a plague. It is best understood as a sickness that erodes and makes a society feeble and self-deprecating. It turns a nation against itself, against national identity, against strength, desiring its own eventual dissolution or cultural suicide. The regressive left is the inevitable conclusion of relativism intermixed with Christian remnants gone secular. It is the leftovers of Christianity, echoes of it, gone secular. It is the theology minus the quality and potency. It is highly religious and puritanical, though in such a way that it lacks either a historical or transcendent founding. It is purely discursive, but still has influence and power because ideology permeates throughout society. Rather than the individual reduced to a number, the individual is reduced to their basic physical attributes. An individual of an ethnic minority is reduced to their skin color, a woman is reduced to her gender and sex, a homosexual is reduced to sexual orientation, a religious person is reduced to their religion. The individual is politicized, easily categorized into this or that political camp based solely on their physical attributes. Neither a woman or homosexual individual is looked at as a whole, rather they are reduced to the physical detail which defines that identity. The detail of being a woman or being gay may indeed have a strong impact on their existence, it is still only a footnote to the person as a whole. The regressive left reduces these individuals to their identity footnotes, primarily as a form of politicization and control. If you are homosexual, it is only in your best interest to support that which panders to that detail, as if there is nothing greater than that small detail. Indeed, identity politics has ensured that the whole must never be greater than the sum of its parts. It is a matter of dissolution in the name of a secular slave morality. Mass immigration is permitted, nationalist identity is denounced; this is the national individual identity dissolved into the general mass. Much like the individual dissolved into the masses, so does national identity dissolve into mere mass humanity. Excessive permissiveness is a virtue. It is the intentional destruction of definition. That which defines identity is dissolved. The vertical is leveled, flattened into the quantified horizontal. This is all deemed righteous and good. The destruction of identity is seen as a saint-like act. National identity, cultural identity, pride in history and accomplishments; these are denounced for the sake of guilt and self-flagellation. In its place, a corporate monoculture of consumerism and elementary universal morality, typically utilitarian and materialist in premise. The downtrodden, the victims, the oppressed are venerated. The strong, the powerful, the successful, these are made villains. The individual which owns his or herself, his or her own accomplishments, his or her own merits, which admires excellence and individuation; this is the truest villain to the regressive left. The regressive left defines its morality in opposition to hegemonic strength. Horizontal and quantified utilitarianism is what defines the slave morality as it seeks only to endure and relieve in opposing response to that harsher morality that rules over them. Its hierarchy is inverted in that the weakest and most victimized are the most revered, and the accomplished strong are the most reviled. The masses must villainize the singular man of individuation. In the grander scheme, they demand descendants feel shame or guilt regarding the accomplishments of their ancestors. The heroes of the past, the grand accomplishments of Western civilizations, the conquests and victories, and display of immense power and leadership, these are to be denounced and one is to feel shame and guilt for their occurrence. That which is heroic, which accomplishes through power, must be reviled and considered a sin. The history of Western civilizations, from ancient to present victories, within the context of this slave morality, was a show of cruelty and vileness. Rather than celebrate the heroic victories of the past, one must feel shame and guilt for it. Self-flagellation and the desire to become the defeated is at the heart this crusade. Blacklisting, shaming, scolding, condemning, these are a few of the multiple ways in which discourse is coerced and the individual punished. The regressive left does not directly attack freedom of speech, rather it attempts to coerce and pressure those opposing into being silent. Whether they be called racist, sexist, Islamophobic, homophobic and so forth, it is all an attempt to shame another and coerce the general discourse. Freedom of discourse they

claim to respect, yet then practice coercion of every possible manner to manipulate the discourse to their favor. In dislike of overt power, the denouncement of identity, it is much like a plague which makes the body sicker and weaker, turned upon itself; it is erosion, plain and simple. The veneration of weakness, and demonization of strength, it only continues to eat itself from within. As a raindrop falls into the ocean, a nation and people must lose its individual identity and dissolves into the global mass. The vertical immediately flattens and dissolves into the horizontal. This is the ultimate conclusion of the regressive left. It is the complete loss of cultural and national identity. It is the dissolution of being into the nothingness. In conclusion, it is a matter of the vertical versus and horizontal, the national versus the global, the individual versus the masses. This is a simple survey based on observation of this sickly ideology that permeates society and drives it forward to its own dissolution. It is an ideology that spurs suicidal impulse. Identity and individuation may resist this dissolving. The active rejection of the secular slave morality may dissipate it in time, though it will always return in some form or another. Own oneself, aspire to individuation, take pride in strength, take pride in history and heritage, be whole, be separate, and to thine own self be true. A Secular Slave Morality first appeared at Liminal Cinema on December 7, and is republished here with permission by the author.

Chapter 5 : Revolutionary Left Radio: Heavy Radicals: The FBI's Secret War On America's Maoists ()

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Messenger France is heading to the polls on April 23 for the first round of its presidential election. This election holds particular importance for the European nation, which finds itself at a crossroads, with its whole political system in question. From abroad, the situation seems puzzling to many commentators. While five candidates appear to have emerged as favourites from the 11 who qualified to stand for election, their platforms, the values they promote and their political affiliations except for a few are not very obvious. The second round of voting will take place on May 7. Labels that date to the King Left and right are old labels, dating back to the French Revolution. If so, it queried, should this right should be absolute or simply suspensive, for a period of time. According to Christian tradition, it is an honour to be seated at the right side of God, or to the right of the head of the family at dinner. Those who wanted a highly restricted veto were seated on the left. Thus, the layout of the room took on political significance: In the 19th century, this vocabulary was increasingly used to describe the political leanings of members of the French parliament. The great advantage of these labels is their simplicity: The French parliament in In this way, political parties can be said to be more or less left wing, or more or less right wing, in relation to one another. It would later set monarchists against republicans, then conservative republicans against the modernists who implemented the major social reforms of the Third Republic that included the freedom of the press, freedom of association, the right to belong to a trade-union and divorce, among other things. At the turn of the 20th century, the left-right debate essentially covered the divide between the defenders of Catholicism and advocates for the separation of church and state. By the s, the liberalisation of social mores had become a key issue, with continuing debates on abortion, divorce, homosexuality, marriage equality and euthanasia. The same is true of immigration and openness to the world, which stood in opposition to cultural, social and economical protectionism. Parties with many faces In France, the divide grew in several political realms. Former president Nicolas Sarkozy was the face of the 21st-century Republican right. What is certain is that there is still a significant difference between the conservative, more authoritarian right that favours an economy in which the state plays a regulatory and protective role, and the liberal right that favours deregulation, less restrictive labour laws and more entrepreneurship. In truth, for each overarching area of political debate, there are at least two right wings and two left wings. Concerning family values and gay marriage, for instance, a minority on the right are open to increased tolerance, while a minority on the left are rather reluctant. The same can be said of immigration. Not everyone on the right is convinced by restrictive immigration policies, while open immigration policies are far from universally approved of on the left. Those who self-identify as centrists sometimes occupy the middle ground on certain main political issues but stand to the left on one issue and to the right on another. Centrists from the Christian Democratic tradition, who favoured social protections, dialogue between workers and management, and oppose unchecked economic liberalism, were also conservative on family issues. Young women dressed as Marianne, the French revolutionary symbol of freedom, demonstrating against same-sex marriage in Paris on January 13 We cannot ascribe unchanging, universal content to these categories. These days, we cannot even say that the right is for the status quo or that the left wants change, as has sometimes been claimed. When it comes to the welfare state, people on the right clamour for reform, whereas those on the left want to defend social protections. Still, in each era, centre, left and right have served as signposts, allowing us to classify political parties, politicians and the ideas they promote. A strong proponent of liberal economic policies, he also supports a certain social safety net and the integration of immigrants while opposing discrimination against minorities. He is trying to attract moderates from the left and the right. Not all the same So why is the belief that there is no real difference between left and right so commonly held? This view can be traced back to opinion surveys from the s. A growing number of people now claim that the concepts of left and right have lost all meaning. Yet these same people, in the same surveys, happily

self-identify on a continuum of left to right and define their political identity in these dichotomous terms. They also respond differently to a variety of political issues , as compared to their self-established position on that scale. This apparent paradox can be explained. Many people who personally feel more left wing or right wing according to their convictions also believe that governments tend to implement similar policies when in power. They therefore expect clear political platforms that can be summarised as left wing or right wing but are ultimately disappointed by the outcomes. As a result, candidates make promises to attract votes without taking into account how difficult they may be to implement. But selling right- or left-wing ideas during an election campaign also serves to make people dream “ capturing hearts and minds at the expense of considering the realities that elected governments must face. This article was originally published in French.

Chapter 6 : Revolutionary Left Movement (Chile) - Wikipedia

"In times of universal deceit, to tell the truth is a revolutionary act." - George Orwell. Founder & Editor-in-Chief, Rod Thomson, provides commentary & more.

At its height in , the MIR numbered about 10, members and associates. The questioning for changes and the opposition against such changes resulted in several small groups or factions. There the young socialists met with Trotskyites, most of them twice their age. Two reasons explain this document and its co-authorship: Several tendencies were represented on the Central Committee, but later, the only line that prevailed was the Marxist-Leninist. The few anarchist and left liberal cadres supporting the "tendencia social-humanista" and that remained in the organization, were confined to academic tasks and trusted the ideological polemic with the emergent "Christian Humanism" and old Stalinists. After the 2nd Congress in , MIR would considered itself not only a revolutionary vanguard party as established in the foundation congress, but also clearly advocated a Marxist-Leninist model of revolution in which it would lead the working class to a " dictatorship of the proletariat ". The government publicized a national list of 13 young MIR leaders for their capture. The banning of MIR by the Christian Democratic government in drastically changed the organization of MIR, which entered a clandestine political existence with semi-autonomous operative-structures that survived even during the first years of the military resistance of MIR against the Chilean coup. The threat from the MIR was underlined by the discovery at the end of May of a guerrilla training camp in the southern province of Valdivia. The Minister had been singled out by sectors of the oppositional left and worker-unions as the top government politician supposedly ordering the repressive actions which culminated in the Masacre de Puerto Montt on March 9, At this massacre, nine working-class men and woman were killed by police in Southern Chile. MIR explicitly condemned terrorism perpetrated against individuals "atentado personal". Ideological issues that would help to explain this anti-terrorist posture of MIR have been referred in historical notes by MIR leaders who survived the epoch. Nationwide unrest and political polarization escalated, as did left-wing and right-wing violence. However, the JCR never achieved real effectiveness. The day of the military coup Fewer than 60 individuals died as a direct result of fighting on 11 September , but the MIR and GAP continued to fight the following day. In , there had been plans to infiltrate 1, Marxist guerrillas from Argentina into Chile in an operation christened Plan Boomerang Rojo Red Boomerang Plan , but the infiltration failed to materialize because of the co-operation of the Argentine authorities with Chile. The MIR had in September given basic military training to some 2, lumber workers in the Panguipulli Lake area and won over the trust of the general population,[20] some miles south of Santiago. In the renewed military offensives in the area under the Pinochet regime between and , the MIR guerrillas around Lake Panguipulli with the help of local militants and sympathizers halted the initial advance of the Chilean Army. Later, in order to disperse them and subdue the province, the Chilean Army ordered a full Brigade of elite troops in the form of Special Forces and Paratroopers and their accompanying U. Still, the organisation had served as a base of support for Allende and had shown willingness to confront violent sedition directed against the Popular Unity government organized by its US-backed right-wing opponents. From the onset on September 11, the MIR became a major focus of death squads and its members began to be subjected to extrajudicial executions and forced disappearances. What is the MIR? On one page page 37 of the political document , the MIR presented the political question of arms in this resistance. The lawsuit noted that under the pretext of war serious violations of human rights had been committed in violations of both international and constitutional law. The document noted that the cruellest example was the extermination of the MIR political organization, in which according to the document its members fell victims to the following crimes:

A debate on July 8th, between rightist Augustus Sol Invictus and leftist Caleb Maupin in New York City. The debate was formally titled "The Revolutionary Left vs.

The Video of the call: Dear comrades Oh militants and fighters for freedom, justice and democracy The popular revolution enters in its fourth year a complex and critical phase. The number of victims and injured have exceeded hundreds of thousands, while millions have become refugees and are displaced and destruction prevails in the country. The ruling bourgeois regime has regained, aided by its allies, the advantage on the military field, while at the same time the influence of the fascists forces of the counter-revolution has increased. The response of the ruling regime to the demands of the peaceful masses during the first year of the revolution was bloody and brutal. This brutal repression led important sections of the revolution to adopt the armed struggle for the defense of himself or herself and his or her parents and their cities. This was not an easy choice and arms were not even taken willingly for many of them, but this form of mass struggle came in reaction to the brutality of the military incursions of the dictatorial regime. The armed struggle has become an instrument for the liberation of the masses and cannot be ignored. The counter-revolutionary forces, whether local, regional or international have attacked our popular revolution, in order to try to abort or derail it of its popular and democratic path. We know that these regional countries have mobilized all their energy in this objective. This situation has been worsened by the absence of a clear political vision that is blurred by alliance with various regional forces and dominates sections of the oppositions. The various sections of the official opposition are also affected by tensions that stem from conflict and struggles of various political and military agendas of regional and imperialist powers that sponsor them. They are all working on trying to derail and abort a popular, democratic and social radical revolution. Both are two sides of the same coin: Both of the mentioned counter revolutionary forces did not hesitate to use sectarianism, religious, ethnic and local differences as well-known and worn instruments to distort popular consciousness and to try to derail the ongoing social struggle and divide the popular masses. The soul of the popular revolution is nevertheless still alive and was able, until now, to avoid falling into this mortal trap. Our revolution erupted in the context of uprisings experienced by the countries of our region since , and as our revolution affected the general course of these revolutions, in return, these latter affected ours as well. These are not merely purely theoretical words, but rather facts that have been proved by the extent of the correlation between these ongoing revolutionary processes in the countries of our region altogether. At the same time, we see that our revolution is part of the struggles of the global toiling masses, of the oppressed and of the marginalized everywhere for freedom, equality, social justice and socialism. We see it in the struggle of the Palestinian people to recover all its land and rights, in the struggle of the peasants without land and labor in Latin America, in the strikes of the miners in South Africa and in other countries, in the struggle of the masses in Europe against neoliberalism and capitalist globalization, in the struggle of the oppressed workers of Southeast Asia, in the struggle of women for their rights and equality throughout the world. Therefore, there is no doubt that our struggles are merged and are unified against the global capitalist system, which is based on exclusion and plunder and exploitation and in which imperialist predators struggled for more profits at the expense of millions of people and of their sufferings. Radical left activists were not absent from the revolution in Syria since the time it erupted, many of them were actually the initiators of it, as new groups or as cadres who left the official communist parties, whose leaders showed their submission to the bloody bourgeois regime. But unfortunately, many of them faded away because of the repression, exile or his or her distaste for arm struggle. But we, the revolutionary left current, remained tenacious and held on to the revolution. With our modest capacities, we participate in all forms of mass struggle, including armed struggle as individuals. This is the road for the victory of the popular revolution, in rooting its nature in democracy and socialism from below, in defending the immediate and general interests of the popular classes, in securing the independence of the will of the people from any imperialist or regional intervention from any foreign power, and in recovering our occupied territories of the Golan by all means possible. We emphasize that its mission is to defend oneself and the popular masses and

their freedom paid heavily for it and for the right to liberate themselves from all tyranny and exploitation, in the face of all the counter-revolution forces, particularly the authoritarian ruling regime. We do not call for death, but for a free and dignified life for the popular masses, for all the popular masses. Because life is beautiful, we want to guarantee that present and future generations are free of all evils, of all persecutions, and of all violence. In our struggle with the toiling masses for their liberation, we call on all the leftist and socialist forces in the region and in the world to affirm clearly and firmly their highest degree of international solidarity, because the fate of our popular revolution will decide the fate of the revolutionary processes in the region, and even beyond its borders. Glory to the martyrs and healing for the wounded and freedom for all the detainees Victory for the ongoing popular revolution All the power and wealth to the people Revolutionary Left Current in Syria March 18, For details for financial support please follow this link:

Chapter 8 : NPR Choice page

Jun 18, Writer and historian Aaron Leonard, the author of Heavy Radicals, joins Brett to discuss the Revolutionary Union/Revolutionary Communist Party of the 60's and 70's, of which Aaron was a member for 30 years.

Political Revolutionary Keywords for a New Left comprises short essays on fifty revolutionary keywords, each word being put to work on a contemporary political issue. He is a committed but non-dogmatic Marxist and a psychoanalyst so, unsurprisingly, anything he writes is likely to be serious and challenging. Despite a strong theoretical and academic background, however, Parker writes in a very engaging and interesting fashion. Revolutionary Keywords does what it says on the tin. Parker has come up with a list of key terms that are used on the left and explains them clearly. This book would be a useful political education resource for anyone involved in Marxist, green or intersectional liberation politics. Parker has taken 50 keywords, including ecosocialism, empire and Islamophobia, and described each. He looks at how they have been disputed, contradicted and generally argued over. He offers suggestions for further reading. He sought to link literary theory with political activism, producing his own keywords book in His project was more academic and formal than this new book, but Parker draws upon his inspiration. Both Parker and Williams believe that words may become more significant and change according to context. The broad context for Parker is the way in which the revolutionary left has come into contact with movements for feminism, ecology and intersectionality in recent decades. Intersectionality has proven controversial for some Marxists as has feminism and ecology , but Parker notes its origin as a term is in fact rather straightforward and rooted in working-class struggle. Workers at General Motors in the United States sought to sue the firm for discrimination in , but were told that they could only sue on the basis of either gender or ethnicity. African-American women, however, felt that they had been discriminated in both forms. The more specific context was the situation British Marxists faced in recent years. A crisis in one of the bigger far left groups opened up prospects for a realignment of left groups, and Marxists like Parker encountered new radical networks. The book was largely inspired by a radical reading group of anti-capitalist activists in Manchester, where Parker is based. Keywords consistently takes important and sometimes seemingly threatening terms and opens them up for discussion. Parker has the ability to make difficult ideas accessible. He is a strong opponent of theory being used to bolster academic careers separate from political struggle. Parker also shows how theory can be used to belittle new activists or impose a narrow party orthodoxy. The fact that he makes concepts from psychoanalysis more relevant to left activists is another virtue. Criticisms can be made. Sometimes the examples seem based on often obscure debates between small groups on the far left. Although international in outlook, there is a lot more Manchester than Mumbai here. An index would have been useful and sometimes it is difficult to track down content. This is an enjoyable and thought-provoking book. Vladimir Lenin said there can be no revolutionary movement without revolutionary theory. Any reader will have some disagreements with the author, but Keywords opens discussion rather than closing it down. He is a researcher, supervisor, and consultant in critical psychology and psychoanalysis. Revolutionary Keywords is a series of essays based on keywords. It is not a dictionary of definitions but contains commonly used keywords and creates essays built around the word. The essays put the keyword into context in modern socialism. Like most books on socialism, this one, too, becomes complex. The term socialism means many different things to many different people. The book discusses many aspects of historical socialism as well as modern day. Topics of race, sex, gender, globalism, and campism are discussed in detail throughout the book. Other topics seem mundane but have deep roots such as discourse, postmodernism, identity, and animals. The discussions run deep and turn out complex. At the end, the recap traces the changes in keywords from and The evolution of keywords leads to the keywords in this volume. Although not intended for the general audience, in fact, I found myself a bit entangled in the subject matter. I felt much the same way on the first day of a semester in graduate school. Needless to say, it is not light reading, but worth the time and effort for those with an interest in the far left. It will be intellectually daring, international in its understandings, and will draw together discourses and events often kept apart within established writing. Above all, it will not be easy to predict. A

Vocabulary of Culture and Society. When Williams went about charting the history of certain definitive terms within radical discourse, however, his focus was very much the white, straight, European and male. In one respect, then, the updating is necessary to introduce to such a progressive project the feminist, queer and postcolonial, yet *Revolutionary Keywords* is not simply tasked with returning neglected subjects to the discourse of the left, as through such an operation it also questions the nature of such discourse. Parker has written a text that, in its every aspect, problematizes a centrism that, left unchecked, can limit revolutionary possibility. The reasons for writing the book are set out in the following terms: To achieve this end, the text rejects a conventional linear structure. The result is a text that can offer up unexpected connections. Then I would use that word in a way closer to how it was meant to operate, but instead of simply explaining it I would put it to work on a different topic. This is a text that does not dismiss the force of boundaries, nor the necessity of structures, but is consistently challenging and transforming what these might be, and the nature and direction of the forces upon which they call. Parker reads how the resistance to this monocultural, violent enterprise mobilises diversity, further suggesting that: Such reversals are consistently read in *Revolutionary Keywords* not in terms of pessimistic dead-ends, but rather the very stuff of critical and political movements. In this text, Parker proves himself once again a truly great reader of the dialectic. There is a reflexivity that actualises, rather than dilutes, the revolutionary politics. Indeed, this is a text that makes real political movement. Or, as Parker has it in his address to his audience: The essays are engaging and well written without being pretentious, and tackle not only the words but what surrounds the words. His new book, *Revolutionary Keywords for a New Left*, is published in the context of the centennial of the October revolution, and should be read in tandem with similarly themed books recently published by Verso e. This is principally so as far as open, heterarchical organizing is concerned 5 â€” i. Put differently, activists need radical theories e. Marxism, feminism, anti-racism in order to interpret and, more importantly, transform the oppressive reality of capitalism-patriarchy-racism. Each keyword chapter begins with a handy and succinct definition. A few descriptions from the book will give a sense of their pithiness: I recommend that readers begin the book by paying particular attention to the concluding essay, which though technically a postface functions powerfully as a preface to *Revolutionary Keywords*. *Political Compass for Activists* This book is written mainly for activists, without in-text citations or references except the Further Reading section at the very end ; as a result the book has a nice flow, which is practical if the book is embraced by many activists as a go-to resource. The social dimension has to do with the question of political freedom, the two extremes being authoritarianism and libertarianism. Then in came the double trauma of Brexit in the U. Now in , both are occupying the upper right quadrant of neo-liberal authoritarianism. Beshara, This traumatic encounter is also an authentic opportunity. It forces us to ask the question: The dilemmas of Lenin: Terrorism, war, empire, love, revolution. Solidarity is what we need. The story of the Russian revolution. The rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality and the grammar of de-coloniality. Justice and the Politics of Difference. Remembering, repeating, and working through. Would readers under 60 understand that reference, I wonder? As I have so little knowledge of international politics, eg 2nd, 3rd or 4th Internationals, troika, entrism etc. How interesting to discover that my son is still quoting the cultural Marxist Raymond Williams 50 years after I studied and admired him at college. I wrote, for my own edification, a 4-point summary of aspects of the changing contexts for resisting capitalism, only to find that, in your excellent concluding essay, you had written a much better one. *Things That Worried Me*: The section on Zionism; I found it totally confusing. The admission that there could be radically different interpretations of Marx; it reminded me too much of the Bible. There are too many traps threatening you in almost every chapter! Things I particularly liked: Your useful division of the subject matter into the periods and Your uplifting description of not only small-scale agricultural initiatives but also transition towns. *Left Unity* - which sounds hopeful. Thank you for sharing your splendid book with me. *Revolutionary Keywords* takes philosophical risks by unlayering the conceptual densities of such complex concepts as antagonism, normalcy, precarity, and accelerationism. In laying bare each concept, Parker provides the philosophico-historical lines of its formation and situates it within its broad social conditions.

Chapter 9 : Revolution and Revolutionary Strategy in Latin America | Dissident Voice

The American Revolution was the 18th-century colonists' struggle for independence from Britain. Learn about the Revolutionary War, the Declaration of Independence and more.

You could almost hear the shovels of earth falling on the Latin American left which has not figured out how to disassociate itself from populism. An indirect heir of those congresses organized by the Soviet Union, the scenography of the hammer and sickle is now hidden, the word communism eliminated from the talks, and Leninist allusions banished. The organizers may have dressed as progressives and sucked in the environmentalists and the indigenous and human rights movements, but the skeleton that supports them continues to mimic the constitution of the conferences staged by the USSR, because they try to pass off as spontaneous what is controlled down to the tiniest detail. Every new phrase uttered was like an extreme unction intoned over their own doctrine. Those who this week clothed themselves in the garments of social struggles and the demands of the most disadvantaged, have shown that once installed in their palaces their objective is to undermine republican institutions and dynamite the legal bases of democracy, actions that in the medium term end up inflicting extensive damage on the very social sectors they claim to represent. The meeting also gave ample space to explaining the false and Manichean dilemma of choosing between a left that still speaks of revolutions and enemies, and neoliberalism, the right and the powerful. In the narrative thread that connected the sessions of the event, one strand insisted on the idea that the left is not finished in this part of the world and nor can one speak of a change in the ideological cycle. The populist champions who devoted a good part of the debates to naming the culprits, with index fingers pointing north, have handed their opponents the arguments to discredit an entire ideology on a silver platter. Experts, perhaps, in that fall from grace, they now appeal to each other to prop them up. That phrase also reveals the real reason for the event. A council to grease the wheels of the machinery that sparks actions, triggers protests, twists the frameworks of opinion and screams, from every lung, opposition to any speech that moves a single inch from the pre-established script. However, not everything from the recently concluded conclave should be discarded. Their sessions can act as a warning to the other left, democratic and less vociferous, that is rarely invited to this type of session, to publicly mark the distance and revitalize progressive ideas on the continent. Latin America needs a left with renewed ideas, modern and responsible, not the conglomeration of unpresentable leaders who met in Havana. We need progressive parties that stop placing responsibilities elsewhere, fearing their own citizenship and fishing in the troubled waters of social conflicts. But for this to happen it is perhaps essential that the Sao Paulo Forum be dissolved. That scenario is not so distant. To the extent that the governments that supported the Forum disappear from the executive map of the region, the meeting is stumbling back and forth among a few countries. The previous meeting was held in Nicaragua and this time it returned to the island, where it had already taken place in and It is easy to guess where the next encounters will be: Bolivia, Venezuela or Mexico. Something, however, cracked the mask and revealed the face hidden beneath the progressive disguise. Laughter in one place, seven hours of terror in another. No attendee of the Sao Paulo Forum condemned the repression. Assistencialism is often defined as the creation of dependence through imposed aid. Thank you for joining us on this long road. We invite you to continue supporting us, but this time by becoming a member of 14ymedio. Together we can continue to transform journalism in Cuba.