

Violence and the Revolution

Nicolás A. Ortega

July 10, 2016

1 Introduction

The socialist movement of today (referring to actual socialists and not those who claim to be socialist but do not propose anything that challenges the capitalist system) can be placed into two main categories, socialists who follow the principles of the enlightenment such as reason, and those socialists who have reverted back to the primitive arguments of ethics which are highly subjective and debatable, proper of the utopian socialists. Most people who we might place in the latter may not even be socialists, as what they propose is simply a reform of capitalism and to go no further (which is much different than proposing a gradual change towards socialism). However, in this essay we will be referring to the former, those who mostly come from Marxist thought, for the latter has already been dealt with in part in my essay *The Fall of Reason and the Rise of the Reactionary Left*.

Although I myself sympathize with the former, those who derive from Marxist thought, using reason to achieve their conclusions instead of emotions which are highly subjective, I see many flaws in those who consider themselves Marxists, most of all being that many still believe that revolution is obtainable through means of violence, and by violence I am referring to warfare. In this topic the latter mentioned above have advanced more than many Marxists who still romanticize the idea of a working class in arms fighting against their oppressors in guerrilla style combat. Of course, unlike those utopian socialists (the latter mentioned above) I do not say so based upon my emotions and ethics, but rather based upon reason.

The fact is that we have advanced to a period in time where guerrilla style revolution is no longer possible, there can be no Russian Revolution in any modern country, and even if it were to happen in some third-world country in Latin America or Africa it would still be limited to just a few countries, while the socialist movement needs to be an international effort, not national (one of the big mistakes of the socialist movement of the 20th

century, as many of them could not think past their own nation still believing in nationalism). There are multiple reasons for this.

2 The Unorganized Working Class

First is that the working class is extremely unorganized. In order for there to be a revolution at all some level of organization is required, but for an armed revolution the level of organization required on behalf of the working class is astronomically larger. Even the anarcho-syndicalist idea of the *General Strike* requires less organization than an armed revolution, as that solely requires that workers stop producing for the ruling class, but an armed revolution requires that the workers learn to combat against a professionally trained military which requires much more time and much more effort. Workers today are too unorganized for this to even be imaginable, and we can only expect that as time goes on they will at the very most be just as organized if not less. This is because the capitalist system benefits twice from the workers being unorganized: in the first place it makes it harder for workers to unionize or work together to achieve a better standard of living, but secondly it means that they are less likely to share meaning they will all consume as individuals and not as a collective which means more consumption. As one can see, this benefits the capitalist system too much for it to simply let the workers become organized.

In this regard you have no further to look than the U.S., where capitalism has advanced the most compared to any other country (a close second the U.S. would clearly be the U.K.). In the U.S. not only are workers of the same field in the same workplace unorganized, but people don't even know their neighbors one block down, at the very most they know those who are directly in front, directly to their sides, and perhaps behind (in reference to their house). This can also be explained by how the U.S. urban layout is very much individualized since most people live in houses rather than apartment buildings, that is, the lack of density creates an environment where the working class of the U.S. barely knows each other and has no chance of organizing itself in a quick and effective manner. This is also fomented by the tendency in the U.S. to simply use the car to arrive at any destination rather than more social mediums such as walking or biking which would allow them to at least see their neighbors. And for those who are European and believe that this is simply the U.S. I would like you to think back 20–30 years and look at what direction your country has been going in. To an extent the U.S. is like a prediction of the future to most European countries in terms of the development of the capitalist society.

In the U.S. you can see that the working class is very much unorganized and it also is so in many other countries of Europe, despite the fact that by comparison European workers are much more organized than those in the U.S., that does not mean that the European workers' level of organization is good enough for even the most basic acts of direct action to create even a hard-line Social Democratic society, and as time goes on this situation will do nothing but get worse. Having seen workers' movements in both Spain and the U.S. I would not say that either of them have the capability of an armed revolution with their levels of organization of the workers.

Of course, I do not deny that the working class can be organized, the only aspect I would argue is the degree to which they can be organized which I believe is highly dependable on the degree to which they have been isolated from one another. And since it can be highly debatable as to the degree to which they can be organized I will give the benefit of the doubt for argument's sake and continue with my second point, that being how the power and technology of the military have advanced so much that any armed revolution against them would be completely futile.

3 Modern Warfare

In the 20th century an armed revolution seemed like the only way to revolt against the repression of the ruling capitalist class, and it was very plausible in that era had more of the working class taken action at an international level, however it can be argued that due precisely to the lack of technological advancement in communications that something of that sort would have been next to impossible until a technological era similar to that which we find ourselves in now. However this has changed very much, if there were to be an armed revolution against the capitalists today it would end in a massacre of the workers taking part in it, which the romantics might find as very appealing (dying for your cause), but I find it as immature and wasteful (in the sense that they are wasting the lives of workers to fight a war that cannot be won). This is because the military power of the ruling class has gotten to the point where destroying a movement such as that of the Cuban Revolution would be extremely simple with a few drones and some troops to catch anyone that tries to escape the area. Even if it were an entire city, such as in the Paris Commune, it would only end with the massacre of those workers who take part in such a revolt, as all the military would need to do is to bombard the city and the revolt would be terminated.

The fact of the matter is that the military of any advanced country has gotten to the point where an armed revolution would be completely futile

against it. The only possible way to achieve a revolution in this scenario is to have the military (or at least the vast majority of it) side with the revolution instead, in which case there is almost no need for an armed revolution, as at that point the ruling capitalist class has already lost its whip with which to keep the workers in line and pose no threat to the revolution of the workers.

4 Manipulation, Surveillance, and Repression

However, there is a third reason which is quite important, and it is that even though a small minority of us may be reasonable beings who make our decisions based upon reason and not our emotions, most people are not and therefore an armed revolution is very likely to lose support especially under an oppressive regime that can easily manipulate the workers and use such a revolution to justify more repression and surveillance therefore making a revolution in general even harder to achieve.

If an armed revolution were to occur even today it would be seen as a group of extremists and terrorists who wish nothing more than to hurt people indiscriminately. By doing this people would be more willing to give up their own liberties in order to protect themselves, liberties that could be essential to forming a revolution. To see evidence for this you need not look further than the terrorism that already exists and has existed (socialist or not), whether they are ISIS, Al Qaeda, ETA, IRA, or any other. In all these cases victim states used the actions of these groups to take away liberties of their people in the name of their *safety*, for even though the intentions of those advocating to remove these liberties may be innocent, the fact remains that this does nothing but to cripple the already disadvantaged working class. This is very clearly demonstrated in the U.S. where after the attacks of the 11 September 2001 many policies were put into place to take away liberties, mostly concerning privacy, from the people. This is evident with agencies such as the NSA which spy on people at a global scale in cooperation with other countries in the name of the *safety* of the American people.

Therefore, if anything an armed revolution would do nothing but to worsen the already disadvantaged situation of the working class and could even be considered an act against the working class itself, for it can even be imagined that a malicious state would create a fake or even real armed revolt simply to justify such actions, and therefore by doing so it would be working towards the advantage of the ruling class. Not only that, but by doing so it would also distance many workers from any such movement or anything remotely associated with that movement, making it more difficult to create a socialist revolution that the workers would actually sympathize

with. And because most people judge based on their emotions and not reason they would be more prone to reject such a movement because of their *ethics* based upon nothing but pure emotion.

5 Conclusion

In conclusion, an armed revolution in the best scenario would simply end in the complete annihilation of such a revolt and in the worst of scenarios with the annihilation of the revolt, everyone associated with it, more state repression, and a feeling of resentment towards any movement that appears to even remotely resemble the revolt (even in terms of ideology). Therefore, such a revolt could be considered an act against the working class which does nothing but to worsen and prolong its suffering at the hand of the ruling capitalist class. Of course, for the most part these people themselves are not following the ideals of Marxist socialism when proposing such a revolution, they either idealize Marx who advocated for an armed revolution (disregarding the fact that he lived in a very different time where such a revolution might have been possible), treating him almost religiously as a prophet/messiah, or they romanticize over the idea of risking one's life for the cause of the revolution of the proletariat, admiring revolutions such as the Cuban or the Russian. Hardly have these socialists truly reasoned their ideas as is proper of the scientific socialist movement born from Marxist thought. Instead they are blinded by their emotions or their religious attitude towards Marx and other socialists of the era such as Lenin or Guevara, and by doing so they fail to see reality and what the world actually looks like as well as the real situation of the working class. Which to an extent can be explained by how many of these socialists are limited to an environment where all they see are themselves and their comrades, perhaps part of a communist party, where all of them are class conscious, but they fail to see how that is simply their small group, most people are not class conscious and most rely on emotions rather than reason to determine their actions. But the fact remains that an armed revolution in this era of a globalized world with highly advanced military and surveillance technologies would end in nothing but a massacre.

6 License

This document is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivatives 4.0 International license. Copyright © 2016 Nicolás A. Ortega