

ROOTS: HOW THE RADICAL LEFT WORKS

ANALYSIS

Author: Gábor Megadja, Senior Researcher



SZÁZADVÉG

7 May, 2020

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Principles	4
3. Intellectuals: Redemption from Maoism to Gender-Neutral Bathrooms	6
4. Tactics and Ethics: with or without violence?	9
5. A Few Examples	11
5.1. USA	11
5.2. Europe.....	14
5.3. Hungary	15
6. Summary	18

The left was born in radicalism. Any other alteration or moderation are later developments and calibrations of the original intent, or perhaps the result, of strategic-tactical consideration. To justify the origin of the radical left, it is enough to mention the three emblematic manifestations of its history so far – the French Revolution of 1789, the Russian Socialist Revolution of 1917, and the German National Socialist Revolution of 1933.



1. Introduction

“Man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains” – in this paradox articulated by Rousseau is the genesis of the left’s mission. But Rousseau also formulated the therapy as well: man *must be forced* to be free.

Whatever its historical form of appearance, the radical left always refers to some kind of “justice” (typically “social justice”): A complete and drastic (i.e. radical) break with the current, unjust conditions. The complete abolition of the current conditions and the enforcement of justice are therefore needed. **Leftism conceived in radicalism is a dissension towards Christian culture from the outset, for the latter, in the eyes of the radical left, is the thinking that embodies the patience of a saint that accepts the imperfections existing in the world, consciously or not – basically making the radical left the enemy of Christian culture.**

The demand for justice runs as a guideline throughout the history of leftism. The French Revolution aimed at overthrowing the “old order” that ruled “unjustly” and on false principles. In the socialist revolution, the working, but exploited and oppressed layer, the proletariat, had to be brought to power in order to create justice. And Germany suffered a very direct injury, surrounded by a more general ideological justification: the "superior race" was suppressed by inferior races. Thus in each case, the left-wing revolution sought to neutralize some kind of harm, to eliminate injustice. Since injustice has always been blatant and intolerable, the radical left has always considered *violence* permissible.¹

Just as the left is always radical in essence, so it is always totalitarian: Injustice should not be tolerated in any form, the groups embodying it must be annihilated, and “justice” must be fully enforced.

¹ See Roger Scruton’s *Fools, Frauds and Firebrands: Thinkers of the New Left* and Paul Johnson’s *Intellectuals*.

https://www.academia.edu/12009844/Intellectuals_From_Marx_and_Tolstoy_to_Sartre_and_Chomsky_by_Paul_Johnson

The question of the existence of “moderate leftism” is a tactical, strategic issue. The impatience of the radical left can be mitigated if their representatives occupy important and established positions in a given society. **Thus, if the radical program of the left can be enforced through various organizations such as NGOs, courts, constitutional courts, i.e. official institutions, they consider the use of violence less necessary** (at the very least, they tacitly support the radical left using violence as well, or perhaps help them with well-established, mainly legal means due to their position). Therefore, whether the radical left uses *revolutive*, that is, revolutionary, or *evolutive*, reformist means, it is a purely methodological, strategic and tactical question.

2. Principles

The genesis of the left can be dated to the French Assembly of 1789: to the right sat the supporters of the king, to the left the representatives of the third order.² But more important than the mere physical location are the ideas that the two sides demonstrated.

The French Revolution was an attempt to implement the radical project of the enlightened intelligentsia. The goal was *tabula rasa*, to create a perfectly rational, non-contradictory, radically new world that is not obscured by a myriad of unjustifiable traditions and religious principles. In the case of the latter, their particular nature also caused a problem for the radical intelligentsia: Rationality is universal, so instead of different traditions and religions, the rule of Reason must be realized.

It is no coincidence that the revolutionaries did not accept parliamentarism either, as it represented "partial interests"³ – and so perhaps it also becomes clear why the radical left around the world is so impatient with the functioning of parliament and, in the absence of power, why it sees it as a quasi-temporary institution. They mostly accept its existence, and, in the absence of a mass base, they do not attack it, but if they do not have actual power, they are dissatisfied and impatient with parliamentarism. The recent cases of disorder in our country's parliament are due to this ancient impatience of the radical left.

The radical left has always appeared in different historical guises, but their principles have not changed: 1) the need for the total creation of "justice", 2) naming the social group(s) carrying injustice as enemies and designating them for destruction, 3) legitimizing violence and means beyond norms, legislation.

The struggle of the radical left for justice lasts to the bitter end. The struggle of the representatives of the new and old orders turns into a class struggle in socialist radicalism, a struggle of nations and races in National Socialist radicalism. **In current radical left-wing identity politics, sexual orientation, skin**

² Most scholars however trace the roots of leftism all the way back to Christian heresies (Voegelin, Kuehnelt-Leddihn, Thomas Molnar, etc.)

³ Jacob L. Talmon: *The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy*, Secker&Wartburg, 1952, pp. 45, 95.

color, ethnicity will become the dividing lines, and the representatives of injustice will be those who are “heteronormative”, “Christian”, “white”, and “male” – the all-encompassing, perfect enemy of “heterosexual Christian white man”, representing the oppressive Patriarchy. (Left-wing radicalism in identity politics combines socialist class struggle with the race war of National Socialism as a kind of “synthesis.”)

It is clear how the original, enlightened intention to create a *post-Christian* civilization will, as a result, be a reminder of what a *pre-Christian* civilization might have been like. Left-wing radicalism in identity politics is virtually seeking to create a *tribal society* by attempting to divide, according to the above criteria. According to the proponents of multiculturalism, what is important is not what unites us – nation, common culture and language, tradition, faith, history, heritage, etc. – but what separates us: class, gender, ethnicity, race.⁴

Although the French Revolution can be considered the creator of nationalism in the strict sense, it only suggests that it failed to fulfill its original radical promise. Nations embody “particular entities“ the same way as parliamentarism or tradition. If the goal of enlightened radicalism is the creation of a perfectly rational, non-contradictory world, then the *nation is an anomaly*. In the continuation, left-wing radicalism did not leave this half-work to that extent. The communist experiment openly confessed to thinking on a global scale,⁵ and National Socialism, despite its misleading name, set itself the goal of establishing a Pan-Germanic empire, in which, even by chance, sovereign nations had no place. So it can be said that in addition to Christianity, nations are that which the radical left seeks to eradicate, regardless of its manifestations. (E.g. today’s radical left is a proponent of the United States of Europe and multiculturalism. Whether they do as something stemming from a religious creed, or they demand the European “supervision” of nation-states in the language of technocracy to restore “justice,” is a minor detail.)

⁴ Roger Kimball: *Tenured Radicals. How Politics Has Corrupted Our Higher Education*, Ivan R. Dee, Chicago, 1990, p. 289.

⁵ Perhaps even Stalin’s nationalism can be seen more as the result of strategic-tactical consideration stemming from realism (and the conflict with Trotsky).

3. Intellectuals: Redemption from Maoism to Gender-Neutral Bathrooms

Left-wing radicalism has always been a project of intellectuals. First the radical intelligentsia of Paris, then the socialist, and then the postmodern intelligentsia worked on it. Its popularity is significant among the academic intelligentsia and the students who are sometimes radicalized by them, but the members of the groups the radical left seeks to liberate are rarely receptive to their program.⁶ In spite of this, their thoughts had a great influence, since, as the left itself realized later, the occupation of culture - once regarded as a “superstructure” by Marx – became all-important, which they have succeeded with in the last half a century. Therefore, it is perhaps no coincidence that the roots of left-wing radicalism should always be looked for among intellectuals.

Similarly, we can observe a kind of “import-export” activity between the representatives of Western radical intelligentsia and the “praxis”. While Western, radical left-wing intellectuals were passionate about Mao’s cultural revolution, those trained by these intellectuals took to their home countries the ideas of the intellectuals: In 1975, an unprecedented massacre was committed in Cambodia by those trained by the radical intelligentsia of Paris and who embraced Sartre’s doctrines of activism and “necessary violence”.⁷

⁶ F. A. Hayek, *The Intellectuals and Socialism*,

https://cdn.mises.org/Intellectuals%20and%20Socialism_4.pdf “The irony is that today, because of its populism, the Right is much closer to articulating the actual ideological stance of (whatever remains of) the traditional working class. J. Butler – E. Laclau – S. Zizek: *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality* Verso, 2000, p. 129.

https://monoskop.org/images/5/53/Butler_Judith_Laclau_Ernesto_Zizek_Slavoj_Contingency_Hegemony_Universality_2000.pdf

It is no coincidence that those who can be considered workers at all today are typically right-wing voters. The left is voted for by the intelligentsia and, especially in the United States, by minorities rhetorically supported by the left. This is also why radical intellectuals are often complaining that the “uneducated” vote for the right – this tune is at least as familiar in Hungary as in the United States.

⁷ Johnson, *Ibid.* p. 246.

Although most radical intellectuals had no connection with workers in their lives, they still longed for a mystical unification of the intelligentsia and the working class.⁸ Compared to radical left-wing theories, of course, reality gives birth to the absurd, thus, wealthy middle-class, affluent young people inoculated with a revolutionary fervor by radical professors threw things at the *real* working-class in 1968: the police.

Although the relationship of the radical academic intelligentsia to Orthodox Marxism is changing, in any case, the dichotomy of the oppressed and the oppressors has also been transferred to the new doctrines. This is how courses have been built around the center of “victimhood”. After the radical left had given up its hopeless cause, the redemption of the proletariat, who adhered more to the existing bonds, horrible dictu to the nation and religion, first they became representatives of trimondialism, then of the locally available ethnic, religious, racial, and gender minorities.

This is how the so-called “*Studies*” developed: African American studies, gender studies, women's studies, gay, lesbian and transgender studies, etc. These do not, in fact, cover disciplines, but *political grievances*.⁹ The bearers of these grievances – and, of course, the radical intellectuals who represent them as their advocates – become the bearers and representatives of virtue and morality. The regime of political correctness is the unity of moralism and radicalism.¹⁰

The radical left in identity politics typically links virtue to qualities – ethnicity, race, gender – that do not stem from the personal decisions of the individual possessing it.¹¹ Virtue is not tied to action, but to *existing qualities*, just as the National Socialists who judged someone to be inferior or superior on the basis of

⁸ Scruton, *Ibid.* and Johnson, *Ibid.*

⁹ Roger Kimball: *Tenured Radicals*, p. xv.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* p. lii.

¹¹ It is not always clear that the innumerable gender identities are the result of choices, and their varying freely is a kind of “human right”, or the current gender identity is what the person was born with, so it is oppressive to put down in the apparent identity group.

biological traits.¹² Meanwhile, the moralism expressed for the benefit of the new oppressed, *virtue signaling*, fills the radical intelligentsia with satisfaction.

In the academic world, which was originally based on free debate and questioning, the radical leftist intelligentsia introduced the *prohibition of emotional harm to people* as a principle, and as a very wide range of questions and opinions can be suitable to potentially offend others, the range of topics that can be talked about freely has steadily narrowed. This is how the so-called "*safe space*" and "*trigger-warning*" culture has developed on American campuses, which is an exemption for all courses and issues where a particular student potentially "doesn't feel safe" – that is, suggestions made there may hurt their feelings. Someone will be virtuous if he/she does not offend anyone, that is, he/she does not bring up, even tangentially, a subject that could accidentally offend someone's ethnicity, race, religion, national, cultural, sexual, etc. sensitivity.

The paradoxical logic of political correctness is as follows: The starting point is relativism, that is, the view that denies the possibility of the existence of objective truth. Truth is replaced by *consensus*, the importance of agreement: what we agree on is right. However, this consensus is supplemented by the motive of *exclusion*. Consensus is *our* consensus, which cannot be questioned from any outside position – there is no truth, and the consensus of outsiders is not ours. (The philosopher Richard Rorty has earned imperishable merits in developing this "model.") And the "*we*" are liberals, feminists, gay rights activists, and other radicals; apart from them, there are conservatives, Christians, traditionalists. There is no true-false, but there will be "true consensus" (ours) and "false consensus" (anyone else's). **The relativist theory promising complete openness is thus leading to intolerant absolutism, which we have known as the censorship of political correctness.**¹³

The radical left is kept in motion by the fact that there are always new issues. The liberation of the working class has shifted to gender-neutral restrooms.

¹² According to Marxist orthodoxy, class identity is also an "objective matter" - some workers can, of course, have "false consciousness".

¹³ Scruton, *Ibid.*

4. Tactics and Ethics: with or without violence?

Injustice is always the “system” itself, and even the essence of the “system” is “institutionalized racism”, “institutional violence”, “structural repression”, etc. The whole “system” is unfair, the legal order itself is unfair, so it is not immoral to fight it by using violence.

The politics of reformism or compromise is not a moral but a tactical issue in the politics of the radical left; it is not dictated by morality but by realism. “Nonviolence” used in a given case is meant to show moral virtue, at the very least, “outwards”; inwards it has only tactical significance. This is openly acknowledged by one of the preeminent voices of the radical left, Saul Alinsky: If we push people to the right by using violence, it is better to stay away from it.¹⁴ Quoting Lenin, he writes that as long as guns are possessed by the “imperialist government”, the Bolsheviks cannot use violence; if they are possessed by them, politics will be dictated by barrels.¹⁵ The goal – to revolutionize the world, in Alinsky's case, the bloodless socialist revolution – does not change, only the path to it.¹⁶

Alinsky has managed to “hack” the system so much that we can consider two people holding high office in US left-wing politics as his disciples: former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and President Barack Obama. The term “community organizer” is so harmless that many may not even notice that the Alinsky-method is used to train radical left-wing political activists – as if it were just a more active joint representative of a residential community. The labeling of political activists as members of “civil organizations” (*NGO-s in English are most apt*) stems from similar tactics. Alinsky's political activists are called “members of civil organizations” by the propagandists of *Newspeak*.

¹⁴ Saul D. Alinsky: *Rules for Radicals. A Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Radicals*, Vintage Books, 1989, p. xxiii.

¹⁵ Alinsky, p. 37.

¹⁶ The “inverse” of the same was justified by Georg Lukacs - when the radical left gets power, it will use violence. In *Tactics and Ethics* he argued that we can indeed lie ourselves through to the truth. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/1919/tactics-ethics.htm>. Trotsky, a saint and martyr of the anti-Stalinist left, also advocated the use of revolutionary terror: <https://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1920/terrcomm/>

When the radical left feels that the “qualitative” side of its efforts is devolving into a “quantitative” one, there will be no question of whether it can use violence. The most obvious cases are the French, Soviet and National Socialist revolutions, but let us not forget that the radical left-wing intelligentsia was, at least, the tacit supporter of far-left terrorism in Europe in the 1970s. The same radical left-wing intelligentsia defended the Stalinist system until the very last moment.¹⁷ (Herbert Marcuse, the hero of left-wing intelligentsia and of 1968, also welcomed the defeat of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution, saying it was a fight against "fascism.")

This intellectual fashion is far from being extinct even to this day. Today, there are still leftists who say that Lenin's repression was merely a "temporary tool" for "a future humane continuation."¹⁸ In reality, it tends to be the other way around. The radical left adapts to the strategy of peaceful operation and then, coming to power, liquidates its political opposition and the so-called "moderate left" (this happened in the Bolshevik Revolution, and also in Hungary after the Communists took power).

Political terrorism and its tacit support also have a “domestically grown” branch in the United States. Let us not forget that the Ku-Klux-Klan practically functioned as an irregular, militant unit of the Democratic Party, seeking to contribute to Democratic victories in the post-Civil War South by means of violence.¹⁹ And just as the Democratic Party tacitly supported the political terrorism of the Ku-Klux-Klan at the time, so are radical left-wing politicians silent today about the actions of Antifa and other radical left-wing organizations.

The various “anti-fascist” radical left-wing groups use almost exactly the same tools as their predecessors in the Ku-Klux-Klan: they send death threats, intimidate others, vandalize and start fires (they do not burn crosses but trash cans and everything else, it is true). They pursue this activity until the target is discouraged from speaking.

¹⁷ See this and the intellectuals’ strange affection to violence in Johnson: *Intellectuals*

¹⁸ Gyula Hegyi: *Lenin 150*, https://nepszava.hu/3075413_lenin-150

¹⁹ There is nothing more absurd than Barack Obama, the first black president of the United States, delivering a eulogy at the funeral of Democratic Sen. Robert Byrd, a former “Exalted Cyclops” of the KKK.

5. A Few Examples

5.1. USA

In 2014, several waves of violent protests erupted in Ferguson, Missouri, after the death of an African American young man, Michael Brown, under disputed circumstances, as part of a police action. This is when the *Black Lives Matter* (BLM) movement was established. Riots following the incident became so severe that police ordered a curfew, and riot police stormed Ferguson's streets to quell looting and arson (where protestors were even throwing Molotov cocktails at police officers).²⁰

The governor of Missouri summoned the National Guard to quell the escalation of violence after the police officer who caused Brown's death was acquitted in court.²¹ Two members of the new "black panthers" (*New Black Panther Party*), a black nationalist movement, were arrested for preparing to blow up police officers during a street protest. A year after the events in Ferguson, a peaceful commemoration had escalated to violent shooting by the evening between the police and African Americans. The governor ordered a three-day emergency and about a hundred violent protesters were detained. In 2016, at the end of a BLM movement in Dallas, Micah Xavier Johnson shot five police officers, wounded seven law enforcers and two civilians.²²

"In his own interest, George Soros diverted the Black Lives Matter movement to spread his anti-capitalist messages," said the retired African American Sheriff of Milwaukee, David Clarke.²³ The BLM website at that time asked its supporters to

²⁰ <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/11242108/Ferguson-timeline-of-events-since-Michael-Browns-death.html>

²¹ <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2014/nov/17/missouri-governor-state-of-emergency-ferguson>

²² <https://www.wsi.com/articles/ferguson-suffers-another-night-of-unrest-1439284454>

²³ <https://www.foxbusiness.com/politics/black-lives-matter-has-been-hijacked-by-george-soros-sheriff-clarke>

boycott “white capitalism” and not to spend their money on “white entrepreneurs”. George Soros donated 33 million dollars to the Black Lives Matter movement.²⁴

In February 2017, political commentator Milo Yiannopoulos was invited to the University of Berkeley. One hundred university professors protested the event in a petition. At the event itself, about 1,500 “anti-fascist” protesters appeared, many of whom participated in acts of vandalism and arson. The organizers were forced to cancel the event, but the violent protest continued – the protesters marching on from the university broke shop windows and started looting in Berkeley.²⁵ The estimated damage was roughly one hundred thousand dollars. The group *Refuse Fascism*, which organized the demonstrations, was supported by George Soros with fifty thousand dollars.²⁶

In April 2017, organizers were also forced to cancel a presentation by U.S. conservative bestselling author Ann Coulter on the grounds that “they can’t guarantee the security of the venue”. Coulter wrote in her Twitter post that she was going there anyway, but in the end the event was cancelled.²⁷ Then, several right-wing commentators (Lauren Southern, Gavin McInnes) organized a movement to stand up for free speech.

The mayor of Berkeley asked the university to cancel the conservative commentators’ presentations on free speech scheduled for 24-27 September, as the city administration feared violent protestors. Finally, the event was held, but this was only possible through the use of strict security measures and metal detectors.²⁸

In the city of Berkeley, “Antifa” protestors attacked the participants of the peaceful *March 4 Trump* event. The police seized baseball bats, bricks, iron pipes and a spear

²⁴ <https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/aug/16/black-lives-matter-cashes-100-million-liberal-foun/>

²⁵ <https://www.berkeleyside.com/2017/02/02/chaos-erupts-protesters-shut-yiannopolous-events-banks-downtown-vandalized>

²⁶ <https://www.breitbart.com/social-justice/2017/02/05/refuse-fascism-group-behind-berkeley-riot-funded-george-soros/>

²⁷ <https://www.sfgate.com/education/article/UC-Berkeley-changes-plans-invites-Ann-Coulter-to-11087363.php>

²⁸ <https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/Berkeley-mayor-asks-Cal-to-cancel-12104330.php>

(!).²⁹ In August 2017, 2,000 to 4,000 protesters gathered in the parks of Berkeley to protest the *Say No to Marxism* rally. The anti-fascist group of about a hundred people attacked the participants of the peaceful rally with shields and bludgeons, but the police did not intervene – saying it would only lead to the spread of violence. Anti-fascist protesters also threatened journalists during the incident.³⁰

Ironically, it is in the very city and on the same university campus that the radical left is fighting for censorship by using violence, where the left launched a *Free Speech Movement* in 1964.

In 2019, there was tension between the members of Antifa and Proud Boys in Portland, Oregon.³¹ During the clash, anti-fascist protesters severely abused the conservative journalist Andy Ngo. Due to the beating, Ngo suffered a brain injury, resulting in necessary speech therapy treatment.³²

Street radicalism is also accompanied by some “rhetorical” radicalism on the part of some representatives. For example, according to Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, a Democratic congresswoman, the United States “operates concentration camps on the southern border.”³³ However, she downplayed the disorderly demonstration operating on the slogan “Punch a Cop”.³⁴

²⁹ <https://web.archive.org/web/20170307201424/http://sfist.com/2017/03/05/pro-trump-rally-in-berkeley-turns-p.php>

³⁰ https://web.archive.org/web/20170829235735/https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/morning-mix/wp/2017/08/28/black-clad-antifa-attack-right-wing-demonstrators-in-berkeley/?utm_term=.7260f3c3db42

³¹ As opposed to dealing with Antifa, the authorities were swift in labeling the Proud Boys a terrorist organization and banning it.

³² <https://thehill.com/hilltv/rising/454712-conservative-journalist-andy-ngo-says-antifa-attack-resulted-in-brain-injury>. Typically, the Proud Boys have since been declared a terrorist organization and disbanded.

³³ <https://edition.cnn.com/2019/06/18/politics/alexandria-ocasio-cortez-concentration-camps-migrants-detention/index.html>

³⁴ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P7RVCtq8Oo8>

5.2. Europe

In November 2016, roughly two hundred radical left-wing Antifa protesters clashed with police in The Hague because, despite the agreement, they had not complied with the provision that banned wearing face masks. Police found sticks and hammers on the protesters.³⁵ In the summer of 2017, a clash of left-wing protesters and police took place in Hamburg at the same time as the G20 summit. Five hundred police officers were injured in the clashes. (Police suggested setting up a database to monitor left-wing militants.)³⁶ The Antifa movement has clashed with police in many places in recent years (Sweden, September 2018, Spain, December 2018 and March 2019). These demonstrations are usually directed against right-wing parties that are successful or can increase their support.

Germany is one of the Meccas of radical leftist movements (as in the good old days!). The radical left took the action upon themselves on *Indymedia*, setting the car of an Axel Springer Verlag journalist on fire twice and then disclosing the journalist's address and suggesting that he should move from there. In March 2019, a group of radical leftists set fire to several cranes on a construction site and then disclosed the contractor's address on *Indymedia*. In November, two radical left-wing men rang the doorbell of a female real estate broker selling luxury properties in Leipzig, whereupon opening the door she was attacked and beaten.³⁷

After the ban on *Indymedia*, which had disclosed the contact details and addresses of the "enemies" of radical leftists, violent protestors numbering one and a half thousand descended on Leipzig. Stones, bottles and pyrotechnics were thrown at police officers by aggressive radical leftists, and several buildings and cars were also damaged during the riot. Thirteen police officers were injured, and six people were arrested.³⁸

³⁵ <https://www.thejournal.ie/dutch-protest-wilders-3092796-Nov2016/>

³⁶ <https://www.dw.com/en/g20-in-hamburg-police-and-protesters-clash/a-39587602>

³⁷ <https://www.insideover.com/society/germany-remains-blind-in-its-left-eye.html>

³⁸ <https://www.dw.com/en/germany-police-officers-injured-in-protests-against-ban-on-leftist-website/a-52153581>

In December 2019, a climate protection group called *Extinction Rebellion* held a demonstration in Brussels. The protesters occupied areas that were not licensed by the police, therefore restricting traffic. The participants ignored the police call to leave, so a water cannon and pepper spray were used. The local leader of the climate protection radicals said they had consciously chosen to break the law.³⁹

In January 2020, two hundred radical leftists blocked the entrance to the lecture hall of the University of Vienna and demanded the cancellation of the lecture by the Freedom Party supporter historian Lothar Höbelt. Participants in the protests included activists from the Austrian Student Union, the Radical Left Platform, Opponents of the Right and the activists of the Autonomous Antifa, but the movement was also supported by the Austrian Communist Youth and the Communist Student Union. The protestors clashed with the police, and the lecture was cancelled.⁴⁰

5.3. Hungary

Unlike anything else, Marx was certainly right that history may repeat itself, but what is a tragedy first will appear as a comedy afterwards. In many cases, the radical left's adaptation of certain techniques in Hungary had such an outcome.

The first movements based on the “international franchise”, that is, the Alinsky method, occurred in 2013, when the Student Network (HaHa) tried to occupy Fidesz headquarters⁴¹ and then MHC.⁴² Initially, the textbook-like Alinsky program did not work, as the politicians at the headquarters offered biscuits to the invading

³⁹ <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-climate-change-belgium/belgian-police-arrest-up-to-300-extinction-rebellion-protesters-idUSKBN1WR0LG>

⁴⁰ <https://apps.derstandard.at/privacywall/story/2000113319157/studierende-blockierten-hoersaal-von-fpoe-historiker-hoebelt>

⁴¹ https://hvg.hu/itthon/20130307_Tuntetoket_hiv_a_Fideszszekhazhoz_a_HaHa

⁴² https://index.hu/belfold/2013/05/31/az_emmi-nel_akciozik_a_hallgatoi_halozat/

protesters.⁴³ However, in 2014, during a protest against the proposed internet tax, protestors damaged the headquarters.⁴⁴

What is unique here is that the radical left-wing disorder in Hungary was started by members of parliament. On 12 December 2018, the Parliament passed the Overtime Act, and as a result, the radical left-wing MPs occupied the pulpit of the House Speaker, interrupting the sitting by using whistles, loudspeakers and flags – the chaos was broadcast live by MPs on Facebook. This undoubtedly gave birth to a new genre, which some radical left-wing representatives (Ákos Hadházy, Bernadette Szél, Péter Jakab, etc.) are trying to pursue.

The day after the parliamentary disruption, demonstrations against the Overtime Act were organized by representatives of opposition parties. The protestors in front of the parliament lashed out at the police, throwing bottles and stones at them, which the police did not return, showing extraordinary patience. Liberal politicians also took part in the violent actions, throwing smoke grenades at the police.⁴⁵

Next, led by radical left-wing opposition MPs, (Bernadett Szél, Péter Jakab, László Varju, István Ujhelyi, Lajos Korózs, Anett Bósz, Ágnes Kunhalmi, Lajos Kepli, Andrea Varga-Damm, Tibor Bana, Zsolt Gréczy, Bence Tordai, Ákos Hadházy), the crowd stormed the MTVA headquarters, and citing their privileges as MPs, wanted access. What is definitely special is that it was not the “simple” protestors, but the MPs who formed the radical left “vanguard”.

What happened at the MTVA headquarters (*Public Service Broadcasters*) were a special mixture of radical actions that are known abroad and that are not afraid of using violence, as well as Alinsky's "soft" method. In the days that followed, some radical left-wing MPs decided to move into the MTVA building, however, their “actions” there had the citizens following the show in fits of laughter rather than causing a shock. Encouraged by the relative success of the action, Jobbik's current

⁴³ <https://www.origo.hu/itthon/20130307-nehany-tucat-tunteto-hatolt-be-a-fidesz-budapesti-lendvay-utcai.html>

⁴⁴ https://mandiner.hu/cikk/20141026_internetado_elleni_tuntetes_all_a_szinpad_a_jozsef_nador_teren?q=cikk%2F20141026_internetado_elleni_tuntetes_all_a_szinpad_a_jozsef_nador_teren%2F

⁴⁵ https://hvg.hu/itthon/20181213_tuntetes_kossuth_ter_percrol_percre_rabszolgorveny/3/pp/74005?utm_source=mandiner&utm_medium=link&utm_campaign=mandiner_202004

president, the radical left-wing Péter Jakab, tried to break into the building of TV2 in May 2019 to disrupt the broadcast, but his Don Quixote-esque struggle ended in failure.⁴⁶ Most recently, radical left-wing politicians Bernadett Szél and Ákos Hadrázy held a traffic-restricting, “honking” demonstration in Clark Ádám Square.⁴⁷

Radical left-wing politicians became the voices of the opposition (Szél, Hadrázy, Jakab, Tordai), while the moderates function practically as decorations. They are fighting for radical left-wing politics to become dominant, and to that end, they are, in turn, crossing the boundaries that MPs should respect.

⁴⁶ <https://www.origo.hu/itthon/20190522-jakab-peter-tv2-berontott.html>

⁴⁷ <https://pestisracok.hu/megbirsagoltak-feljelentettek-a-rendorok-a-hadrAZY-es-szel-felhivasara-dudalokat/>

6. Summary

Historical experience has shown that the fascist and National Socialist variants of the radical left are slightly more successful in winning the relative majority than the other variants, but they do not hesitate to apply tricks, scams or coups either. The radical left almost never seeks to gain power in a legitimate way, with the support of the majority – probably it carries the knowledge in its DNA that its chances are usually too slim to do so. Therefore, we can expect the radical left to remain true to its original mission and methods as well.

