

Radical Americas: A Hemispheric History of the Left

Spencer Beswick

Historic contradictions have exploded across the Americas in recent years. Chilean protesters took to the streets to defy 30 years of post-dictatorship neoliberalism, forcing the country to draft a new constitution and elect a socialist president. A far-right coup deposed Bolivia's first Indigenous president, but voters chose another socialist in the next election. The Workers' Party returned to power in Brazil after the United States voted out Donald Trump in the wake of the George Floyd Rebellion; meanwhile, Colombia elected a former guerrilla as its first Leftist president. The neoliberal Washington Consensus, already challenged by the antiglobalization movement and the Pink Tide, appears to have crumbled. Meanwhile, social movements continue to build alternative worlds across the Americas, from below and to the Left, as the Zapatistas say. The anticapitalist radical Left has been central to these historical and contemporary events. What methodological frameworks enable a broad understanding of the historical development of the hemispheric Left, and how does this approach contribute to contemporary social movements?

I argue that a multiscalar transnational approach spanning the twentieth century is crucial to understanding the history of the Left in the Americas. Previous historical work has largely been trapped in ideological, temporal, and geographical silos. One either studies the history of anarchism or of Marxism; thus, we have a growing body of scholarship on the early period of anarchism in Latin America and the United States and a wide range of work on early Communist activity, but little attempt is made to connect them.¹ This trend is echoed in the geographic silos that separate the United States, Canada, Mexico, Central America, the Caribbean, and South America. Similarly, the history of Latin America is split into disconnected temporal periods that undermine our understanding of the broad historical arc of the radical Left in the long twentieth century. In this article, I employ a transnational framework that connects political ideologies and time periods which are typically separated.² This framework brings together the foremost recent English-language scholarship, including translations of key Latin American scholars, into a synthetic historical conversation that stretches across ideological, geographic, and temporal boundaries.³ This methodological approach reveals a broad radical Left which has at times been riven by ideological disputes but has been defined also by adaptation and cooperation. The history of the Left's creative struggle offers models for non-sectarian, undogmatic collaboration in today's social movements.

What is the radical Left? Despite real analytical and strategic differences,

the radical Left is united by a shared endeavor to address the foundational roots of social injustices. It seeks to overthrow—not simply tweak—capitalist social relations. Leftists work towards the common goal of a stateless, classless society characterized by collective self-determination, worker control of production, and individual freedom and dignity. In my historical approach, I emphasize active participation in ant systemic movements over theoretical distinctions. Yet clarification of differences is also necessary. Anarchists are antistate or libertarian socialists who advocate the reorganization of society into voluntary federations based in social equality and individual freedom.⁴ Syndicalists, who overlap substantially with anarchists, believe that revolutionary unions should prefigure the new world and act as the vehicles to re-organize society.⁵ The labels of socialism and communism are at times used interchangeably; this paper will follow the general approach of classifying socialists as those who pursue reformist strategies whereas communists advocate revolutionary seizure of state power by a vanguard party.⁶ An undogmatic radical Left acknowledges significant ideological differences but manages to collaborate on common projects and struggles. Dogmatism and sectarianism have long been the bane of the Left, but the transnational history discussed in this article reveals alternative currents of theory and practice that are unconstrained by both national borders and rigid ideological lines. Indeed, transnational networks have often enabled non-sectarian connections and collaboration at multiple levels, stretching from Caribbean anarchist networks in the early twentieth century to the “provocative cocktail” of political traditions represented in the Zapatistas and other new social movements of the late twentieth century.

In order to bridge temporal and geographic boundaries, I present a hemispheric narrative of the twentieth century that stresses the dialectical interplay between historical developments and the evolution of the Left.⁷ The article begins by demonstrating how a transnational methodology aids our understanding of early-twentieth-century networks of anarchist revolutionaries. Before Marxism-Leninism rose to popularity in the wake of the Russian Revolution, anarchism was hegemonic in the radical Left. A transnational framework reveals the deep interconnections between anarchists across the hemisphere who transmitted new theories and organizational methods between various local and regional contexts—even in the face of violent repression. My discussion of the use—and indeed the necessity—of a transnational analytic framework at the end of this section provides a foundation for the remainder of the article. After exploring several case studies of anarchist networks across the Americas, I address the decline of anarchism and the rise of Marxism. In the 1920s-1930s, I situate the post-Russian Revolution growth of Marxism-Leninism in the context of increasingly centralized Fordist production methods across the hemisphere. At its best, Marxism-Leninism was creatively applied to local conditions, including to the “Indian question” in Peru and the Black Belt Thesis in the United States. The creative revolutionary period of Marxism-Leninism gave way to a rigid Stalinist “stagism” and popular front participation in nationally oriented

democratic movements in the 1930s-1950s.

A post-World War II democratic opening across Latin America was marked by a commitment to social democracy and state-led social and economic development. When these movements went too far to the Left, as in Guatemala, the United States intervened to drown them in blood. This imperial violence taught lessons to young radicals like Che Guevara—himself an emblematic transnational revolutionary—who vowed not to repeat the mistake of non-violent reformism. The Cuban Revolution of 1959 dramatically transformed the hemispheric Left, inspiring a generation of young people to go to the mountains and form guerrilla *focos*. The “Cuban Model” should be understood as not just an international, but rather a transnational phenomenon, as the role and scale of local actors, transnational networks, and nation-states were blurred. Even so, the Cuban model failed everywhere it was attempted, most famously by Guevara himself in Bolivia. In its wake, neoliberal counterrevolution spread across the hemisphere.

The article ends by examining two successive (and sometimes simultaneous) developments on the Left: the rise of anarchistic “new social movements” in the 1980s and the Pink Tide’s renewed push for democratic socialism in the early-twenty-first century. New social movements responded to the post-Fordist transformation of economic production by organizing on a more territorial basis to build autonomous worlds from below. These movements eschewed national boundaries and often refused to engage with nation-states on principle. Instead, as John Holloway put it, they sought to “change the world without taking power.”⁸ The rise of Pink Tide Leftist governments in the early 2000s challenged this orientation and recentred the role of progressive states. Ultimately, however, the Pink Tide has crashed upon the shoals of global economic changes, seemingly demonstrating that nation-states can no longer chart their own path in the global economy. Meanwhile, social movements continue to organize from below and develop new modes of relating to the state.

Throughout the article, I demonstrate how a multiscalar transnational approach enables a broad synthesis of over 100 years of history of the radical Left stretching across the Western Hemisphere. I conclude by highlighting lessons for writing hemispheric history that draws on multiple interlinked scales of analysis. In writing a transnational hemispheric history, I decentre the United States as imperialist nation-state while drawing attention to ordinary people’s transnational connections across the Americas. While the United States government has sought to dominate and exploit the nations and peoples of the Western Hemisphere, ordinary people have consistently attempted to forge cross-border relationships of solidarity.

Early Anarchism and the Transnational Approach (1880-1920)

Social movements at the beginning of the long twentieth century were driven by the anarchist Left. Early industrialization across the Americas provided a working-

class social base for anarchist politics. Beyond unions, anarchists were active in every sphere of life, from mutual aid societies and cultural organizations to newspapers, vegetarian restaurants, and nature retreats. Anarchists were prominent in four major transnational networks throughout the Americas. First, the Southern Cone of South America hosted arguably the strongest anarchist movement in the world—rivalling the better-known movement in Spain. Anarchists and syndicalists controlled major unions in Argentina, Chile, and Brazil, including chapters of the Industrial Workers of the World and Argentina's dual "FORAs." They led both urban and agrarian general strikes that, at times, approached revolutionary rupture and prompted violent state repression.⁹ Second, anarchists organized networks in the Caribbean into a regional revolutionary force. With major nodes in Havana (Cuba), Tampa (Florida), and San Juan (Puerto Rico), anarchists and their ideas circulated throughout the Caribbean basin. In Havana, anarchists published the influential newspaper, *Tierra!* and activists worked in Cuba, Florida, and New York City to radicalize Cuba's national independence movement. In Panama, anarchists organized itinerant workers constructing the Panama Canal and in Puerto Rico they organized tobacco workers and ran several newspapers and cultural organizations. These networks were fluid and regional rather than bound by nation-state borders. Caribbean anarchists were also tied up in global networks between radicals in the colonial and postcolonial world, particularly between Cuba and the Philippines. While some anarchists rejected nationalism completely, others took a more nuanced position and argued that true national liberation required social revolution.¹⁰ Debates around nationalism in this period informed anarchist positions on nationalism throughout the twentieth century.

Anarchists also organized across Mexico and the United States. Anarchists in Mexico and the border region with the United States were central to the Mexican Revolution. The role of collectivist antistate peasant rebellions as one of the driving forces of the social revolution remains central to the radical imaginary in Mexico.¹¹ The anarchist Mexican Liberal Party led by Ricardo Flores Magón operated across the Mexican border with the United States, at one point organizing an armed incursion with the IWW in an attempt to spark a Mexican Commune. Although nationalist liberals ultimately won out, anarchists across the hemisphere were inspired by the fight for land and liberty in Mexico.¹² Finally, these years were the anarchist apogee in the United States. Well-known radicals including Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman, and the Haymarket Martyrs comprised the most visible of national and transnational networks consisting of union activists, radical educators, and bomb-throwing insurrectionists, many with close ties to Europe and various parts of Latin America.¹³ These networks were eviscerated in the post-World War I Red Scare, with hundreds of key figures deported, others thrown in jail, and newspapers forced to close. In each of these four regions, anarchists formed the backbone of revolutionary organizing within labour unions and countercultural milieus.

Throughout these four regional networks, women theorized and practiced

a militant working-class feminism inspired by an anarchist orientation towards autonomy and equality in everyday life. Although feminism is sometimes seen as the domain of middle-class white women, anarcho-feminists advocated for working women's liberation. For example, *La Voz de la Mujer* in Argentina, founded in 1896, was one of the first major anarcho-feminist newspapers in the hemisphere, belying the notion that feminism is a domain of the "first world." Through the tireless efforts of anarchist women, anarchist feminism gained some hold in the broader Argentine anarchist and labour movements.¹⁴ In Chile, anarchist and socialist feminists were active during the same time period and combined a left-wing economic program with women's liberation.¹⁵ At the other end of the hemisphere, the anarchist feminist perspective was popularized by women including Emma Goldman, Voltairine de Cleyre, and Lucy Parsons, who each connected the domination and exploitation of the proletariat with that of women.¹⁶ In each of these examples throughout the Americas, women fought against sexism within the Left and argued for the need to connect gender and class. Through their active struggle, they contributed to the richness of revolutionary anarchism in the Western Hemisphere.

These case studies demonstrate how the history of the hemispheric anarchist and radical Left can be best understood through a transnational framework. Recent anarchist historiography has embraced and promoted the "transnational turn." By rejecting nation-states, moving frequently across borders, and organizing subversive transnational networks, anarchists are, in many ways, the ideal subjects for this approach.¹⁷ Transnational history decentres nation-states (and the accompanying centre vs. periphery dichotomy) and enables a history from below at multiple fluid scales of analysis, including local, regional, and global.¹⁸ This lens avoids the pitfalls of nation-state bounded analysis. Nation-based studies, as social historian Davide Turcato argues, tend to present a history of "cyclical patterns of advances and retreats" in the anarchist movement that "fosters interpretations identifying discontinuity, spontaneism, and lack of organization as inherent to anarchism."¹⁹ Turcato argues that a transnational framework reveals a different story of Italian and global anarchism. Despite repression and local ebbs and flows of activity, anarchists continually moved across the globe and built networks across national boundaries. Thus, he says, "the analysis of transnational scope reveals forms of continuity and organization unavailable to analyses of national scope, and by broadening our perspective on the anarchist movement it compels us to look for more sophisticated interpretations of the movement's dynamics."²⁰

A similar picture is revealed across the Americas when we analyze the hemispheric anarchist movement through a transnational lens. Newspapers, feminist theories, and union organizers all moved across national borders that meant little to them. Repression and defeat in one locality often prompted radical migration, at times voluntary and at times coerced, which spread new forms of organization across the hemisphere as well as to Europe and Asia. Indeed, even sedentary anarchists rejected the legitimacy of states and borders in their commitment to cosmo-

politan internationalism.²¹ A transnational approach necessitates not simply considering histories of multiple countries (or movement between them), but rather operating at multiple scales of analysis: local, regional, national, hemispheric, and global. Limiting our approach to bounded nation-states would obscure the vitality of the transnational anarchist movement. Of course, this does not only apply to anarchism; employing this transnational framework to tell the history of the broader radical Left helps both decentre nation-states and enable a more effective understanding of its history from below.

Creative Adaptation of Revolutionary Marxism (1917-1935)

Marxism overtook anarchism on the Left in response to both economic developments and the Russian Revolution. Syndicalist forms of the anarchist struggle had proliferated within the nascent industrialization of the early twentieth century. While anarchism had a stronger working-class base than often presumed, it flourished in the relatively informal production conditions of this period.²² As federated anarchist labour unions began to challenge the rule of capital, capitalists responded by centralizing and formalizing production—in part to break the power of syndicalist unions. This formalization provided fertile ground for Communist Parties to organize centralized unions. In addition, anarchists were unable to offer a satisfactory response to the global depression of the 1930s. Anarchism provided little alternative to the popular-national forces that took power—including Franklin Delano Roosevelt's (FDR) New Deal Democrats in the United States, Lázaro Cárdenas's agrarian reforms in Mexico, and the popular front government in Chile—all of which were supported by their respective Communist and Socialist Parties.²³ Yet even in countries where anarchism seemed to disappear after the early 1930s, such as Mexico and Argentina, the tenets and ideals of anarchism lived on in libertarian currents within Communist Parties and within the everyday lives of ordinary people fighting for freedom, equality, and self-determination.²⁴

The Russian Revolution of 1917 sparked a turning point in the history of the hemispheric Left. The Bolsheviks proved to radicals as well as terrified ruling classes that social revolution was not only possible but imminent. Many anarchists were initially emboldened by the revolution, seeing it as the first step towards the new society for which they fought. Only after several years of increasingly worrying news from Russia—including the accounts of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, who had been deported from the United States to Russia—did many anarchists begin to turn strongly against the Bolsheviks.²⁵ The revolution changed the nature of labour organizing across the Americas. Marxists assumed leadership of the radical Left after decades of anarchist predominance. In response to a call from the new Communist International, Communist Parties were founded across the Americas and became poles of attraction and struggle. Some, such as the Brazilian Communist Party, were even founded by former anarchists who were convinced by the Russian Revolution of the necessity for Leninist models of revolutionary or-

ganization.²⁶

The 1920s to mid-1930s were Marxism's most dynamic "revolutionary period" across the Americas. As Brazilian Marxist Michael Löwy argues in his introduction to *Latin American Marxism*, this period was marked by an undogmatic adaptation of Marxism to the realities of Latin America.²⁷ The most significant Marxist theory of this period was written by José Carlos Mariátegui, who was a founding member of the Peruvian Socialist Party (which became the Communist Party). Mariátegui employed a Marxist framework to analyze underdeveloped Peruvian capitalism and argue that the coming revolution must be both socialist and anti-imperialist. His approach to the "Indian Question" provided the basis for the confluence between Left and Indigenous struggle in the twentieth century: the problem, he argued, was not one of culture or education but rather possession of land. Socialist revolution would draw heavily on pre-conquest structures of "Incan Communism" to provide the basis for a new society.²⁸ This theorization of colonial underdevelopment and socialist revolution was not contained within national borders. Although Mariátegui's analysis was based in Peruvian history, radicals brought it to a variety of locations across the Americas with shared colonial experiences, often transmitting it through transnational networks and conferences organized by the Communist International.²⁹ In a different context, the Communist Party USA adapted Marxism-Leninism and the Moscow line of the national question into the "Black Belt" thesis to organize African American communities fighting for land and self-determination in the US South. Creative application of Moscow orders enabled local Party leaders to blend Marxism with local African American traditions of resistance in the fight for racial equality and economic liberation.³⁰ Mariátegui's writing and the Communist Party USA's practice exemplify Marxism in the Americas at its best: creative, non-dogmatic, and adaptive to local conditions while connected by transnational networks. Yet Communist Parties never reached the point of revolution; scattered uprisings like the 1932 communist-led peasant revolt in El Salvador were drowned in blood.³¹

Stalinism and the Post-War Democratic Opening (late 1930s-1959)

The revolutionary period gave way in the late 1930s to a policy of strategic unity with all democratic forces in antifascist popular fronts. Concerned by the threat of fascism and the continuing global depression, Communist Parties helped form popular fronts and Left-nationalist governments, including Chile's *Frente Popular* governing coalition and Mexico's Lázaro Cárdenas government. In the United States, the Communist Party organized within a broad Popular Front with connections to FDR's New Deal. In this context, Communist Parties across the Americas embraced a Stalinist stagist thesis that argued that Latin American countries must first undergo a transition to bourgeois democracy and capitalism before progressing to socialism.³² Rather than fighting for revolution, Communist Parties united with the progressive sectors of the national bourgeoisie to carry out democratic reforms and liberalize

the economy. Marxists isolated revolutionaries and instead joined liberals of all stripes in the struggle for democracy. This marked a retreat from transnational revolution into bourgeois-aligned, nation-state-based reformism. Analysis of this period must engage primarily at the level of the nation-state, even while maintaining a transnational outlook. The transnational framework does not preclude engaging with nation-states; rather, it treats the nation as one scale of analysis among many.³³

A democratic opening, led in part by the Left, occurred in the immediate years after World War II. Across the hemisphere, military dictatorships fell to democratic forces which attempted to institute political, social, and economic democracy. These democratic governments aimed to correct historical inequalities and provide the basis for new models of citizenship and society in the second half of the twentieth century.³⁴ Guatemala is the paradigmatic example. A popular uprising overthrew Jorge Ubico's dictatorship in 1944 and instituted the progressive governments of first Juan José Arévalo and then the more radical Jacobo Árbenz. With the backing of the Communist Party, the Guatemalan Left attempted to build a progressive—albeit still capitalist—democracy in the country. This required the nationalization of unproductive foreign-owned land and its distribution to the poor peasantry. Land redistribution sparked backlash from both Guatemalan and US elites, who overthrew Arbenz and instituted the brutal ruling class control of Guatemala.³⁵ This led to civil war and genocide of the Indigenous Mayan population in the 1980s.³⁶ This process produced an impoverished notion of neoliberal, individualist democracy in place of an expansive social democracy.³⁷ Tellingly, Che Guevara would reflect that the Cuban revolution must avoid Guatemala's fate by seizing and maintaining power through armed force.

The Cuban Model, 1968, and Democratic Socialism (1959-1979)

The 1959 Cuban Revolution challenged Communist Party stagism and convinced radicals across the hemisphere that socialist revolution was possible through guerrilla war. After the Cuban Communist Party (called the Popular Socialist Party) provided measured support to the US-backed dictator Fulgencio Batista in the name of national unity, a small group of rebels led by Fidel Castro and Che Guevara fought a successful two-year guerrilla war in the eastern mountains that culminated in their victorious entry into Havana in January 1959. In the aftermath, the Cuban revolutionaries carried out the first attempt to build a socialist country in the Western Hemisphere.³⁸ The Cuban state implemented sweeping agrarian reform, nationalized the economy, and helped lead the global Non-Aligned Movement. The internationalization of revolution was central to the Cuban strategy. Che Guevara and the French intellectual Régis Debray popularized the “Cuban model” of revolution, referred to as *foquismo*, which maintained that socialist revolution could be made by small bands of militants fighting rural guerrilla wars.³⁹ Che Guevara himself, of course, is an emblematic transnational communist revolutionary. The borders of nation-states meant little to him as he motorcycled from Argentina across Latin

America, learned the dangers of nonviolence in Guatemala, joined Fidel Castro and his band of rebels in Mexico, fought a successful guerrilla war in Cuba, and attempted to spread the revolution across Africa and Latin America until his untimely death in Bolivia. He did not simply travel from country to country, but rather conceived of the world in a fundamentally transnational manner as a communist militant.⁴⁰

The Cuban revolution and the *foquista* model inspired a generation of young people to found rural guerrilla bands. These guerrillas, often trained in and supported by Cuba, spanned from the Argentine People's Revolutionary Army to the Mexican Party of the Poor.⁴¹ They each framed their revolutionary movements as simultaneously national and part of a transnational project for the liberation of the human race. Despite heroic efforts, each attempt to repeat the Cuban example would fail—most notably Che Guevara's own disastrous attempt to lead a guerrilla band in Bolivia—until the 1979 Sandinista revolution in Nicaragua, which drew upon a variety of ideological tendencies. Some communists abandoned the rural model in favor of urban guerrilla warfare inspired by the Brazilian communist Carlos Marighella's "Minimanual of the Urban Guerrilla."⁴² The model was replicated across the Americas, including by the Black Liberation Army in the United States, who drew on Marighella's work and compared themselves to the Uruguayan urban guerrilla Tupamaros.⁴³ In the 1970s, the transnational urban guerrilla model spread from Latin America to Western Europe, including the Red Army Faction in West Germany, the Red Brigades in Italy, and Direct Action in France. Each urban rebellion was soundly defeated in the 1970s and '80s.

Before the advent of extensive urban guerrilla rebellion, however, a decade of social movement activity culminated in the transnational upswell of 1968. By rejecting Stalinist stagism and integrating class struggle with new forms of identity-based and humanistic movements, the 1960s New Left broke significantly from the Marxist "Old Left." New modes of struggle aiming to transform everyday life emerged from labour, youth, Indigenous, and women's social movements. Interconnected uprisings occurred across the hemisphere from the demonstrations against the Olympics in Mexico City to student struggles against the Brazilian military dictatorship.⁴⁴ The transnational history of this period has been extensively researched and discussed. For the purposes of this article, 1968 functions more as a transition point in the evolution of the twentieth-century Left rather than the radical rupture that it is often held to be. As the next section discusses, 1968 marks the beginning of the articulation of new modes of struggle that integrated Marxism with anarchism, participatory democracy, and anticolonialism.

After a decade of guerrilla defeats and the experience of 1968, Salvador Allende's 1970 electoral victory under the Popular Unity banner in Chile offered another political paradigm. In the early 1970s, the Chilean democratic road to socialism presented an alternative to the revolutionary Cuban model.⁴⁵ The Chilean experience under the Popular Unity government still stands as the closest that dem-

ocratic socialism has come to success in the Americas—although it was driven in part by the Guevarist Revolutionary Movement of the Left (MIR), which promoted revolutionary change outside the ruling coalition.⁴⁶ After the beginning of land reform in the 1960s under the Christian Democrat Eduardo Frei, Allende was elected with a mandate to deepen the land reform and begin to socialize the Chilean economy. Workers took over their factories and ran them democratically as peasants conducted land seizures to accelerate the agrarian reform, while the right wing grew increasingly violent.⁴⁷ After three years of struggle, in which the United States infamously helped to “make the economy scream,” Allende was overthrown by a US-backed military coup and the country descended into seventeen years of dictatorship under Augusto Pinochet. The Chilean coup solidified the rule of military dictatorships across South America’s Southern Cone and heralded years of escalating counterrevolution across the hemisphere.

Neoliberalism and the New Social Movements (1970s-2000s)

Latin America’s economic system shifted dramatically beginning in the 1970s, leading a new generation of leftists to conclude that previous revolutionary methods were outdated. This period was marked by the state’s privatization of public services, attacks on organized labour, and counterrevolutionary offensives against the gains of progressive social movements. International bodies including the International Monetary Fund and World Bank instituted harsh structural readjustment programs in response to a so-called “debt crisis” which led to what some call the “new enclosures.”⁴⁸ Seizing state power to remake society seemed less and less tenable as the role of individual nation-states was limited to protection of private property and national economies were increasingly both decentralized and globalized. The traditional social base of the Marxist Left—organized factory workers—was decimated and increasingly replaced by decentralized “informal” labour in the service sector and in small companies that avoid state regulations. These developments transformed the composition and strategy of the radical Left. Beginning in the 1980s, a wave of “new social movements” challenged the state-centric strategies of both the Old and New Lefts and returned to a more anarchistic strategy of building power from below. New methods of struggle were created (and re-discovered) that attempted to move beyond the state and organize from below with a territorial rather than labour union base.⁴⁹ Thus, they can be best approached through a territorial scale of analysis that, for instance, connects the Zapatistas directly to land-based and Indigenous social movements across the hemisphere rather than viewing them as mediated primarily through nation-states and national economies. In this sense, neoliberal globalization has forced us to understand history through a transnational framework that decentres nation-states.

The new social movements fought for autonomy and self-management against both state and capital. They can be most readily understood by defining them against earlier Leftist strategies. While the classical Marxist Left was state ori-

ented, the new social movements built autonomy outside it. The new movements are primarily composed of informal workers, squatters, Indigenous communities, youth, and women, rather than the traditional male factory workers. Raúl Zibechi stresses that these movements were primarily led by women and were establishing “new familial and productive forms...in which women constitute a unifying pillar.”⁵⁰ As Silvia Federici reminds us, capitalism and colonialism both require the violent destruction of the power and autonomy of women.⁵¹ Women and Indigenous people are reclaiming autonomy and power in the new movements. Further, as Raúl Zibechi argues, these movements are perhaps more accurately understood as “societies in movement” (especially Indigenous societies) rather than “social movements,” because they are composed of entire societies outside the state with alternative cosmologies, social relations, and subjectivities.⁵² Fundamentally, while the Old Left (and much of the New Left) attempted to seize state power to remake society, the new movements attempt to build power and autonomy from below, to create, as the Zapatistas put it, a “world in which many worlds fit.”⁵³

The Zapatistas are the most well-known example of the new social movements. After decades of organizing in Chiapas, Mexico by Indigenous leaders, Maoists, Guevarists, and Christian Leftists, the Zapatista Army of National Liberation burst onto the global political scene in armed takeover of towns across Chiapas on NAFTA’s start date, New Year’s Day 1994.⁵⁴ Since then, the Zapatistas have built power from below by creating autonomous self-governing communities linked to networks of civil society organizations and the global Left. They have made notable progress in Indigenous autonomy, education, healthcare, and women’s rights, and helped to spark the post-Soviet revitalization of the global radical Left in the antiglobalization/Global Justice Movement.⁵⁵ The Zapatistas put into practice the Bolivian Indigenous scholar Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui’s concept of *ch’ixi*, the mixing of Indigeneity with the Western World to create new forms of Indigenous modernity.⁵⁶ To take one example, they combine traditional Indigenous knowledge with Western medicine in their autonomous healthcare system.⁵⁷ They have helped build lasting local, regional, and global networks of Indigenous and other revolutionary forces.

Beyond the Zapatistas, there has been a profound shift towards anarchistic, territory-based new social movements across the hemisphere. These stretched from the Brazilian Landless Workers’ Movement (MST) and the 2001 Argentine uprising to urban squatting in many major cities across the Americas. In the United States as well, social movements underwent a territorial re-orientation in the late twentieth century, from Hakim Bey’s “temporary autonomous zones” to the advent of anarchist social centres.⁵⁸ This shift is not limited to the Americas; it has been part of a global response by the Left to post-Fordist neoliberalism. In Western Europe, autonomist movements rejected traditional factory organizing and attempted to organize territorially through squatted networks of alternative infrastructure in the 1980s.⁵⁹ While there is currently a wave of academic work on the new social move-

ments, it has been carried out primarily by sociologists and political theorists. Situating these new social movements within the long arc of the hemispheric Left reveals the resurgence of the anarchist orientation of the early twentieth century. The new territorial focus on building autonomy from below embodies a rejection of the nation-state system itself.

The economic restructuring of the 1980s and the rise of new social movements took place concurrently with a wave of limited democratization across parts of Latin America. Throughout the 1980s, movements against dictatorship and for democracy grew in many countries including Chile, Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay.⁶⁰ While containing elements of the radical Left and based in part on the traditional Leftist base of the labour movement and progressive elements of the middle class, these movements were more centrist than radical. None of them articulated a program of socialist revolution; rather, they called for a return to formal democracy and constitutional rule. But this new democracy, as Greg Grandin argues, was an impoverished form with limits set by the market and representative decision-making structures. Rather than full democratic participation in social, economic, and political life, this movement conceived of democracy in the constrained sense of individual rights mediated by the market.⁶¹ This model of citizenship was a far cry from the democratic socialism of Allende's Chile or even the progressive democracy of Arbenz's Guatemala. The radical Left was no longer inside the state, but beyond it.

The Pink Tide and Beyond (late 1990s-today)

The Pink Tide appeared to reverse this antistate trend, but with contradictory results. After decades of elite rule, social movements (or their Left representatives) gained control of the state across several key countries in South America, primarily Venezuela, Bolivia, Ecuador, Argentina, and Brazil. Significant elements of the Left re-oriented towards the state and were able to make real progress from seats of power, including Venezuela's reduction of poverty under Hugo Chavez, Brazil's *Bolsa Família* welfare program, and Bolivia's strong economic growth under Evo Morales.⁶² Yet, this growth and reform was dependent on a specific conjuncture of an export boom that now seems to have passed, with resultant economic contraction (seen most strikingly in Venezuela under Chavez's successor, Nicolas Maduro).⁶³ Pink Tide governments have been increasingly criticized by elements of the new social movements. Raúl Zibechi offers perhaps the most emphatic critique, arguing that Pink Tide governments were not simply products of the new social movements; in fact, their role is primarily to co-opt grassroots initiatives, to "govern the movements' and cancel their anti-systemic effects."⁶⁴ They ultimately preserve the power of the elites and protect the state and capital from revolutionary forces. In response to this danger, Zibechi argues, the movements must fiercely defend their autonomy and territory from the encroachment of the state.

Others in the movements have staked out an alternative position in which they attempt to use the space created by Leftist governments to build the struggle

more effectively from below. In this view, the state is approached in instrumental terms. Beginning from the position of the movements, the question is asked: how can we use the government to increase our own power and autonomy? For instance, George CiccarIELlo-Maher argues that Venezuelan social movements have been able to expand the size, scope, and radical orientation of their network of communes due to state support. The state provides funding, resources, and official legitimacy for the communes, which operate in semi-autonomy from the state. The goal is a “Commune State” that would function fundamentally differently from either a bourgeois or Marxist-Leninist state.⁶⁵ This dream has been eroded during the Maduro years, but many *comuneros* continue to struggle for its realization. The recent right-wing coup against Evo Morales in Bolivia—followed by another electoral victory for the Left—popular uprisings in Chile leading to the election of the young socialist Gabriel Boric, and the election of the former guerrilla Gustavo Petro as president in Colombia are but the latest developments in the story of the Pink Tide and the struggle to build autonomy from below.

New social movements have also revitalized the North American Left. In the United States, Occupy Wall Street was organized by anarchists who attempted, with notable success, to popularize anticapitalist analysis.⁶⁶ Occupy was part of a global wave of uprisings in 2011 that began with the Arab Spring and the European movements of the squares, which were experienced by their participants as a transnational efflorescence of the radical imagination.⁶⁷ Occupy was followed by Black Lives Matter and the Standing Rock Indigenous resistance to a new oil pipeline construction, demonstrating the resurgent vitality of Black and Indigenous struggles for self-determination.⁶⁸ Antifascist organizing exploded in the wake of Trump’s presidential election, popularizing radical tactics previously limited to the world of militant punk antifascism.⁶⁹ The 2020 George Floyd rebellion embodied abolitionist dreams of a world without police, prisons, and state borders. In Canada, Indigenous peoples have begun to confront the official politics of recognition that have failed to challenge the colonial relationship between the Canadian state and Indigenous peoples. Idle No More was only the most visible case of a new wave of rebellion and reassertion of Indigenous rights to self-determination.⁷⁰ The hemispheric Left is growing in strength and capacity, and new movements provide hope for a radically different future.

Conclusion

Approaching the Left through a broad geographic and temporal framework is crucial to understanding its history. This approach balances the tendency to cordon off time periods, geographies, and ideologies. A bird’s-eye vantage point—itself inherently transnational—reveals underlying historical trends in the development of the Left’s struggle against capitalism and colonialism. It also highlights transnational connections between seemingly disparate struggles, such as how the Black Liberation Army in the United States drew on the Tupamaros guerrillas in Uruguay, who

were themselves inspired by Brazilian urban guerrillas. This reflects an earlier period of transnational anarchism in which Cuban anarchists were inspired by their comrades in the Philippines to push national liberation struggle in the direction of social revolution. A transnational approach is necessary to capture these connections at the heart of the radical Left.

This article has provided a broad framework for a new history of the radical Left across the twentieth century, emphasizing both ruptures and continuities. Across the Western Hemisphere, the predominance of regional anarchist networks in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century gave way to revolutionary Marxism in the 1920s and '30s in the wake of the Russian Revolution and the rise of Fordism. The threat of fascism forced a retreat into popular front reformism that contributed to the democratic wave that swept the hemisphere after World War II. The Cuban Revolution helped spark a new model of struggle in the 1960s that peaked in 1968 and contributed in altered form to the Chilean democratic road to socialism in the early 1970s. Although the Cuban Revolution itself survived, much of the Left was drowned in blood by military dictatorships that heralded the rise of neoliberalism. The resurgence of anarchistic forms of new social movements in the 1980s mirrors the strength of anarchism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Both came in periods of capitalist restructuring and relatively informal forms of production. Similarly, the Pink Tide experience resonates with the movements for popular democracy in the 1940s and '50s. This broad view reveals an expansive radical Left that has struggled for freedom, equality, and self-determination in many different forms.

Although my primary arguments are historical, I have also highlighted underlying political lessons for today's Left. This approach to Left history encourages non-sectarian collaboration between competing tendencies. Examples of cooperation, whether between anarchists and communists in early 1920s Argentina or what Subcomandante Marcos has called a "provocative cocktail" of political tendencies within the Zapatistas, provide a framework that challenges the stark divisions on the Left. Finally, the emphasis on transnational networks encourages readers to identify not with our imperialist government but rather with alternative histories of grassroots solidarity and cooperation across borders. This framework provides a mode of engagement that decentres the importance of nation-states and focuses instead on the actions of ordinary people struggling to build a new world.

 NOTES

¹ Two notable exceptions are the work of Geoffroy de Laforcade on Argentine anarchism and communism (cited throughout) and Donald Hodges, *Mexican Anarchism after the Revolution* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995).

² Gilbert Joseph highlights attempts to expand the temporal range of Latin American Cold War studies scholarship in his state of the field essay “Border Crossings and the Remaking of Latin American Cold War Studies,” *Cold War History* 19, no. 1 (2019): 141-170.

³ Engaging with Spanish-language scholarship is beyond the scope of this article, which is intended to highlight the state of the English-language field and synthesize it into a broad historical conversation.

⁴ As anarchist anthropologist David Graeber remarks in *Direct Action: An Ethnography* (Edinburgh; Oakland: AK Press, 2009), it is a mistake to locate the beginning of anarchism in classic theoretical works rather than in social movements. Nevertheless, see the Pierre-Joseph Proudhon anthology edited by Iain McKay, *Property is Theft!: A Pierre-Joseph Proudhon Reader* (Edinburgh; Oakland; Baltimore: AK Press, 2011) for an original mutualist vision of anarchism; see the collection of Mikhail Bakunin’s work in G.P. Maximoff’s *The Political Philosophy of Bakunin: Scientific Anarchism* (Glencoe: Free Press, 1953) for an insurrectionary collectivist orientation; see Peter Kropotkin’s *The Conquest of Bread* (Edinburgh; Oakland: AK Press, 2006 [1892]) and *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution* (London: Freedom Press, 2009 [1902]) for the classical vision of anarchist communism; and for a divergent individualist trajectory see Max Stirner’s *The Ego and His Own: The Case of the Individual Against Authority* (London; Brooklyn: Verso, 2014 [1844]).

⁵ The best known syndicalists in the US context are the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), which had chapters across the Americas. See Peter Cole, et al., *Wobblies of the World: A Global History of the IWW* (London: Pluto Press, 2017). For a defense of syndicalism as the only genuine anarchist tradition see Michael Schmidt and Lucien van der Walt’s *Black Flame: The Revolutionary Class Politics of Anarchism and Syndicalism* (Edinburgh; Oakland: AK Press, 2009).

⁶ This distinction is not the most rigorous but nonetheless provides a useful historical and theoretical dichotomy. The classic reformist socialist text is Eduard Bernstein’s *The Preconditions of Socialism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993 [1899]). See Vladimir Lenin’s *What Is To Be Done? Burning Questions of our Movement* (New York: International Publishers, 1969 [1902]) and *The State and Revolution* (New York: International Publishers, 1969 [1917]) for classic articulations of Marxist-Leninist revolutionary strategy. For an excellent introduction to Latin American Marxism see Michael Löwy’s introduction to his edited collection *Marxism in Latin America from 1909 to the Present: An Anthology* (Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press, 1992).

⁷ This hemispheric approach is indebted to Heidi Tinsman and Sandhya Shukla’s

call, first in a special issue of the *Radical History Review* and then in an edited volume published by Duke University Press, to “imagine our Americas” in a hemispheric framework, for “the topic of the Americas might provide a space for rethinking histories of imperialism, nation, and area while at the same time outlining the full necessity of interdisciplinary ways of thinking.” “Introduction: Across the Americas,” *Imagining Our Americas: Toward a Transnational Frame* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007), 3. This article aims to rethink histories of the radical Left through this transnational, hemispheric framework of the Americas.

⁸ John Holloway, *Change the World Without Taking Power: The Meaning of Revolution Today* (London: Pluto Press, 2002).

⁹ There is much excellent work on Southern Cone anarchism during this period. See in particular Geoffroy de Laforcade, “Straddling the Nation and the Working World: Anarchism and Syndicalism on the Docks and Rivers of Argentina, 1900-1930” in *Anarchism and Anarcho-Syndicalism in the Colonial and Post-Colonial World* ed. Lucien van der Walt and Steven Hirsch (Boston: Brill, 2010) and “Memories and Temporalities of Anarchist Resistance: Community Traditions, Labor Insurgencies, and Argentine Shipyard Workers, Early 1900s to Late 1950s,” in *In Defiance of Boundaries: Anarchism in Latin American History*, ed. Geoffroy de Laforcade and Kirwin Shaffer (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2015); Osvaldo Bayer, *Rebellion in Patagonia* (Oakland: AK Press, 2016); Raymond Craib, *The Cry of the Renegade: Politics and Poetry in Interwar Chile* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016).

¹⁰ Kirwin Shaffer, “Tropical Libertarians: Anarchist Movements and Networks in the Caribbean, Southern United States, and Mexico, 1890s-1920s” in *Anarchism and Anarcho-Syndicalism in the Colonial and Post-Colonial World* (2010); *Anarchists of the Caribbean: Countercultural Politics and Transnational Networks in the Age of US Expansion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020); *Anarchist Cuba: Countercultural Politics in the Early Twentieth Century* (Oakland: PM Press, 2019); and “Panama Red: Anarchist Politics and Transnational Networks in the Panama Canal Zone, 1904-1913” in *In Defiance of Boundaries: Anarchism in Latin American History* (2015). See also Benedict Anderson, *Under Three Flags: Anarchism and the Anti-Colonial Imagination* (New York: Verso, 2007).

¹¹ The classic work on the Mexican Revolution is Alan Knight’s *The Mexican Revolution* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986), though it minimizes the importance of anarchist currents including the Zapatistas. Adolfo Gilly’s *The Mexican Revolution* (New York: The New Press, 2006) corrects this historical oversight and emphasizes the incipient anti-capitalism of the agrarian revolution, though he ultimately argues from a Trotskyist perspective that the peasant revolution was unable to triumph due to the limitations of peasants as a class. For the enduring legacy of the Mexican Revolution for the radical Left, see for instance Alexander Aviña’s *Specters of Revolution: Peasant Guerrillas in the Cold War Mexican Countryside* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014).

¹² On the Mexican Liberal Party, see Claudio Lomnitz Adler’s *The Return of Comrade*

Flores Magón (Brooklyn: Zone Books, 2014) and David Struthers, *The World in a City: Multi-Ethnic Radicalism in Early 20th Century Los Angeles* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2019), both of which attempt to integrate the national and the transnational. For the enduring legacy of Magón see for instance Bruno Bosteels, “Neither Proletarian Nor Vanguard: On a Certain Underground Current of Anarchist Socialism in Mexico” in *No Gods, No Masters, No Peripheries: Global Anarchisms*, ed. Barry Maxwell and Raymond Craib (Oakland: PM Press, 2015).

¹³ See Kenyon Zimmer, *Immigrants Against the State: Yiddish and Italian Anarchism in America* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2015); Paul and Karen Avrich, *Sasha and Emma: The Anarchist Odyssey of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman* (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2012); Christopher J. Castañeda and Montse Feu (eds.) *Writing Revolution: Hispanic Anarchism in the United States* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2019); Andrew Cornell, *Unruly Equality: U.S. Anarchism in the 20th Century* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2016).

¹⁴ Maxine Molyneux, “‘No God, No Boss, No Husband!’: Anarchist Feminism in Nineteenth-Century Argentina,” *Latin American Perspectives* 13, no.1 (Winter 1986): 119-145.

¹⁵ See Elizabeth Quay Hutchinson’s history of feminism and gender on the Chilean Left in *Labors Appropriate to Their Sex: Gender, Labor, and Politics in Urban Chile, 1900-1930* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001).

¹⁶ Paul and Karen Avrich, *Sasha and Emma*; Paul Avrich, *An American Anarchist: The Life of Voltairine de Cleyre* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978); and Jacqueline Jones, *Goddess of Anarchy: The Life and Times of Lucy Parsons, American Radical* (New York: Basic Books, 2017).

¹⁷ See Constance Bantman and Bert Altena (eds.), *Reassessing the Transnational Turn: Scales of Analysis in Anarchist and Syndicalist Studies* (2017), particularly their excellent introduction in which they note that “transnationalism seems to be a natural characteristic of anarchist movements” (7). The contributions to this volume represent some of the best recent scholarship on both anarchist history and transnational methodology more broadly.

¹⁸ Indeed, a transnational approach can deconstruct how we think about nations (and nation-states) themselves. As Laura Briggs, Gladys McCormick, and J.T. Way argue, “‘transnationalism’ can do to the nation what gender did for sexed bodies: provide the conceptual acid that denaturalizes all their deployments, compelling us to acknowledge that the nation, like sex, is a thing contested, interrupted, and always shot through with contradiction.” “Transnationalism: A Category of Analysis,” *American Quarterly* 60, no. 3 (September 2008): 625-648, 627.

¹⁹ Davide Turcato, “Italian Anarchism as a Transnational Movement, 1885-1915,” *International Review of Social History* 52, no. 3 (December 2007), 407-444, 409.

²⁰ Turcato, “Italian Anarchism,” 411.

²¹ See Raymond Craib, “Sedentary Anarchists” in *Reassessing the Transnational Turn: Scales of Analysis in Anarchist and Syndicalist Studies*, ed. Constance Bantman and Bert

Altena (Oakland: PM Press, 2017).

²² See the argument for anarchism's working-class (rather than petty bourgeois) base in Lucien van der Walt and Steven Hirsch's introduction to their edited collection *Anarchism and Anarcho-Syndicalism in the Colonial and Post-Colonial World* (2010).

²³ In the United States, see Andrew Cornell's analysis of the anarchist inability to respond to FDR's New Deal in *Unruly Equality*.

²⁴ See Donald Hodges, *Mexican Anarchism after the Revolution*; Bruno Bosteels, "Neither Proletarian Nor Vanguard"; Geoffroy de Laforcade, "Straddling the Nation and the Working World"; Geoffroy de Laforcade, "Memories and Temporalities of Anarchist Resistance."

²⁵ See Paul and Karen Avrich, *Sasha and Emma*.

²⁶ See Edilene Toledo and Luigi Biondi, "Constructing Syndicalism and Anarchism Globally: The Transnational Making of the Syndicalist Movement in São Paulo, Brazil, 1895-1935" in *Anarchism and Anarcho-Syndicalism in the Colonial and Post-Colonial World*, ed. Lucien van der Walt and Steven Hirsch (Boston: Brill, 2010).

²⁷ Michael Löwy, "Introduction: Points of Reference for a History of Marxism in Latin America," in his edited collection *Marxism in Latin America from 1909 to the Present: An Anthology*. Translated by Michael Pearlman. (Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press, 1992).

²⁸ See José Carlos Mariátegui, *Seven Interpretive Essays on Peruvian Reality* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1971). For recent appraisals of Mariátegui's thought and continuing significance see Mike Gonzalez, *In the Red Corner: The Marxism of José Carlos Mariátegui* (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2019) and Juan E. De Castro, *Bread and Beauty: The Cultural Politics of José Carlos Mariátegui* (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2021).

²⁹ For an overview of Mariátegui's significance to Latin American Marxism see Marc Becker, *Mariátegui and Latin American Marxist Theory*, Latin American Series, No. 20 (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Monographs in International Studies, 1993).

³⁰ Robin D.G. Kelley, *Hammer and Hoe: Alabama Communists during the Great Depression* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2015).

³¹ Thomas P. Anderson, *Matanza: El Salvador's Communist Revolt of 1932* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1971).

³² Michael Löwy, "Introduction" in *Marxism in Latin America*.

³³ As Constance Bantman and Bert Altena argue, it would be a mistake for historians to simply "replicat[e] their subject of study's disregard for the state and boundaries," because states were some of the most important historical actors. Indeed, a transnational lens reveals how states themselves often operated transnationally, particularly in organizing surveillance and repression against anarchists and other dissidents. See Bantman and Altena, "Introduction" to *Reassessing the Transnational Turn*, 7-8.

³⁴ For analysis of the democratic opening see Greg Grandin *The Last Colonial Massacre: Latin America in the Cold War* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011). A similar phenomenon briefly took place in the United States. Workers led a wave of strikes during WWII, struggled for civil rights in the North, and elected Black Left-

ists to office in New York City before the McCarthyist Red Scare decimated the communist Left. See Martha Biondi *To Stand and Fight: The Struggle for Civil Rights in Postwar New York City* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2003).

³⁵ See Stephen Schlesinger's classic *Bitter Fruit: The Untold Story of the American Coup in Guatemala* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1982).

³⁶ See Susanne Jonas, *The Battle for Guatemala: Rebels, Death Squads, and U.S. Power* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1991).

³⁷ This is a central argument of Greg Grandin's *The Last Colonial Massacre*.

³⁸ For an introduction to the history of Cuba and the Cuban Revolution, see Louis A. Pérez, Jr. *Cuba: Between Reform and Revolution*, Fifth Edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014) and Aviva Chomsky, *A History of the Cuban Revolution*, Second Edition (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2015). For an account of the Cuban Revolution that decentres Fidel Castro and highlights the role of ordinary people in grassroots struggle, including in the underground urban movement, see Lillian Guerra, *Heroes, Martyrs, and Political Messiahs in Revolutionary Cuba, 1946-1958* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018). See also Lillian Guerra's critical history of the first decade of the revolution, *Visions of Power in Cuba: Revolution, Redemption, and Resistance, 1959-1971* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012).

³⁹ See Régis Debray, *Revolution in the Revolution? Armed Struggle and Political Struggle in Latin America* (New York: Verso 2017 [1967]).

⁴⁰ See Jon Lee Anderson, *Che Guevara: A Revolutionary Life* (New York: Grove Press, 1997) and Michael Löwy, *The Marxism of Che Guevara: Philosophy, Economics, Revolutionary Warfare*, Second Edition (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007).

⁴¹ For more on the Mexican guerrillas see Alexander Aviña's *Specters of Revolution: Peasant Guerrillas in the Cold War Mexican Countryside* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014).

⁴² Carlos Marighella, *Minimannual of the Urban Guerrilla* (Montreal: Abraham Guillen Press, 2002 [1969]).

⁴³ See for instance the Black Liberation Army's 1973 pamphlet "Break De Chains" in which they quote Carlos Marighella and state that "we are the Babylonian equivalent to the Tupamaros of Uruguay." This can be found online in the Freedom Archives's collection of documents from the Black Liberation Army: http://freedomarchives.org/Documents/Finder/DOC513_scans/BLA/513.BLA.Break.De.Chains.pdf. For an optimistic analysis of the urban guerrilla model, see James Kohl and John Litt, *Urban Guerrilla Warfare in Latin America* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1974).

⁴⁴ For an excellent account of the Latin American New Left in 1968, see Jeffrey Gould's "Solidarity Under Siege: The Latin American Left, 1968," *The American Historical Review* 114, no. 2 (April 2009), 348-375. See also George Katsiaficas's sweeping history of the New Left in *The Global Imagination of 1968: Revolution and Counterrevolution* (Oakland: PM Press, 2018). The grassroots upswell of the 1960s was accompanied in the intellectual realm by the development and popularization of

Dependency Theory to explain the history of underdevelopment in Latin America. See B. N. Ghosh, *Dependency Theory Revisited* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000).

⁴⁵ See Peter Winn's *Weavers of Revolution: The Yarur Workers and Chile's Road to Socialism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).

⁴⁶ See Marian E. Schlotterbeck, *Beyond the Vanguard: Everyday Revolutionaries in Allende's Chile* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2018).

⁴⁷ For a damning account of this rightwing violence see Peter Winn's "The Furies of the Andes: Violence and Terror in the Chilean Revolution and Counterrevolution" in Greg Grandin and Gilbert Joseph (eds.) *A Century of Revolution: Insurgent and Counterinsurgent Violence During Latin America's Long Cold War* (2010).

⁴⁸ See the Midnight Notes Collective's issue on "New Enclosures," *Midnight Notes* 10 (1990).

⁴⁹ See Raúl Zibechi's *Territories in Resistance: A Cartography of Latin American Social Movements* (Oakland: AK Press, 2012). For more on how new social movements respond to changes in the capitalist world-system see Andrej Grubačić and Denis O'Hearn, *Living at the Edges of Capitalism: Adventures in Exile and Mutual Aid* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2016). See also work on the West German Autonomes, who also abandoned labour organizing and embraced territorial resistance in networks of squatted buildings during this time period, particularly George Katsiaficas *The Subversion of Politics: European Autonomous Social Movements and the Decolonization of Everyday Life* (Edinburgh; Oakland: AK Press, 2006), and Bart van der Steen et al., *The City is Ours: Squatting and Autonomous Movements in Europe from the 1970s to the Present* (Oakland: PM Press, 2014). Finally, this coincides with the growing prevalence of anarchism in the United States, which was increasingly separate from the labour movement and based in infrastructure such as infoshops and punk houses. See David Graeber, *Direct Action: An Ethnography* (2009) and, for a much more critical take, Murray Bookchin's polemical *Social Anarchism or Lifestyle Anarchism: An Unbridgeable Chasm* (Edinburgh; Oakland: AK Press, 1995). For a broader framing of the development of the US Left in this period, see L.A. Kauffman, *Direct Action: Protest and the Reinvention of American Radicalism* (London: Verso Books, 2017). Kauffman includes an extended discussion of the Central America solidarity movement, which was an emblematic case of grassroots cross-border solidarity organizing.

⁵⁰ Raúl Zibechi, *Territories in Resistance*, 17.

⁵¹ Silvia Federici, *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body, and Primitive Accumulation* (Edinburgh; Oakland: AK Press, 2004).

⁵² Raúl Zibechi, *Territories in Resistance*, 208-209.

⁵³ See John Holloway's influential critique of the strategy of seizing power in *Change the World Without Taking Power: The Meaning of Revolution Today* (2002). For an excellent collection of recent scholarly work on Latin American social movements, see Richard Stahler-Sholk, Harry E. Vanden, and Marc Becker (eds.), *Rethinking Latin American Social Movements: Radical Action from Below* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2014).

⁵⁴ For a comprehensive social history of the origin of the Zapatistas, see John Womack Jr.'s introduction to his *Rebellion in Chiapas: An Historical Reader* (New York: New Press, 1999).

⁵⁵ For a selection of recent work on the Zapatistas, see Gloria Muñoz Ramírez's history *The Fire and the Word: A History of the Zapatista Movement* (San Francisco: City Lights Books, 2008); Hilary Klein's analysis of the Zapatistas' relationship with Indigenism and the revolutionary Left in "The Zapatista Movement: Blending Indigenous Traditions with Revolutionary Praxis," in *No Gods, No Masters, No Peripheries*; and Raúl Zibechi's analysis of the Zapatistas as part of a continent-wide shift towards new social movements in *Territories in Resistance*.

⁵⁶ Rivera Cusicanqui "Ch'ixinakax utxiwa: A Reflection on the Practices and Discourses of Decolonization" in *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 111, no. 1 (Winter 2012): 95-109.

⁵⁷ See Hilary Klein, "The Zapatista Movement."

⁵⁸ See Hakim Bey's T.A.Z.: *The Temporary Autonomous Zone, Ontological Anarchy, Poetic Terrorism* (New York: Autonomedia, 2003) and Alexander Vasudevan's *The Autonomous City: A History of Urban Squatting* (London: Verso, 2017).

⁵⁹ See George Katsiaficas *The Subversion of Politics* (2006).

⁶⁰ See Karen L. Remmer, "The process of democratization in Latin America," Studies in *Comparative International Development*, 27 (1992), 3-24.

⁶¹ See Greg Grandin's analysis in *The Last Colonial Massacre*.

⁶² For a collection of recent scholarly work on the Pink Tide, see Steve Ellner (ed.) *Latin America's Pink Tide: Breakthroughs and Shortcomings* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2019).

⁶³ For a critical assessment of the Pink Tide, see Mike Gonzalez, *The Ebb of the Pink Tide: The Decline of the Left in Latin America* (London: Pluto Press, 2019).

⁶⁴ Raúl Zibechi, *Territories in Resistance*, 270.

⁶⁵ See George Ciccarillo-Maher's *We Created Chávez: A People's History of the Venezuelan Revolution* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2013) and *Building the Commune: Radical Democracy in Venezuela* (London: Verso, 2016). See also Dario Azzellini, *Communes and Workers' Control in Venezuela: Building 21st Century Socialism from Below* (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2018).

⁶⁶ See Mark Bray, *Translating Anarchy: The Anarchism of Occupy Wall Street* (Winchester: Zero Books, 2013).

⁶⁷ See Marina Sitrin and Dario Azzellini, *They Can't Represent Us!: Reinventing Democracy from Greece to Occupy* (London: Verso, 2014).

⁶⁸ See Keeanga-Yamahitta Taylor, *From #BlackLivesMatter to Black Liberation* (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2016) and Nick Estes, *Our History Is The Future: Standing Rock Versus the Dakota Access Pipeline, and the Long Tradition of Indigenous Resistance* (London: Verso, 2019).

⁶⁹ See Mark Bray, *Antifa: The Antifascist Handbook* (Brooklyn: Melville House, 2017).

⁷⁰ See Glen Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*

(Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014).