The Left in the postmodern storm:
The pitfalls of thinking about a policy
of more social justice in the era of post-factualism

La Izquierda en la tormenta posmoderna: Los escollos para pensar una política de más justicia social en la era postfáctica

Marie-Astrid Dupret
Universidad católica del Ecuador
astrid.dupret@gmail.com
Orcid code: https://orcid.org/0000-001-6392-9245

Abstract

There is a strong political malaise in what refers to the Left. This feeling of confusion can be explained by the advent of postmodernity and the numerical disruption that have transformed society and subjectivities. The post-truth politics of the so-called post-factual shows a loss of ethical values, replaced by discourses based on emotionality and imaginary identifications. The transhumanist vision of the world, supported by cybernetics and above all genetic engineering, promotes the idea of a quantified being, freed from the social bond. It points to a model of atomized and inequitable society, and to the accentuation of the ecological crisis. The Left has not reflected on these transformations and does not offer alternatives to counteract the societal destructuring due to neoliberalism. The struggle towards the collective reappropriation of human life and nature could open the way to a new ideal of the Common Good.

Keywords

Common good, inequality, monetization, post-factualism, post-truth politics, transhumanism.

Resumen

Existe un fuerte malestar político en lo que se refiere a la Izquierda. Este sentimiento de confusión puede explicarse por el advenimiento de la posmodernidad y la disrupción numérica que han transformado la sociedad y las subjetividades. La *post-truth politics* de la llamada era postfáctica muestra una pérdida de valores éticos, remplazados por discursos fundados en la emotividad e imaginarios identificatorios. La visión transhumanista del mundo, apoyada por la cibernética y sobre todo la ingeniería genética, promueve la idea de un ser cuantificado, liberado del lazo social. Apunta a un modelo de sociedad atomizado y desigualitario, y a la acentuación de la crisis ecológica. La Izquierda no ha reflexionado sobre estas transformaciones y no ofrece alternativas para contrarrestar la desestructuración societal debida al neoliberalismo. La lucha hacia la reapropiación colectiva de la vida humana y de la naturaleza, podría abrir el camino hacia un nuevo ideal de Bien Común.

Palabras clave

Bien común, desigualdad, monetización, política de la posverdad, postfáctico, transhumanismo.

In this brief essay, we have chosen to talk about the Left in general, as far as what is proposed is valid for a large majority of Lefts, from the most centrist to the most radical. It should be added that this reflection is essentially based on political situations in Europe and Latin America, which present essential similarities despite very different contexts. Finally, the field in which this work is inscribed could be called Political Psychoanalysis', a thematization of Lacanian psychoanalysis but which already has famous representatives such as Slavoj Zizek, for example.

Disorientation

At present, it is very common to hear that there are no differences between the Left and the Right, a comment that is directed above all to the Left parties. It is revealing of the deep malaise that permeates political life in today's world and, especially, the difficulty that the Left has to propose alternatives to the increasingly large inequalities in the socioeconomic order because it feels unarmed at the time of responding to societal changes that have accompanied postmodernity and the cyber and digital revolution. Nor

has the Left questioned the evolution of the social bond and the subjective sensitivity that have accompanied these transformations. It looks like a ship in the middle of a storm that does not find a direction to guide its navigation.

Since the birth of capitalism, profound divergences have divided the main political currents of modern countries between left and right. For the Right, entrenched in the principles of capitalism, the programmatic guidelines are clearly defined by macroeconomic objectives, the safeguarding of the means of production by private hands and the maintenance of the banking system, with the idea that the tranquility and stability of the dominant class is the best guarantee of employment and, therefore, of decent living conditions for the rest of the population. In return, traditionally, the parties that claim a position of the Left have given the preeminence to the people who make up the community, so that social and redistributive purposes have prevailed in their programs, with policies that put the welfare of citizens and citizens social justice above financial and economic development.

To these, we must add parties organized around nationalist values that have resurfaced after a certain lethargy; they have no programmatic proposals beyond ethnic and religious salvation, with a superficial ideology glorifying race and *Heim*, to which disadvantaged indigenous classes are easily identified, despite the fact that they generally maintain strong ties with economic elites of your country.

As for Communism, often equated with totalitarianism, it has fallen into "misfortune" and has been removed from the politically correct vocabulary. For the most part, the parties related to this line have disappeared from the world stage, leaving the word almost exclusively linked to countries with regimes that no longer maintain anything of communist values, as is the case of China, instead of opening the space to the analysis of 'the communist idea', as Alain Badiou (2009) suggests.

Finally, the term 'populism', an empty signifier, as defined by Laclau (2004, 2005), applies to very diverse and opposite political models, which are far-right or more radical lefts, or the so-called Latin American 'populisms' that have implemented important social reforms. This lack of definition accentuates the feeling of current programmatic undifferentiation. Historically, there has been a radical difference in the way society is conceived between Right and Left. As Jean-François Lyotard explains in *The Postmodern Condition* (1979), for the first, society constitutes a 'whole', a 'self-regulated' set in which technocrats, with the help of cybernetics, play a deci-

sive role in ensuring proper functioning and performative efficiency based on competitiveness, with the aim of improving 'the life of the system' and, therefore, that of its members (pp. 26-27). While, until recently at least, the Left, heiress of Marx's capitalist 'political economy criticism', was based on the idea of a society divided and encouraged by the class struggle, based on a critical analysis, reflective or hermeneutical 'that interrogated the' values' and the 'ends' employed to achieve economic goals (pp. 28-29).

But, at the end of the twentieth century, the process of accelerated digitization has drastically changed the scenario; and, in political discourses, the gap between one and the other was narrowed, with the diffuse feeling that there is only one path for humanity. Lyotard writes: "The alternative (between two models of society) still belongs to a thought by oppositions that does not correspond to the liveliest modes of postmodern knowledge" (p. 29), and does not allow us to understand what is happening, "what some analyze as the dissolution of the social bond, with the passage of social collectivities to the state of a mass composed of individual atoms thrown into an absurd Brownian movement[1]" (p. 31). The truth is that, since the publication of *The Postmodern Condition* in 1979, the numerical maelstrom has extended to almost the entire planet, transforming societies into sums of isolated individuals represented by statistical graphs and, right around the corner, over the entire population thanks to the *big data* that seek to produce accurate information about each individual. What is worrisome is that, with the support of transhumanism, a futuristic ideology according to neoliberal ambitions, the structure of the human subject's thinking is changing in depth, a change that crosses all spheres of sociocultural life.

In this context of numbers and technology, traditional politics appears as a parasitic activity that undermines social coexistence. Which explains the strong disaffection suffered by politicians, considered as incompetent, without authentic representation, usually deaf and, above all, corrupt. How often do you hear a rookie candidate, often well known in the world of sports, entertainment or an entrepreneur, boasting about not being 'political', as if it were proof of personal value not stained by commitments and dark interests. What makes said candidate attractive seems to be his distance from traditional parties and, moreover, the rejection of any political project

---

1   The 'Brownian movement' is the random movement that is observed in the particles that are in a fluid medium (liquid or gas), as a result of collisions with the molecules of said fluid (Wikipedia).

that proposes greater justice and social changes; as if occupying a place of power was essentially a matter of image and casting, while the discussions around the actions necessary to improve the well-being of the population and achieve equitable redistribution do not interest anymore, since, supposedly, traditional politics should be replaced by a 'rational administration' carried out by technocrats (Zizek, 2015, p. 351).

The problem that corrodes the socialists as well as the communists, is that their object of attention and the axis of their programmatic construction have become invisible as society has changed its face and that the idea of a community united by symbolic and ethical values has vanished under a lot of numbers. And they don't know how to elaborate political proposals, since there are only individual actors freed, according to what they believe, from the sociocultural tradition experienced as an outdated conventionalism. The movement of the Yellow Vests in France that refuse to gather around any flag, clearly reflects the political disorganization and the ideological malaise of the current world.

From there, the uneasiness of different wings of the left that do not find a grip, nor do they offer the time to reformulate proposals based on the new subjectivities. There are no more militants committed to action on the ground, and no one pays attention to their speeches, so many left-wing politicians no longer speak out on international issues - the case of Venezuela is particularly striking in this regard - and, when not they can do something else, they just appear on the public scene without giving their opinion about the moral aspects that could compromise their politically correct image. Moreover, the word 'progressive', another empty signifier in the sense of Ernesto Laclau (2004) if one does not analyze to what progress it is referring to, becomes the alibi against any deeper elaboration. In fact, for many, to be progressive is to adhere without hesitation to the promotion of a digitalized society under the transhumanist ideal, with the conviction that there is no other option than Development, with a capital D.

This situation shows that the discourses promoted by the numerical society also cross the Left and justify much of the desert of political thought evident in the traditional parties; which does not represent a stumbling block for the Right when this theoretical fog favors its sidereal navigation based on numbers more than human experiences.

A digitized and monetized society

The numerical revolution shapes postmodernity, but understanding it implies going back to the birth of statistics. In a book whose title can be translated "When the world became a number" (2016), Olivier Rey explains: "The presence of statistical thought finds its origin […] in a transformation of the ways of being a collective", as a result of the social social misery 'and the loss of common symbolic references at the end of the 18th century (p. 16): "The social mutations, induced by the industrial and political revolutions, were decisive in the' great leap forward 'of statistics in the nineteenth century," in particular 'the social issue' (p. 17). It was then that statistics gradually transformed into a way to quantify reality to offer a graphic description of the main societal problems or, at least, of those that interested the researchers. Associated with cybernetics and computer science, they led to a numerical interpretation of life and a numerical view of the world that reduced the speaking being to a simple accounting individual. Because due to digitalization, everything human, and also the material, became measurable and susceptible of transforming into statistical indicators; to the point that: "It is no longer personal experience, but statistics that we must rely on from now on to know what to think about reality" (p. 9).

In this way, statistics have become 'a total social fact', according to Marcel Mauss' expression, "a fact that concerns the whole of society and its institutions, and affects […] all aspects of social life" (p. 15). In parallel with the statistics, monetization seized social life; As Georg Simmel wrote in 1900, quoted by Rey (p. 16): "Monetary economics (...) has introduced the ideal of numerical expression into practical life"; everything can be transformed into money, a phenomenon inherent to neoliberalism, with reducing effects on morality and justice in a society of pure numbers.

The new computer logic and the quantification that accompanies it have affected institutional discourses and their legitimacy, by implying a new grammar of the social order without reflection on the ethical principles that support it; and the community is diluted in a sum of individuals and statistics that transform everything into numbers, needs, occupations, complaints, diseases, etc., so that the subjects once subject to the same laws and the same cultural values, are increasingly dispossessed of their symbolic identity and the features that specified and distinguished them from others, while gradually losing their *ethos*. In this context, the relationship with the other,

the one belonging to the same group or the foreigner becomes fragile to the extent that collective values erode and lose their cohesive force, so that the person, deprived of symbolic references, seeks desperately speculative and imaginary identifications, while fiercely rejecting those who do not seem like it, without the possibility of creating a social bond of exchange and reciprocity - it is the typical problem of postmodern nationalisms resulting from the disaggregation of the social bond and that, at In spite of being limited in an offer of a superficial imagery such as the type of clothing or the cut - or the color - of hair, they allow the individual to feel part of a group and therefore recognized among peers.

Postmodernity and other post

Postmodernity is undoubtedly the origin of the many "post" of today's world, although it does not refer to the disappearance of a previous time but rather to the evolution of modernity increasingly distant from the past from which it was born: "Designates the state of culture after the transformations that have affected the rules of the games of science, literature and arts since the end of the nineteenth century"; with "disbelief in front of meta-narratives" (Lyotard, 1979, p. 7). The advent of postmodernism reflects the introduction of a new logic of thought and a new subjective grammar due to the rapid extension of the process of digitalization and computerization of daily life, that leads to the decomposition of the social bond, correlative with worldwide expansion of neoliberalism (Dupret, 2018, p. 35).

In postmodernity, the registration of the Symbolic, as Lacan puts it, loses its socializing value due to the tendency to discredit the great cultural, religious or secular traditions, and with the bracketing of the principle of reality, so that the relationship between the individual and the collective, the singular and the plural is disrupted and the ideal of common good and social justice crumbles. This structural change, at the level of both sociocultural and subjective *ethos*[2], results in the fading of the feeling of being part of a community of thought and life. In fact, this evolution is reflected in the discursive landscape with the appearance of some new expressions such as

---

2   Although ethos is not yeta widely used word, it seems very appropriate to talk about what some like Lévi-Strauss have called collective unconscious.

post-truth or post-factual, which clear the everyday scene to give way to transhumanism, a millenarian myth that deludes the human being with the idea of an eternal life. exempt from suffering, though, it should be specified, for those who have the means to acquire this luxury...

The truth is that, in this last decade, the signifiers starting with 'pos(t)' have multiplied[3], postmodern, post-factual, post-truth, but also post-populism, post-philosophy, or even post-history, the latter with a semantic weight that has not yet been calibrated. The question is to understand what the insistent use of this prefix reveals. It is loaded with meaning and sometimes refers to what is behind in opposition to what is ahead in the space plan but, also many times, refers to a before compared to a later, a temporality that results from a succession of moments, or even a closure, in which case the 'post' would come to reveal something past, a time out of order, something that is no longer valid, an outdated thought without legitimacy to deal with current phenomena. This *post-mortem* value is presented as a declaration of death with respect to the foregoing, underlining the lack of interest in the past with an affirmation of a present without debt to the past. Understood in this way, the post cancels the dialectic as a constructive principle of thought and wipes the slate clean of the idea of stages and moments of reflection, especially ethics, in scientific processes. Likewise, the idea of 'post-history', a variant of the end of History that Francis Fukuyama announced, and, therefore, the end of dialectical materialism and class struggle; that is, the appearance of a world in which the human being becomes an extraterrestrial without roots, immersed in the immediacy of the present, without the possibility of projecting into a future; because without a past, there is no imaginable future. But also, almost insurmountable structural difficulties so that a social group can consider actions to open a path to less oppressive destinations.

Post-factual and post-truth

Other pos(t) are less disturbing at first sight, such as post-factual and post-truth, although they bring to light the change in subjectivity they highlight, as well as the new ways of thinking about the world that gradually infiltrate current rationality, in accordance with the neoliberal model and the promo-

---

3   Another increasingly fashionable prefix is 'trans' with its conscious and unconscious values…

tion of consumerism, and with imaginary science fiction and technological advances without limits sustained by the mirages of cybernetics at the service of the market. The phrase 'post-truth politics', made fashionable in 2010 by David Roberts in a blog for Grist magazine, dedicated to the defense of the environment, was recognized in 2016 as neologism of the year by the Oxford English Dictionary. Since then it has spread, associated with the expression post-factualism and in relation to fake news. The term "post-truth" contains some ambiguity to the extent that it gives the impression of validating what, precisely, is denouncing, a "post-factual" policy that does not take into account the criterion of truth; and indeed, it gives the impression that it no longer needs to be based on the truth of the facts. The question is to know to what extent the dimension of the idea of truth can be dispensed with, in order to maintain a minimum of order and a peaceful coexistence. It is worth asking to what extent a human 'society', etymologically a society of people who "have consented to go together 'ad symbolum'" (memory around shared symbols), (Legendre, 2001 p. 47, note 1, citing Isidoro of Seville), by accepting a common Reference, can they do without the function of truth?

To speak is to implicitly recognize the existence of a truth value in terms of words and discourses, and includes the option of lying. The criterion of truth —*adequatio intellectus cum rem* — allows judging the validity of the relationship between words and things and has to do with the content of the sentences and the coherence of the sentences and the discursive structure. In this sense, the truth (or falsehood) of assertions goes through all human constructions, as well as the subject's ability to relate to the reality that surrounds him and, therefore, to other human beings.

Nor can the concept of truth be dispensed with when talking about justice. When questioning a witness in court, he is required to say "the whole truth and only the truth," that is, describe the reality of the facts as accurately as possible; lying would mean a punishable transgression and would consist - or did it consist? - in a major ethical fault. One cannot corner the truth principle with impunity; and the myth of the tower of Babel illustrates the sociocultural collapse when each opts for their own linguistic 'truth'. Therefore, the bracketing of the truth creates uneasiness, confusion and distrust of politics and any future projects.

The truth is that the lack of love for the truth produces a strong discomfort in relations with the next as well as with the other when replacing the pact of the word with imaginary identities characteristic of nationalisms.

Undoubtedly, the threatening perception of the migrant has a lot to do with uncertainty about the way in which new arrivals will behave, since they have other customs, other beliefs that are assimilated to wrong and sometimes dangerous social values.

The Oxford Dictionary defines the post-truth predicate as follows: "Relating or denoting circumstances in which objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief". The 'post' attached to the word truth indicates not so much an evolution of meaning, but the denial of its moral and pragmatic value in social structure. And post-truth politics, by nurturing the imaginary to the detriment of the accuracy of the word, encourages an adulteration of the facts and a programmed misinformation at the service of hidden interests, with major consequences on the orientation of the policies within a country or even worldwide. It is no accident that the expression was born on the subject of Watergate; and spread with Brexit and the electoral campaign of Donald Trump, both linked to popular voting (a referendum and a presidential election, respectively). Katharine Viner, in an article entitled "How technology disrupted the truth", published in The Guardian of June 2016, drew attention to the collusion of post-truth with fake news, explaining the political impacts of the use of information distortion that, far from being innocent, respond to precise motivations and objectives. Because the manipulation of public opinion in order to obtain their support is intended to deceive and confuse. But the truth is that disinterest in truth is not limited to electoral campaigns as shown by the world of lobbying and influencers. There is no doubt that Venezuela is an exemplary case of fake news and post-truth politics with more lying information than proven facts.

Around the word post-factualism, composed with a 'post' added to the word factualism, a new ethic has been developed that detracts from the concordance between words and facts. In the Oxford Dictionary, factual thinking of the early twentieth century is defined as: "Any theory that treats facts as being of prime importance, originally especially in moral matters; the theory that moral conclusions can be drawn from factual data alone". Gilles Gauthier comments on this regard:

> We have entered a 'post-factual era' in which the consideration of reality would have become an accessory […]. The widespread use of lies and emotions by political actors seems to be the most obvious illustration and,

without a doubt, one of the causes of the suppression of the consideration of the facts in the public debate. (2018, p. 2)

To explain this unprecedented situation in its current dimension, Gauthier emphasizes that, despite being related, the concepts of information and communication are distinguished in terms of the apprehension of the reality of the facts referred to. The information, he writes, "has as a condition of possibility the recognition of a reality" (p. 2), so that from "this formal subordination of information with respect to (this) reality the question of truth "(id.); it is true or false according to whether or not it offers an exact representation of reality. On the contrary, when it comes to communication, "its relationship with the real is secondary" (p. 3); "What is important is the interrelation, sharing, dialogue" (p. 3), it is less about "really than 'truthfulness': its criteria of appreciation are sincerity and authenticity rather than accuracy and adequacy to the real "(p. 3), and revolves around the fact of" sharing opinions and emotions ". The reality vanishes, the truth loses its importance and in return, it grows "an intersubjective relationship between journalists and their audiences, a more conversational and fun way of press discourse, as well as a larger space for comments" (p. 3). C. Bybee and J. Ettema, two authors to which Gauthier refers (p. 4) "had described the post-factual age as the emergence of the mixture of genres between journalism, fiction, entertainment and advertising", which implies a "Distance from the facts [the factual] in the political discourse and the press"; "Communication produces a representation that institutes/presents as real; it is a place of co-construction of a new reality" (p. 3). The post-factual is related to the very powerful anti-realist philosophical point of view in our days" (p. 3), therefore, "the existence of an outside world and the ability to produce knowledge are in doubt, or even radically denied" (p. 3). This departure from factual reality is very congruent with the transhumanist worldview in which the postmodern discourses of unlimited progress rest.

Transhumanism and the genetic modification of the human being

Transhumanism is a new current of thought (The World Transhumanist Association was created in 1998 and is studied in several universities) that advocates the creation of a new individual, freed from its natural bonds and limi-

tations imposed by reality, through state-of-the-art techniques, particularly genetics. For Olivier Rey (2018), the idea of transhumanism expresses the desire that "humans give rise to more effective/performative beings" (p. 9):

> The technological development was first oriented towards the outside world. But the time has come when it is thinkable, not only to transform the world but to humans themselves - be it by interventions on their biological constitution or by hybridization with the machine [...]: Humans thus improved, augmented, would no longer be precisely humans but beings of another order, post-human. (pp. 14-15)

According to the great voices of transhumanism, this transformation will become possible thanks to a conscious and provoked human biological evolution that neglects 'natural selection' (p. 8). 'In the intellectual and cultural plan', it maintains "the desirable of a fundamental improvement of the human condition through new technologies" and in practical terms, proposes "to study and promote all the technologies that can serve this objective — among others—, orienting public policies and financing in this end" (p. 15). In summary, it is about 'modifying human' existence with 'incremental' innovations (which modify what already exists), but above all with 'disruptive innovations' that break with the past (p. 16).

Transhumanism is not presented as a science and its statements are not intended to account for a state of the world, nor to elaborate a theory; but it maintains an intrinsic relationship with neurosciences and artificial intelligence; and it is based on a maximized technological development without ethical considerations. In appearance, it is not an ideology either, in the sense of a system of ideas that inspire a government, a party, or that offer guidelines for social and economic decisions (Rocher, 1977, p. 475); however, it guides and even encourages the political options related to its vision of humanity, which corresponds to the definition of ideology as "set of ideas, beliefs of a certain epoch, a society, or a class" (Le Robert). Above all, it plays a decisive role in determining the axes of future research, precisely those that will benefit from very high funding. It is not intended to be a philosophy or a reflection on human nature, and its relationship with the world, but it is based on a vision of the human as defective, "a state that must be overcome" (p. 15), a weak being that It must be transformed.

Therefore, the most appropriate word to designate transhumanism is that of cosmology, although a particular cosmology in that it is not about con-

templation, but proposes to modify reality and recreate the cosmos. In this sense, it has many of the ingredients of a religion whose object of worship would be a futuristic technology at the service of infinite progress towards the liberation of the individual from his natural constraints, a world of fiction and fantasy, far from pain and death. However, on the horizon of this myth, some disturbing aspects are drawn with greater consequences for the thinking subject and the social bond, among which the issue of subjective ethics, the socioeconomic plan and, finally, the ecological environment have a special relevance for any political project of the Left.

Indeed, transhumanism not only gives technological advances a central role, but also presents its dictum as to the form of future life. In the field of genetics, innovative manipulation capabilities become necessities, so that the discourse of technology without contextualization can serve alarming purposes, far beyond concrete proposals, insofar as it excites with the idea that there are no limits to the fulfillment of the most foolish desires - let's think about male pregnancy. Everything seems possible without being accompanied by a reflection on the moral consequences of interventions that modify the physiological nature of the human being. When one speaks of the right to have children or of cloning, the ethical question becomes inescapable, however, in fact, it is increasingly obliterated for ideological and economic reasons. There is much more money for research on fertility methods even after menopause than for psychological support for damaged childhoods.

Of course, these budget allocations have major political consequences.

> Technology in effect, as it becomes more complex and the pace of innovation increases, marginalizes and necessarily eliminates democracy. The more technology is sophisticated, the more democracy must yield to technocracy. (pp. 122-123)

In any case, the transhumanist ideal rests on technological treatments only available to the richest and is intimately linked to consumerism without looking at its societal consequences. And in fact, it takes into consideration the isolated person, unconcerned with collective and environmental interests:

> Those who announce the advent of artificial super intelligences and cyborgs are founded, to justify their prophecies, in prolonged technological development curves […]. But […] they ignore other curves, which allow us to foresee that the material conditions necessary for the continuation of this development will no longer be met. (King, 2018, p. 170)

The production of an egotistical superhuman, that is a 'quantified self' (p. 8) measured according to its consumption capacity, has the price of 'subject dehumanization' and the end of the social bond.

Despite these findings, many leftist parties applaud the idea of 'Progress' sustained by transhumanism, and value technological advances as such, instead of facing them critically, based on a more just, equitable and solidarity social project to counteract ecological storms. Already in his time Trotsky wrote: "Man will rise to a higher level, create a higher biological and social type or, if they want, a superman" (quoted by King, p. 168). What is usually forgotten is that only the most powerful will be able to benefit from these advances and protect themselves against the devastating effects of "our dependence on nature" and "the increasing precariousness of our condition" (p. 171).

This enthusiasm is explained because transhumanism supports the idea of a being freed from earthly bonds, a superman without castration in psychoanalytic terms. But its seductive effect and the credibility on which it rests can only be explained by the spectacular successes of cybernetics and digitalization. Planetary networks of communication, genetic engineering, artificial intelligence: progress is immense; and the promises of a virtual world away from suffering and death, encouraging; But it's a farce. Bernard Stiegler (2016) writes:

> It will not be possible to combat transhumanist discourse if it is not repoliticized - if the issue of disruption does not appear in it as a mismatch between technical system, social systems and biophysical systems, and, consequently, as the need for a new public power (p.151)

It is what the Left still does not seem to have heard.

The Left in search of a new paradigm

This journey of words and discourses typical of the post-factual era and the digitalized society traces the landscape of postmodernism and brings to light some causes of the disorientation of the Left in the face of the destructuring of human communities, gradually reduced to myriad of beings isolated in their egocentric bubble and connected by virtual networks. The Left no longer knows, in whose name is it talking? nor in favor of what social

ethics is fighting for? For which it usually aligns with the policies of a United Right around its mercantile concerns and its transhumanist ideal of privatization and monetization of the individual and the planet. It has forgotten the axial values that served its as goals, such as social justice or equality, and also fails to get rid of nationalist claims conceived by post-truth policies with its answers, by the way, superficial and emotional, but effective in appeasing the human need of feeling protected by glorious identifications.

At the end of this essay, here are some suggestions of topics and elaborations necessary for the Left if it does not want to get lost in the path of uncertainty. First, it cannot do without the hard work of rethinking itself: In today's world, what does the 'Left' signifier from a political perspective cover? a reflection to which all parties that recognize themselves under this name should participate. Secondly, it is convenient to analyze, in the face of disaggregation and socio-cultural dispersion, what constitutes a Society and a Community today. A pause time to examine what so-called 'Progress' means is essential and requires adequate studies in terms of what are the elements of this Progress that can create more humanity? And what are those who atomize social life and enclose the subject in a bodily self, detached from others? This aspect is particularly relevant when it comes to genetic manipulation, artificial intelligence and cybernetics. Likewise, the responses to the ecological challenge require limiting development and technical advances based on sustainable and renewable proposals, designed within a humanistic dimension. In this way, the Left will be in a position to offer a political framework to citizen solidarity initiatives and to the actions of associative movements, often orphaned by support, at the same time, economic, social and cultural. In summary, the reappropriation of the symbolic and ethical values that form the background of a coexistence based on a minimum of harmony around the idea of a Common Good, could be a paradigm for the Left to redefine its projects and programs around some axes consistent with their initial societal proposals.

It should be noted that, in this text, no reference has been made to some valuable attempts to promote policies clearly geared towards improving the living conditions of the community. However, even in these exceptional cases, there is a lack of sufficient work of reflection and theoretical and pragmatic elaboration to counteract the devastating effects of numerical disruption in society, so that the changes carried out hardly resist the aggressive return of the neoliberalism.

Bibliography

Badiou, A. (2009). *L'hypothèse communiste*. Paris: Lignes.

Dupret, M.-A. (2018). La servidumbre voluntaria del sujeto posmoderno. *Ecuador Debate 104*, 31-40.

Gauthier, G. (2018). Le post-factualisme. *Communication, 35*(1), 1-12. Recuperado de https://bit.ly/30YWdHk. DOI: 10.4000/communication.7530.

Laclau, E. (2004). *Hegemonía, política y representación*. Subsecretaría de la Gestión Pública, República Argentina, 8 de octubre de 2004. Recuperado de https://bit.ly/2Zatwqn

Laclau, E. (2005). *La razón populista*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Legendre, P. (2001). *De la Société comme Texte. Linéaments d'une anthropologie dogmatique*. Paris: Fayard.

Lyotard, J.-F. (1979). *La condition postmoderne*. Paris: Les éditions de minuit.

Rey, O. (2016). *Quand le monde s'est fait nombre*. Paris: Stock.

Rey, O. (2018). *Leurre et malheur du transhumanisme*. Paris/ Desclée De Brouwer.

Rocher, G. (1977). *Introducción a la sociología general*. Barcelona: Editorial Herder.

Stiegler, B. (2016). Dans la disruption, comment ne pas devenir fou? Paris: Ed. LLL.

Viner, K. (2016): How technology disrupted the truth. *The Guardian*, 12/06. Recuperado de:
https://bit.ly/29AM0Ji

Zizek, S. (2015). *Moins que rien. Hegel et l'ombre du matérialisme dialectique*. Paris: Fayard.