

CONTRIBUTIONS TO ESPECIFISMO

Carl Eugene Stroud

THE BACKGROUND

In *Social Anarchism and Organization*, the Anarchist Federation of Rio de Janeiro (FARJ) devotes an entire chapter to chronicling and unifying around explicit contributions and influences to their own practice of *especifismo*. On the surface, this kind of chapter in a book can appear to be the typical work of internet researchers, coming off like a script for a video essay. But when we really consider the significance of a political organization going to the lengths of putting into words a commonly shared and recognized tradition, this is clearly not a simple task of summarizing and paraphrasing, so to include this short history in a political program is even more noteworthy.

Tradition can be a touchy subject, and traditionalism is a counter-revolutionary force, leading some radicals to conclude that it's inherently dogmatic to even breach the subject. All this makes the discussion of the anarchist tradition especially difficult.

In anarchist spaces, influences are usually more autobiographical than traditional, and they're almost always divisive. This is what has made the arrival of the *especifismo* current in the anglosphere so striking: it situates itself within a particular class struggle tradition and distances itself from anarchist currents that do not have the final objective of a libertarian socialist society.

In revolutionary contexts, the socialist tradition is different from the conservative, ruling class forces that defend the status quo with the label *revolution*. There are "patriotic revolutionaries" and "religious revolutionaries". There are parliamentarians who want a "revolution" of the voters, and there are capitalists who claim to be "revolutionizing" society. In socialist contexts, the anarchist tradition is different from the social democratic and Marxist tendencies that insist on the party form and the State as a means to a socialist society. And in exclusively anarchist contexts, *especifismo* is different from

anarchist ideologies that do not take up the traditions of revolutionary class struggle and organizational dualism [1].

So, especificismo is contemporary, but it isn't exactly new. Its oldest influence is the socialist movement, and the next is the libertarian tendency within this same movement, picking up on anarchist traditions dating back to the 19th century, while addressing shortcomings and errors made by anarchists in their struggle for libertarian socialism.

Regarding organization and strategy, especificismo is a distinct pivot from less theoretically founded anarchist currents [2]. This is not an ideology for scoring points in debates, and it does not claim to provide a moral sense of righteousness to its militants. It does not consider anarchism a belief system or a pledge, nor is it something springing from our inherently rebellious human nature. Anarchism, if it is to be a revolutionary force, must be a political project seeking transformation for all of society, not only the most radical individuals. This is what is meant by social revolution, an objective realized through organized militancy [3].

Militant Commitment

Are we more committed to being cool or to revolutionary militancy? This is a real question that militants should be comfortable seriously asking [4]. Especifismo insists on the organization asking this kind of question of its militants and its militants asking it of each other. Responsibility like this is mutually reciprocated:

“[militant] commitment imprints a link between militant and organisation, which is a mutual relationship in which the organisation is responsible for the militant, as well as the militant being responsible for the organisation. As well as the organisation owing satisfaction to the militant, the militant owes satisfaction to the organisation.” (p. 73)

This degree of militant commitment is characteristic of especificismo and is related to its emphasis on strategy:

“An especificista model implies that we have to do things that we don’t like very much or to cease doing some things that we like a lot. This is to ensure that the organisation proceeds with strategy, with everyone rowing the boat in the same direction.” (p. 72)

This is not an organization of capable individuals looking to spectacularly exercise personal whims and individualistic experimentation. Militant commitment is not only about agreeing to share responsibilities with others; it is also about respecting certain priorities [5]. This collectively increases the social force of the individual militants. What good is a committed militant who refuses to go in the same direction as their comrades?

Trust between comrades requires commitment from everyone involved. And organizing a space where this trust can be employed as a revolutionary tool means everyone agreeing to act with a single strategy, a group orientation that is clearly defined and entirely explicit. Otherwise, our actions and efforts do not have the desired impact:

“causing many of them to be lost [...] To act with strategy, as we have seen, implies taking into account a plan of all the practical actions performed by the organisation, seeking to verify where you are, where you want to go and how.” (p. 72)

In many contexts, simply having a conversation about strategy is no simple task; arriving at a strategy that everyone will commit to is another feat altogether. So, militant commitment is needed at every step along the way: to produce and articulate the strategy beforehand, to realize the strategy in the real world with changing dynamics and oppositional forces, and to reflect on the strategy and evaluate its effectiveness going forward. Militant commitment is a fundamental element of revolutionary organizing and effective direct action. It is the collective force behind the specific anarchist organization.

The Political Organization

The specific anarchist organization discussed by FARJ is not just any anarchist group. It has distinct characteristics, and not all social anarchists choose this model of organization [6]. Especificismo is a specific articulation of strategy, opposing “broad” (non-specific) organizational models. For FARJ, the political organization should not attempt to serve as a:

“great “umbrella” that covers all types of anarchists [...] These broad (in)definitions apparently group more anarchists in the organisation, however, we believe that we should not opt for the criterion of quantity, but the quality of militants.” (p. 74)

This means a limited membership with clear criteria for entry. It also means a lengthy process of militant formation and gradual incorporation into the group. All of this ensures that “[only] militants with ideological affinity with the organisation are inside the specific anarchist organisation” (p. 73). Importantly, this could address certain security concerns, making it easier for everyone to be on the same page about who should know what, guaranteeing that the most sensitive decisions and actions are guarded by the most layers of trust and militant commitment.

Organizing in this way ensures that the most committed militants are making decisions for themselves, exercising direct democracy over their own engagements. These militants should not allow themselves to become “sleeves” for others who participate in debate and decision making but never seem to show up when it's time to do the work or whose interest declines whenever mass mobilizations naturally wane. Groups that do not actively organize against these tendencies are perpetually stuck in a situation where:

“[some] people participate a bit in the organisation, others are more committed; some assume more responsibilities than others and all have the same power of deliberation. Thus, many deliberate on activities that they are not going to perform, that is,

they determine what others will do [...] When an organisation allows for someone to deliberate something and not assume responsibilities, or that they assume responsibilities and do not meet them it allows for an authoritarianism of those who deliberate and put work on the backs of other comrades.” (p. 73)

This problem negatively affects the anarchist movement everywhere. Today, the organizational model of *especificismo* has garnered interest because we are desperate for ways of avoiding this all-too-common outcome. In their writings, FARJ outlines how this can be done through multiple fronts of engagement, varying degrees of commitment, and a militant defense of collective responsibility, inspiring anarchists internationally, but not without criticism.

THE CRITIQUES

It isn't just a lack of self-discipline that burdens anarchist organizations since the problem is collective, not individual [7]. Without an explicit commitment from individuals, there can be no collective action, but without responsibility, this commitment is meaningless. The organized combination of commitment, responsibility, and self-discipline is realized by the specific anarchist organization. This degree of unity is essential to *especifismo* because:

“there is no way to have an effective practice or even constitute an organisation without agreeing on some “initial questions” [...] For anarchists that do not advocate this unity the anarchist organisation could work with different ideological and theoretical lines. Each anarchist or group of anarchists may have their interpretation of anarchism and their own theory. This is [the] motive for various conflicts and splits in organisations with this conception.” (p. 72)

Still, some critiques of *especifismo* do not stop at its conception of collective responsibility or its emphasis on unity. Some anarchist tendencies, whether individualist, philosophical, or lifestyle oriented, also see problems with the class struggle bias and with the practice social insertion.

The discourse around these critiques, their arguments and counter arguments, as well as the discussions in the wider anarchist movement, have also contributed to *especifismo*. In *Social Anarchism and Organisation*, FARJ addresses these differences directly, making clear that in writing the text they:

“[sought] to differentiate [their] understanding of anarchism from another, purely abstract and theoretical, which only encourages free thinking, without necessarily conceiving a model of social

transformation. Anarchism, thought of only from this model of critical observation of life, offers an aesthetic freedom and endless possibilities. However, if so conceived, it does not offer real possibilities of social transformation, since it is not put into practice, into action. It does not have the political practice that seeks the final objectives.” (p. 69-70)

Following from this, not all of anarchism is equally relevant to the practice that *especificismo* is trying to realize, not all of anarchism will lead to the same ends, not all of anarchism is revolutionary, and not all of anarchism is part of the socialist movement.

Individualists and Bourgeois Anarchists

Militancy is the collective defense of a political line. It means realizing that line on the social level together. Militancy is not individual action that has no organizing potential. Acting without organization is contrary to *especifismo* which, at its core, is about “fighting to organize and organizing to fight”. It shouldn’t be too much to expect all the members of a political organization to share the same strategies and goals. This is what is referred to as the political level: unity of ideology, theory, and strategy, a specific anarchist organization.

Some anarchist tendencies consider it less than ideal for members of a political organization to limit their actions in accordance with a single, collective strategy. What are the limits, for example, of anarchist individualism? This question is not only philosophical. For revolutionary anarchists, it is also political. And for the militants of *especifismo*, this question has everything to do with organization.

Since the political organization is obviously composed of individuals, of their actions, of their values and ideals, individuality is not at all a bad word. Afterall, it is the individual experiences of people in struggle that informs anarchist theory. However, this shouldn’t mean prioritizing individual whim over collective decision-making, and it definitely shouldn’t mean compromising the final objective of libertarian socialism because of a single person or commune’s alternative vision.

Since its appearance in the anarchist movement, individualism has led to numerous splits and divisions, resulting in the hollowing out of an organized force of anarchists. It has been part of the repeated failures of syndicalist and community efforts, and it has threatened pluralistic spaces, sometimes taking the side of capital, bosses, and the very system it claims to oppose. For these reasons and more, *especifismo* is against anarchist individualism which defends the idea that:

“to be an anarchist means to be an artist, a bohemian,
to promote the sexual freedom of having open

relationships or with more than one partner, to wear different clothes, to have a radical haircut, to behave extravagantly, to eat different foods, to define yourself personally, to fulfill yourself personally, to be against revolution (?!), to be against socialism (?!), to have a discourse without rhyme or reason – enjoying the freedom of aesthetics – in short, becoming apolitical.” (p. 74)

Militants committed to social transformation don't simply dress a certain way or have a certain lifestyle; they must be engaged in organizing politically with other revolutionaries who share their same ideology.

Another threat to political organizing and social-level struggle is what could be termed “bourgeois anarchism”. It manifests itself as technocratic vanguardism and is often confined to intellectual scenes online and amongst downwardly mobile, well-educated members of the middle class. The problem is not the class status of these anarchists or their official credentials; it is their position in the class struggle. This kind of anarchism tends to either:

“abandon the proposal for social transformation, or constitute itself into a group that fights for the people, not with the people – assuming the position of vanguard and not of active minority [...] They end up making of their anarchism a “movement in itself”, which is characterised by being essentially of the middle class and intellectuals, by not seeking contact with social and popular struggles, by not being in contact with people of different ideology.” (p. 71)

Especifismo poses a clear and uncompromising ideology, but this is not expected to be the ideology of the masses. We have to take our ideology from the specific organization to the mass organization, from the political level to the social level, but it is theory, not ideology, that allows us to learn about our world and the particular situation where we find ourselves.

Unlike ideology, which we hold resolutely, theory is flexible and dynamic, constantly moving and developing, becoming more and more relevant to the actual struggles of our time and place and to our

final objective. But theory without practice cannot be revolutionary, just like practice without theory cannot be effectively strategic.

Learning is obviously important, and many militants in the especificismo current are students, professors, and autodidacts. Like them, we must continue to grow our knowledge and combine it with the expertise of other people to develop our social force, both our force as individuals and our force as an organized libertarian movement. Anarchism must have constant contact with the people. This is where it informs its political practice.

Class Struggle

Class is not necessarily economic. It refers to relationships of domination, especially in capitalism, an exploitative ruling order that forces some people to suffer while others benefit. We see this division everywhere in our society: the exploited and dominated classes are certainly *not* the ruling class.

Anti-statist principles are not enough; we must also have anti-capitalist political practices, fighting on the side of the dominated to end the entire exploitative system. Anarchism was born out of this fight to end the division of classes. It took hold where it was most obvious that capitalism was failing and would never be able to live up to its promises. In *especifismo*, commitment to class struggle means working to organize a popular power that comes out of real conflicts because it is through these experiences that we are all able to witness the weaknesses and shortcomings of the system for ourselves. In this sense, class struggle is an inherently radicalizing experience [8].

It is because class struggle is a social level phenomenon that *especifismo* emphasizes the social vector:

“When we seek to apply anarchism to the class struggle we assert what we call social work, and which we defined earlier as “the activity that the anarchist organisation performs in the midst of the class struggle, causing anarchism to interact with the exploited classes”.” (p. 70)

Anarchism should not avoid class struggle (i.e., lifestyle-ism) any more than it should lead it (i.e., vanguardism). The goal of a revolutionary political organization that interacts with the social level should be popular power. It is about building a social force capable of overthrowing capitalism and the State. This kind of liberation comes directly out of the conflicts of the real people, as they fight against systemic domination, in our communities, in our workplaces, and around the world.

Social Work

The political practice known as social insertion is commonly misunderstood, and since it is “the main activity of the specific anarchist organization”, at this time, continuing to clarify this concept is political work [9].

When we use liberal ideology to interpret what is meant by social work, we reenforce a vague “assistentialism” that defends philanthropy as a strategy for combatting systemic domination. This sort of conception does not have a class bias; it is not working toward a social revolution; it does not have socialist ends. The social work of a revolutionary anarchist organization does not have the same content and objectives as the welfare state.

There is also a different interpretation of social work which assumes that any form of interaction between the social and political levels is “bourgeois” or “reformist”. This is an extremist position that FARJ refutes, saying that:

“anarchism should not be confined to itself, nor shy away from social movements and people of different ideologies [...] Since we understand that class is not defined by origin but by the position that you advocate in the struggle, we believe that to support social movements, to assist mobilisations and organisations different to the reality in which you are included is an ethical obligation for any militant committed to the end of class society.” (p. 71)

Avoiding this kind of interaction with people from different schools of thought will only isolate anarchists from mass mobilizations, making anarchist practices and principles irrelevant. The idea of “position in the struggle” not only refers to the ethics of anarchist militants but also the point of contact where the political organization has influence in social movements. This is where new theories, practices, and information are obtained by revolutionary militants. Through the flow of ideas, the political organization is able to develop in a way that is always relevant to the struggles of its own time and place [10].

Without an understanding of social insertion *in* the class struggle, especifismo is wrongfully criticized. While the alternatives proposed by other anarchists are not always clear, it seems that:

“[besides], at least apparently, not having a strategic formulation what happens in practice is that these anarchists seek to work with propaganda, very restricted to publications, events and culture [...] propaganda is also central for us, but it is not enough if done without the backing of social work and insertion. With this support propaganda is much more effective. Therefore, propaganda, in especifismo, should be performed with these two biases: educational/ cultural and struggle with social movements.” (p. 71)

Anarchism has a long tradition of critique and defense of certain tactics, strategies, and organizational models, while clearly opposing others. This tradition has roots that go back to the birth of the anarchist movement from within the struggle for socialism. And it is from these roots that especifismo traces its influences.

THE INFLUENCES

Bakunin and Malatesta, Magón and Makhno, the Russian Revolution, the Spanish Revolution, the Anarchist Federation of Uruguay (FAU), anarchists on multiple continents, from more than 100 years of history, these are the influences mentioned by the Anarchist Federation of Rio de Janeiro (FARJ), in their text *Social Anarchism and Organization* [11]. All of these, in some way, have contributed to the theory and practice of especificismo.

For people becoming newly familiar with anarchism and anarchist history, the quantity of names and events mentioned can be intimidating. This causes some of us to resist new information that may require additional research, while others don't see the value of studying history that is not immediately relevant to our current lives. This summary is meant to serve as a small collage of figures, events, and organizations that are relevant to a general study of especificismo. It is a *very* basic introduction, a quick overview of their relevance to this internationally growing anarchist current.

For people who are already familiar with these historical references, there remain other pertinent questions. What do all the influences of especificismo have in common? What is the significance of these influences as opposed to others? What is left out and why?

The Platform

Nowadays, when discussing contributions to especificismo, “the Platform”, a document written by Ukrainian anarchists exiled during the Russian Revolution, takes a primary position. Though the two are commonly associated and, today, their militants affiliate with each other on the international level, especificismo does not come out of, or pick up on, a particular thread of influence from platformism. Simply put, especificismo is not platformism; it is not a Spanish language equivalent; it is not a modern, Latin American branding of the same thing.

To begin with, platformism is not a thing of the past. There are contemporary platformist organizations existing to this day, and they *do* contribute to especificismo. Secondly, platformism was originally born out of the organizational mistakes of anarchists during the 1917 Russian Revolution, a very specific event in world history. Especificismo, however, is a way of addressing the constant need for the social vector of anarchist militancy, something that has been overlooked by many different anarchist currents, again and again, throughout the history of our movement.

So, despite also being influenced by Bakunin, the Platform is not really the lost twin of especificismo that it is sometimes assumed to be. Still, these assumptions are not entirely misplaced. For example, FARJ cites the Platform as having influenced their own political practice, and we can see that the desire to improve anarchist organization is the basis for the articulation of both especificismo and platformism. It is their most fundamental commonality. Both express an urge to correct the mistakes of anarchists, mistakes that were born out of real struggle, genuine reflection, and honest analysis [12]. We can say that the two currents share the same conception of anarchism as a collective practice informed by experience.

Still, there are subtle differences which become more obvious in comparing the relatively short “Platform” document, to *Social Anarchism and Organization*, a detailed organizational program in fifteen parts. One significant difference is that the original platformist document does not go into detail about theoretical questions of

anarchist organization. While it does describe a specific union of anarchists emphasizing federalism, tactical unity, etc., it was informed primarily by military actions during an active war [13]. In our own contexts, today, an armed military uprising is not a short-term likelihood. We find ourselves at a different point in the revolutionary struggle, and this is one reason that the *especifismo* current has had such resonance in the anarchist movement internationally. It lays out a theory for militancy that is generally relatable. This is not something overlooked by the anarchists who wrote the platform; it was simply not their concern.

Nevertheless, a century later, and in completely different situations, the Platform continues to serve as one of the most relevant reminders of:

“the importance of the involvement of anarchists in the class struggle, the need for a violent social revolution that overthrows capitalism and the state and that establishes libertarian communism. [It] is also an important contribution on the question of the transition from capitalism to libertarian communism and on the defence of the revolution [...] The Platform advocates an anarchist organisation, at the political level, that acts in the midst of social movements, a social level, and emphasises the role of active minority of the anarchist organisation. Moreover, it makes important contributions [to] the model of organisation of the political level of the anarchists.” (p. 77-78)

Many of the similarities between the two currents have been elaborated on and developed in the 21st century, by militants who are still active. These ties continue to strengthen today.

FAU (Federación Anarquista Uruguaya)

The ideas of *especifismo* are not novel ways of interpreting anarchism [14]. The current is deeply tied to the revolutionary struggle for libertarian socialism. *Especifismo* has a class struggle bias born out of the anarcho-sindicalist tradition in Latin America. FAU, the original source of *especifismo* as we understand it, was formed in 1956 and still exists to this day. In addition to syndicalism, they were also influenced by:

“the expropriator anarchism from the Plata River region. [...] At the end of the 1960s, parallel to the mass organisation, the FAU developed the organisation of its “armed wing”, the People’s Revolutionary Organisation - 33 (Organización Popular Revolucionaria - 33, OPR-33), which realised a series of sabotage actions, economic expropriations, kidnappings of politicians and/ or bosses particularly hated by the people, armed support for strikes and workplace occupations etc.” (p. 79)

Anarchism within class struggle, not outside of it; social revolution wielding transformative popular power, not political revolution that substitutes one regime for another; these are the ideas refined, developed, and defended by the FAU who later:

“abandoned focalism as a paradigm of armed struggle, avoiding militarisation while possessing social insertion in the population [...] [FAU] re-articulated itself and developed its work on the *especifista* model which we advocate today, with three fronts of insertion: union, student, and community.” (p. 79)

Today, social insertion along multiple fronts remains one of *especifismo*’s most influential contributions to anarchism around the world. In addition to giving name to the current, FAU has also contributed to *especifismo* by insisting that anarchism is only emancipatory when it has contact with the struggles of the people. This is true regardless of the tactics we choose to employ.

Bakunin and Malatesta

As has already been mentioned, historically and theoretically speaking, the first influence of *especifismo* is Mikhail Bakunin, followed by Errico Malatesta. These anarchist theorists are not “founders” of the *especifismo* current, but their ideas do serve as its foundation, in particular the Bakuninist concept of two axes of engagement and the Malatestan concept of the specific anarchist organization.

This all goes back to “the activity of the libertarians within the International Workers’ Association (IWA), and which gave body to anarchism” because it was within this organization that two foundational tendencies of the socialist struggle developed, “one centralist and one federalist” (p. 75). The immensely influential anarchist-communist current also traces its roots back to this time [15].

Bakunin envisioned an organization of only the closest, most trusted revolutionaries, capable of acting in ways that a mass movement cannot [16]. This was the beginning of what is known in anarchism as organizational dualism. It allows us to theoretically distinguish the political level from the social level. This is Bakunin’s most essential contribution to *especifismo*, and it is this influence that *especifismo* shares with other revolutionary social anarchist currents around the world.

It was in regard to the political level that Malatesta articulated the concept of a specific organization [17], and it is within a larger tendency of organizational dualism that *especifismo* locates itself. Though they have used different terminology depending on the language and the region, anarchist-communist, platformist, and syndicalist practices have all contributed to the model of organizational dualism that is called *especifismo*.

Russia, Spain, Mexico, and Brazil

The anarchist elements of the Russian Revolution of 1917 and the Spanish Revolution of 1936 are also considered contributions to *especifismo*. This includes the experiences of both peasants and workers [18]. In Russia, as happened during Bakunin's era, authoritarians clashed with libertarians over the need for centralized state authority, this time, run by the Bolshevik Party [19]. But in Spain:

“a social revolution was effectively carried out. A revolution under fire that wanted to reach all sectors, from unjust economic structures to the daily life of the population; from the decrepit notions of hierarchy to the historic inequalities between men and women.” (p. 78)

Anti-capitalist efforts during the Mexican Revolution, including the community-level struggles of Ricardo Flores Magón and the Mexican Liberal Party (PLM), also come up as influences [20]. And in reference to contributions to *especifismo* coming from Brazil, FARJ says that previous generations:

“prepared the conditions that allowed for the full insertion of anarchists in the unions and in social life, with the formation of schools and theatre groups, besides a reasonable written production.” (p. 78)

This preparation, today, also allows for the organized social insertion of anarchists in other parts of the world, through the spread of these ideas and practices.

Conclusion

Social Anarchism and Organisation concludes succinctly saying that this “conception of the historical references of *especifismo* is not dogmatic” (p. 79). We could also add that it is not overly exhaustive. It is never possible to fit everything into an historical account, and in writing this summary, even more from FARJ's history has been omitted. However, in chronicling the influences of a political current, the militants of a specific anarchist organization are not trying to pose as historians or academics. It is more important that the common histories of our revolutionary political tendencies can be shared, better yet that they be made even more shareable.

This is the value of the kind of refined, in-house history presented by the FARJ. It simultaneously serves as an introduction for radicalizing people and a shared baseline for radicalized militants, especially in an organization that is willing to explicitly identify specific historical influences. At first glance, another locally relevant history of the international anarchist movement may seem useless, like just another summary of the same old thing, but when the story of a revolutionary current is produced out of practice and collective action, it serves (on the political level) a more specific organizing function than any popular history book ever could.

ENDNOTES

1. "In the *especifista* model there is necessarily this differentiation between the political and social levels of activity [...] Thus, [the specific anarchist organisation] is an organisation of anarchists that group themselves together at the political and ideological level and that carry out their main activity at the social level, which is broader, aiming to be the ferment of struggle." (p. 70)
2. "[*Especifismo*] refers to a conception of anarchist organisation that has two fundamental axes: organisation and social work/insertion [...] These two axes are based on the classical concepts of differentiated actuation of anarchism in the social and political levels (Bakuninist concept) and specific anarchist organisation (Malatestan concept)." (p. 69)
3. "*Especifismo* advocates an anarchism that, as an ideology, seeks to conceive a model of performance that transforms the society of today into libertarian socialism by means of the social revolution." (p. 70)
4. "As militancy, for us, is something necessary in the struggle for a free and egalitarian society we do not believe that it will always be "cool". If we had to choose between a more effective model of militancy and another more "cool", we would have to opt for effectiveness." (p. 73)
5. "The priorities and responsibilities mean that everyone is not going to be able to do what passes through their head, whenever they want. Each one will have an obligation to the organisation to accomplish that which they undertook and that which was defined as a priority." (p. 72)
6. "There are diverse anarchist organisations that are not *especifista*. Therefore, *especifismo* implies much more than to advocate anarchist organisation." (p. 69)

7. "Lack of commitment, responsibility and self-discipline constitutes a major problem in many anarchist groups and organisations." (p. 73)
8. "For us, anarchism was born among the people and that's where it should be, taking a clear position in favour of the exploited classes that are in permanent conflict in the class struggle. Therefore, when we talk about "where to sow the seeds of anarchism", for us it is clear that it has to be within the class struggle; in the spaces in which the contradictions of capitalism are most evident [...] There are anarchists that do not support this class struggle bias of anarchism and, what is worse, there are those that accuse it of being assistencialist *, or of wanting "to apologise for the poor". Denying the class struggle, most of these anarchists believe that as the classic definition of bourgeois and proletarian classes does not take today's society into account, then one could say that classes no longer exist; or that this would be an anachronistic concept [...] We fundamentally disagree with these positions and believe that, regardless of how we define classes – whether we put more or less emphasis on the economic character etc. – it is undeniable that there are contexts and circumstances in which people suffer more from the effects of capitalism. And it is in these contexts and these circumstances that we want to prioritise our work." (p. 70)
9. "We argue that, through social work, the anarchist organisation should seek social insertion, "the process of influencing social movements through anarchist practice". (p. 70)
10. "[We] believe that social work brings necessary practice to anarchism, which has an immense contribution in the development of the theoretical and ideological line of the organisation [...] Groups and organisations that do not have social work tend to radicalise a discourse that does not have support in practice." (p. 71)
11. "We have broad ideas that start with the ideas of Bakunin and the alliancists in the IWA, go through the conceptions of Malatesta and his practical experiences at the social and political levels, as well as the experiences of Magón and the PLM in the Mexican Revolution. We are also influenced by the

experiences of the anarchists in the Russian Revolution, with emphasis on the Makhnovists in the Ukraine and the organisational reflections made by the Russians in exile, as well as the experiences of the anarchists in the Spanish Revolution around the CNT-FAI. In Brazil, we have influences from anarchist “organisationalism”, highlighting the experiences of the 1918 Anarchist Alliance of Rio de Janeiro and the 1919 (libertarian) Communist Party. Finally, the influences of the FAU, both in their struggle against the dictatorship, as in their activity in fronts with unions, community and student movements.” (p. 79)

12. “We understand anarchism as an ideology, that is, a “set of ideas, motivations, aspirations, values, a structure or system of concepts that have a direct connection with action - that which we call political practice.” (p. 69)
13. “[The Platform] is more a contribution to the discussion of anarchist military action than a document to discuss anarchist organization in all different contexts.” (p. 78)
14. “Currently, *especifismo* is advocated by various Latin American organisations and developed in practice, even if not by this name, in other parts of the world.” (p. 79)
15. “Following the collectivist tradition of the anarchism of Bakunin’s time – which advocated, in the future society, distribution to each according to their work – was born the anarchist communist current – which has since then advocated distribution to each according to their needs.” (p. 76)
16. “The Alliance was an organisation of active minority composed of the “most secure, most dedicated, most intelligent and most energetic members, in a word, by the closest”. It was formed to act secretly in order to address the issues that one could not publicly address and to act as a catalyst in the labour movement. The Alliance defined the relation between the social and political levels [...]” (p. 75)
17. “[...] he called [it] the anarchist party [...] This organisation should act in the so-called “mass movements” of the time and influence them as much as possible [...]” (p. 76).

18. “[...] in southern Ukraine the peasants of Guliai Polie, a village that since the 1905 revolution had had strong anarchist organisation, founded the Peasants Union; which decided to fight for the social revolution independent of the government, seeking self-management of the means of production.” (p. 77)
19. “The [authoritarian elements] were for seizing the state apparatus and moving towards the dictatorship of the (Bolshevik) Party, directed by an all-powerful central committee; the [libertarian elements] for libertarian and self-managed communism in the form of councils of soviets of workers, peasants and the people in arms.” (p. 77)
20. “The PLM became clandestine and organised more than 40 armed resistance groups throughout Mexico and also had indigenous members, known for their struggle for community rights and against capitalist property.” (p. 77)

This text along with “A Companion to the English Translation of *Social Anarchism and Organisation*” and “How do you say especificismo in English?” are supplemental materials for what is called Militant Kindergarten. It is a time when we return to study an important influence in the English-language understanding of especificismo.

Social Anarchism and Organization by the Anarchist Federation of Rio de Janeiro (FARJ) is like an outpost deep in the forest. It is a small shack full of tools, supplies, and instruction manuals. Through repeated visits, from many different starting points, we have continued to return to this station in the woods. Together, we have learned to orient ourselves and dependably find it. Yet, its contents cannot just be taken all the way back through the forest to our own homes, workplaces, and communities. The Center for Especificismo Studies is the name for the trail that takes us to the hidden base camp, and Militant Kindergarten is the name we give to our expeditions.