

## **The July Document**

**from Militant Kindergarten**

**by the Center for Especificismo Studies**

“We seek to create proper concepts, aiming to give original character to the theory that we wanted to create, and in this endeavor, we think we have been very successful as we, in our view, construct and formalize a coherent theory, articulating classical and contemporary theories, as well as our own conceptions. We desired to build this discussion and its formalization in a collective manner. Organizational objectives must be pursued in the midst of struggle. We believe that in struggling for reforms, social movements do not become reformists – those who understand the reforms as an end. Even with the struggle for reforms, social movements can sustain a revolutionary practice and be against reformism.”



While these words originally come from Parts 1-7 of *Social Anarchism and Organization* by the FARJ, this edited and abridged version represents our organizational understanding of this text which has been essential to the development of the Center for Especificismo Studies and the continuation of Militant Kindergarten. We have composed, numbered, and subtitled the following paragraphs by adapting our “Reading Guide” without page numbers or ellipsis to make for a smoother reading:

## 24. THE DEBATE ABOUT ORGANIZATION

We wanted to reach more conclusive positions. It was becoming increasingly necessary to further the debate and to formalize it, spreading this knowledge both internally and externally. Our actions sought to give each militant of our organization the structure, space, and necessary support so that this debate would be able to take place in the most desirable way possible. We desired to develop a proper theory that was not simply a repetition of other theories developed in other places and at other times. We seek to create proper concepts, aiming to give original character to the theory that we wanted to create, and in this endeavor, we think we have been very successful as we, in our view, construct and formalize a coherent theory, articulating classical and contemporary theories, as well as our own conceptions. We desired to build this discussion and its formalization in a collective manner. It is not enough for us that one or another comrade writes all the theory of the organization and that others simply observe and follow their positions.

## 25. ANARCHISM

We understand anarchism as an ideology that provides orientation for action to replace capitalism, the state, and its institutions with libertarian socialism – a system based on self-management and federalism – without any scientific or prophetic pretensions. Anarchism is conscious action with the objective of imprinting the desire for social transformation on society.

## 26. HISTORY AND CONTEXT

In certain contexts, anarchism assumed certain characteristics that retreated from the ideological character, transforming it into an abstract concept which became merely a form of critical observation of society. Thought of from this perspective anarchism ceases to be a tool of the exploited in their struggle for emancipation and functions as a hobby, a curiosity, a theme for intellectual debate, an academic niche, an identity, a group of friends, etc. For us, this view seriously threatens the very meaning of anarchism.

## 27. SOCIAL VS. LIFESTYLE ANARCHISM

There is today a social anarchism returning to struggles with the objective of social transformation, and a lifestyle anarchism that renounces the proposal for social transformation and involvement in the social struggles of our time. We advocate that anarchism recaptures its original ideological character, or as we previously defined it, a “system of concepts that has a direct connection with action, [...] of political practice”. For us social anarchism is a type of anarchism that, as an ideology, seeks to be a tool of social movements and the popular organization with the objective of overthrowing capitalism and the state and of building libertarian socialism – self-managed and federalist.

## 28. EXPLOITED CLASSES

Accepting this classification, and being conscious of its limitations, we define the category of exploited classes as the peripheral areas that are dominated by the centre. Hence the need for all the struggles of the exploited classes to have a revolutionary perspective, in order that they do not seek simply to make parts of the peripheral areas constituted into new centers.

## 29. AUTHORITARIAN VS. LIBERTARIAN

Authoritarians, including some who call themselves anarchists, think of the centre as a means, and orientate their politics towards it. For them, the centre – considering this to be the state, the party, the army, the position of control – is an instrument for the emancipation of society. Libertarians do not think of the centre as a means, and struggle permanently against it, building their revolutionary model and their strategy of struggle in the direction of all the peripheries. Anarchism has to be in permanent contact with the peripheries in order to seek out its project of social transformation. Anarchists stimulate social movements in the periphery from the grassroots and seek to build a popular organization in order to combat – in solidarity – the existing order and create a new society that would be based on equality and freedom, and in which classes would no longer make sense. That is, in its activity in the class struggle anarchism considers as elements of the exploited classes traditional communities, peasants, unemployed, underemployed, homeless, and other categories frequently overlooked by the authoritarians.

## 30. THE SOCIAL VECTOR OF ANARCHISM

The emergence of what we call the “social vector of anarchism” began at the beginning of the 1890s, driven by a growth in the social insertion of anarchism in the unions, which culminated in the second decade of the twentieth century. We call the social vector of anarchism those popular movements that have a significant anarchist influence – primarily with regard to their practical aspects – irrespective of the sectors in which they occur. These mobilisations, fruits of the class struggle, are not anarchist as they are organized around questions of specific demands. The mobilisations constituted in the social vector of anarchism are made within the social movements, considered by us as preferred spaces for social work and accumulation, and not as a mass to be directed.

### 31. REVOLUTIONARY GYMNASTICS

The means of struggle made by the mobilization around short-term issues serves as “revolutionary gymnastics”, which prepares the proletariat for the social revolution. Anarchism was able to present itself as an ideological tool of struggle.

### 32. THE STRIKE MOVEMENT

This whole conjuncture of mobilization occurred with ample influence of the anarchists, who tried to carry out their propaganda in the unions; not circumscribing these within the anarchist ideology – the unions were for the workers and not for anarchist workers – but utilizing them for the propagation of their ideas. There was even a large cultural movement that worked together with the union mobilisations and was very important: rationalist schools inspired by the principles of (Francisco) Ferrer y Guardia, social centers, workers theatre and other initiatives that were fundamental in forging a class culture, an object of union in times of struggle. There was also, at this ascendent juncture of struggle, the formation of two political and ideologically anarchist organizations which sought to work with the union movement. The first of these was the Anarchist Alliance of Rio de Janeiro (*Aliança Anarquista do Rio de Janeiro*), founded in 1918 by the need for an anarchist organization for working within the unions, and which was important for the 1918 insurrection. However, with the repression that occurred the Alliance was disbanded, returning to organize in the first Communist Party (of libertarian inspiration) founded in 1919. Alliance and the Communist Party grouped together members of a sector of anarchism which is called “organizationalist” and which understood as necessary the distinction between levels of action – the political level, ideologically anarchist, and the social level, of union mobilisations. These militants understood as necessary the existence of specific anarchist organizations to act together with trade unions. It is important to emphasize that, at this time, anarchists already had a preoccupation with their specific organization.

### 33. DEMOBILIZATION

The context of anarchism was marked, primarily, by the confusion between different levels of activity. Malatesta argued for the need for two levels of activity: one politically anarchist, and the other social, within the union, which would be the means of insertion. On one side, a part of the anarchists defended the need for specifically anarchist organization, which should seek social insertion in the unions. On the other, anarchists who had understood militancy within the unions as their only task. Unionism, which was the social vector, the medium of action that should lead to an end – expressed by the social revolution and the constitution of libertarian socialism – ended up becoming the end itself for many militants. The social vector of anarchism was on an upward curve until the beginning of the 1920s when the crisis of anarchism, parallel to unionism itself, began to develop. Culminating in the 1930s in their demobilization and in the loss of this social vector.

### 34. SOCIAL AND POLITICAL LEVEL CRISIS

The context of the crisis of unionism eventually extended to anarchism itself. So, a crisis at the social level also condemned the political level since there was no real difference between the two at the time. Without anarchist organizations, when the social level – or a sector of it – enters into crisis, the anarchists are not able to find another space for social insertion.

### 35. IDEAL PERES

The FARJ claims to continue the militancy of Ideal Peres and the work that originated from his history of struggle. In 2002 we initiated a study group in order to verify the possibility for the construction of an anarchist organization in Rio de Janeiro, the result of which was the foundation of the FARJ on 30th of August 2003. For us, there is a direct link between the militancy of Ideal Peres, the construction of the CEL, its functioning, the change of name to CELIP and the

subsequent foundation of the FARJ. Ideal Peres was born in 1925 and began his militancy in that context of crisis, when the social vector of anarchism had already been lost. In the 1970s, after prison, Ideal organized in his house a study group that had as its goal to bring in youth interested in anarchism and, amongst other things, to put them in touch with former militants and establish links with other anarchists in Brazil. This study group would constitute the nucleus of the Libertarian Study Circle (Círculo de Estudos Libertários - CEL). With the death of Ideal Peres in August 1995 the CEL decided to honor him by modifying its name to the Ideal Peres Libertarian Study Circle (Círculo de Estudos Libertários Ideal Peres - CELIP).

### 36. ESPECIFISMO ANARCHISM

For us, the path to the recovery of the social vector passes, necessarily, through a specifically organized anarchism that differentiates the levels of activity and is present in the class struggle. All of our actual reflection aims to think of a strategic model of organization that enables a recovery of the social vector, in that this points to our objective of overcoming capitalism, the state and for the establishment of libertarian socialism. What we seek, in this context, is only a station in the struggle. Unlike the early twentieth century, when the preferred terrain of class struggle was the unions, we now consider that unionism can be a means of insertion, but that there are others far more important. Broadly understood, the existence today of particularly exploited classes permits the social work and insertion of anarchists: the unemployed, peasants, landless, homeless etc. For us, to be well-organized at the political (ideological) level will allow us to find the best path to bring back this social vector of anarchism, be it where it may.

### 37. CAPITALISM

As we emphasized earlier, the wage-laborer – classic object of analysis in the socialist theses of the nineteenth century – for us, constitutes today only one of the categories of the exploited classes. On one hand, that which is called the “bourgeoisie” and which we will treat in this



text as “capitalists”, holders of private ownership of the means of production, who contract workers by means of wage-labour. On the other, that which is called the “proletariat”, and which we will treat in this text as “workers” who, possessing nothing more than their labour power, have to sell it in exchange for a wage. Besides this, unemployment means that when the capitalists go to the market they encounter workers in abundance, as there is a greater supply of workers than there is a demand.

### 38. A COMPLEX MARKET SYSTEM

As a system that reproduces injustice capitalism separates manual and intellectual labour. This separation is the result of inheritance and also of education since there is different education for the rich and the poor.

### 39. GLOBAL EXPLOITATION

Motivated by the logic of profit, private enterprises are responsible for transferring the entire hierarchy of classes to the relationship between people and the environment. In general terms, economic globalization is characterized by an integration, on a global scale, of the processes of production, distribution, and exchange. Production is carried out in several countries, goods are imported and exported in enormous quantities and over long distances. This system, if it on the one hand leaves unemployed in areas with optimal conditions, on the other allows for the extortion that causes precarity to be accepted and threatens the organization of workers who are increasingly more controlled and pushed to the periphery.

### 40. HISTORY OF THE STATE

The state has always been an instrument for perpetuating inequality and a liberty-extermimating element, whatever the existing mode of production. We consider the state the set of political powers of a

nation, which takes shape by means of “political, legislative, judicial, military and financial institutions etc.”; and, in this way, the state is broader than the government. The state has been characterized by a “double game” of promising the rich to protect them from the poor and promising the poor to protect them from the rich. After the Industrial Revolution arose the so-called “social question”, which obliged states to develop assistance plans in order to minimize the impacts of capital on labour. In the late nineteenth century arose, as an alternative to liberalism, a more interventionist conception of the state which, if on the one hand sought to create policies of “social welfare”, on the other implemented methods to contain the advancement of socialist initiatives, already quite strong at the time.

#### 41. THE STATE AND CLASS RELATIONS

A state that clearly defends the position of the capitalists could intensify class struggle, so there is nothing better, from the capitalists’ point of view, than to give it an aspect of neutrality. Nevertheless, one should bear in mind that the state, as a strong pillar of capitalism, seeks to sustain it and, if capitalism is a system of exploitation and domination, the state cannot do anything else but sustain the class relations that exist in its midst. In this way the state defends the capitalists to the detriment of the worker. As it has a monopoly on the use of violence in society, it always uses it to enforce the laws, and as laws were made in order that the privileges of capitalist society could be maintained, then repression and state control are always to sustain “order”. That is, to maintain the privileges of capitalism and keep the ruling class in domination. Today the state has two fundamental objectives: the first of them, ensuring the conditions for the production and reproduction of capitalism; and the second, to ensure its legitimacy and control. For this reason, the state today is a strong supporting pillar of capitalism. The state extrapolates the political ambit and functions as an economic agent of capitalism, working to prevent or minimize the role of its crises or of the falls in its profit rates.

## 42. AUTHORITARIAN SOCIALISTS

Contrary to what the authoritarian socialists believed (and still believe), the state is not a neutral organism that can work at the service of the capitalists or of the workers. If anarchists have written so much about the state it is justifiably because the critique of capitalism was consensus between libertarians and authoritarians – the divergence was around the state. The authoritarians supported the capture of the state and the dictatorship of the proletariat as an intermediate stage – which was falsely called socialism – between capitalism and communism. The position of the libertarians which we hold today is that for the construction of socialism the state must be destroyed, together with capitalism, by means of the social revolution. Any state creates relations of domination, exploitation, violence, wars, massacres, and torture under the pretext of protecting the “citizen”.

## 43. REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY

By delegating our right to do politics to a class of politicians that enter the state in order to represent us we are giving a mandate, without any control, to someone that makes decisions for us: there is an inevitable division between the class that does politics and the classes that follow. “Politicians” represent the hierarchy and separation between leaders and led, within and outside of their own parties. The more that the politicians are responsible for politics, the less the people engage in politics and the more they remain alienated and distant from the making of decisions. This, obviously, condemns the people to a position of spectator and not that of “master of oneself”.

## 44. SPECIFIC CRITIQUES TODAY

If we can apply these critiques to the state today, we must know that our reality is particular, and that the direction of the world economy has had profound influence over the form of state with which we live. This critique of the state is not linked to one or other form of state,

but to all its forms. So, any project of social transformation that points to the social revolution and libertarian socialism must have the end of capitalism as well as the state as an objective. Although we hold that the state is one of the strongest pillars of capitalism, we do not believe that with the end of capitalism the state would, necessarily, cease to exist.

## 45. SOCIAL REVOLUTION

The objective of the social revolution is to destroy the society of exploitation and domination. Libertarian socialism is that which gives constructive meaning to the social revolution. Together, the destruction – as a concept of negation – and the construction – as a concept of proposition – constitute the possible and effective social transformation we propose. The social revolution is one of the possible outcomes of the class struggle and consists of the violent alteration of the established social order and is considered by us the only way to put an end to domination and exploitation. It differs from the political revolutions of the Jacobins and Leninists by supporting the alteration of the “order” not just with a political change, through the state, exchanging one directing minority for another. Unlike political revolution, social revolution is accomplished by the people of the cities and countryside who bring the class struggle and its correlation of forces with capitalism and the state to the limit, by means of popular organization. Social revolution occurs when the social force developed in the heart of the popular organization is greater than that of capitalism and the state and, put into practice, implants structures that support self-management and federalism, wiping out private property and the state and giving rise to a society of complete freedom and equality. So, we do not understand the social revolution as simple evolution nor as an obligatory consequence of the contradictions of capitalism, but as an episode that marks the rupture and is determined by the will of the organized exploited classes. The construction of the popular organization will develop the spirit of struggle and organization in the exploited classes, seeking the accumulation of

social force and incorporating within it the means to struggle in accordance with the society that we wish to build.

#### 46. VIOLENCE

The violent action of the social revolution must, at the same time as the expropriation of the capitalists, immediately destroy the state, giving place to self-managed and federated structures, tried, and tested within the popular organization. So, the authoritarian conception of “socialism” as an interim period in which a dictatorship is established within the state is, for us, nothing but another way to continue the exploitation of the people and must be rejected absolutely, under any circumstance.

#### 47. LIBERTARIAN SOCIALISM

As the social revolution must not be made only by the anarchists, it is important that we be fully inserted in the processes of class struggle in order to be able to orient the revolution towards libertarian socialism. Libertarian socialism is on the one hand socialism, a system based on social, political, and economic equality, and on the other hand, freedom. So, a project for a future society that promotes equality and freedom can only be, for us, libertarian socialism, which takes shape in the practices of self-management and federalism. A culture of self-management and federalism should already be well developed in the class struggles so that the people, at the revolutionary moment, do not allow themselves to be oppressed by authoritarian opportunists; and this will be through class-based practices of autonomy, combativeness, direct action, and direct democracy. The more these values exist in the popular organization, the less will be the possibility of constituting new tyrannies. When we treat our conception of social revolution, or even when we think of a possible future society, we want to make clear that we do not seek to determine beforehand, absolutely, how the revolutionary process or even libertarian socialism will occur. We know that there is no way to predict when this transformation will take place, and so any reflections must always consider this aspect of

strategic projection of future possibilities from the point of possibilities, of references, and not of absolute certainties.

#### 48. SELF-MANAGED AND FEDERALIST

Contemporary interpretations of self-management and federalism separate the first as the economic and the second as the political system of libertarian socialism. We do not understand the separation between the economic and the political in this way when it comes to self-management and federalism. In the new society all those that are able to would need to work, there no longer being unemployment, and the work would be able to be performed in accordance with personal ability and disposition. People will no longer be obliged to accept anything under threat of experiencing want and not attaining their minimum living conditions. Children, the elderly and those unable to work will be assured a dignified life without deprivation, all their needs being met. For the most tedious tasks or those perceived as unpleasant, in some cases, there could be rotations or alternations. Even in the case of the carrying out of production, where the co-ordination of some specialists is needed, rotations in function and a commitment to the training of other workers with similar skills will also be necessary for more complex tasks. In a system of collective ownership, rights, responsibilities, wages, and wealth no longer have a relation with private property and the old class relations, based on private property, must also disappear. Libertarian socialism is, so, a classless society. The ruling class will no longer exist, and the whole system of inequality, domination and exploitation will have disappeared. No one would effectively be the owner and the means of production belong to the collectivity as a whole, or all the members of the collectivity will be owners of a portion of the means of production, in exactly the same proportions as the others.

#### 49. CITY AND COUNTRY

In the case of the persistence of the individual property of the peasants, of those that work the land themselves, it would be more appropriate

to understand this situation not as property, but as possession. So, property would always be collective, and possession individual. Possession because the value of the land would be in its use, and not trade. And relations with this would be guided by the needs of the producer and no longer that of the market. Such a situation alters everything, so it is necessary to establish a new category.

## 50. WORKERS' AND CONSUMERS' COUNCILS

The economy of libertarian socialism is conducted by workers and consumers. The workers create the social product, and the consumers enjoy it. In these two functions, mediated by distribution, the people are responsible for economic and political life, having to decide what to produce, and the consumers what to consume. The local structures of libertarian socialism in which workers and consumers organize themselves are the workers' and consumers' councils. Profit will no longer be the imperative in the relations of production. Councils are social bodies, vehicles through which the people express their political and economic preferences and exercise self-management and federalism. In them daily political and economic activities are decided and carried out. The workers' council organizes production and the consumers' council organizes consumption.

## 51. INTELLECTUAL AND MANUAL LABOR

Many tasks, primarily those involving manual labour are completely unpleasant, harsh, and alienating, and it is not fair that some workers are fully occupied with them, while others are dedicated to performing enjoyable, pleasurable, stimulating, and intellectual tasks. If this happens then certainly the class system will be rebuilt, no longer based on private property, but on a class of intellectuals that will command, and another of manual workers that will execute the commands. Seeking to end this separation the workers' councils could have a balanced set of tasks for each worker, which would be equivalent for all. So, each worker will be responsible for some pleasant and

stimulating tasks, that involve intellectual work, and other harsher and more alienating tasks, that involve manual labour.

## 52. FUNCTIONING COLLECTIVISM

The goal in libertarian socialist remuneration is that it be guided by the communist principle “from each according to their ability, to each according to their need”. However, we understand that to implement this principle libertarian socialism should already be in full function, with production in abundance. Until this is possible, remuneration can be done according to work, or effort – this being understood as personal sacrifice for the collective benefit. So, it would be a case of functioning collectivism, using the maxim “from each according to their ability, to each according to their labour”, and, at the moment in which it becomes possible apply the communist principle, giving “to each according to their need”.

## 53. TECHNOLOGY

Unlike some libertarian tendencies which believe that technology contains in itself the germ of domination, we believe that without it there is no possibility for the development of libertarian socialism. With the advent of technology and it being used in favor of labour, not capital, there would surely be a gain in productivity and consequently a significant reduction in the labour time of people, who could use this time for other activities. It is worth emphasizing that our ecological proposals differ radically from “conservationism” and “primitivism”. From the former, because this means the maintenance of class society and the complete commodification of nature. From the latter, because we consider the “anti-civilization” proposal a complete absurdity, seeking a romantic return to a distant past or, even worse, a kind of suicide of all humanity and a negation of all our contributions to the maintenance and well-being of nature. Ecological consciousness should be developed from the time of struggles that precede the revolutionary rupture and in the future society itself. Human beings differ from other natural elements and other species by establishing



social relations with everything surrounding them, because they possess the capacity to think about themselves, to make theories about reality, and with these aptitudes have managed to drastically modify the environmental setting that is their surroundings.

#### 54. SELF-MANAGED FEDERALISM

With the use of technology in favor of workers and its development; with the end of capitalist exploitation and the fruits of labour going completely to the workers; with full employment in place workers will have more time that could be spent in three ways. First, with the natural loss of productivity that the balanced set of tasks will cause, seeing that it will “de-specialize” labour a bit. Second, with political decisions, which will demand time for discussions and deliberations that would have to be made in the self-managed workplace and community. Finally, with the remaining time – and we think that with these changes time off will be much greater than that of today – everyone will be able to choose what to do: rest, leisure, education, culture etc. Both worker and consumer councils would use self-management as a form of management and decision-making, both in the workplaces and in the communities. We must bear in mind that the decision-making process is a means and not an end in itself and, so, we also have to concern ourselves with agility in this process. Clearly, consensus should not be used in the majority of decisions, since it is very inefficient – especially if we think about decisions on a large scale – besides giving a lot of power to isolated agents that could block consensus or have a lot of impact on a decision in which they are a minority. Increasingly, society should develop its culture in a libertarian direction, and this should not only happen at the moment of the social revolution and after it; but already at the moment of struggle, of the construction and the development of the popular organization. There no longer being the separation between those that do politics and those that don’t – since under libertarian socialism it would be the members of society themselves that would realize politics on a daily basis.

## 55. RESISTANCE

Capitalism and the state exert oppression over other political forces that constitute resistance to them. So, in order to attain our objectives, we advocate active and articulated resistance which seeks, in organization, the permanent increase of social force. For the construction of this resistance, it is necessary to align with those that agree with our proposal for social transformation. There is no way of thinking about this necessary transformation without organization and the progressive growth of social force. For us, the social transformation we want to take place passes, necessarily, through the construction of the popular organization, through the progressive increase in its social force until the moment at which it would be possible to overthrow capitalism and the state with social revolution and open the way to libertarian socialism. Furthermore, we argue that the popular organization must be accompanied by a parallel development of the specific anarchist organization, which should influence it, giving it the desired character.

## 56. STATUS QUO ORDER

Disorganization, poor organization, and isolation, in fact, end up supporting capitalism and the state – seeing as though they do not allow for the construction of the necessary social force. By not taking part, in an appropriate manner, in the relation of force or the permanent conflict of society you end up reproducing “order”. Disorganization and poor organization are reproduced on the social level – of social movements, in which one should build and develop the popular organization – with the difficulty of accumulating social force, causing the natural spontaneity of this level not to manage to carry out the set of desired social transformations. Isolation and individualism make it so that neither the political nor social levels exist in a desirable manner, articulating neither the popular nor anarchist organization. We must think of ways and means for the popular organization such that it can overthrow capitalism and the state, and, by means of the social revolution build libertarian socialism – its objective. At the same time, we must think of ways and means for the

specific anarchist organization such that this can build the popular organization and influence it, giving to it the desired character and arriving at libertarian socialism by means of the social revolution – its objective.

## 57. SOCIAL FORCE

We believe that every individual, as the social agent that they are, naturally possesses a social force, which is the energy that can be applied in order to achieve their objectives. This force varies from one person to another and even in the same person over a period of time. To achieve their objectives, individuals frequently make use of instruments that can increase their social force. Organization that takes the form of free association is indispensable to our project of social transformation because, when individuals work together, their social force is not simply the sum of individual forces, but much more than this. Organization can happen in an authoritarian way, by means of domination, or in a libertarian way, by means of free association. So, we can conclude that to be able to carry out our project of social transformation association is fundamental because it is through it, and only through it, that we will be able to accumulate the social force necessary to overthrow capitalism and the state. An increase of social force can be achieved with various instruments, but primarily the organization of the exploited classes with the greatest number of people possible and a good level of organization – which necessarily implies self-discipline, commitment, and responsibility. In order to differentiate the discipline much preached by the authoritarians from the discipline that we advocate, we choose to use the term self-discipline, it being for us, together with commitment and responsibility, indispensable for the construction of an anti-authoritarian organization that aims to increase its social force. This self-discipline, in our view, is less in the popular organization and greater in the specific anarchist organization, varying according to the context. In periods of greater social turbulence, the need for this self-discipline increases. In times of ebb, it can be smaller. For this the specific organization must constitute itself as an organization of active

anarchist minority with a high level of self-discipline, commitment, and responsibility.

## 58. ORGANIZATION AS CONVERGENCE

We advocate a model for the creation and development of what we call the popular organization. It is undeniable that there is a latent social force in the exploited classes, but we understand that it is only through organization that this force can leave the camp of possibilities and become a real social force. It will be the permanent increase of the social force of the organization of the exploited classes that will be able to provide the desired social transformation. We understand the popular organization as the result of a process of convergence of diverse social organizations and different grassroots movements, which are fruit of the class struggle. For this reason, we believe that we should favor all kinds of organizations and movements of this type, understanding this support as the consequence of our most fundamental ideas. When the organization has a class character this stimulates and empowers the class struggle. In this way the popular organization is built from the bottom up, from the “periphery to the centre”, and outside of the power centers of the current system. Authoritarians have treated the mass movements from a hierarchical perspective, seeking to dominate them.

## 59. NECESSITY NOT IDEOLOGY

We believe that social movements should not fit and lock themselves within an ideology, whatever it may be. We do not believe in anarchist, Marxist, or social democratic social movements, or those of any other specific ideology. For us, an anarchist social movement, or one of any other ideology, would only tend to split the class of the exploited, or even those that are interested in struggling for a particular cause. That is, the force that must drive the creation and the development of social movements is necessity, and not ideology. Although we believe that social movements should not be made to fit within anarchism, we think that anarchism must, as far as possible, be spread within social

movements. Social movements are fruit of a tripod comprised of necessity, will, and organization. The social movements which we advocate are not and should not be anarchist but, rather, are fertile ground for anarchism.

## 60. AUTONOMY IN MOVEMENTS

Political parties want to lead and direct the social movements, thinking themselves superior to them and judging themselves to be the enlightened that will bring consciousness to the exploited classes. Often their members are intellectuals that want to know, better than the people themselves, what is best for them. Other organizations that seek control, such as churches and bureaucratic unions, also do not help social movements. Social movements should not be linked to politicians or to any sector of the state because we know that when they come wanting to help, in the vast majority of cases they are looking for a “base” for their party-political interests, or seeking to calm movements, establishing their dialogues with institutions of the state. So, those who want to lead, to order or to cause such that the social movements serve their own goals should not have influence over them, since they do not struggle for the collective good of the movements but use the maxim that serving yourself is the best way to serve others. There is no problem with people that support social movements not being in exactly the same conditions as the other militants. So, we consider it just that employed people support the struggle of unemployed workers, that people who have housing support the struggle of the homeless, and so on. Furthermore, when we talk of autonomy, we must keep in mind that autonomy, for us, does not mean the absence of ideological struggle or even a lack of organization. When you encourage “non-ideology”, frequent spontaneity; when you renounce the project and the revolutionary program – often calling this autonomy – you open spaces and leave open terrain for the ruling class, the bureaucrats and the authoritarians that will occupy these spaces.

## 61. COMBATIVE MOVEMENTS

An important feature of social movements is their combativeness. By claiming that they must be combative we wish to say that social movements must establish their conquests by imposing their social force, and not depend on favors or good deeds from any sectors of society, including the state. Combativeness is characterized by a posture of defense of class struggle outside the state. Combative social movements do not fight in order to have power in the state or in their institutional structures of power. They are always organized outside the state, advocating the return of political power to the people. We also support direct action as a form of political action as opposed to representative democracy. However, there are those who defend popular power as the support of vanguards detached from the base, hierarchy, authoritarian parties, claims to the state and bureaucracies of various kinds. When popular power signifies this second model, then we are in complete disagreement. The struggle for emancipation must be done strategically, making direct action more or less violent conforming to the demands of circumstance. When it needs to be violent it must always be understood as a response, as self-defense in relation to the system of domination and exploitation in which we live.

## 62. DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENTS

Direct democracy takes place in social movements when all those who are involved in them participate effectively in the process of decision-making. Even the leaders and assumed functions are temporary, rotating, and recallable.

## 63. MILITANT CONDUCT

As there is no complete knowledge it is the process of exchange between the militants which allows for an education, in which there is no teacher and student; all are teachers and students. Everyone learns and everyone teaches. In this way occurs the construction of an

education that respects people's culture and empowers militants through dialogues, debates, exchanges of experiences. Class solidarity occurs through the association of one person with another to form a social movement, or even of one social movement to another in pursuit of building the popular organization and the overcoming of capitalism and the state. When they are guided by the interests of class, social movements are internationalist. In this model of social movement there is a necessity for militant conduct with ethics and responsibility. Ethics, which guides correct militant conduct, is grounded on principles that are opposed to capitalism and the state and which supports co-operation, solidarity, and mutual aid. It also guides militant behavior which operates without harming others, which encourages support, not allowing postures aimed at division or unfair infighting. Responsibility, a principle that opposes the values of capitalism, encourages the militant of the social movements to have initiative, that they assume responsibilities and fulfil them – this will prevent that a few are overloaded with many tasks – that they have attitudes consistent with the fighting spirit and that they contribute in the best way to the social movements.

#### 64. SHORT, MEDIUM, AND LONG-TERM

Organizational objectives must be pursued in the midst of struggle. Seeking to permanently increase the radicalization and social force of the popular organization, we understand it to be possible to reach the social revolution and so constitute libertarian socialism. With a long-term perspective, movements have a greater ability for conquest, seeing as though the more distant the objectives, the greater the conquests – the first conquests not being the end of the struggle. The short-term gains, so-called reforms, when conquered by social movements, will serve as ways to lessen the suffering of those who struggle and at the same time will teach the lessons of organization and struggle. We believe that in struggling for reforms, social movements do not become reformists – those who understand the reforms as an end. Even with the struggle for reforms, social movements can sustain a revolutionary practice and be against reformism.