

Two writings and many concordances

*References:

-Article (by Massimo Passamani), *La parola e la cosa: A proposito di progetto rivoluzionario*, in "I giorni e le notti: rivista anarchica", n. 11, lug. 2020;

-*Riflessioni in merito al substrato anarchico contemporaneo informale, insurrezionale e internazionalista (per un nuovo manifesto anarchico)*.

Starting from different assumptions, or different perspective on reading the past and the future of the revolutionary movement, as well as the social in which it has acted and act in our contemporaneity, very important concordances emerge between the two writings, including: **1)** Past models, which have guided the revolutionary action until recently, are no longer needed today, as unsuitable to face the new reality of the State-capital; **2)** the restructuring of the prevailing system of capitalism and the state, carried forward in the last decades, has unexpectedly and radically changed all the social structures in every corner of the planet, making the society of domination irreversible as the material conditions of life have been removed from the subordinate social, and by that even those values that governed the multiple communities, values that founded the autonomy of each of them, have been zeroed out or reduced to a minimum; **3)** hence the disappearance of "class" social referents which, according to the readings of the past, fed the revolutionary movements and represented the fulcrum on which to build the struggle for the existing and at the same time "illustrated" the path on which to build the liberated future; **4)** consequence of the restructuring that has taken place and of the current disorientation even of contemporary anarchism is the absence of a revolutionary project (model, paradigm) valid for both attack and defense, capable of shattering the walls built at various levels by capital- State and project the struggle towards the possibility of self-determined life of individuals and communities.

considering this situation, the reflections of the two interventions also seem to agree on some other assumptions and conclusions **5)** the anarchist universe in its various insurrectionalist facets is the one that in recent times has shown an incredible lucidity and vivacity not only in grasping even the most hidden aspects of the change that has taken place, but it's the one that, from individuals and groups, has manifested the ability to intervene unmatched in many places on the planet, although besieged by the prevailing system, highlighting how from the analysis of reality one can grasp the assets and the points that can and must be hit; **6)** nevertheless, it's also evident that lucidity and vivacity are not sufficient to contrast and therefore destroy the existing, so everyone's effort is essential to be able to conceive an anarchist project actualized to the reality of the current domination, shared by as many situations in the movement as possible. It is evident that no single group nor any single comrade are capable of elaborating this project; and in fact not only does it not exist but it is also far from being even only in someone's mind.

hence the need for a collective effort, therefore to direct energies to an international debate so that at least the outline of a project is achieved. Meanwhile, the different angles of interpretation from which the two documents originated seem to agree on another fundamental point as well; the need to start from the territory in which each situation operates, be rooted in it and at the same time build that international network of contacts, relationships, exchange of experiences, readings, projects and struggles in which one participates or begins, in order not only to escape isolation and immediate repression by the established powers, but to dramatically enlarge those possible ruptures that can be realized in terms of overthrowing the canons of oppression and exploitation in progress.

Yet, despite the many convergences, there are also points in the two reflections/proposals, which seem distant and therefore deserve both further clarification and a collective debate so that the different possible instances and views are evaluated, which even in their differences they can coexist.

From this perspective, for example, it is necessary to deepen or better clarify the concept of "touching the ground" and the consequent one, according to which the criticism of the form of

"direct democracy experiences that are really worth criticizing" ... "can't stop at the form (unanimity against majority, revocable delegates against permanent spokespersons, etc.) but go down to the level of contents: which are not so much the speeches, but the practices with which life is transformed, what is put in common besides words, the relationship between the self-organization of violence and real dialogue, the social spheres that are touched and overwhelmed by the struggle. In short, the degree of irreversibility achieved by a movement".

The problem is not of little importance, because if on the one hand there is agreement on the need for anarchist situations to take root in the territory, that is, to study it and get to know the social composition and "prevailing mentality" included, on the other there is no some certainty, even if it is possible to mobilize the territory in riots (for the most disparate reasons), that there is then the generalized consensus (here understood above all in its meaning of self-determined practices of struggle and life) for the construction of irreversible realities for recovery by the system.

After all, ours are only attempts, even if our activities are supported by the best revolutionary projects.

Certainly as anarchists we practice always and in any case, where possible, and even more in the dynamics projected to generalized insurrection, as much communism as possible, but the full possession of the territory, however small at the moment, requires that that portion of the population that inhabits it, in large or small quantities, acquires in turn the right tension and the necessary consciousness.

The indispensable support for this to happen in the shortest possible time span comes from the extension of the riot and its international expansion.

Which again brings us back to the indispensable construction of more or less stable relations between the different insurrectionist situations, which must support each other, even if distant.

From this consideration it seems to me very valid to continue to argue that the immediate task, however, is not so much for us anarchists to destroy and build at the same time, because with this impulse we could destroy from the present only what we can immediately build rather, immediately destroy as much as we can of the structures and infrastructures present in the territory, precisely to make it reversible and therefore create the concrete space, as a moment and "ground under your feet", to affirm at the highest levels those values, those relationships, that egalitarian management of already implicit methodologically and organizationally in the struggle. The debate, however, is just starting.

