

**GRUPPI ANARCHICI FEDERATI
/G.A.F./ EDIZIONI DEL C.D.A./**

AN ANARCHIST PROGRAMME



INTRODUCTION

Who are the GAF? They are the smallest and youngest of the three national federations of Italian anarchist movement (the other two are FAI and GIA), formed at the end of 1965. Several months previously there had been a split in the FAI (hitherto the only national federation), giving rise to the GIA. Some autonomous groups of young libertarians, who had already collaborated together and had many ideas in common, formed a federation of their own – the Federated Young Anarchists Groups (GGAF). which subsequently became the Federated Anarchist Groups (GAF) in 1969.

Why this translation (into English, Spanish and French)? Firstly, to make ourselves known at an international level as a federation, to acquaint others with our analyses and interpretation of anarchism and with our ideas of organization. Secondly, by our example, to stimulate other anarchist and libertarian federations and organizations to do the same thing. Despite our essential internationalism, information and ideas circulate too little and with too much difficulty at an international level, precisely at a time when everything we are fighting against is taking on an increasingly international aspect.

Turin, May 1st, 1977

What follows is not THE anarchist program but ONE anarchist program, that of the Federated Anarchist Groups (GAF) approved by their assembly of March 20-21, 1976.

This program is the result of ten years of joint experiences and discussions and is simply the schematically organized expression of ONE way of interpreting anarchism in Italy today and contemporary socio-economic reality, although certain theoretical assumptions as well as some of the more general aspects of the analysis will certainly have a wider validity in space and time.

Some fundamental assumptions e.g. the unchangeable nature of equalitarian and libertarian principles, the coherence between means and ends etc., are the theoretical and historical heritage of anarchism as a whole and as such are not linked to particular situations or convictions, being common to any interpretation of anarchism and therefore also to this program.

The program has a deliberately «open» character, open not only to modifications and corrections in its analyses, a natural consequence of objective structural changes and a thorough critical theoretical examination, but also to new ideas and modifications as regards the practical side for new experiments and experiences. Thus, in line with the character of the GAF, it is a program to be continually verified and periodically confirmed or rectified.

PROGRAMME OF THE FEDERATED ANARCHIST GROUPS

1. ANARCHISM

Anarchism is firstly a system of values. Secondly it is the wish to bring about the putting into practice of these values within a social system in as complete a way as possible. Thirdly it is a way of approaching the social reality in order to understand it, interpret it and transform it. Anarchism is thus *ethics, science* and *revolutionary program* at one and the same time: the ethics of freedom, the science of freedom and the program of freedom.

Naturally the schematic distinction between these three aspects of anarchism is merely a coherent way of presentation after a hundred years of libertarian thought and struggles, theory and practice and is not a metaphysical way of deriving the doctrine from abstract ideas of social justice. In fact, the three aspects are indissolubly linked one to another and grew initially out of a sort of «distillation» of the aspirations towards emancipation of the lower classes as expressed in their struggles, to gradually become a complete and coherent system, modified and tried out in practice and confirmed or rectified on the basis of subsequent historical developments.

2. ANARCHY

The anarchist system of values when applied to a model of society is called anarchy. By this term we do not wish to imply any specific and detailed description of the «ideal society» but rather the various elements held in common by the various representations of the anarchist «utopia», in its basic functions and structures.

In this sense anarchy may be seen as a society in which exist the maximum amount of *freedom* and *equality* (although in fact the latter is simply the social expression of the former i.e. libertarian relationships can only exist among equals). In other words, anarchy is the global alternative to a hierarchical model of society.

The imposed and rigidly pyramid-like structures of the hierarchical society are substituted by a functional multiplicity of free groupings and communes which are ever open to modification. The imperative of law is substituted by *mutual agreement*; workers' exploitations is replaced by *workers' control*; private ownership of the means of production is replaced by *common* possession (for social forms of production) and *individual* possession (for individual forms of production). The centralization of political power and of the state is substituted by *decentralization* and *federation*; delegation is replaced by *direct democracy*. The division of labor is substituted by the *integration* of labor, be it agricultural or industrial, manual or intellectual. The passivity of the masses, as subordinate producers and conditioned consumers, is replaced by the *creativity* of groups and individuals; social inequality with its uniform stereotypes is replaced by natural *diversity* within a framework of total equality; the morality of obedience and prevarication is replaced by that of freedom and *solidarity*. The repression and/or commercialization of the senses is replaced by the joyful liberation of human nature.

In this sense anarchy is not a myth but a real end to be pursued, even though it may

be possible only through a series of approximations and even then perhaps not completely. All action should derive from this end and refer to it as control of its own coherence.

3. THE HIERARCHICAL SOCIETY

Anarchy then is the global alternative to the hierarchical model of society. To the model as a whole and not to any particular hierarchical society. Thus anarchism is the theoretical system and the social movement opposed to *all* hierarchical structures with their values, religious and pseudoscientific ideologies. Although in historical terms anarchism originated in the workers' fight against capitalism in the last century, it has always stood for and continues to stand for a refusal not only of domination by the bourgeoisie, but of all kinds of domination.

In hierarchical societies all human relationships are in one way or another based essentially on domination, in so far as the hierarchical model is reproduced in every aspect of society and in the seeking for authority becomes a pronounced character trait. Of prevalent importance in these relationships of domination is the relationship deriving from *economic exploitation*, which is inherent in the principal social activity. The hierarchical stratification determined by exploitation, in the various forms it has taken in the variety of economic systems which have been evolved through history, is the fundamental stratification. Nonetheless this stratification is an expression not only of hierarchical division of productive functions in the narrow sense, but more generally the *hierarchical division of social labor*. In some societies economic power (and/or privilege) has become fused with political power, whereas in others there is a formal division: in some societies the former appears derived from the latter, in others vice versa. In either case however both are monopoly of a privileged *elite*.

The state is the fundamental political institution of every modern hierarchical society and the anarchists' attacks are thus directed, as they have always been, first and foremost against the state, and not only the «bourgeois state» (the political structure of capitalist society) but *every* kind of state of the present, past or future in as much as the state is organized power, i.e. domination. The anarchist criticism of the state takes on a new dimension in the face of the monstrous totalitarian interference with individual freedom and its on the spot transformation of economic power as well as political power.

4. THE CLASS STRUGGLE

In the stratification caused by exploitation social groupings, the classes, identify themselves with diametrically opposed interests. The class struggle is universally present in every hierarchical society, albeit at varying degrees of intensity and with various forms and levels of collective awareness. The fight between the exploited classes and the exploiters, between those who exercise economic power and those who have to suffer it. It is also the struggle between those who have privilege and those who aspire to it, between bosses and those who aspire to become bosses, between ruling classes and classes in the ascent towards new forms of rule.

There are thus two kinds of class struggle. Unfortunately the evolution of man in history has been characterized by the latter, and history shows us a succession of ruling classes exercising power in a variety of ways and with various kinds of exploitation. The other class struggle, which cuts *right across* history, is that of the lower classes, slaves, plebeians, serfs, wage-earners in their continual search for emancipation or at any rate to lighten the burden of their

exploitation.

Both forms of conflict are of interest to the anarchist: the one because anarchism has, directly or indirectly, derived its values and bases the possibility of an anarchist revolution on the aspirations towards emancipation expressed by the exploited classes; the other because it is from a study of this kind of struggle that we come to an understanding of the *dynamics* of inequality, i.e. of the mechanisms by which the class society transforms and perpetuates itself.

5. MODES OF INTERPRETATION

Apart from a few very elementary societies, numerous categories are identifiable in the social stratification. The complexity of these categories is generally transformed into an ideology by that «sociology», which seeks to confuse and dilute the searing reality of the class struggle into a multiplicity of minor conflicts in no way contradictory to the perpetuation of the system. These sociological schemes are an ideological reflexion of the present tendency of the system to defuse class antagonism by multiplying the separations in a continuous gradation of exploitation and privilege.

But even in a graded structure it is possible to identify the class struggle with its essential features as regards a revolutionary program and analysis. It is sufficient to recognize at the summit and base of the social pyramid those classes in opposition to one another in which we recognize those categories with equivalent functions in the social division of labor. Thus, for example, we could simplify our mode of interpretation to a bipolar system in which we would see, in isolation with respect to a more complex social reality, the insolvable antagonism between *two poles* of class presumed to be fundamental. This bipolar scheme certainly has a basis in reality, however partial an interpretation it might be, and is a useful instrument above all for the identification of a *mouthpiece* for the revolutionary movement, i.e. the class (or group of classes) which undergoes domination and exploitation, but its theoretical and practical limitations must be clearly borne in mind.

One of its limitations is that it is applicable only to relatively «static» social systems (as for example nineteenth century capitalism and perhaps Russian style «state socialism»). In such systems the bipolar conflict singled out is the dominant one, as it refers to the dominant mode of production, and the middle class in particular is just an inert «diaphragm» between the two antagonistic classes and is not, wholly or in part, an agent of social and economic transformation i.e. seen as a class in itself, struggling for power.

In the historical phases of transition, such as that we are now passing through, the two-class scheme becomes useless in that it prevents us from seeing and comprehending new forms of power and exploitation arising from within the old structures; at worst it can serve only to mystify, in so far as it conceals the reality of the class conflict between the two social groups competing for power.

In order to arrive at a fundamental representation of these periods of «dynamism», it is essential to see the conflict as between *three* classes fighting one another *at one and the same time* i.e. the dominated class, the dominating class and a class «on the way up». Thus we are able to identify the two forms of class struggle which coexist: two forms with opposed historical significance, however many occasional links there may be between the two.

6. THE THREE CLASSES

The present historical phase of transition marks the passage from the capitalist system to a new system of exploitation. This is the key to an understanding of the complex international socio-economic and political situation and of its convulsions, the result not only of different imperialist interests, but also of late-capitalist, post-capitalist and intermediate social systems opposed to each other and with a number of varieties for each category.

On the basis of the three class model one can single out the two main actors of society's transformation (old and new bosses) both at the international level and at the level of single national structures in those areas where capitalism has not been buried yet, as in the «State socialism» countries and to a certain extent in the Third World. One can single out the dominated and exploited class which, as always in the historical phases of transition, accentuates its *own* class struggle, partly because the change renders less effective the psychological and ideological instruments of submission, and partly because the class on its way up makes a special effort to mobilize the rebellious energy of the exploited as a vehicle for its own ambitions.

The class, or rather the group of exploited classes, consists of those who in the social division of labor perform *manual tasks in the broadest sense of the word*. To a greater or lesser extent, depending on the particular national economic structure, the grouping will include proletarians (agricultural wage-laborers, industrial workers and wage-earners in the service industries, including clerical workers with purely executive functions), the lower levels of autonomous workers, whose «autonomy» has become reduced to mere self-management of one's exploitation, and finally the urban and rural sub-proletariat (unemployed, underemployed, dropouts, etc.). Objectively speaking these categories and classes are exploited, quite independently of the mechanism by which the exploitation may manifest itself (which may not necessarily be the typical or dominating mode of exploitation) and equally independently of the subjective awareness of the exploitation.

The «old bosses» are the *capitalist bourgeoisie* whose privileges are based on the private ownership of the means of production and who exploit primarily (though not exclusively) according to their characteristic rapport with production, i.e. by means of the extortion of the surplus value in a market regime of manpower and goods.

The «new bosses»), which in the so-called Socialist countries are the ruling class and in late-capitalist societies share the domination with the bourgeoisie in a dynamic balance which shifts constantly in their favor, are the technobureaucrats.

7. THE NEW BOSSES

The new ruling class, the technobureaucracy, defines itself in the intellectual work corresponding to managerial functions in the hierarchical division of social labor. The «new bosses» have these functions and from them derive their relative privileges and powers not on account of private ownership rights of the means of production but rather by virtue of a sort of intellectual ownership of the means of production, i.e. a possession of the knowledge inherent in the direction of the great economic and political groupings. The most complete form of their present domination, i.e. in the so-called socialist bloc, presents a picture of technobureaucrats with a monopoly of economic and political power, exploiting not at an individual level but collectively by means of «class ownership» of the means of production. That is, they appropriate a privileged share of goods and services not directly, as happens under capitalism, but indirectly

by means of the state which appropriates this «class» quota and then redistributes it among its own functionaries depending on each one's position in the social pyramid, i.e. depending on the hierarchical importance of that particular function.

In advanced capitalist western societies the new bosses have less clear cut outlines and their specific role of exploitation is linked to capitalist exploitation in general. Both in historical and functional terms they derive from the clerical middle class at the service of the capitalist bourgeoisie. The growth of joint-stock companies, of commercial and financial trusts and of multinational companies, together with the steady expansion of state functions in the social and economic field, have generated (and continue to do so) the conditions for an increased importance and power of technical and administrative company bosses and bosses of state institutions.

Bureaucrats (state managers) and technocrats (managers of private companies) are two aspects of the new class, still differentiated even if mediated by the hybrid figure of the manager of a public company. The technobureaucrats appropriate their class privileges, i.e. the fruits of their exploitation, by means of very high salaries, prizes, bonuses, special emoluments, etc. In the case of managers of private companies these various payments may be seen as disguised company profit, i.e. capitalist surplus value. The privileged payments made to state managers are instead typically technobureaucratic. The pay of managers in public companies and in those with state participation show in part as profit (a vestige of mercantile capitalist mechanism) and in part as truly privileged rights to a slice of the wealth produced, not so much in company terms as at a national level.

8. JOINT-STOCK COMPANIES AND THE MULTINATIONALS

In the big joint-stock companies, the power of the technobureaucrats finds its expression in «managerial» terms. Not only does increasing fragmentation of share ownership render meaningless the power of decision of the overwhelming majority of capitalist-shareholders, but also the enormous complexity of management problems and competence to deal with them transfers to the managerial class the control of the economic mechanisms, which in turn, proportionately reduces the power of even the majority shareholders, unless these happen to be shareholders and managers at one and the same time, thereby combining the features and prerogatives of the old bosses and the new, as indeed often happens in the historical phases of transition.

We see increasingly a split developing between the traditional capitalist pairing of ownership and control: the owners remain interested in company affairs but it is the technobureaucrats who in fact and also by right (the so-called «delegation») exercise economic control. *Legal* ownership of the means of production, whilst still a source of privileged income, is no longer necessarily *economic* ownership.

The independence of the technobureaucrats is yet more marked in multinational companies. Shareholders power over «their» company at an international level is practically non-existent. The production-distribution processes are so complex and articulated that only the managerial staff is capable of controlling and coordinating them. Furthermore the multinationals are structured in such a way as to produce a hierarchical division of labor, among the various geographical regions, corresponding to the vertical division of labor within the company itself: the power of decision and high level jobs are concentrated in the metropolises of the developed countries (with a certain number of sub-capitals in the not so developed countries) whereas in

backward countries activities with a very low technological content are developed. This is a new kind of international exploitation involving not only advanced states and backward states, but also the multinational companies who directly take on the new function of colonizers.

9. THE ADVANCED CAPITALIST-STATE

The state plays a fundamental role in an advanced capitalist economy. Firstly either directly or indirectly it possesses a thick network of industries and services in the key sectors. Furthermore it regulates, controls, plans and coordinates, to an ever increasing extent, company activities, by means of legislation, credits, taxes, etc. Finally it is far and away the principal client of the private sector.

State intervention in the economy is nothing new for capitalism: rather it has been the constant support and companion of capitalism right from the beginning. Nonetheless the intensity and thoroughness with which the state today, and in the future basically even more so, is present in the economy together with the tremendous development of social services managed by the state are rapidly transforming the significance of this presence. When 30-40% of the Gross National Product of advanced capitalist countries is absorbed by public administration, one can say that from being a question of quantity it has passed to one of quality.

The state, in its role as defense apparatus of capitalist interests, is changing into being a privileged breeding ground for the new ruling class, concentrating as it does, that is at its higher levels of hierarchy, a very high and growing percentage of economic power, which in turn fuses with political power. The latter thus comes to progressively lose its subordinate role. While the technobureaucratization of the big private companies goes ahead, in the public companies and in the state apparatus technocrats and bureaucrats come to express less and less the interests of the old bosses and more and more *their own*.

In a similar fashion effective political power is passing from the legislative assemblies to the executive organs and thence to heads of administration. The majority of advanced capitalist countries have a democratic parliamentary political structure, but in no case does parliament, the formal seat of «popular sovereignty», *really* govern the state.

The power of the state is a permanent power and is exercised by a certain number of autonomous institutions not subject to the instable influence of the vote: we must look at precisely these organisms to see where true power lies. Governments come and go, but the state machine carries on functioning.

The state consists first and foremost of these permanent autonomous institutions: the army (regular officers and NCOs, special troops), the police, the ministries, the autonomous administrations, social security and welfare organizations, magistrates etc., i.e. the so-called «executive» institutions, not tied to electoral considerations, only slightly subject to government influence and practically immune to parliamentary influence. Executive power is continually strengthened. Each of these institutions reproduces in itself the hierarchical pyramid of the state: from the summit of these hierarchies (as well as from the direction of the big public and private holding companies and in varying degrees also from party and trade-union leadership) are made those choices that parliament «represents» on the stage of political institutions.

This evolution of political power is further connected to the growing complexity and multiplicity of roles played by the advanced capitalist state, to its totalitarian tendencies a consequence of the necessity to control, by channeling them into new institutions, the

centrifugal forces continually generated by the increase in size, complexity and level of intervention of the state, in a vicious circle tending to develop the functions, number and power of the technobureaucrats.

10. POST-CAPITALIST SOCIETIES

In those countries with a «state socialism» we see the full realization of a technobureaucratic post-capitalist set-up. It is post-capitalist both in historical terms in so far as this socio-economic system made its appearance after the capitalist system and also for the fact that advanced capitalist societies show a similar tendency. Nonetheless this definition does not necessarily imply an ordered sequence for the single national entities. The post-capitalist set-up seems to have been installed firstly in precisely those countries not yet fully developed in capitalist terms and indeed with substantial remains from pre-capitalist days, perhaps due to a structural affinity between the feudal system and the technobureaucratic system, which in many respects could be considered a kind of «industrial feudalism».

Among the post-capitalist countries, three main models are discernable: the Russian, the Chinese and the Yugoslavian model, and although there are major differences between them they nonetheless have a substantial uniformity as regards the economic mechanisms and the essential social structures. Yugoslavia, alongside prevailing post-capitalist elements, also has certain advanced capitalist elements plus elements of «workers' control», although the workers' control is in fact compressed between controls on the part of the state bureaucracy and technocratic developments within the companies themselves. China appears to follow a line of development of greater decentralization with respect to Russia, shows a certain popular participation at the lower levels of decision making, with a greater intersectional and territorial equilibrium (city-country), less brutal and violent and less explicitly repressive policies, thanks to a high level of mass involvement in a mixture of gregariousness and religion. We have little reliable information regarding the Chinese model: insufficient to analyze with precision a system which is still «young» and in evolution, but sufficient to classify and judge it. In order to see its class nature we have only to note its rigid hierarchy with thirty levels bureaucratically defined (of which the first six are directive), we have only to note its economic inequality, with a scale of «wages» which in the factory already differentiates between minimum and maximum in a ratio of one to six and which in state administration is more in the order of one to thirty-six...

The Russian model is the most suitable for a portrayal of post-capitalist societies, not only because it is the model of nearly all the «state socialism» countries (even Cuba is rapidly adapting to it, after having produced its own original features in its initial period of «socialism») but also for the fact that after more than half a century of existence it is sufficiently well-known and consolidated. It has all the typical features of the technobureaucratic system. The merging in the state of economic and political functions identifies the social hierarchy in the state hierarchy. The abolition of private ownership of the means of production signifies their collective appropriation on the part of the technobureaucracy, which directs production in its own interests, appropriating the social surplus value in the form of special privileges: not only in terms of high salaries but also, and perhaps especially, privileged goods and services such as the *dacia*, special shops, trips abroad, the use of motorcars, higher education for their children, etc.

Below the technobureaucracy and a clerical, technical, professional and artistic «middle class», there is the overwhelming majority of the exploited ones, manual laborers in the city and

country alike, modern slaves of state, deprived even of the only economic freedom conceded by capitalism to the proletariat: the possibility of selling one's labor to the highest bidder and of fighting together with one's comrades in exploitation to wrest more tolerable working and living conditions.

The post-capitalist economic structure hinges on planning, which substitutes the labor and goods market. Planning different from that of advanced capitalist countries. With an economy which is entirely in state hands and hierarchically structured from the factory right up to the heads of planning, it is no longer a question of urging the various companies to follow the indications set out in the plan: the power group *decides* the results to be sought (depending on the internal and external needs of the system and the needs of the ruling class, mediated among the various groups and levels of which it is made up) and sorts them among the various sectors and companies, who are bound by them. The plan decides not only the quantity and quality of the products, but also investments, prices and wage levels, quite apart from any mercantile mechanisms. Thus categories such as wages, currency, etc. have an economic meaning which is completely different from the corresponding capitalist-mercantile terms: the terminology remains but the underlying relationships are changed.

The incredibly complex and complicated nature of global planning, with its consequent phenomena of inefficiency and waste, has tended in recent years to create a greater swing toward partial decentralization in the Soviet Union. In addition to the demand for technical and economic efficiency there are of course the interests of the company managers and of the various complexes, i.e. the local technocrat who, in demanding greater autonomy and decentralization in the making of decisions, are ipso facto demanding more power for their category at the expense of central bureaucracy.

In semi-official language, *nomenklatura* is the name given to the new «soviet» bosses, it being the term used to define those belonging to the managerial levels of the state: the higher categories of civil servants, superior officers in the army and police force, party and union bosses, technocrats of production ... about a million Russians rather «more equal than the others, thanks to the position held by them in a meritocratic hierarchy, where technical and administrative «merit» and political «merit» are marked by rigid selection already at school and an equally rigid selection procedure at a party level.

The party has a fundamental function in the «soviet» structure, and in the post-capitalist society in general. The party, to which in the IJSSR belong a mere 10% of the population, runs right through society from the lower middle levels up to the top, excluding only the lowest social levels, in a hierarchy superimposed on the state hierarchy, like a church within the state. Nonetheless at the uppermost level the two hierarchies converge. The party directly administers production and distribution, but also exercises a tight control over every aspect of life in the society, in so far as it is the carrier for the state ideology (Marxism-Leninism), which serves to formally legitimate the power and privileges of the new bosses.

11. THE THIRD WORLD

A halfway house as regards social structures and economic mechanisms between advanced capitalist industrial societies and post-capitalist societies is the «third world, the African, Asian, Latin American states, generally ex-colonies and «underdeveloped» or «developing». There is a wide variety of political forms in these countries, ranging from a parliamentary democracy to dictatorship (which may be either military or simply by a one

party state), with a tendency towards the latter. Ideologies too range from «right» to «left», international alignments are generally «neutral» but apart from a number of exceptions tending to be more or less dependent on either the Russian or the American Empire. There is also a mixture of economic structures ranging from predominantly advanced capitalist elements (normally on account of the presence of the multinationals backed by North American or European capital) to predominantly post-capitalist elements along almost Yugoslavian lines.

Behind all this variety of forms lies one common unifying reality: the efforts made by the third world to break away from being mere pawns in the game of international exploitation. After the most brutal phase of colonialism by plunder was concluded, advanced industrial countries began to establish new relationships of economic dependence, based on an international subdivision of labor in which those goods with a high technological content are reserved for the ruling «neo-colonialist» countries and on rates of exchange unfavorable to the products of the third world. From this «unequal exchange» derives the insurmountable difficulty of the third world in any effective economic expansion and consequently its progressive relative impoverishment. Thus third world ideologies, be they right-wing or leftist, are characterized by a strong nationalism streaked with autarchist tendencies.

The role of the state in this effort of the third world is fundamental: national economic development is effected primarily with state capital (or from companies with mixed state foreign capital) and through the nationalization of foreign companies. It is natural therefore that with such a model of development an indigenous ruling class should grow up more of a techno-bureaucratic nature than capitalist. The so-called «national bourgeoisies» do not in fact consist of bourgeois, i.e. capitalists, but above all of state functionaries, among whom military officers often occupy a central position, and of indigenous bosses of multinational and mixed capital companies.

The «socialist nationalism» of the developing countries (and of the various national liberation movements, breeding ground for the future «national bourgeoisies») is then the third world's way to economic development and at the same time their path towards a technobureaucratic social set-up.

12. ITALY: ECONOMIC STRUCTURES

The phenomenon of direct or indirect state participation in the economy, a characteristic element of advanced capitalism, is highly developed in Italy. From its beginnings in the thirties under Fascism, at the same time as the Great Depression, the economic policy of massive and progressive state intervention has been widely pursued by the Christian Democrat regime also. Today more than 31% of the turnover of the 200 leading Italian industries comes from state-controlled companies. Foreign capital (in the form of multinationals) constitutes a further 26%. Thus in terms of big industrial capital the public sector is now almost equal to the private indigenous sector as regards direct control. The percentage of state influence is increased if in the figures quoted for direct control we include indirect control exercised via credit, in so far as there is an absolute preponderance of the public presence in the banking sector.

State intervention in the Italian economy has developed above all in the form of shareholding, a progressive and painless form of state takeover which well expresses, in its combination of capitalism and bureaucracy, the advanced capitalist phase of transition. In the post-war years

only once has nationalization been resorted to, to acquire a state monopoly in the electricity sector (with the consequent setting up of ENEL). There has on the other hand been a constant and massive increase in state participation, both by means of the «natural» development of existing companies and by means of «salvage» jobs on private companies in difficulty; in much the same way has there been an increase in public financing of private companies, which is a frequent preparatory step towards shareholding and thus towards direct control.

At the beginning of the Seventies 30% of industrial investments were made by companies with state participation, and these same companies contributed over 15% of added value to the manufacturing and mining sectors and 24% approximately of added value to the transport and communications sector.

Of the four biggest Italian companies three are publicly controlled: IRI, ENI and Montedison. The first is an economic colossus coordinating almost 70% of state shareholdings. With more than 180 companies in Italy (and dozens of others abroad) controlled directly by the mother holding company (IRI) or else through its eight financial holdings (Finsider, Finmeccanica, SME, etc.) and a thick network of joint participations with other public and private companies, it operates in nearly every sector of the Italian economy, from banks to supermarkets, from highways to canned food, from airlines to motorcar construction, from shipbuilding to iron and steelworks. The second public enterprise, ENI, is also a holding company which, through nine head companies controls or participates in nearly 200 businesses, about half of these being abroad, especially in the petrochemical field. Montedison (chemical and pharmaceutical products, textiles, foodstuffs) is also a fully fledged member of state participation schemes, despite its being mainly financed by private capital; the state, through IRI and ENI in particular, is not only the biggest shareholder, but also owns a higher percentage of shares than all the main private shareholders put together, in so far as the majority of the shareholding is highly fragmented. The large financial group Bastogi similarly gravitates in the area of the public economy, being controlled by public credit institutions.

Other public holding companies (EGAM, EFIM and GEPI) are present to a lesser, though significant, extent in various sectors of production and their importance is growing. The most recent of these, GEPI, which was formed in 1971, should theoretically acquire companies in difficulty, only on a temporary basis for the public sector, in order to «make them pay» prior to returning them to the private sector. In fact, however, it is proving to be an instrument of state takeovers (just as IRI before it, founded for the same purpose).

The big Italian private capital is for the most part concentrated in few oligopolies such as FIAT-IFI, Pirelli, Olivetti. However the private sector consists above all of small and middle size businesses, which in Italy still employ more than half of the total labor force. 28% of industrial workers are employed in businesses with a work force of less than ten, 29% in businesses with a work force of between 11 and 100, and 43% in businesses with a staff of over 100, whereas in France the equivalent figures are 12,27 and 61% and in Germany 2,19 and 79%. The fact that, compared to other advanced capitalist countries, Italy has a far greater fragmentation of shareholdings, that is to say the fact that it is way behind in terms of concentration of capital, is a characteristic feature of the Italian economy and one of the causes of its structural weakness. It should be noted however that while a certain proportion of small and middle size businesses produce goods and services in competition with the public and private oligopolies, a growing number operate with big capital. Unlike the former, these businesses are not in contradiction with the economic necessities of advanced capitalist rationalization; that may in fact achieve a high level of efficiency (and exploitation).

Another characteristic feature of the Italian economic structure, apart from the

noticeable tendency for the state to take over big capital and the slow development of concentration, is its clear cut geographical dualism, i.e. the persistent underdevelopment of vast regions, above all in the South and in the islands. This has meant and continues to mean large internal emigration and social tensions on account not only of psychological problems of adaptation to different cultural environments, but also because of very serious lacks in the infrastructures of the poles of industrial development. It is no accident that the recent resurgence of working class pugnacity should see young immigrant workers to the North as the main actors, rather than the indigenous working class, despite the latter's high level of unionisation. Similarly, it is no accident but rather a consequence of the North's economic domination of the South, that the South has witnessed the recurrence of the flames of revolt.

The structural elements of weakness in the Italian economy (retarded concentration, strong dualism, low level of productivity in the public sector, the incredibly burdensome nature of an overlarge state administration and the cumbersome and superfluous nature of much of the social security and welfare organisations) have brought about the end of the post-war boom, which had been based predominantly on a super-exploitation of manpower (keeping wage levels below those of other industrial countries) without there being any accompanying technological and financial dynamism. On the other hand, the resurgence of the workers' struggles at the end of the Sixties with the subsequent near-adaptation of wages to «European» levels has eliminated the prime cause of the «Italian miracle». The coinciding of these indigenous factors with a more general international cyclical economic depression and a great increase in the costs of raw materials, which are generally lacking in Italy (all this in a national context of serious planning deficiencies, i.e. the incapacity of the government to carry through any economic policy without its being bureaucratic, aimed at helping privileged groups or simply «charity work»), has brought on a crisis unparalleled in its seriousness, implications and duration by anything since the Thirties: a crisis which, in the logic of a society based on exploitation and according to the economic mechanisms of advanced capitalism, manifests itself to the workers in the form of unemployment and inflation, which in turn can only be solved by further state intervention in the economy, i.e. by further erosion of capitalist power in favor of technobureaucratic power.

13. ITALY: CLASS STRUCTURE

In the complicated mixture of post-industrial and pre-industrial elements, early and advanced capitalism, which constitute the social and economic reality of Italy, a country which can be classified as top of the poor European countries (Spain, Portugal, Greece) and at the same time bottom of the list of the rich European countries, in this mixture of social classes, groups and layers with various modes of production or intermediate forms, the bourgeoisie and the technobureaucracy may be clearly distinguished.

The former consists of about 200.000 capitalist-entrepreneurs of big and middle size businesses, together with their families. The latter, in numerical terms almost as big as the former, consists of bosses of state-controlled industries and organizations, political and trade-union leadership and the managers of those companies with state participation, whereas less than half of this class consists of managers of big and middle size private companies. The absolute and relative strength of the technobureaucracy is a result of

the «Italian model» of economic development and of the pronounced presence of foreign capital backed multinationals. Paradoxically, at the top of the pyramid, Italy has a more developed technobureaucratic class structure than other Western countries with a more advanced economy.

The middle class reproduces the division between bourgeoisie and technobureaucracy in its division between *petty bourgeois* (small scale capitalist-entrepreneurs in industry, agriculture and the service industries as well as most of the professional workers, apart from a minority who on account of their functions and income level may be integrated into the ruling class) with a total of about 4 million active persons, and a *petty technobureaucracy* (technicians, specialised office workers, non-managerial public and private functionaries, regular officers in the Forces, teachers, party and union apparatus) with about 3 million active persons.

At the bottom of the social pyramid there are the exploited classes, consisting of an urban and rural proletariat in the strict sense of the term (manual wage-laborers) with 9,5 million active persons, to which should be added about a million office workers with purely executive and routine functions, several million «autonomous workers» (lower levels of craftsmen, farmers and businessmen with no personnel or staff) who are in fact manual laborers in a sense, and lastly more than a million sub-proletarians, i.e. occasional workers, domestic workers, social outcasts and dropouts, etc.

There is a great inequality in Italy as regards income levels. Even if we leave aside the very rich (the upper portion of the ruling classes) and the very poor (the sub-proletariat, concentrated particularly in the South and on the islands) the average income of the ruling classes and the average of the exploited classes are in a ratio of ten to one in favor of the former.

Social movement in the last fifty years has witnessed a constant growth in the technobureaucracy's numbers and its substratum in the middle class at the absolute and percentage expense of the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie substratum. Among the exploited classes there has been mainly a growth in the numbers of lower level clerical workers. In the next few years there will probably be a further slight increase in the numbers of the technobureaucracy, a much bigger increase in the petty technobureaucracy, with a parallel reduction in numbers of the petty bourgeoisie and autonomous manual laborers. For all classes there has been, and there will continue to be, an overspill from the primary to the secondary and tertiary sectors, as is indeed typical of industrial and post-industrial development respectively.

14. ITALIAN POLITICS AND INSTITUTIONS

As in all states the evolutionary process of advanced capitalism at present manifests itself in the form of a parliamentary democracy. However, again typical of every advanced capitalist state, most of the political power lies in the executive and in governmental institutions, neither of which are subject to elections.

The way these institutions run (rules, regulations, customs, privilege, etc.) is identical to how things were under Fascism, not only because the heads of these organizations are the same as under Fascism but also and above all because the set-up is basically functional (despite typical Italian inefficiency, which is however curable) as far as the state is concerned, particularly to the state which manages to be a dynamic compromise between

old and new bosses which found its expression first in Fascism and then with the republic of the «Christian Democrats».

Apart from Parliament's abdication from its role as supreme institution, the Italian state presents us with another typical characteristic of advanced capitalism: its progressive tendency towards totalitarianism, i.e. the state tends to intervene in every social function, in the first instance to regulate it and later to absorb it into itself; it tends to invade and indeed does invade every aspect even of the private life (for the totalitarian state the word «private» does not exist) of the citizen. The Fascist state was openly totalitarian, whereas the post-Fascist state is *de facto* totalitarian, and the process of identification between state and society has been taken up again since the War in a less folklorist fashion but in an even more insidious fashion, both at an institutional and ideological level.

With this invasion of privacy and the strengthening of the apparatus of repressive control and psycho-ideological conditioning, the state is well on the way to a progressive limitation, *de facto* rather than *de jure*, of personal and collective freedom, quite apart from the *form* the Italian politics may assume in the short and middle term. This is not to say that the political forms are completely unimportant from a revolutionary point of view. For us more important is the «form» of advanced capitalism in Italy today and its possible forms tomorrow, since for every form there is a corresponding and different mixture of imposed obedience and extorted consent, various levels of tolerance and repression of dissent, various political steps taken to deal with the «non-integrated» members of society and hence diverse ways of imposing propaganda, agitation and organization as regards the anarchists (legal/illegal, open/ clandestine, with a whole range of intermediate positions).

A number of political variations are theoretically *possible* in Italy as regards the social and economic policies of advanced capitalism, from «social democracy» (in the broad sense of democratic and reformist) to «Fascism» (in the broad sense of authoritarian and reformist), from the Scandinavian model to the Chilean model, from the American model to the French model..., the West offers a great variety. In practice however, the reality of Italy does not seem to offer many *probable* alternatives, all of which are on social democratic lines.

15. THE LONG MARCH OF THE ITALIAN COMMUNIST PARTY (PCI)

The peculiarity of the Italian political system and thus of its probable model of evolution, with respect to other Western social democratic models, is the presence of a very strong reformist communist party. In one way or another, all aspects of Italian politics have to take this presence into account.

The PCI is a mass working-class party which can count on the votes of a third of the electorate, controls the main trade union centre, has the ruling majority in many communal, provincial and regional administrations, possesses and controls joint-stock companies and cooperatives, has an important influence on culture, a party which for thirty years has pursued with great ability the strategy of letting things take their time and which is in fact already a participant in power.

Nearly three quarters of legislation between the years 1948 and 1968 had the assent of the PCI, which can not therefore be considered a party against the system, i.e. a revolutionary party but rather one of the very pillars of the system.

At the end of the Sixties a compromise between Communists and Catholics seemed imminent, after ten years of preparation in the shape of a Centre-Left government. But the PCI's long march was stopped by the USA, who have powerful economic and strategic interests in Italy, and by the «partito americano» (a derogatory term implying the subservience of the Christian Democrats and the Social Democrats to America) which received money in various forms from the United States, who resorted to the «strategy of tension», a split in the Social Democrats and various other political and financial manoeuvres and blackmail.

The mounting up and growing seriousness of the social, economic and political contradictions, the referendum on divorce and the results of the local elections of June 15th 1975 (which, amongst other things, showed a definite swing of the middle class vote from the DC to the PCI) have prepared the way for the collapse of the Christian Democrat regime and set the PCI once more on the road towards a more explicit co-management of power. The American «imperial metropolis» still puts up a strong resistance which the PCI is doing everything possible to combat, stressing its «westernization» (by accepting NATO, for example) and which anyway the Americans are extremely unlikely to push to a «Chile situation».

The most probable political hypothesis for the future is the «Italian way to reformism» which, in the absence of a genuine and strong Social Democratic party, can only revolve round the PCI, be it in the version of the «leftist alternative» (a government made up of Socialists and Communists), or in the form of the «historical compromise» (between Christian Democrats and Communists). The fact is that a serious economic plan is essential for Italy, as for any other advanced capitalist countries, not least because of the lack of organization and partial backwardness of the structures of production and distribution, economic dualism between North and South, etc. This plan can only be effected with the collaboration of the Unions, managers and controllers of workers' conflicts. To speak of Unions in Italy today means above all to speak of the PCI.

To be sure, this is not the only *possible hypothesis* for the future direction of Italian politics, but to us it seems the *most probable*, the one we will most likely have to face up to. This hypothesis implies a process of transformation of the state, in an authoritarian sense – constantly but under «democratic» forms, together with a further shift «to the right» of the PCI and it is on this supposition that a revolutionary strategy is to be based.

16. LEFT OF THE PCI

The progressive shift to the right of the PCI, which in recent years has abandoned quite openly all trace of revolutionary language and mythology, has left and will leave ever more political space to the left. The first effect of this has been to spawn a myriad of Marxist-Leninist organizations, mini-versions of the PCI but also revolutionary, who ably rode the tiger of student protest and the almost contemporaneous regeneration of proletarian pugnacity, adopting forms which were initially assembly-based and which were quasi anarcho-syndicalist, thanks in part to the virtual non-existence of an anarchist and libertarian movement.

Objectively speaking the Marxist-Leninist have played a contradictory role, a disturbance for the PCI while at the same time doing it a great «service». The involuntary service has been to give the PCI «extremist cover», thereby enabling it to stress its reasonableness and

reformism, whilst at the same time being a sort of «parking zone» for juvenile rebellion, whence it is easy sooner or later to end up in the arms of the PCI. Indeed in recent years its youth organizations have begun to grow again, recuperating many of those disillusioned by the extra-parliamentary experiment.

Something analogous has happened, starting from 1968 and even more after 1969, on the left of the trade unions with the opening up of a political space for actions (wildcat strikes, sabotages, etc.) and organizations (assemblies, the CUB – «Unitary Base Committees» – etc.) outside the unions. The unions however have taken even more effective and intensive steps than the PCI to recuperate their lost sheep. It is far less dangerous to allow room for student «insubordination» than for that of the workers. Student rebellion, originally a revolt against authority and arising also from a deep sense of unease of the category regarding the inadequacy of the scholastic structures when confronted with the opening of the institutes of the masses and the new competences and functions of the technicians, does not in *itself* contain any truly revolutionary prospects, given the functional destination (petty technobureaucracy) and hence the class interests, of the various levels of graduate. The same load of revolt, when applied to the reality of the exploited classes evidently gives quite different results. Apart from anything else, student unrest upsets the system rather less than worker unrest. Terrified of being unseated from their control over the proletariat, during the «hot autumn» of 1969, the three main Unions have subsequently shown themselves able to adapt to the needs of a direct democracy expressed by the base, and showing in this a surprising elasticity and ability, thereby recuperating most of the assemblies, shop-stewards and shopfloor committees, using them as probes for the feelings of the proletariat and as instruments for the manipulation of consent.

The strong affirmation of the PCI in the local elections of June 15th 1975 surprised the Marxist-Leninist mini-parties, three of which had presented their own electoral list, and as a consequence Avanguardia Operaia and PDUP («Proletarian Unity Democratic Party») moved more rapidly to the right towards the PCI, of which they now constitute a kind of external left-wing current, and on the other hand there was a partial, even if perhaps only temporary, return of the third extra-parliamentary polarity – Lotta Continua – towards a position of «Leftist subversion».

In any case, the Marxist-Leninists, reproducing as they do the false revolutionary sentiments of old-style authoritarian socialism, cannot be said to constitute a genuine alternative to the PCI and the bureaucratic Trade Unions. Only anarchism has something serious and coherent to say in the struggle of the exploited of today, speaking out as it does against bosses both old and new. Anarchism alone can provide the theoretical and practical instruments for interpreting and fight the technobureaucratic evolutionary process and for organizing the refusal of the whole system into a revolutionary project, a refusal which the PCI is ever less able to pretend to represent, in so far as it distinguishes itself less and less from this same system.

17. THE REVOLUTIONARY CHOICE

The anarchists' plan is *revolutionary*, because the constitution of an equalitarian and libertarian society is possible only with a «revolution», i.e. with a more or less violent historical phase of rapid and profound economic, political and ethical transformations, etc.

The revolutionary choice is obligatory, because revolution is a necessary passage for every substantial change in society. Indeed revolution is a necessity not only, or perhaps we should say not particularly, on account of the violent resistance put up by the ruling classes to the loss of its privileges, but even more because it is only through revolution that the popular desire for radical change may find an outlet, that the minority can become a majority or near totality and the exploited masses can become an actor in history.

It is only in certain periods, when the «certainties» of existence lose their significance, when the traditional system of values and the institutions of power lose their sacred character, it is only in these moments of crisis that the true base of constituted order starts to crack, this base being the passive consent of the masses. It is only in these periods that, both in the individual and in the masses, the psychological domination of the «bosses» begins to come unstuck, a domination consisting of temperamental attitudes and mystifying ideologies, modeled and inculcated in the exploited right from the moment of birth! For this reason the history of mankind has always seen revolutionary «crisis» as the necessary point of arrival for past evolutions and at the same time necessary starting point for future evolutions.

It is therefore extremely important that this revolutionary passage, the *sine qua non* for the liberation of equalitarian and libertarian tendencies and popular creative energies, the transformation desired by the anarchists, extended to every camp of social relationships and of such depth has to call for the *active, voluntary* and *conscious* participation of the largest possible number of men and women.

18. THE CLASS STRUGGLE AND REVOLUTION

The anarchist plan for revolution derives from the class struggle of the exploited classes its guarantee of possible, or even probable, achievement. The universal existence of the class struggle in every hierarchical society gives us an initial indication, of crucial importance however banal it might seem: *social inequality is not natural* and only the resort to instruments of force (both psychological and physical) guarantees its survival. A second indication, drawn from the observation of the variety of forms of conflicts between rulers and ruled is that the serfs, slaves, wage laborers, exploited and in general all those downtrodden by each and every system, show a constant tendency to refuse their class condition.

All this, *in objective terms*, means that the emancipative aspirations are only to be achieved through the abolition of classes, by means of a transformation of society into equalitarian forms. In fact the history of revolution and revolts has left us numerous examples as witness to the fact that the exploited masses, whenever it is able to organize society as it feels does so with *approximations* of equality and freedom.

A third element which the history of class struggle gives us consists precisely in these practical indications, in these popular «utopias» achieved from time to time, albeit in a fragmentary fashion, in a creativity of clear libertarian stamp, in these examples of how the exploited masses sees its own collective emancipation. Anarchism arose out of this age old tension for equality and libertarianism, developing the objective tendencies of the exploited and their exemplary indications into a system of thought and action which represents the highest level so far reached by revolutionary theory and practice. Nonetheless class struggle and anarchist revolutionary struggle are not synonymous.

Firstly the former can also express itself in reformist terms and that is indeed the dominant form it takes outside pre-revolutionary periods. Secondly social conflict does not exhaust itself in the class struggle but expresses other revolts in addition which, in a complicated and sophisticated hierarchical system, arise from inequalities and dominations not directly class-related: sexual, ethnic, racialist, etc. All these revolts have a common equalitarian matrix in parallel with the class struggle although not necessarily and not completely. From all these revolts as from the revolts of individuals anarchism may derive new theory and practical material and re-order these movements or aspirations to partial emancipation into its revolutionary program for total emancipation.

Only with this deliberate and organized program and with this re-ordering it is possible to realize the revolutionary potentiality of the class struggle. Outside this *possibility*, there is only the historical reality of a continual transformation of the exploitation and oppression, in which the class struggle of the exploited cannot «make history», i.e. it can not bring about any structural changes unless they be to the advantage of a new ruling class, for whose mystifying interests it will become once more the vehicle. In Italy in the near future, this signifies that the class struggle of the exploited will serve, willy-nilly, the «technobureaucratic» interests, until, and unless, the libertarian revolution makes sufficient impact.

19. THE LIBERTARIAN REVOLUTION

We have spoken of «libertarian» revolution rather than of an «anarchist» revolution or of «revolution» alone. We do not believe either in a purely anarchist revolution or in the usefulness of any revolution as such. After fifty years of historical experience (Russia, Spain, China, Cuba, etc.) it is in fact clear that 1) the unleashing of popular equalitarian and libertarian tendencies is a short-lived phenomenon unless it can have the possibility of self expression in adequate organizations; 2) «state socialism» is not a step forward on the road of human emancipation.

At the same time, however much the anarchists may grow both in quality and in numbers prior to the revolution, we do not believe they can have sufficient strength and their ideas have sufficient influence to give a univocal mark to the revolutionary transformation: other forces will participate. However, right from the beginning the anarchist presence should give an equalitarian and libertarian character to the revolution (with the destruction of the state apparatus, the abolition of private property, and the creation of base organizations for workers' control and direct democracy). The other revolutionary components should not then prevail to such an extent as to stifle at birth workers' control, direct democracy and revolutionary experimentation nor such as to impede a pluralist and decentralized development of the revolution. This revolution, the libertarian social revolution, the only revolution for which it is worthwhile sacrificing some of the present, arises from the coming together of a series of favorable conditions. The aim of anarchist activity is to create these conditions.

Of these conditions, some may be considered *subjective* and others *objective*, i.e. some are determined by the will of the «revolutionary subject»; others by external factors. The objective conditions are generally those which tend to favor any revolution, economic crisis, wars, conflicts between dominating social groupings, an excessive weakening or even disintegration of power, etc. The history of revolution gives us abundant examples of these

objectively favorable conditions. In so far as they are not directly or predictably subject to the influence of the revolutionary movement, they are outside the specific aims of anarchist activity.

The necessary subjective conditions for a libertarian social revolution may be schematically indicated as the maximum possible quantitative and qualitative development of the anarchist movement and of the organized libertarian presence in social conflict and the maximum possible diffusion of the critical awareness and of the spirit of revolt against authority.

When we say maximum «possible» development we wish to stress that on the one hand in a non-revolutionary period there are relatively tight limits to revolutionary militancy and to the acceptance and even understanding of anarchist ideology and the putting into practice of libertarian method. On the other hand, we would also underline that this level of «saturation» is necessary for the revolution to have the possibility of developing in an anarchist direction, i.e. for the natural tendencies of the exploited to have the chance to emerge, organize and progressively mature towards more advanced forms of freedom and equality.

These then are the strategic objectives of anarchist activity. It is not possible to quantify it or collocate it in time. The time necessary for the optimal development of the subjective conditions for the libertarian revolution (and indeed the very possibility of its being attainable in a reasonable space of time) is linked to so many variables that predictions can do no more than indicate the pessimism or optimism of an individual opinion. The most we can say is that as things are at the moment we are still a long way off and the work still to be done is enormous.

20. MEANS AND ENDS

We can trace a series of intermediate objectives of successive stages which define the revolutionary strategy only in the sense of a progressive construction of the final objectives, i.e. of the progressive realization of the subjective conditions favorable to the libertarian social revolution; means and ends come together and the growth of the one corresponds to a gradual seeking after the other.

This is not to deny *all* revolutionary values in the thousands of fights put up by the exploited and the oppressed to wrest a few crumbs of betterment or fragments of liberty or to keep what they have hard won. It is indeed mainly thanks to the anarchists presence in these social conflicts that revolutionary conditions can mature. It is anyway undeniable that such struggles, quite apart from their validity for the revolutionary end, *rightly* attach great importance to the lower classes, to whom it would be nonsensical to ask them to set aside for the time being their desire to live better. We do not believe however that the partial conquests resulting from these struggles can be aligned in a progression that *objectively* brings us any closer to the revolution.

Anarchist intervention in these struggles is motivated by the *subjective* value (i.e., the social maturation of their actors) they can have, especially if they set themselves objectives and use methods which are libertarian and equalitarian *oriented*. Thus, for example, workers' demands which aim at reducing the inequality in the place of work are of value only in so far as they may serve towards giving the exploited an increased sense of solidarity and desire to level, and *not* of any belief in the progressive elimination of

inequality up to a point in which it would be possible to unify the objective interests of the workers. There are in fact definite maximum limits to the elimination of inequality in a system inherently based on exploitation. Thus, even the battle for the conquest of greater freedoms is of value only in so far as it may increase the rebellion of the oppressed against authority.

The State cannot afford to have no limits to the freedom it allows to its citizens and indeed in formally «democratic» regimes such as Italy the various fights for freedom turn out in general to be attempts to defend the existing liberties from attacks by power and as the state in an advanced industrial society gets increasingly totalitarian so these battles will become even more *defensive*. *To fool oneself that there exist partial objectives and conquests of objectively revolutionary value is a paradoxical version of reformism. Precisely because they are essentially partial and limited they must be reformist in the sense that they may be integrated or reabsorbed* in the dynamics of advanced capitalism. But the awareness acquired, the growth of organization, outside the institutions, i.e. all that derives from the libertarian *mode* of fighting it is this that interests anarchists. For results, if obtained with workers' control and direct action, bring the libertarian revolution nearer, but if these same results are obtained with delegation and hierarchical organizations, they make it-more remote.

This is a classic case of the consistent coherence of the anarchists as regards means and ends, which does not have an exclusively moral basis but also a scientific one. Means and ends are in a cause and effect relation to one another and the choice of ends necessarily determines the means, whatever the wish may be of those who recourse to a particular means. Therefore it is idealistic or worse, mystifying, to say that the end justifies the means. Rather the opposite is true, that the means «justify» the end, in so far as they contain the end already, albeit partially.

21. THE ANARCHIST MOVEMENT

The anarchists are not a guiding minority but rather an aware and active minority, nor is it therefore the vanguard of the masses but rather an element of revolutionary ferment *in* the masses. The anarchist movement must be a theory reference point for the exploited, spokesman for the anarchist program (revolutionary, libertarian and equalitarian) in its entirety and in all its coherence and pluralistic diversification. We said entirety and coherence: by reminding us of the essential ends at each partial success, at every deviation, at each consequence, however insignificant or not it may be. We said pluralistic diversification: a fruitful development of the anarchist's wealth of interpretations, analyses and organizational ideas.

One of the objectives of our activity is to construct a movement strong in its influence, widespread, serious and organized, without the organization compromising our coherence in the name of a false ideal of «efficiency». The anarchist organizations, be they groups or federations or whatever, should even be prepared to sacrifice a little *efficiency* to their coherence, because it is precisely in their coherence that their *effectiveness* lies. It is only in this way, by avoiding the dangers of authoritarianism and bureaucratism that the anarchists can aspire to be the critical conscience for libertarian organizations against excessive preoccupations regarding «efficiency».

22. GROUPS AND FEDERATIONS

The organizational structure of the anarchist movement must correspond to its pluralistic nature, i.e. it should be articulated in a confederation, be it formal or informal, of groupings with similar ideas about what anarchism means, and of geographical groupings bringing together groups of the same town or region and therefore, presumably, with the same problems and conflicts. A federal grouping is the natural organizational projection of anarchism, which should reach up to international level.

But even before joining in a federation, the fundamental organizational step, in our opinion, is the traditional «affinity group», i.e. a nucleus of militants small enough to permit the active participation of all in the decision making process and yet ample enough to contain within itself a variety of personal experiences and struggles: flexible in its decisions but faithful to the anarchists refusal of the majority-minority principle. In so far as the essential features of anarchist organization are based on assembly democracy, unanimity of decision taking, only small groups with most general and more specific ideas held in common can be coherent with anarchism's basic principles and at the same time efficient in the dynamics of decision taking and at an operational level. The «affinity group», as we may call this unit, will have an affinity of ideas but also a certain personal affinity, and this is indispensable when we remember that the group is not a company but a living together of the struggles and conflicts and as such will occupy a major portion of one's life. The richer the life of the movement the denser and more differentiated will the organizational network be, a network of groups, federations, associated nuclei, of local or national importance, short-lived or lasting, collectives, committees, etc. Even in the field of the press and publishing anarchist enterprises have always been and will always be instruments of cohesion and *functional* connection.

23. THE LIBERTARIAN MOVEMENT

The libertarian movement is the totality of organizations consisting not only of anarchists – the anarchists may indeed be in a minority – but all will share, if only in part, the same means and ends as anarchism. In other words they are organs which, while not necessarily accepting anarchism *in toto*, do accept to a considerable degree the antiauthoritarian and equalitarian basis both in theory and practice, albeit in specific fields and in the form of a compromise and/or mediation with the reality of the social struggles. In factories, the barracks, the schools, the neighborhood, etc., wherever conflicts develop, wherever rebellion manifests itself against class rule, wherever there is the refusal of exploitation, of ethnic oppression, of sexual repression, wherever there is the more or less conscious refusal of authority- there will arise, sometimes as an anarchist initiative but more often spontaneously, libertarian organizational nuclei, of a more or less ephemeral nature. All these base structures, instruments of direct action, as well as cooperatives genuinely controlled by the workers themselves, experimental communes which set out to be viable alternatives to the traditional family, antiauthoritarian pedagogical ventures ... these are the bricks and mortar for the building of a libertarian movement, in which what anarchist militants «do» may become what the exploited «do».

24. LIBERTARIAN ORGANISATIONS

Anarchists should work not only for the setting up of self-managed nuclei of struggle, but also so that these cells may link up on the basis of the sector of intervention and on a geographical basis, to avoid their isolation destroying them or reabsorbing them into the institutions (parties, unions and their lackeys). The active presence of the anarchists and their clarity of ideas is crucial in this phase of aggregation and development in order to combat any hierarchical regressions. Naturally, it will not be possible to apply to libertarian organizations the same organizational criteria which would be valid or rather essential for the anarchist movement. The anarchists' constant task will be however to prevent the formation within these organizations of any kind of hierarchy and to avoid any corrosion of a group's self-management of its struggles, i.e. of *direct democracy*. We maintain that in social struggles and in the building of libertarian organizations the anarchists must tend to operate in a «unitary» manner, fully aware that what differentiates them is still less important than what they hold in common. There would in fact be no sense in reproducing that organizational pluralism at a level of libertarian organizations which at a specifically anarchist level is natural and indeed vital.

On the other hand we believe that the relations between the anarchist movement and the libertarian movement should not be in any way institutionalized and even less should there develop a hierarchical relationship out of their association (such as that existing between a trade-union and a political-party). The only link, but it is a strong one, between groups and anarchist federations on the one hand and libertarian organizations on the other should be the active presence of anarchist militants in the latter and the influence they can have on their comrades in struggle on account of the respect the anarchists will have won for themselves by their daily actions.

25. ANARCHO-SYNDICALISM

Historically the libertarian presence has made itself felt above all in the movements of the peasants and industrial workers, nor is this a mere coincidence. By its very nature anarchism, as the theory and practice of emancipation, could not but be a participant if not the actual promoter of organizations for the defense of the exploited and of their struggle, could not and can not but be present in organized manifestations of the class struggle. The anarchist movement was actually born from the antiauthoritarian sectors of the First International. The most important and regular form assumed by the anarchists' presence in the daily struggles of the workers is *anarcho-syndicalism*, thanks to which in many countries, even if often only for brief periods, a vast libertarian movement has been established, aggressive, feared and respected, a movement similar (and perhaps in Spain in 1936, identical) to that which we believe to be the essential prerequisite for the libertarian revolution.

More practiced than theorized, as is proper, and with a certain diversification from one country to another, anarcho-syndicalism has consistently shown two aspects: it is both libertarian and revolutionary, i.e. its structures were as decentralized as possible with virtually no bureaucracy and its ultimate aims of subversion, working that is for the total emancipation of the workers, and were always present even in the single episodes of the daily struggle which were lived as preparatory skirmishes for the final battle.

At a distance of half a century from the years of maximum development of anarcho-

syndicalism it is still valid as a basic form of libertarian intervention, as one of the key sectors of that libertarian movement that we must construct and develop. The topics of anarcho-syndicalism should be thoroughly and seriously studied and discussed. The movement of the workers is no longer the same, because the working class itself is no longer the same: from being an emarginated *community* and hence culturally autonomous and subversive as well as being ferociously exploited, it has become little more than a statistical category, well on the way to cultural integration and exploited to a degree and in a fashion which are easier to tolerate. The authoritarian and reformist organizations which have hegemonized the movement of the workers have been both the effect of this class evolution and also of an acceleration and facilitation of the same evolutionary process.

Nonetheless the last decade has shown that the political and cultural integration of the working class is not an irreversible process; we have seen how the refusal of the system can still take root in struggles which began as a wish to improve one's class position *within* the system: we have seen especially in countries torn by strong social and economic contradictions how the proletarians, can be the actors in a violent social conflict, dangerous for the stability of the system itself. From 1969 up to today the workers have, to a greater or lesser degree, done without the institutional structures of the class struggle (the trade unions) on a number of occasions even if they have not hitherto been able to form an organized alternative outside the institutions, with some ephemeral and partial exceptions. Unfortunately, in the crucial years in which the proletarian struggle re-emerged, an anarcho-syndicalist presence was completely lacking, as also a strong and qualified anarchist presence in such a way as to favor the aggregation of the episodic and temporary in a revolutionary program and libertarian structures, in order to avoid dispersion and to recuperate the most aware and combative minorities. In these structures, which should not come «from without» or «from above» but from «within» the movement struggling outside the institutions or against them, in this «re-founding» of a revolutionary and libertarian syndicalism, it is here that the guarantee of true *proletarian autonomy* lies.

Today, in advanced industrial societies, we believe that anarcho-syndicalism still has the possibility of taking root, and though it may be a minority movement, it will still be important – its pugnacity and agility will compensate for the disadvantage of size in respect to the bureaucratic trade unions. Particularly appealing will be its *libertarian* aspect, i.e. its belief in assembly democracy and direct action which is also its best guarantee of fundamental irreconcilability with the social, political and economic hierarchies, i.e. of its revolutionary nature.

26. CULTURAL PRESENCE

All hierarchical societies are based not only on repression but more even on the consent of the exploited themselves, through their adhering to the system of dominant values. This consent normally helps to maintain the inevitable class antagonism within controllable limits. The tendency for advanced capitalist society to evolve towards totalitarianism exercises a growing psychological and ideological control, by means of the extraordinary possibilities provided by the mass media, which spread the dominant ideologies with an intensity and strength of conviction comparable only to the golden days of religion. Also, the mass media and mass scholarization are rapidly eliminating the sole advantage of popular marginalization – its cultural autonomy.

Pure bourgeois ideology practically no longer exists, in the sense of liberalism with its values of unequalitarian individualism, and the dominant ideologies in the Italy of today in terms of information and culture are in fact simply various versions of one sole ideology of technobureaucratic evolution, with a constant nuance varying from the blandest and most disguised reformism with all its hybrid values of bureaucratic paternalism to a more coherent Marxist-type reformism, with its values of hierarchical and meritocratic collectivism. This latter is the solidest and most coherent cultural presence, on the increase also at an academic and artistic level, thanks to its greater suitability to historical evolution, thanks to its greater intellectual dignity, thanks to thirty years' patient and intelligent work on the part of the PCI which has been a presence almost unopposed in the context of Italian progressive intellectuals.

A libertarian cultural presence is virtually nonexistent at all levels, both among the intellectuals and in the masses and rebel minorities. Because of this absence, fundamentally antiauthoritarian concepts have been translated into Marxist (and thus authoritarian) terms in the fields of education, city planning, sociology, psychology etc., neutralising such revolutionary content as they may have had. Thus a libertarian culture must be re-founded at all levels by means of the strengthening in quantity and quality of the anarchist press and publishing, by means of a greater number of cultural initiatives, but first and foremost by efforts being made to constantly enrich and update the main arguments of anarchist thought, which are in fact identical with the main arguments of the liberation of mankind.

Anarchism, with its extreme coherence and critical lucidity which deny every form of domination, should be the reference point for whatever blossoms in a genuine antiauthoritarian sense, for all outside or/and against the «academies»; anarchism, with its impassioned defense of individual and collective free creativity, should be the reference point for writers, actors, singers, painters, who refuse to be mere jesters for the system and yet do not wish to put themselves at the service of old and new Zhdanovisms; anarchism must be above all a point of reference and cultural ferment for the exploited masses, because a genuinely alternative culture to that of the ruling classes is inseparable from the growth of a strong libertarian movement, i.e. from the increased number and commitment of consciously antiauthoritarian social struggle.

27. VIOLENCE AND ARMED STRUGGLE

Apart from small fringes of believers in non-violence and terrorists, the anarchists have always had a balanced attitude towards the question of violence, neither wholly accepting nor wholly refusing it but rather justifying it on certain conditions and in certain circumstances.

They have always refused indiscriminate violence and terrorism. On the other hand they have justified or at any rate condoned *on an ethical level* the use of violence as instrument of defense or justice, whilst at the same time possibly having different ideas as to the usefulness or opportunity of a given act of violence in so far as the recourse to violence can cause political and psychological consequences which will be different and even contradictory depending on the time, place and modality chosen. It is with the criteria of opportunity and hence of effectiveness that anarchists have judged and will always judge «violence to things» (bomb explosions, offices being devastated, sabotages in

factories, etc.).

However fundamental elements in the judging of the sagacity of violence are the logical link and the *apparent* quantitative proportion between violent actions and their motivations, i.e. the extent to which these actions may be understood by the proletarian «audience », if not for all the public opinion. The genuine armed struggle, urban guerrilla warfare of the kind we have seen recently in Italy (the «Red Brigades» and «Armed Nuclei of the Proletariat»), France (GARI), Germany (RAF and «June 2nd), outside pre-revolutionary situations, can have value only for their exemplary nature of «propaganda by action». This particular kind of revolutionary propaganda, of stimulus to • revolt, should be judged as to how opportune it is also on the basis of efficacy and how «economical» it is, i.e. on the basis of its *real* capacity to provoke rebel ferment and increase or accelerate the reawakening of awareness in the exploited and also on the basis of the relationship between the «cost» of the armed struggle and its results. We believe that in Italy today and indeed in all the formally democratic industrial societies, there is more to be lost than gained and thus our opinion of these actions at this time in these countries is negative, as *broadly speaking* is to be considered negative the use of violence when this is not endorsed by the collective consciousness of the exploited or at least by substantial minorities of rebellious proletarians. This by no means signifies that elsewhere, or in given different times and conditions, our judgment might not be positive.

28. THE INTERNATIONAL DIMENSION

Anarchist action can and must be international in its scope, not only because of the fundamental internationalist vocation of the anarchist, but also because the libertarian revolution, if it can come about in a national context, cannot hope to avoid being crushed and suffocated; not simply because exploitation and domination have a over-national aspect, particularly pronounced in countries with a fragile economy such as Italy, but also on account of the fact that social conflict and the political situation present remarkable analogies and connections in a number of European countries. In this sense the other Latin countries in Europe (Spain, Portugal and even France) shown a certain affinity to Italy: these countries both because of the level of social and economic development and because of historical tradition present a higher level of working class pugnacity and also those new ferments of rebellion against hierarchy which typify advanced capitalist societies.

Particularly important for the anarchist program is Spain where the anarchist movement has maintained its proletarian roots, despite forty years of fascism, as the present re-emergence of the CNT would appear to indicate, and where the post Franco transition

period with all its economic and political difficulties can offer favorable opportunities and sufficient space for the libertarian forces, this due in part to the blatantly reformist and compromise orientated nature of the PCE.

29. AGAINST HISTORY

To sum up, anarchist activity in Italy, starting out from immediate reality and its contradictions without conceding anything to illusion – or pessimism – must work *against* the natural evolution of the system which is totalitarian and hierarchical oriented, and at

the same time uphold everything that tends towards the equalitarian and libertarian, in the factories, the schools, working class neighborhoods, in the country, in every field of the social conflict, supporting existing struggles and instigating new ones. In the immediate future our task must be to keep alive the rebel spirit, grown up especially in the young in recent years, and stressing and clarifying its original and essential nature of being anti-authority. We must organize or help to organize equalitarian tendencies in coherent programs and structures, in order to prevent these from being absorbed or exploited by the institutionalized opposition. Lastly we must organize the highest levels of equalitarian and libertarian consciousness in anarchist projects and structures.

Thus our initial task will be to combat the dynamic balances of advanced capitalist evolution, the consolidation of social, economic and political reforms which bear the mark of technobureaucracy and the new ideologies of consent, in order to enlarge and defend the space for action outside the institutions, in order to keep alive the conflict and to spread a more conscious spirit of rebellion, to prepare in the long run for the revolutionary clash.

FEDERAL AGREEMENT OF THE FEDERATED ANARCHIST GROUPS

The federal agreement of the GAF limits itself to essentials and reflects the organizational simplicity of the federation. What distinguishes the organization of the GAF from other anarchist federations is the absence of any kind of fixed position or fixed representation : the federation itself is deliberately based more on agreement than on pre-established rules. The fact that article 14 even allows the entire federal agreement to be modified bears witness to the elasticity attributed by the GAF to their organization.

Of particular importance are those autonomous ventures, to which specific reference is made in article 7, ventures organized in complete autonomy by GAF militants, without any claim to being official or representative, which has decided advantages in terms of flexible decision making and extending its field of operation. This was the case of Crocenera Anarchica, between 1969 and 1972, which dealt with political and legal defense and counter-information regarding the episodes of provocation and repression and which played a fundamental role for the movement in crucial moments, launching the national campaigns for Pinelli (who was a GAF militant) and Valpreda. This is also the case of "A-Rivista Anarchica" (began 1971), the Italian editorial group of "Interrogation" (from 1974), the Comitato Spagna Libertaria (from 1974), the new management of Edizioni Antistato (from 1975) and the Centro Documentazione Anarchica (from 1976).

These initiatives have never claimed to be «official» GAF ventures, rather in so far as was useful and possible, they have aimed to serve to anarchist movement in its entirety. Thus numerous conferences and open assemblies are held (e.g. the national assemblies of "A-Rivista Anarchica". The organizing, or better, aggregating, role of these initiatives must be borne in mind in order to understand the «unitary» role of the GAF in the context of the Italian speaking anarchist movement.

Local organization is important too, and here the GAF have taken an active part, tending to coordinate and make more effective the work of various groups with a common geographical though not (necessarily) with the same ideas.

One last observation: the organizations of GAF are linked to its numerical and geographical limits (Northern Italy). A substantial growth of either of these two factors would give rise to new problems, to which the elastic organizational form of the federation is perfectly predisposed.

1) The Federated Anarchist Groups are an affinity federation, i.e. of groups with similar ideas regarding the analysis, strategy and organization of the anarchist movement in Italy.

2) The recognized bases of this affinity are the program and the modes of organization as expressed in the present agreement.

3) There are direct contacts between the groups, each group being linked to all the others by regular exchanges of ideas, and, whenever useful and possible, of help also.

4) Correspondence with other federations, initiatives, groups and comrades within the movement may pass via a common federation address, which may integrate but not substitute the direct and active presence of the single groups.

5) The activity of each group or part of the groups does not imply the responsibility of the entire federation for these activities. No group may act or adopt positions in the name of the federation unless they have a precise mandate from the federation to do so.

6) From the affinity, frequency and regularity of the relations between the federated groups naturally derives a general agreement regarding the activity of the various groups. This agreement can be expressed in joint programs of activity for short periods or longer.

7) Other groups can collaborate in the initiatives taken by one or more groups to the extent and in the modality decided from time to time and the group or groups promoting that activity will continue in complete autonomy, apart from the obligation to faithfully respect any agreements they may have made with others.

8) The federation assemblies, in which as many comrades as possible should participate, will be held at least three times a year. The organization and the verbalization of the assemblies will be done on a rotation basis by the various federated groups. In these assemblies, as well as exchanging information and examining practical and contingent questions, questions of theory and strategy will also be discussed on the basis of one or more papers presented by one or more groups.

9) On the invitation of a federated group, anarchist comrades and groups not belonging to the federation may participate in the assemblies or in part of them.

10) Unanimous decisions are binding on the whole federation, whereas those made by a part are binding only on those groups which accepted them. The decisions of the assemblies must be ratified by the groups and will be taken to be ratified if not contested within a fortnight from the assembly.

11) A «defense network», consisting of at least four geographically representative comrades, will concern itself with aggressive repression. Every comrade is answerable to his group, the sum totality of the network corresponds to the federal assemblies.

12) The group put 10% of their takings into a federal fund, to be spent in the manner decided by the assembly.

13) A group can adhere to the federation if it agrees with the program herein contained and if the groups which already adhere to the federation are unanimously in favor. Similarly a group can cease to be part of the federation for the opposite reasons and with the unanimous opinions of the other groups.

14) The present agreement and the program here in contained may be modified, by the unanimous decision of the assembly and subsequent ratification by the groups, in all its clauses.