newspaper *Vetriolo* [Vitriol]. To request copies of *Vetriolo*, they can be contacted via vetriolo[at]autistici.org





# What international?

**Interview and dialogue with Alfredo Cospito from the prison of Ferrara**

Alfredo Cospito

Autumn 2018

Alfredo Cospito
What international?
Interview and dialogue with Alfredo Cospito from the prison of Ferrara
Autumn 2018

Originally published in in the anarchist newspaper “Vitriol” in Italian. Issue 2 (autumn 2018), issue 3 (winter 2019) & issue 4 (March 2020).
Part one was translated into English by act for freedom now! <actforfree.noblogs.org/2021/09/06/interview-and-dialogue-with-alfredo-cospito-from-the-prison-of-ferrara-published-in-anarchist-paper-vetriolo-issue-2-autumn-2018>
Part two was translated by Abolition Media. <mpalothia.net/italy-interview-with-anarchist-prisoner-alfredo-cospito/>
& Part three was translated by Anarchists Worldwide. <anarchistsworldwide.noblogs.org/post/2020/06/18/italy-what-international-interview-with-anarchist-prisoner-alfredo-cospito-part-3>
The following interview is dialogue between anarchist comrade Alfredo Cospito, who is currently imprisoned at Ferrara Prison, and the editors of the Italian anarchist

# Contents

web. The clash, the revolt that naturally develops in the street, among the people, is guerrilla warfare carried out by the "people" in arms. "Counter-information" is not enough, it becomes revolutionary when it feeds the action, when it becomes a tool for the nuclei of action allowing them to synchronize their attacks and trigger the generalized insurrection. Only by acting in this way can we build "an anarchist international", the simpler its operational dynamics will be the more effective its action will be and the more likely it will really affect our lives.

An elementary "tool", adaptable to reality, constantly evolving, I think we should focus on this objective. The FAI/FRI was one of the attempts to realize such a "project", an attempt born from the crisis of this world, in a spontaneous and natural way without leaders and theorists, by the will and action of hundreds of anarchists halfway around the world. I am firmly convinced that one day a "black international" will rise, as if by magic, from the ashes of the many defeats that we as anarchists have suffered in history, and on that day an oxymoron will come to light, an organization without organization, and it will be wonderful…



# Part One

**Internationalism has always been the principle inspiring the actions and horizons of the exploited who do not accept the role that society has given them. It has always been a vaccine against opportunism of every kind, a guarantee that those who practice it are not the servants of their boss or a foreign boss, but are authentic enemies of all forms of exploitation and authority. Internationalism as tension, as spirit, does not change with the changing of times. But the way it becomes real in history changes. Reformists, opportunists and authoritarians have always tried to pervert internationalism towards their own interests. The question of questions, the lever get the world to rise up, is therefore the International. How, what should the International be today? Should it be a real "organization", a federation of groups, a "world party"? Or can there be instruments or "structures" that are closer to the anarchist Idea and that are more effective in this historical period?**

Like "scientific" socialism, anarchism was born to oppose a global process, capitalism and the advent of the bourgeoisie. It is more than natural that anarchists and Marxists have from the beginning pursued with alternating fortunes an international organizational dimension. In the nineteenth century, with Bakunin, anarchy abandoned the philosophical, idealist level to take its first steps in the real world. First against Mazzini's messianic liberalism, to then clash with Marx's state socialism, giving rise to the autonomist federalist currents within the First International.

These first concrete steps of anarchism were taken thanks to two international organizations that today we could define "clandestine", which acted in the shadows within the "real movement", that of the workers, the proletarians. The International Alliance of socialist democracy operating from 1868 to

1872 and the International Alliance of revolutionary socialists operating after1872. Paradoxical as it might seem, I think that still today the attempt to create international "clandestine" organizations that act under the radar within mass movements can be incredibly effective and topical.

Marx's "scientific" conception could not tolerate it, considering it a naivety, a forcing, a remnant of eighteenth century conspirationism. A little like how today the vast majority of the anarchist movement does not understand plotting in secret against the State and laws. It was Engels who first saw in "clandestinisation", the double level, the attempt to hegemonise the International. Over time the anarchists made endless attempts to organize themselves internationally: Saint Imier in 1872, Amsterdam in 1907, Berlin in 1921, Paris in 1949, London in 1958, Carrara in 1968 with the creation of the IFA… but over time the conspiratorial perspective weakened until it almost disappeared. That "almost" is constituted in recent decades mainly of the efforts of the Anarchist Youth Federations with the name "First of May" at the beginning of the 1960s to bring solidarity to Spain under Franco's regime through destructive action and armed struggle, and subsequently by the revival of the insurrectionary perspective enriched by the relaunch of the "affinity group" and informal projectuality. Up to the present day, with the birth of the FAI-FRI and with all those actions around the world that talk to one another through claims and concretize a kind of "black international". Before I answer your question about what the international should be today and how it should be structured, let us try to clarify what this international should fight against. Let's dwell a moment on the concept of capitalism.

When we talk about capitalism we cannot avoid talking about technology and science. Up to the end of the sixteenth century science and technology were separate fields, then a growing osmosis formed between the two, until the dawn of the most advanced capitalism when in the nineteenth



substantial and fictitious, so we have the excuse ready: "coherence is not possible in this world". This does not detract from the fact that the discourse on the "purity" of the medium that is used, if not tackled in practice, risks becoming a bit like those theological discourses that the fathers of the church used to make about the sex of angels: a *facia*, something without any connection with real life. It is therefore necessary to make a further effort and enter into the specific, in particular, for example without the web, the FAI/FRI armed struggle experience (however limited in time it may have been) would never have been able to spread throughout the world. Each action corresponded to another in response somewhere far away in the world, this without any coordination or an all-encompassing structured organization. In this case, the "internet" made it possible to exclude authoritarian mechanisms avoiding, thanks to the anonymity and lack of knowledge between the various action groups and individuals, the birth of leaders and hierarchies. In a dynamic of this kind (without organizational structure) the web becomes "important" because it is organic and structural to the same action, it becomes a kind of "sounding board", or a "backbone", and if you break it the communication is "paralyzed", it languishes. Receiving news (claims of responsibility) from the anarchists from the countries in revolt allows us to act more effectively, with immediacy, striking in their support "at home", facilitating the internationalization of the struggles.

Today we cannot limit ourselves to bypassing the fictitious and distorting information of power by making "counter-information", we must go further…And here we return to the title of this interview, "What international?". How can we harmonize our strengths and build the international that we (as we have already said many times) feel the need for? The circulation of news followed by international action campaigns is a first step, difficult to achieve without communication via "internet". Not for nothing, when there is a risk of insurrection in a country, the "power" immediately censors and closes the

you pose is vital, and I believe there is some truth in what you say. The risk is indeed very high, but if we want to be incisive and effective with our action we cannot do without getting our hands dirty with technology and therefore with something really toxic and dangerous. In order to get down to reality, in the same way that I "dirtied" my hands with a gun, an "instrument of death", in order to carry out the action against Adinolfi I had to identify beforehand the target, the address…on the internet, I had to compromise with technology. Not to mention the "necessity" that we sometimes feel to communicate to the greatest number of comrades scattered around the world, our reflections, the motivations of our actions, the repressive waves that affect us. The use of a simple weapon is much less toxic than the use of the web, it includes fewer risks because it is linked to concreteness, materiality. Of course, even in that case there are some drawbacks, we run the risk of being "fascinated", of being conditioned by the object, the instrument, of getting carried away by "violence", of giving in to efficient, specialist, "militaristic" tendencies, but it is nothing compared to the risk we run using technology even only in terms of communication. With the web and all its technological "derivatives" we risk totally detaching ourselves from "reality", to become extras in a video game, ending up "living" in a virtual world made of "subversive" chatter that gives us the illusion to do, to act, but that actually neutralizes us by throwing ourselves into the arms of the "power" that slowly (without even realizing it) engulfs us, burning our life, our time, not so different from what happens to a prisoner locked in a cell. How many comrades exhaust their "revolt" in front of a keyboard? By doing so, alienation and dissatisfaction feed each other and find their outlet in the aggression towards those closest to us. The accusations of inconsistency, if not worse, "rain down", the really sad thing is that for many it is the only way to feel "revolutionary". Roaring incitements to action of an exceptional radicality, but never followed by deeds, only words, because everything is in-



century, science and technology became inseparable. Some argue (rightly, I think) that capitalism is substantially the product of the union of science and technology, or rather the subjection of science to technology. When we speak of imperialism today we speak of a scientific-technological revolution. And this "revolution" leads to an increase in the number of exploited, the bourgeoisie are thinning out, the dispossessed are increasing.

Fewer and fewer people have knowledge and therefore wealth on our planet; this "new" imperialism is increasing exponentially the gap between the included and the excluded. A tiny segment of humanity is responsible for this situation, at the service of the modern states and capital. The modern states and capital have created the conditions that could lead to the advent of a new world that will overthrow humanity as we know it today, annihilating all life on the planet. Scientists, mathematicians, biologists, computer scientists, chemists, researchers in all branches of science, technocrats, the whole aristocracy of human knowledge, without the large investments and resources that only capitalism and the states, with the exploitation of the majority of the population on the planet, can give them, could do nothing, let alone carry out that "revolution" which has been underway for some time and which if carried out "successfully", will bring about such radical a transformation of our nature that it will in fact be equivalent, if it is not stopped, to the extinction of the human species at least as we know it today, and the change would certainly not be for the better. The "class struggle" remains the driving force of everything, our greatest resource, but only if it directs itself against the State and capital in equal measure. Only capitalism and modern states can adequately feed the technological progress, so much so as to lead us towards the abyss. So, I believe that this international has to fight against states and capital and feed class hatred, the hatred of the excluded, the poor, the proletarians, directing its

energies against lobbyists, the military, industrialists, the rich, technocrats, politicians, statesmen, technicians and scientists. Against all the included, those who hold knowledge and capital and therefore power, whatever it may be. Technology is no longer at the service of capital, on the contrary increasingly capital is at the service of technology, this is the direction in which we are heading. The logic that commands us is less and less mere profit but the even more ruthless scientific logic; once a scientific discovery has been made it is impossible to go back, even if the ensuing technological innovation is leading us by the hand towards self-destruction. We have seen it with nuclear weapons, we will see it with the enormously more devastating and uncontrollable artificial intelligence, we are going ahead automatically without any possibility of turning back. "We are condemned to everything that has been invented once and for all". Likewise we are condemned to take the following step until the final crash. Like the character in Hate who, falling into the void, reassures himself thinking: "so far so good, so far so good…" I don't know whether internationalism will save us from this fall into the void, if as you say it will be the lever that will allow us to uplift the world and subvert it. But one thing is certain: in order to oppose this new capitalism decisively the collapse of the system must be global. Wars of position lead to defeat as much as anarchists awaiting the right moment to act have already lost.

It is here that the anarchist vision of action comes into play. Much more than revolutionary gymnastics or simply being prepared when the collapse of the system comes. It is in action that the anarchist realizes himself/herself, that they exist as such. It is in individual gestures of destruction, hotbeds of revolt and insubordination, that the anarchist lives their anarchy now, today, breaking with all forms of waiting. This living "nihilist" conception of being anarchist is accompanied by the relationship praxis-theory. In order to be effective theory must come out of praxis, not the opposite. Only by clashing with



own concreteness in the observation of the effect that actions have on reality. Those who claim that "propaganda" has a bad name due to it being a "political instrument" are right, but if we tie it to action this acquires ethics, strength, beauty. We must be pragmatic when we choose a "tool", never neglectful of its usefulness. The times change the weapons at our disposal, we must update ourselves, our press (newspapers, magazines) are insufficient instruments to communicate with the "masses", to millions of oppressed people. The "press" finds its meaning almost exclusively as a "physical place" of debate, evolution of our ideas and communication between us. I will never tire of repeating it, today, the only way we can reach a substantial number of excluded people is through "exemplary", destructive action. Claims of responsibility, small groups of comrades who practice armed struggle, comrades who take to the streets bringing conflict, only in this way can we pierce the curtain of silence that states erect around their dominion. It hasn't always been like this, in the distant past our press has had a certain influence on the "masses", just think of the tens of thousands of copies printed in the 1920s of the Malatesta newspaper, "*Umanità Nova*". The last generous attempt to build something similar (at least here in Italy) took place in the 1990s, when the most combative part of the anarchist movement tried to found a daily newspaper, an attempt that then failed because of the repression and the huge work that would have been needed to raise funds, energy and skills. Of course, from the "cultural" point of view, at least since 1968 the influence of anarchist and libertarian thought has always been strong in art, in sociology, in anthropology…But this is another story that concerns not only the "printed paper" but also the kind of anarchism that rather than fighting and destroying power tries to limit it, to put patches on it, to improve things, I don't say it with contempt, it's simply an anarchy that I don't feel is "mine".

You ask me if the technology we use to communicate risks "compromising", distorting what we want to say. The dilemma

**act as a simple conduit and the total reliance on *telematic* tools to learn about a myriad of "news" and different facts about the anarchist movement. Moreover, the use of the Internet has led to a greater "internationalization" of certain aspects of communication between anarchists, as well as having dictated a new speed in communication itself. There are those who think it is possible to use such tools in a way that does not excessively compromise the words and meaning of what we say; and those who – like us – believe that they are tools and technological achievements that are uses of power. There's still a lot to be said about, and not only that. What do you think?**

"Spreading ideas" and "propaganda", "thought" and "action", the heart of anarchist coherence, anarchist action should always coexist. Dissemination of ideas: the debate between anarchists, the deepening and evolution of our analysis, of our thinking. Propaganda: openness to the world through deed, action, demonstrations, street fights, destructive actions that speak to everyone. The power in a democratic state persecuted, counteracts the "propaganda" when action is taken, but also those anarchists who with sites and newspapers incite action. This is indicative of what power fears, it fears our words when they clearly make "propaganda", it fears the thought that pushes to action, the thought that one puts into action. Then, when the spread of ideas takes place through the "propaganda of the deed" to the States, all that remains is to give in and lose power or react and repress with violence. The spread of our iconoclastic thought in combination with our action risks becoming deadly for any democratic or dictatorial "power" that does not contemplate the building of a new state, of a "counter power". This is why the repression is unleashed in a preventive manner even against the simple propaganda of the action made with our writings.

It is often said that ideas and intuitions are forged only in action, but the reflections that determine them must have their



the system arms in hand can we build the action that will allow us to give ourselves the "organizational", "informal" tools that will enable us to strongly contribute to the "international" (instrument to affect reality effectively) that we as anarchists feel so much need of. We anarchists have this international in our blood; our vision against states, borders, our rejection of all forms of nationalism leads us by the hand towards this perspective, we just need to concretize the response to this need. This dialogue between anarchists has always been there around the world, we have always influenced one another from one side of the globe to the other. Many, many have been the attempts to give constancy, a minimum structure to this international vision of the movement. But theory falling from above, overriding praxis and reducing it to the minimum terms, bureaucratisation, gradualism (a sort of impotent reformism) have penalized these intentions, however generous, reducing them (far too often in the last 40 years) to a sterile testimony of a glorious past. Today "informal" projectuality (based on communication without intermediaries through claims of destructive actions carried out by fluid and chaotic individuals and affinity groups scattered around the world) is giving us the chance to concretely relaunch an "international" that could unleash an unstoppable chain reaction in a dangerous way for the system. Certainly we are talking about infinitesimal minorities, but why exclude a priori that, as often happens in nature, an imperceptible virus injected perhaps by an insignificant mosquito bite can kill the mighty elephant? This is a possibility that it would be stupid to renounce; imagine if anarchists of action, in spite of their many differences, were to succeed in joining forces while safeguarding their autonomy, their diversity. After all, ours is the only alternative to capitalism that hasn't betrayed itself. Perhaps because we have always "failed". More than once in history there have been glimpses of anarchy concretized but always for short periods, we preferred to succumb rather than accept a "revolutionary" dictatorship. These fail-

ures of ours have left in us utopian strength, the primordial force of our utopia. It is in our striving towards this that our actions become reality, living matter, action, projectuality, praxis – theory. If we look at which forces push us towards the international we will see that all concrete attempts at internationalizing struggles have "solidarity" as their driving force, solidarity with a population in struggle, solidarity with migrants, solidarity with sisters and brothers hit by repression… "Solidarity" is the first thrust, the *deus ex machina* of every struggle that aims to involve mutual aid, because it comes from an inner need that is important for every human being. You ask me what the international should be and what are the instruments, the most anarchist and effective structures, in which our profound need for internationalism can express itself. This is a controversial question, the points of view can be many. In the history of our movement specific organizations, federations, even parties, let's remember UAI which Malatesta himself defined an anarchist party, were all put to the test even on an international level with mixed fortunes and common failures. Far be it from me to make "moral" judgement concerning which organizational form should or should not be adopted. Otherwise we get tangled up in jesuitical discourses on what is or is not anarchist, excommunicationing right, left and centre. I spent my life doing this and only now do I realize that it is a huge waste of time and energy. What I can try to give an answer to is what for me is the most effective "structure" or "tool" to concretize a powerful, aggressive, dangerous anarchist international. An international that makes power bleed, by hurting it, by waging war on it effectively. I shall be clear and brief: for me this "international" already has its form, its own dynamics even if only in outline. With its ups and downs and its smallness and greatness, it is made up of all that world of sisters and brothers who, through their claims, also without acronyms, talk to each other, giving support and solidarity to one another calling for campaigns all over the world. A small thing at first sight, but



**in this dialogue, now our thoughts also end up on those means, on those publications, which allow the discussion of ideas and practices pertaining to anarchism, as well as making possible their propaganda or dissemination. Clearly there are substantial differences between propaganda and the spread of anarchist ideas. The mere spread seems to leave a sense of indeterminacy. So we ask ourselves: what meaning can it have, today, in a world where everyone is invited to spread their intellectual garbage and to amortize with their culture, with their opinions and considerations, to spread anarchist ideas? On the other hand, with regard to the term and concept of propaganda, it seems to us that this has taken on an almost negative value in anarchist contexts. It almost seems to mean that propaganda of anarchist ideas is a malicious fact because it would correspond to an attempt to convince or persuade "the people" ("and then propaganda makes it the power!"). We don't feel the same way. We want to find at the end that deeper value that unites the possibility of making known one's own ideas also in order to be able to reach possible accomplices to a constant agitation aimed at keeping anarchist thought in turmoil, also this expression of the conflict against power, never separated from action.**

**Anarchist propaganda, a thing of the past, something that has disappeared along with another propaganda, the one of the deed. We also know that, depending on the weather, terms can have very different values and meanings, but we do not want to go too far. I mean, what does anarchist propaganda mean to you today? And then, very heavily, another boulder falls: in the age of the Internet, of sites and blogs, even anarchists have "ventured" (so to speak) into the net – this has had many harmful consequences, in our opinion. Among these, the almost complete disappearance of paper publications that no longer**

progress. That is why today "the anarchist revolution" sounds anachronistic, an out-of-this-world concept. This concept can regain its meaning, its concreteness, its topicality only if it is accompanied by "revolt", by violence. The "revolt" is satisfied with "pathos" (feelings, passions, fascination) and "praxis" (destructive action, propaganda of the deed, violence). The "revolution" is a complete, complex concept, it also needs "ethos" (values) and "logos" (strategy, rationality). With ethos and logos, "myths" are not built, revolutions are not unleashed[1]. And revolutions only come when revolutions have opened a breach in the hearts of men, women, the oppressed, the excluded. Everything has its moment, every action is a child of its time. The "anarchist revolution" is the daughter of our revolutionary violence. So we are not living in a time of a crisis within anarchism but of regeneration.

The "revolt" and the "revolution" are linked in a double thread, however interdependent, interconnected, always in harmony. I will say more, the "revolution" must not become a "status quo", it must be a sort of permanent revolt, of continuous, "infinite" experimentation. The "myth" is the invention that results in the "revolution". After all, "history" and "myth" have the same purpose: "to paint the eternal man under the man of the moment"; women and men in revolt destroyers and creators of new societies, new worlds.

**Discussing also some anarchist ideas and concepts such as those on which we reflect upon in this interview,**

[1] My reflections on ethos, pathos, praxis and logos were inspired by Amedeo Bertolo in "*Pensiero e azione. L'anarchismo come logos, praxis, ethos e pathos*". I hope that no one will mind the "abysmal" distance between my anarchist terrorism and its creative anarchy. The beauty of anarchy lies precisely in the fact that in the course of experimenting with new paths, sometimes, even the "opposites" touch each other. Bertolo was looking for the "right balance" between these forces, I think that only from the fusion of these can be born the new, because life is contrast: rational and irrational, hate and love, all less than mortal static "balance". Harmony is the child of "imbalance", of chaos.



which contains great hope in itself, a real possibility that, after the failure of scientific Marxist determinism, can restore hope to the oppressed of the earth, bring new life to an anarchy that risks annulling itself in a post-anarchist gradualism, which behind the semblance of "realism" delivers us entirely into the politics of gradual changes, reformism. Only by not postponing the revolution to some far-off tomorrow, but living it now, violently, without compromise or mediation will we be able to push ourselves out of this dead end. I know I am repetitive in my contributions and writings from prison. I am not looking for originality at all costs but the few ideas I have I will repeat ad nauseam in the hope that they are discussed. I am firmly convinced that the knot we need to untangle in order to become more incisive and cause as much damage as possible to this hyper-technological system that rests on two crutches, capitalism and the state, is how to "organize" without betraying ourselves, without giving up any individual freedom as we do so. My adhesion to the project FAI-FRI says a lot about what I think should be the way forward and what this "international" should be. We will find the way to talk about that later on, it is a simple and at the same time complex discourse, which, like all vital things, divides the movement, creating tensions, misunderstandings and, last but not least, repression, and we are just at the beginning ...

**The media are announcing the arrival of robots with great fanfare. We shall see. The role that science plays in the world of exploitation, however, has been clear for millennia. How to stop this monster that is threatening to disrupt life on this planet for ever? What perspective should inspire the actions of an international towards scientists? Could individual direct action be accompanied by mass explosions, as happened in the past with the "luddite" movement (for example by people who have a grudge against robots because these take their jobs away or make the pace of slavery worse)? And how**

**do you see "historical" movements such as ELF, ALF and the like?**

It is true that the media are announcing the arrival of robots with great fanfare. And when they do, they almost always link this phenomenon to the danger of unemployment, some more imaginative media go even further, seeing the advent of robots as an overcoming of the human, a dictatorship of machines to which a generic humanitarianism should be opposed. For decades they have been bombarding us with the danger of an imminent ecological catastrophe, suggesting at best a digestible, ecological technology, and the hope of a spontaneous collapse of the system (to the most "radical" ecologists) in the worst case. Why are the media doing this? They give us a huge amount of information that leads us by the hand to fictitious solutions, a "generic humanitarianism" which acts as a counter-balance to an equally generic concept, that of "people", suggesting a supposed inevitability of catastrophe from which only "fate", a meteorite, a nuclear war, the arrival of green men can save us. In this way they undermine our will by convincing us that the possible is impossible. Leaving us with only two "alternatives", the false hope of a technology on a human scale or resignation to the inevitable in the false hope that "god", "fate" will deliver us from the nightmare. What could we counterpose to all this shit? Full awareness of our own strength, full awareness of who is responsible for exploitation, wars, the impending catastrophe. One single class has control of the hyper-technological society. One class alone enjoys its benefits, all the others enjoy the rubbish, the crumbs, the exploitation. It is not the robots that are our enemies, but those who design them, capitalism and the states, that finance these projects, men and women in flesh and blood. I'm sure I am stating the obvious in saying that a "liberated society" that uses a hyper-technological model is a contradiction in terms. We must have the courage to renounce "progress", we must have the courage to oppose it arms in



ues to clash with reality, to sound false, out of place. If we want to be honest, we must tell ourselves that, even when we take part in uprisings and insurrections in distant countries, making our generous contributions, we know very well that no matter how just the cause we fight for, it will never lead to an anarchist revolution. We are so convinced that with "reality" we always have to make compromises, so convinced that it is no longer reality that transforms us, it is we who run towards it adapting and giving up our extreme idea of freedom in view of a possible, concrete "reality". In doing so we obscure, we water down, we lose our utopian spark, we renounce the "anarchist revolution", a perspective for us now "out of this world", "anachronistic", impossible to achieve. We no longer believe in it, this is the truth, deep in our hearts, day after day, year after year "realism" has undermined our certainties, digging an almost unbridgeable chasm. Fortunately the aforementioned Fukuyama was wrong, the game is not over, the story has not come to an end. The history of humanity (at least until now) has always been characterized by leaps forward, historical moments in which the "revolutionary" break is as inevitable as it is inexorable. The world around us is changing faster and faster but the technology that is going crazy has not yet managed to significantly affect our humanity, our instincts, our "soul". But as we have said the stakes have risen, now the very survival of humanity and life on this planet is at stake. The only concrete possibility we have to reverse this trend is the "anarchist revolt" with all its disruptive charge of feelings, passions, irrationality, class hatred, anti-technological instincts against the so-called scientific "progress". It will not be rationality, moderation or balance that will save us but the irrationality of passions, feelings, hatred, love, anger, revenge. It is not the time to build new societies but to destroy existing ones. It is the time of the revolt, of the "fascination" of the "myth" of the "anarchist revolution". It will then be the "revolution" to create, to build, but this must not concern us now because there is no revolution in

anarchist movement), the discourse of nuclear power was superficially addressed and the question of technology, of the "mega machine" (for me now central) was not even touched upon. The criticism that at the time some comrades made of that claim to be essentially a series of accusations against the other components of the movement contained truths. What I'm trying to tell you is that with time the analyses evolve, the important thing is not to give up, not to stand still at the post and above all never give in to the power that in my case means not giving up (in the situation in which I find myself not even on a theoretical level) the violent clash with the system, the armed struggle, whatever it costs. Remaining true to oneself is not always a quality, sometimes it is equivalent to a defeat, it makes us predictable, in some cases "folkloristic". Consistency must not mean going down the same road again and again. Stagnating one's strategy is in fact suicide, and brings nothing new to the fight. Being locked in a cell should not prevent me from evolving and looking for new paths. To have the strength to relaunch, all you need to do is keep your criticism and irony about yourself and the world firm. Self-criticism and irony: two indispensable antibodies so as not to turn us into fanatics or ideological trombones. So you should not be surprised if today I contradict myself with what I have argued in the past, questioning the credibility in our mouths of the resounding term "revolution", going so far as to argue, as I did in this interview, that "revolution" as a word sounds empty and therefore "enemy".

This sort of "injured majesty" is certainly a provocation (as you say) but it brings with it a substantial "criticism" linked to an attempt of mine to "analyse" reality which has its great limits, but which finds its tangible meaning in practice. Almost all anarchists fill their mouths with the word "revolution", very few act accordingly by hitting power structures, even fewer go further by hitting men and women in the hierarchies of domination, but even in these cases the sound of this word contin-



hand by risking our lives to stop this self-destructive process, which is not at all inevitable. Only the systematic exploitation of billions of women and men can sustain modernity, there is no communist state "utopia" that can hold. This will be the case at least for as long as the reins are in the hands of us imperfect humans, until the ruling class is forced to delegate (cede) command (of a "mega-machine" by now too complex to be managed) to a "super-intelligence" then, yes, we can expect "virtual wellbeing" for all, "infernal wellbeing" without any freedom, which I don't even wish on my worst enemy. But let's be clearer about what are we talking about: however "science fiction" and fanciful it might seem, we are talking about a "revolution", which if not stopped will disrupt the life of the whole planet. If capitalism is the alienating and alienated offspring of the supremacy of technology over science, we can easily conclude that the product of this relation is the "mega-machine" in which we all live immersed in today. The next step will be this "mega-machine's" gaining awareness through AI (artificial intelligence). Let's take it step by step: all over the world investments in AI are substantial and multiplying year after year. In 2016 Europe invested 3.2 billion euros, 20 billion euros are predicted in 2020. The United States have already invested 18 and 37 are predicted in 2020. 12 billion euros all over the world in 2017 solely for the study of algorithms capable of learning from their errors, autonomously. In an advanced stage, the creation of neuromorphic computers, which instead of performing calculations based on binary codes (on – off) use processors that exchange signals as our neurons do. By reaching infinitely greater speeds and more and more reduced dimensions and ways of functioning "closer" to our mind. The effects on the market, even if partial, are already there: – self-driving cars– medicine (analysis of medical records, X-rays, diseases, viruses) – robotics (all the systems that manage robots) – industrial automation – analysis and management of complex systems such as the road

network in a metropolis – automatic management systems – analysis and forecasting of stock market trends – analysis and forecasting in the meteorological and agricultural fields – analysis of videos and texts and images published online – logistics management. Those running this "revolution" today are a limited number of scientists, super-specialized technicians in a few centres scattered around the world. They all are within reach of an anarchist international, a combative one, even if limited in strength. Its best weapons? Willpower and determination, these two qualities are sufficient to chase back, slow down this technological "progress" they want us to believe unstoppable. We still have time at our disposal and room for manoeuvre, especially as the "system" is not yet fully aware of the turning point it is about to take and investments, however huge, are just at the beginning. It is very likely that government bureaucracies and intelligence agencies have a certain ineptitude and rigidity that will prevent them from fully understanding the importance of certain developments, which could be clear to those of us external to these logics and certain specialisations. Let's say that our being outside and against the system could allow us a greater overview, a greater mental elasticity. The obstacles to understanding such a technological "revolution", such a turning point, could be particularly strong for governments, states and capitalists.

But what would this turning point, this technological "revolution" be? The agricultural revolution spread around the world over thousands of years, the industrial revolution over hundreds of years, the information technology revolution over a few decades and it will have its apex, its "point of no return" with what technicians and scientists define "an intelligence explosion". The "Human Brain Project" founded in 2005 hopes to recreate a human brain within 20 years. This will trigger the so-called "explosion", the transition from human intelligence to (sub-human) super-intelligence. Scientists claim that once the human intellectual capacity is reached in a very short time



**invent a series of actions because there is a project that stimulates my mind…**

**Doesn't it seem a mistake to have slipped into this vein, albeit with a completely different goal?**

I could justify my "renunciation" of the "revolution" by quoting Camus: "Since we no longer live the time of revolution, let us learn to live at least the time of revolt". In reality I agree with him only on one point: today we are certainly not living the time of "revolution", but that of "revolt". But I want to make it clear that my apology for the "revolt" is not a retreat, nor an invitation to settle for a half measure in a lean period. I am convinced that there is no "revolution" without a sequence of countless revolts that precede and prepare it. These revolts allow us both to live, immediately and fully, the pleasure of our anarchy (we were born for this, it is our nature) and to open ourselves to the world by building revolt after revolt, action after action, the "myth" of the "sun of the future", building brick after brick our credibility in the eyes of the oppressed without which there can never be a "revolution" worthy of the name. Our role today can only be this: to strike, strike and strike again… Forging with blood, sweat and immense pleasure the "myth" of "avenging anarchy". An anarchist revolution is possible. We just have to find the courage and strength to sustain such an imaginative and utopian perspective. The fact that it has nothing "ideological" and "authoritarian" is precisely because it is inherently imaginative and utopian. In the claim of the "Olga" Cell, this optimism clearly emerges in a declaration of passionate love for the "social revolution". At that time it was (and still is, but today I do so in a more articulated way) important to relaunch action in the perspective of an overall change and overturning of things in the world (social revolution). Since in your question you mention the responsibility claim for the pistol attack against Adinolfi, let me say that in any case that writing had great limits. It was totally bent in on itself (addressed almost exclusively to the

**peaceful sleep – for example – of the winegrower who does not want a strike in his field, where he continues to exploit migrants as slaves, who fears the revolution more than anything else, since we would take away, as they say, their home and their vineyard.**

**We are going to be tough this time: the risk, when people say that the revolution is over, is that there are comrades who are so stupid – and there are, indeed – that they do not understand that this is a provocation, and they really believe it! So your invectives against the revolution may not so much push the comrades to act here and now, but not to act at all. Rebels need a dream; why go to jail or get killed?**

**Besides, today, to blame the revolution, don't get offended, it's not very original. It began in 1992 with Francis Fukuyama, with his essay "The End of History and the Last Man". According to the American regime philosopher everything was over: democracy, capitalism, the liberal state had won forever. The eternal nightmare of the eternal present. A philosophical-social paradigm that society has reified in various ways: from TV to the consumerism of the web, the objects of consumption change very quickly, but it seems conversely to have lived in the same era for thirty years. And because anarchists, even those who profess to be more turgidly antisocial, live in this society and absorb its vices and ideas, many anarchists have begun to think exactly as the system wanted us to think: from the articles on "*A-rivista anarchica*" or "*Umanità Nova*" that pontificate on the end of the violent social revolution, which should be replaced by anarchism as a cultural, Kantian, normative idea... up to the comrades that were once fighters who are depressed today, because, sometimes, absence of revolutionary perspective also means absence of planning fantasy. I also**



(even months) the intelligence explosion will be triggered, consisting of an exponential and uncontrollable growth of the intellectual capacity of AI. From that moment the risk of losing the reins of our destiny will be very high, to the delight of the transhumanists homo sapiens will transform into something else, something obscure, an abortion of nature, a cancer for this planet even more than we already are. Fortunately for us, scientists are by nature often too "optimistic" in their timing and "imaginative" in their outlook. We can well believe in our ability to oppose if not reverse this process. It depends on us, on our lucidity, on the strengths we bring to bear, on the weapons we put in place. I think the important thing is to not be overwhelmed by catastrophism, which doesn't strengthen us but leads us to resignation in the face of the inevitable. In order to have a more precise idea of the technological leap that "modernity" is promising us through super-intelligence, let's try to read a couple of definitions that technicians give of the same: «any intellect that greatly overcomes the cognitive performances of human beings in almost all the domains of interests», an ultra-intelligent machine is «a machine that can greatly overcome all the intellectual activities of any human being, however intelligent». According to those working on it, super-intelligence will be the panacea against all evils, the Aladdin's lamp that will solve all our energy, pollution, economic problems, it will find the cure for all diseases, it will even promise, if not immortality, a-mortality. But the very scientists and technicians who are dreaming about these future advances (which, let it be clear, will inevitably "benefit" only the class of the included) are terrified of it and consider its advent extremely dangerous, so much so that it makes the dangers of the atomic era, of a nuclear war, ludicrous. Scientists and technicians, although still far from reaching it, are desperately studying possible virtual reality traps within which to contain it, deceive it, cage it once they reach it. Fears and hopes, the law of science condemns us to

"progress" to go ahead at any cost ,even to the detriment of our survival as a species. But what worse condemnation for a slave than an amortality that prolongs the agony of a life without freedom. We anarchists have always been sensitive to these "issues" because nothing has challenged our freedom in recent years more than "modernity", technology. We have not limited ourselves to sociological analyses of technique and technology over the years. Those of us more inclined to action, the anarchists who have put destructive direct action into practice through informality and affinity groups, have deployed a theoretical and practical armamentarium on the sensitive and peripheral points to be struck, optic fibers, power cables, pylons… The tendency has been that from the centre we needed to move to the periphery of the system where controls are inferior, where vital lines, if interrupted with reproducible means (fire, bolt cutters…) could wreak considerable damage; there has been much talk recently about interrupting the flow of goods. This tendency that prevails today among insurrectionalists owes its birth (in my opinion) to the opposition of anarchism of action to the BR [Red Brigades] "lottarmatismo" of the late 70s when the "keyword" for anarchists became that the State did not have a heart, a centre. Meantime the BR were maintaining the necessity of striking "the heart of the State" in the figures of its most significant men. Many decades have passed, everything has changed but this "formula" which had a strong sense at the time has become a "mantra", a "dogma" that has perpetuated itself in the same way, losing more and more meaning and becoming harbinger of obtuseness, intransigence, justification for fears never expressed. This methodology, at least as far as concerns the country where I find myself living, has been reduced to a refusal (never admitted, but in fact practiced) to strike people, those directly responsible for the nefariousness of the system. For many anarchists there is only "sabotage" and destructive action (striking and destroying things). The ex-



"splendid" literature but ephemeral because they are devoid of any real relevance, detached from the struggle, far from life.

**For a few years now, you've been taking an "against the revolution" stance. A position that we imagine you have matured in prison, since the claim of the Olga/FAI-FRI Cell ends with a declaration of love for the social revolution. We believe we have perfectly understood your position, that is, the provocation "against the expectation of revolution", which means postponing the action to better times, when the objective conditions will be in place. In short, the wait-and-see and all its sauces, even if cooked with revolutionary recipes. As long as it remains a provocation, they're in. The dialectical paradox: revolutionaries today are reformists. It's effective. But it stops being effective if you abandon the paradoxical use of expression. Let's try to explain. It is effective against so-called social anarchism – social, but not classist – which "fronts" with a section of the bourgeoisie for success on specific objectives (workplace strikes, defending rights, etc.), waiting for conditions to improve for the revolution. A bit like what was said at the time of the war in Spain in 1936: first win the war, then make the revolution. It is therefore effective against the frontism that postpones the revolution, after having solved more pressing problems, in order to solve them, alliances are made with those subjects that the revolution should instead exterminate. So ask you: isn't it like giving the ball game to your opponent? What else should be expected for the revolution? Hasn't capitalism destroyed our planet enough already? Haven't you already put enough on the shoulders of generations of exploited people? Instead of saying that the revolution is over, it would be better to defend the necessity of the revolution here and now, against those who want to postpone it until the distant future so as not to disturb the**

assemblies and relate to the people. Forcing ourselves at times to limit our interventions so as not to run the risk of being isolated, of being put out of the "game". Actions meditated and mediated by the social context that surrounds them. The characteristic of this type of action is to pursue objectives that involve the concrete life of people, linking them firmly to the reality of immediate, albeit partial results that have the merit of making people understand the real potential of direct action, of the refusal of delegation. Both these practices are characterized by a great leap in quality which, in my opinion, cannot be ignored, which puts them above all other anarchist practices: destructive action, armed action, questioning the state monopoly of violence. One can only start from this to overturn, to revolutionize the world because the seeds of the future brotherhood and sisterhood already lives today in conflict and in the way we choose to organize it. Only in a context of struggle, conflict, can we immediately taste, today, the purity of free relationships, of love, of living, revolutionary solidarity. The rest is compromised, quiet living, alienation, long-term surrender. Anarchy does not live in what we say or write but in what we do. We would like to take it for granted that those who talk about certain practices have experienced them with their own skin, but unfortunately this is not always the case. That is why (in my opinion) we should pay more attention to the texts and reflections in the claims. In those cases we can't be wrong, whoever wrote them has acted and put their life on the line. By necessity their words have a materiality, a concreteness, a greater weight, we know with certainty that those who write them have moved to action putting their lives at risk. The strength of communication through actions lies precisely in this. Some comrades define the claims as useless texts full of demagogy, it may be so, but at least in these (however "demagogic" they seem) we are certain that the words carry the "burden" of life lived, acted upon. Something that is missing from many texts full of



clusivity of this practice is also widespread in the "ecological" milieu with a few significant exceptions, Kaczynski for one. ALF and ELF also take on this propensity to exclude violent actions against people (with a few sporadic exceptions). These "organizations" are important for other reasons because they are an important example (because concrete) of how one can "organize" in a destructured way. As some comrades say "the organization that does not have or want organization". In my opinion, their influence on the practice of FAI-FRI is without any doubt, it suffices to think of their communicating through actions and their international campaigns. I hope we'll have the chance to talk about this more in depth later… Here in Italy in the anarchist sphere only a few actions of the FAI have gone against that tendency in recent years. The much denigrated "parcel bombs", an ancient practice which, whatever you say, is part of the anarchist "tradition". Just think of the so-called "galleanists" in America or the dispatching of explosive trunks addressed to the biggest Italian dailies carried out by [Italian] anarchists who had escaped to France during the fascist regime, to mention but a few. As I have already said in the past, the distortion of "history", the purging of inconvenient facts is not an exclusively Stalinist practice, even we anarchists practice it in our own small way, often unconsciously. You mention the Luddite movement, anarchists, and not only, far too often present this movement as an exclusive example of the practice of "sabotage", erasing the part of that history which is less digestible for a certain vision of action. Murder was also part of the Luddites' paraphernalia, they didn't limit themselves to the destruction of looms. In 1812 William Horsfall, the owner of a textile factory, was shot (dead) in an ambush. A few days earlier he had promised his workers he would put down any revolt and that Luddite blood would flow up to his saddle. It was he who succumbed, it was his blood that flowed. Three Luddites were hanged for that gesture of revolt. It was not a sporadic case, when we read the just

exaltations of Luddism we hardly ever hear mention of this kind of action. Why? Is "sabotage" perhaps more subversive, more dangerous to the system than the physical elimination of a boss? Certainly today it involves a greater reaction by the system, more repression. But "fear" is never a good counselor, it makes us lose our rationality, our sense of reality. Perhaps the sense of loss of reality is due to the tomes and tomes, the endless "sociological" disquisitions of anarchists on the word "terrorism", and on how this word can "isolate" us and is uniquely the product of power. Terrorism is a practice that anarchists (as almost all revolutionary and people's movements) have always used. I will never tire of repeating it no matter how inconvenient and a bearer of repression it might be, because I believe that intellectual honesty and coherence go hand in hand, and in order to be credible, therefore effective, in action, we must be honest with ourselves and others, and not reason according to immediate convenience but in perspective. Terrorism, intended as a practice that spreads terror among the ruling class as Emile Henry did, as Algerians did by striking French bars (the examples are endless), however questionable it might be on a "moral" level, has never isolated anyone and history tells us so. Terrorism from below to above has all the justifications in the world. Excuse me if I've gone off the subject, but I had to say certain things, no matter how inconvenient. Let's move on to the next question…

## Part Two

**Analyzing the history of the movement of the exploited, of the poor, oppressed and proletarians, we see that anarchist ideas are born, nourished and developed in these contexts; on the other hand, most of the anarchists also come from there (of course there are also exceptions). These ideas were born mainly**



insurrectionalist who, in order to facilitate a collective and quantitative growth, is willing (setting intermediate objectives in specific struggles) to limit and calibrate their own destructive violence. To understand better, let us look at what these differences are, specifically, from a "structural-organizational" point of view, they are remarkable, between small "affinity groups" scattered throughout the territory that communicate through claims, promoting "international campaigns", and "affinity groups" linked to a specific struggle in the territory that relate to "open assemblies" extended to the population and the "movement". Equally radical are the differences at the "operational" level. On the one hand, actions of violence and strong impact which have as their objective the "propaganda of the deed", the simple spreading of terror among the ranks of the exploiters. Therefore, an action that does not need to compromise, to mediate with the existing because it does not aim at an intermediate struggle. Its only purpose (besides the pure, beneficial, enjoyable pleasure of destruction) is to regenerate at any cost the "myth" of the "avenging anarchy", of the "sun of the future", of the "anarchist revolution". Through the "propaganda of the deed" they rebirth this "myth" regaining that credibility among the exploited that we have lost over time. Credibility that we will obtain with actions that will not set any limits because they will have only one objective, the deeply ethical one of hitting the exploiters hard by avenging the exploited. So a practice that appeals to the "nihilist", "dark" side of anarchy, revenge, hatred, violence and a strong irrationality dictated by the "crazy" and courageous desire for freedom, in my opinion is the most lively and optimistic part of our anarchy, the one that will lead us to revolution. On the other hand, there is insurrectionalism (social anarchism) with its links to the territory, with its actions that put all sorts of reformists and gradualists in the way. Actions which have as their objective the immediate concreteness of a specific struggle, which must take into account the popular

by spreading everywhere. In the 1980s I saw an epidemic of attacks on pylons all over the country, decades later I witnessed, amazed and full of enthusiasm, the international campaigns and the FAI/FRI explosion reach halfway around the world. Past experiences (too brief, sometimes), but which leave the mark of a full life, a life worth living, the life of an anarchist of action overflowing with optimism. They are satisfactions difficult to understand for those who have not experienced them, but easy to achieve, just jump into the fray and move from theory to action, so you open a world…

These three practices, over the years, have all been tested in the field and even if (sometimes) they have produced a "distorted logic of factions", they represent the most vital and combative part of anarchy, its concretization in the world. Especially when these debates involve comrades who practice action, in that case they acquire a different, real value. Precisely for this reason, even among those who practice informality, contrasts, even strong ones, have never been lacking. We should not be surprised, especially if we think that the latter (informality) can be characterized by different dynamics both from a "structural-organizational" and an "operational" point of view. Over the years, the greatest disagreements have been over the claim of the actions and above all over the use of acronyms, seconded only by the concept of "spectacularization" referring to certain actions accused of not being reproducible. In reality we are talking about different practices that have different, not conflicting, but profoundly different ends. That involve opposing attitudes and choices in life and that give rise to the two sides of today's anarchy of action. On the one hand, the "anti-social" and "nihilist" conception which, with the violence of the action taken to the extreme consequences, recasts the "myth" of the "avenging anarchy"; the "social" implications of its action exist but will be seen tomorrow, when this "myth" will have breached the hearts of the oppressed. On the other hand, the "social" anarchist, the



**during the birth and growth of industrial capitalism (indicatively from the early 1800s to the 1970s), and up to 40 years ago, the organizations of the exploited and of the workers are mainly mass and the anarchist groups (and the individuals who are part of them) are also the fruit of that historical era. With the advent of capitalist restructuring in the 1980s, followed by a drastic change in the world of work, even anarchist action and organization undergo changes; to the classic organizations of synthesis (or mass), the less rigid structures, based on affinity and informality, are opposed. The new technological restructuring, based mainly on robotics will obviously lead to other drastic changes (mass unemployment) and the new proletarians will probably be employed in moving goods. In this context, in which the impoverishment of the proletarians (and obviously the exploitation of humans, animals and land) and the wealth of the exploiters will increase, does it still make sense to talk about class struggle? Are there still margins to involve – in the struggle for the destruction of this techno-industrial civilization – the exploited, the proletarians, the excluded? Should we try or renew forms of struggle organization?**

This question starts from logical assumptions by making the organizational method depend on external conditions. But, for us anarchists, it is not all so simple, linear and logical because, not being "politicians," in our case, the "means justify the ends," not vice versa. Consequently, if capitalism "restructures," it must not change our way of "organizing ourselves" because it is in the means we use that our anarchy lives.

Our luck is that the anarchist practice of informality and affinity groups has never been as close to reality as it is today. Paradoxically, we were not the ones to adapt to reality; it was reality that adapted to us. The reality has run towards us, making our practices extremely effective, which over time

have become the ideal to unhinge a complex and chaotic system like the one we are forced to survive in today. Only a simple, extremely reproducible and equally chaotic, elusive and adaptable practice as informality and the affinity groups can do it. These ways of "organizing" are not an adaptation to the "capitalist restructuring" of the 1980s: since the time of Cafiero and his "propaganda of the deed," they have always been at the base of anarchist action, so much as to characterize our organizations of synthesis. Within each anarchist synthesis organization that was posed in a revolutionary manner, there were in fact affinity groups that acted informally, often indicating the way to go and rekindling the action.

It is also absurd to think that the class struggle is over; we are immersed up to the neck, but unlike yesterday the barbarization due to the technological isolation (that each of us carries with us) deprives us of the real perception of the phenomenon in its complexity. This barbarization involves a return to primordial, wild (and therefore purer) forms of class conflict. The mediation figures "unions" and "parties" are skipped. In the most technologically "advanced" part of the world, the social subject that once characterized the oppressed class, the "proletariat," has been replaced by an indefinite and desperate class that has no self-awareness. Meanwhile, hatred and anger have accumulated, saturating the air, making it unbreathable and ready to explode at the first spark of the right intensity. The power is well aware that despite having less than good cards in our hands, it plays them well, fueling conflicts between the poor. But they are only palliative, only slightly effective. The unions and left-wing parties no longer work. Their role has been replaced by weapons of mass distraction like racism and patriotism. But how long will it last? The strategy of putting the poor against the poorest is short sighted. The general impoverishment, due to the technological wave and the consequent unemployment, will defuse racisms and patriotisms, but only if we play our cards



tenor were not lacking against the comrades of the Informal Anarchist Federation. Having said that, however, it must be said that the affirmation of the "new" is almost always accompanied by gestures of aggression towards the "old" and we anarchists are no exception. Equally verbal aggression against "official" anarchists were not lacking ("armchair anarchists", "cowards", "reformists", "bourgeoisie"…), nothing tragic, normal dynamics (even if unpleasant and counterproductive) within a movement, the anarchist one, overflowing with conflicting passions and beliefs and (let me say it) for this very reason still vital.

You argue that the debates risk being reduced to simple "mockery for its own sake" and that "reproducibility, informality, anonymity" are far removed from real "theoretical-practical" findings, undermined as they are at the root (*a priori*) by a "distorted logic of factions". You would be right if such practices had never been tested in the field, but in fact a significant part of the movement has experienced them for years on its own skin. I've been in prison for years for this. For better or for worse I have tested in practice, in reality, the effectiveness and consequences of such "concepts". I have enjoyed exhilarating victories and suffered discouraging defeats. When we "dirty" our hands with action, ups and downs are inevitable. When we are confronted with certain dynamics of conflict we cannot be sure of anything. Everything is possible, even the most unimaginable things can be realized as if by magic. The only certainty we have is that only by concretely clashing with power can we rework, expand and improve our action and practice, the rest is secondary. "Reproducibility, informality, anonymity", three simple words that mean more to me than abstract and cerebral theories. I have attempted (not always successfully) to be consistent and to live my anarchy right now.

The "reproducibility", I connect it to a feeling: the joy of seeing one's own practices (the actions of anarchists) surprise

that they give rise to less intense repression by the State. The rejection of insurrectionism or informal experiences such as FAI/FRI by "classical" anarchism is almost always motivated as an "ethical" rejection of violence and specifically of certain actions (bomb attacks, arson attacks, parcel bombs, knee-cappings, expropriations…). For those who call themselves "revolutionary" it is more than obvious the hypocrisy of such a motivation. The revolution with its tragic trail of civil war is among the most violent events imaginable and when we talk about "classic" social and organised anarchism we are talking about comrades who have never questioned the concept of revolution, of a violent break with the system. For those who do not remove revolutionary violence from their ideological landscape, the indignant opposition to certain practices has its roots elsewhere, not in ethics, but in fear. Fear of repression, fear of losing that deceptive image (however comfortable) of the naive anarchist dreamer, innocent and defenceless victim of the system, who from *Piazza Fontana* onwards, many, here in Italy, have used as a shield against repressive vicissitudes. A "saint" on which a certain "social" anarchism, at times post-anarchist, has founded its own "myth" and its own "fortunes". The anarchist armed struggle, albeit a minority one, has challenged this "myth" especially when it is claimed proudly in the face of the judges. We must then resign ourselves to the inevitable: the "ideological" prejudice against "new" forms of struggle is in the nature of things. Each new form of organization inexorably "disorganizes" preexisting realities that have their own end, displacing them and questioning them. The birth of what you call "factions" is the result of this "disorganization", of this conflict. Our history is full of infighting between comrades who in theory (though with different practices) should be on the same side. The "insurrectionists", when they appeared, in the 70's and 80's, suffered very violent attacks, shameful accusations were made against them. Decades later, accusations of the same



well. In the time necessary to settle down and to guarantee to all citizenship incomes, the system will be exposed, almost unarmed, to our attacks. In that time, the hatred will reach its climax and perhaps it will be the right time that in this unfortunate country, the anger will be directed towards the real people responsible for the misery: the State and masters.

Furthermore, the popular madness of sovereignty is undermining parliamentary democracy from its foundations. This sort of "populism" produces contrasting and irrational thrusts that are difficult to manage for the ones that triggered them. Today, the possibility of our action opening a breach becomes real. We must have clear ideas, conviction and tenacity to change hatred, to open the eyes of the exploited. Will and determination can bring back the clock of history, making us start again from where we started to lose those two irreplaceable qualities. A century ago we were overwhelmed by the force of an authoritarian "communism" that poisoned us with its fruits, "social democracy" and "dictatorship of the proletariat," which, with their brutality, brought to the end the "myth" of the social revolution of "the sun of the future" and of anarchy as concrete prospects for total liberation. We argued in our "modernity" that we did not need "myths," but so we killed utopia, the greatest weapon we had to subvert this world. Historically we have focused too much on rationality, on science, neglecting the instincts of revolt, the feelings, the passions underlying the human.

We have lost sight of "the possibility of making it" and this has made us so enraged that we do not recognize, for example, the greatness of the gesture of one of our brothers, Mikhail Zhlobitsky, who blew himself up in the Arkhangelsk FSB headquarters to avenge his own comrades, tortured by Russian cops. This very young companion has acquired today the founding value of a vital anarchy, ready to play with everything in order to free this world. Things are changing fast; the anarchists are awakening from their torpor. We are witnessing phenomena

unthinkable up until a few years ago, for example the spread of anarchist communism in a country like Bangladesh where the leading role of the working class remains strong. (Incidentally, it is premature to talk about the end of the working class, as for much in the southern hemisphere human labor will be cheaper than that of robots). We are witnessing the passage from the tragic failures of state communism to the hopes of anarchist communism. An important part of an entire population, the Kurdish one, would seem to have adopted a sort of "libertarian socialism," ecologist and feminist.

Closer to my vision of anarchist practice, the informal trend acts "organizing" itself in half the world through international campaigns called by affinity groups, striking like a leopard in a chaotic and nihilistic manner. The air is saturated with electricity, this tension is felt even in this cell. Convinced, as I am, that we are inexorably going towards a "perfect storm," we cannot afford to put aside any hypothesis of struggle. Much less can we renounce violence in all its nuances and gradations. We are relatively few, the time at our disposal is limited, we just have to play our cards well and put aside false moralisms and hesitations. If we want to have at least one possibility, we must be bearers of a more open vision, not waste precious energy trampling our feet on each other.

You ask me if you should experiment or renew forms of struggle organization; it would be more than enough if everyone put their planning into practice with conviction, tenacity and consistency. Whether it is in a social or anti-social perspective or through the informal or specific organization of synthesis or individually, the only discriminant from my point of view to avoid being an instrument of the reformists is insurrectional violence. We must start immediately, now to practice it, each according to the intensity necessary for our own planning. A strategy that does not include direct confrontation, armed with power, is destined for recovery, failure and defeat. This recovery has many names and justifications: "gradu-



## Part Three

**In some of your recent writings you have wanted to open a debate on: action and affinity groups, individual actions, claims of responsibility, ways to informally organize oneself among anarchists and propaganda through direct action. There are many different experiences that reach the present day, many and diverse within the different tensions of anarchism. We do not believe that there is, for the anarchism of action, an unavailability or impossibility with respect to the current historical context. Anarchists, in different ways and in every age, have always acted "here and now". We would like to ask you, evaluating these experiences and different ways of acting and organizing in a horizontal and anti-authoritarian way: could one say that there is, especially in Italy, an ideological prejudice against "informal organization", "anarchist groups", and "claims of responsibility"? Equally, is the debate, which often ends up in mockery for its own sake, far from being able to confirm absolute validity or theoretical-practical evidence regarding "reproducibility, informality, anonymity", in the Italian context conditioned by methodical, functional and *a priori* productive calculations, in a distorted logic of "factions"?**

The "ideological" prejudice against informal organisation here is nothing new. Although there is no doubt that some concretizations of informal practice are more acceptable to "classical" anarchist organising than others. The "small" reproducible, unclaimed actions against structures of domination, without initials of any kind, create fewer problems than actions that endanger the lives of men and women in power, especially if these are claimed with initials that have a constancy over time. The former compared to the latter are more acceptable to the "movement" for the simple reason

alism," "post-anarchism," lately Negri and Hardt have produced another one, theorising an "antagonistic reformism". The usual sirens that justify our fears, which feed our resignation, doing a great service to power. To avoid any form of recovery, it would be enough to act as anarchists. The atrocities that cry out for vengeance are endless; we must demonstrate with the action that the king is naked, that the master can and must bleed. In company or alone, hit and aim well. If our discourse wants to become "social subversion," it is necessary to go back to being "recognizable" and "credible."

The "recognizability" can be obtained through the risky, clear and direct practice of the claimed actions, with or without acronyms. Or from those anonymous actions that are immediately recognizable for the objectives that strike or for the modus operandi of the action itself. Equally clear and direct can be the anarchist fragment of a procession that clashes with the police service, a block, a burning barricade that takes the guerrilla into the metropolis. A circled A drawn alongside a burning barracks speaks as clearly as a claim. If our goal is that of "social subversion," communicating with others who are oppressed becomes a priority, and everyone understands who we are and what we want. Our media, magazines, books, sites ... are not enough. They have a strong meaning in the deepening, in the improvement of our vision of reality, in the strengthening of the analysis, in the knowledge and consequently, in the development of our practices, but they are not able to affect the curtain of silence that power erects in defense of the "totalitarian democracy." A silence, that of democracy, made of a deafening noise of endless opinions that cancel each other out. Only destructive actions manage to break through that chatter and through them our words acquire real value, managing to arrive with strength and concreteness. Television, newspapers, radios, sites are forced to talk about it, sending our message loud and clear, even to those who never dreamed of questioning the existing. We are



now that this wall is cracking is more than ever suicidal and despite everything, even today, in this period of systemic crisis, too many "anarchists and revolutionaries" fall into the trap without even realizing it. Every time we avoid the street clash because a "communicative" parade was decided in the assembly. Every time during the strike, one submits to the decisions taken by the "base" representatives, avoiding the violent "suicide" clash with the cops. Whenever media is moving towards peace in order to maintain its occupied home or social center, this wall is strengthened. At the base of this reinforcement is the continuous postponement of the violent and armed conflict with the system. We should find the courage to stand against the majority of our own comrades and take on the responsibility of raising the level of confrontation. Only the angry impetus of individual initiative, bypassing the "rationality" of assemblies can give us this strength, defeating hesitations and fears. But strength and courage are not enough, one must also have a certain lucidity. Despite the opportunities that the times give us, we cannot take advantage of the opportunities presented to us. Our efforts must be dispersed; we are at the forefront of any conflict, street clash; in many cases, it is we with our decision and initiative to strengthen the "movements," but then the fruits are collected by others. Our message appears blurred; it cannot take flight. It is increasingly our action to make these movements visible and to strengthen, but then? It is as if something is missing and that something, from my point of view, is the armed actions that should, in a clear and punctual way, stand alongside, even in different times and spaces, the various struggles, giving more space to our message, to our struggle in the street.

talking about facts and words that reach millions of women and men. It is not absurd to think that someone of them can in this way become aware and become our accomplice. That would be enough to give us one more chance.

The "credibility" is instead given by the coherence between thought and action. For those who approach us, our extraneousness to leaders, hierarchies and sexisms of any kind must be clear. Those who approach our practices must know with certainty that we will never compromise with power and that no one will be left alone to face repression. The "credibility" of conquest also through the courage and consistency that we demonstrate individually when things go wrong. Once arrested, at the cost of being isolated and crushed by relentless repression, don't give in a step. But above all it consists in the trust we gain in the field. Who joins the anarchists must have the certainty that we will never betray the word given and that it costs the goals we have set ourselves or we will succumb to it.

"Recognition" and "credibility" will cost us tears and blood and can only be achieved through desperate tenacity. Who fills the mouth of "social war" must necessarily take note of it and prepare for war. The time has come to revive the "avenging anarchy," to return to be frightening. As difficult as it may seem, it is necessary to succeed in bringing together the suggestion of the "myth" with the reflection of "planning." Only in this way will the "revolution" return to being a real prospect for millions of exploited people, losing its connotation of "waiting for mature times" that today makes it an empty, enemy word. Through the individual revolt, each of us, in groups or alone, one step at a time, one attack at a time will give new life to the idea of revolution, giving it a concrete, anarchic sense.

**Anarchists have historically "intervened in the social," as we would say today, with clear ideas and necessarily violent actions, in different areas and contexts. In history they have always created fear, terror and concern both to the privileged classes and to every**



**authority, government or institution and, naturally, also to all those revolutionary authoritarian political components. Today, similarly to the level of violence that capitalism puts in place in the permanent war and in the techno-industrial society, the response of rebellion should certainly be greater than it is. However, if on the one hand we find at the social level, citizenship struggles that already start with a certain type of political orientation and also fringes of the antagonism that put into effect logics of recovery of the social conflict, such as: the political candidacy, institutional bargaining, the regularization (occupied house), authoritarian drifts, peaceful strikes, providing a good shore pad on which the system can count on supporting; on the other hand, there is also a movement of radical opposition and living solidarity, despite the fact that in recent years there has been a decline and a reduction in conflict, even by anarchists. What worries most, and from which no one is exempt, is the condition of loss and lack of preparation that returns despite interesting moments and opportunities in some contexts of struggle. Expressions, such as "intervention in the social," or "real struggle," have become semantic games, words that can sometimes justify a secular, alternative, associational policy among many. In your opinion, it should not be of interest to anarchists, revolutionaries, to lead and push to a desirable level of confrontation and conflict with the State, against private property, with violent means and practices, instead of seeking strategic-political mediators with the legalistic and institutional civil society?**

I can only agree with you and answer "yes" to your question. I go further by telling you that the first wall we find to defend the system is precisely these recovery logics, these "strategic-political mediators" as you call them. Accepting the logic right