

# THE PLATFORM

AT

# 100

VOICES OF ORGANIZED ANARCHISTS ACROSS THE GLOBE  
VOL. 1 THE AMERICAS



[www.blackrosefed.org](http://www.blackrosefed.org)



Produced by Black Rose Anarchist Federation



## Recommended Reading

Corrêa, Felipe and Rafael Viana da Silva. *Bakunin, Malatesta, and the Platform Debate: The Question of Anarchist Political Organization*. 2017. São Paulo, Brazil: Faísca Publicações.

Corrêa, Felipe. *Freedom or Death: The Theory and Practice of Mikhail Bakunin*. 2024. Montreal, Québec: Black Rose Books.

Kokinis, Troy Andreas Araiza. *Anarchist Popular Power: Dissident Labor and Armed Struggle in Uruguay, 1956-76*. 2023. Chico, CA: AK Press.

Baker, Zoe. *Means and Ends: The Revolutionary Practice of Anarchism in Europe and America*. 2023. Chico, CA: AK Press.

The Friends of Durruti Group. *Towards a Fresh Revolution*. 1938.

North Eastern Federation of Anarcho-Communists. *The Global Influence of the Platform Today*. 2003. South Africa: Zabalaza Books.



more than half a century earlier as he helped to found the Alliance of Socialist Democracy within the International Workingmen's Association (also known as the First International). In other words, far from an innovation of the Platform, the anarchist embrace of formal revolutionary political organization can be traced to the movement's origins.

Today we recognize this insight as 'organizational dualism,' a phrase that refers to the necessity of, and reciprocal relationship between, revolutionary political organization and mass organization. While organizations interviewed in this survey may identify to a greater or lesser extent with a particular historical framework—most commonly platformism or *especificismo*—all hold the organizational dualist principle as a central tenet.

The first volume of interviews here covers anarchist political organizations in the Americas. Volume two covers organizations in Europe, Asia, and Oceania. ■



### Federación Anarquista Uruguaya Uruguayan Anarchist Federation

*1. The Uruguayan Anarchist Federation was formed in 1956 following the merger of several groups of activists in the labor movement, young anarchists, and the magazine Voluntad. Could you briefly explain why these groups came together and what the process of forming the federation was like?*

**fAU:** Between 1955 and 1956, several anarchist groups that had been active in different spheres came together. On the one hand, there

were worker activists linked to the labor movement and historical spaces of popular organization; on the other, libertarian youth and student sectors seeking to bring anarchist intervention up to date in the new social struggles; and there was also the magazine *Voluntad*, an organ for political and propaganda work. They were joined by militants from different generations, including comrades whose histories dated back to the early decades of the 20th century and to significant experiences like the Spanish Revolution.

The unification was a response to a shared concern: the need to overcome the organizational fragmentation of anarchism and build a political tool capable of intervening more effectively in the Uruguayan and Latin American reality. There was a perception that anarchism was going through a period of weakness and that it was not enough to preserve traditions or affinity groups. It was necessary to rebuild a stable political organization with the capacity for analysis, strategic planning, and social engagement.

Throughout 1955, a Commission for a Uruguayan Libertarian Federation operated, promoting debates, circulating documents, and organizing plenary sessions where principles, organizational forms, and work perspectives were discussed. The goal was to reach basic political agreements prior to the formal founding. From that process emerged the Declaration of Principles, the Charter, and the first strategic definitions that would give rise to the Uruguayan Anarchist Federation in 1956. Even back then, the common theoretical denominator for the militants engaged in this political work was *especificismo*. This conception of anarchism was taken as a strong general reference, signifying that they were in the process of building an anarchist political organization. The most influential theoretical figures at that time were Errico Malatesta and Mikhail Bakunin.

These groups understood that it was necessary to move from an anarchism that was primarily symbolic or scattered to an organized anarchism, with a commitment to having a real impact on the class struggle and popular movements. This concern is one of the founding characteristics of the fAu and of *especificismo*.



Authors of the Platform, Peter Arshinov (top middle), Ida Mett (bottom middle), and Nestor Makhno (bottom right).

cial-democratic and Marxist-Leninist experiences, which in many cases have demonstrated profound limitations, both strategically and organizationally.

At the same time, the effects of the problems of state-capitalism—deepening inequalities, the precariousness of labor, the rise of authoritarianism, wars, environmental destruction, and the intensification of forms of domination—have brought the need for revolutionary alternatives back to the forefront.

We understand that this is still a modest process given the scale of the challenges at hand. But we believe that this international strengthening of “organized anarchism” expresses an attempt to rebuild a socialist, revolutionary, and libertarian alternative rooted in the concrete struggles of the oppressed classes.

Compared to other currents of socialism, our understanding is that there is a retreat of anarchism and of all revolutionary expressions of socialism. Internationally, alongside the rise of the far right, there is also a rise in highly centralized and authoritarian expressions of socialism. In Brazil, this is visible, and we do not yet have a thorough analysis to explain this phenomenon. However, regarding anarchism and the revolutionary movement, we believe that organized anarchism has grown and positioned itself as a libertarian socialist alternative approach to the challenges of class struggle. ■

The Organization was conceived as a federation of cells and activists linked through collective agreements, shared political responsibility, and federative operation. This organizational form drew both on the historical tradition of River Plate anarchism and the conviction that unity must be built on the basis of common political commitments. Although members came from different activist backgrounds and diverse spheres, priority was given to a federal political organization centered on a common strategy to intervene in reality and build social and political power.

Therefore, theoretical discussion was neither tense nor extensive. There was a tacit agreement from the outset. The “old-timers” considered many of the controversies they had once passionately debated to be settled. Thus, the political character of the organization being founded lay more in how the task was to be approached across the different fronts of work—trade union, student, neighborhood, and internal—and in the conjunctural analysis of Uruguay in relation to the broader political landscape, trade union affairs, and student and neighborhood movements, with a special emphasis on Latin America.

***2. The fAu has 70 years of experience as an organization, including in armed struggle against the civil-military dictatorship of the 1970s-80s. What were the most difficult obstacles you faced, and which ones remain challenges today? What lessons were accumulated from these experiences?***

**fAU:** It took deep humility to understand the new conditions in which the popular struggle was unfolding. It was necessary to rebuild organizational tools, reestablish social ties, and develop responses suited to a reality very different from the one that existed before the dictatorship.

We can also mention today’s challenges, such as setting out to break with prevailing individualism to build practices of solidarity and defining how to confront the policies of destitution coming from

above. We always do so with a perspective of class independence for those at the bottom, proposing and driving the struggle and organization in social spaces.

To a certain extent, this has always been one of the main challenges of the fAu: to interpret each historical moment without simplifications or dogmas, to identify the possibilities and limitations of each conjuncture, and to develop the capacity to sow organization, struggle, and popular accumulation of social force under the concrete conditions imposed by each era.

In that sense, our concern has been to keep alive a political tool capable of engaging with the real problems of each era, rather than preserving a doctrine and mechanically repeating past experiences. For the fAu, following anarchist principles does not imply immobility, but rather the capacity to produce responses to new challenges, always maintaining the horizon of social transformation.

### ***3. In which mass movements are members of the fAu active?***

**fAu:** With regard to the concept of mass movements, in the fAu tradition we usually speak of organized popular movements or expressions of the organized people. In that sense, historically we have been active in both the student movement and the labor movement, and we have a long history of grassroots activism rooted primarily in the neighborhoods of western Montevideo, but also in other working-class neighborhoods.

Likewise, we have historically participated in campaigns to promote popular initiatives through plebiscites and referendums against regressive laws that harm those at the bottom. We have also participated in popular and mass campaigns in defense of the right to asylum, as well as campaigns to denounce human rights violations during the dictatorship, search for the disappeared, and condemn the oppressors.

Currently, the militants in our organization are primarily engaged in union and neighborhood organizing.

mobilization. We understand that popular movements constitute the fundamental terrain of the class struggle and that it is from them that real processes of social transformation can emerge.

Our work seeks to strengthen practices of grassroots democracy, direct action, class independence, combativeness, and self-management. We also defend the need for long-term political and organizational accumulation, understanding that revolutionary transformation requires a prolonged process of building social power.

Furthermore, we have made progress in expanding the OSL's organizational reach to different regions of Brazil, seeking to build a national organization effectively rooted in the concrete struggles of the oppressed classes.

### ***6. The current of 'organized anarchism' appears to be growing across the world, including in South America, what do you think accounts for this?***

**OSL:** First and foremost, it is important to note that the term "organized anarchism" can be misleading. This is because it has at least two meanings. On the one hand, it can refer solely to the organizational wing of anarchism (which opposes the anti-organizationalists), and in this sense, anarcho-syndicalists, synthetists, and other currents would also be included, since they too advocate for organization (albeit in forms different from those we do). On the other hand, various organizations that draw from our tradition (alliance-based, platformist, and specifist) use the term "organized anarchism" to refer to our current. In this case, organized anarchism and our current would be synonymous. It is always good to make this distinction, because we do not advocate "organization"; we advocate a specific form of organization, which differs from others, such as anarcho-syndicalism and synthesisism, for example.

In any case, we believe that this organizational growth of anarchism is related to various historical and political factors. First, there is a prolonged crisis of traditional forms of the left, especially so-

sical Marxism or the problems of postmodernism and poststructuralism.

On the one hand, we consider it necessary to overcome problematic aspects of Marxism, especially its economic, deterministic, and statist tendencies, as well as the historical identification between socialization and nationalization (society and the state) that characterized much of the experience of so-called “real socialism.” We also understand that certain formulations of “historical materialism” or “dialectical materialism” have ended up crystallizing excessively rigid interpretations of social reality.

On the other hand, we reject the contemporary advance of postmodernism and progressive liberalism in broad sectors of the left. We consider problematic the fragmentation of social analyses, the denial of the centrality of class struggle, epistemological relativism, and the replacement of structural perspectives with exclusively discursive or identity-based approaches.

Our libertarian materialism seeks to affirm a critical science and reason, articulating class, race/ethnicity, gender/sexuality, and nationality within a structural and class-based perspective. We seek to construct our own libertarian social theory, grounded in classical and contemporary anarchist authors, capable of strategically guiding our political practice and our revolutionary project.

#### ***5. What areas of mass or base organizing does OSL prioritize or involve itself in presently?***

**OSL:** OSL is active on various fronts of grassroots organizing and social work, seeking to strengthen the self-organization of oppressed classes and build a project of popular power with a socialist and libertarian character.

We are involved in labor, community, student, agrarian, and territorial movements, as well as initiatives related to the struggle for housing, organizing in the periphery, and various forms of popular

#### ***4. Today, 100 years after the publication of the Platform, we would like to ask about your relation to that document. Some theorists argue that especificismo has a history distinct from that of platformism, but together they constitute two currents of organized anarchism worldwide.***

***To what extent are the two similar or different? What lessons do you draw from the experience of the Russian and Ukrainian Revolution described by Dielo Truda? What did especificismo add to the organized current of anarchism that may not be found in the Platform? Is the Platform relevant to anarchists today?***

**fAU:** During the formation of the fAu, the classic documents of platformism—such as Dielo Truda’s Organizational Platform—did not have a direct influence, although it was likely known to several of the founding militants. Our main organizational reference, as we mentioned earlier, came from the Malatestian tradition, from local experiences of anarchism in the Río de la Plata region, and from the debates developed by generations of Uruguayan militants.

However, this does not imply an open opposition between the two currents; we can find some points of convergence between them, without forgetting that the Platform emerged at a specific historical moment that we understand cannot be mechanically transposed to the Latin American reality.

But we can say that both especificismo and platformism stem from a critique of the more diffuse forms of anarchist organization and affirm the need for a specifically anarchist political organization, with strategic unity, collective responsibility, social engagement, and a transformative vocation. Both currents understand that anarchism must actively intervene in popular struggles and not limit itself to propaganda or abstract criticism of the system.

The differences lie mainly in their historical trajectories and in certain political emphases. Platformism emerged in exile among militants linked to the Ukrainian revolutionary experience led by Nestor

Makhno and Pyotr Arshinov, as an attempt to respond to the difficulties faced by the anarchist movement during the Russian Revolution. Specificism, on the other hand, developed within the Latin American and River Plate context, drawing on its own tradition that included Malatesta in the River Plate region, the FORA, the FORU, the specific Uruguayan groups of the 1910s and 1920s, Fosalba, local trade union and organizational debates incorporating the region's trade union, neighborhood, and student experiences, as well as an ongoing reflection on the particularities of Latin American social formations and imperialism.

While some historical platformist currents placed the emphasis on building an anarcho-communist organization, *especificismo* tended to emphasize the relationship between political organization and social integration, the building of popular power, and the need to develop strategies adapted to each concrete reality.

Ultimately, these are two expressions of the organizational tradition of revolutionary anarchism that developed in parallel. Both share the conviction that profound transformations require organization, the accumulation of forces, and active participation in the struggles of oppressed sectors, rejecting both spontaneism and authoritarian conceptions that subordinate popular movements to external leadership.

Beyond this digression on differences and similarities, we can recognize the value of the Platform, which, in its time, sought to resolve a common problem: preventing anarchism from being reduced to a sum of scattered initiatives without adopting the hierarchical and statist logic of authoritarian revolutionary parties, and developing a revolutionary alternative to the party model that was taking hold in the Soviet Union. They recognized the need for organization, strategy, and coordinated intervention in the class struggle, and they rejected the concentration of political power in a party elite and the subordination of popular organizations to the state.

**5. *What defines the fAu? How is it organized? How are decisions***

strategic contributions into a proposal suited to the contemporary Brazilian and Latin American reality.

**3. *How does the Platform inform the theory, practice, and/or organizational structure of OSL?***

**OSL:** The Dielo Truda Group's Platform holds fundamental historical importance for our current, especially because it clearly systematized organizational principles that were already present in earlier experiences of revolutionary anarchism. Its defense of theoretical, tactical, and strategic unity, collective responsibility, and federalism contributes directly to our organizational conception.

The OSL understands anarchist organization as a programmatic political organization. We understand that without unity and organic coherence, anarchists tend toward dispersion and an inability to influence the actual processes of class struggle.

We seek to articulate the Platform with the contributions of Latin American *especificismo*, especially those of FAU, which has delved deeper into issues related to social integration, mass work, and the need for the sustained building of popular power in peripheral and dependent contexts.

Thus, the Platform influences our national organizational structure, our understanding of the role of the specific anarchist organization, and our defense of a revolutionary project based on self-management, federalism, and class struggle.

**4. *OSL puts forward the concept of Libertarian Materialism as an alternative to both idealism/postmodernism and the classical conception of Dialectical Materialism. Can you articulate briefly the framework of this analysis?***

**OSL:** Our conception of materialism—or libertarian realism—seeks to construct a libertarian social theory capable of interpreting contemporary reality without falling into either the limitations of clas-

*gether to form OSL are well known for their work in receiving, articulating, and transmitting the organizational-strategic concept of **especificismo**—the most widely known example being FARJ’s **Social Anarchism and Organization**.*

*We are conducting this interview on the 100th anniversary of the Dielo Truda Group’s publication of the Platform. While both **especificismo** and “**platformism**” are expressions of organizational dualism, there are often questions about the similarities or differences emphasized in each approach. Does OSL view these differences as purely artificial and aesthetic? Or is there a substantive divergence between them?*

**OSL:** We understand that **especificismo** and **platformism** are distinct historical expressions of the same anarchist tradition: organizational dualism, whose origins can be traced back to Bakunin and the experience of the Alliance. Both defend the need for a specific anarchist organization with theoretical, ideological, strategic, and tactical unity, working in a complementary manner with popular and mass movements.

For us, the differences between **especificismo** and **platformism** are not merely artificial, nor do they constitute irreconcilable divergences. They pertain, above all, to the historical and regional conditions in which these experiences developed. **Platformism** emerged in the European context following the Russian Revolution, particularly from the experience of the Dielo Truda Group and the critical analysis of anarchist failure in the face of Bolshevism. **Especificismo**, on the other hand, developed mainly in Latin America, led by the Uruguayan Anarchist Federation (fAu), incorporating reflections on imperialism, dependency, and strategies for social integration in peripheral countries.

The OSL claims both traditions as legitimate heirs to the anarchist organizational dualism of Alliance-based origin. We consider that there are more convergences than divergences between them, and we seek precisely to synthesize their historical, organizational, and

*made at the different organizational levels (e.g., regional, federal, etc.)?*

**fAu:** The fAu sees itself as a revolutionary, federalist, and **especificista** anarchist political organization, dedicated to building popular power by engaging in the struggles of the exploited and oppressed classes. Our goal is not to replace popular movements or act as a vanguard, but to contribute to their strengthening by articulating political organization, revolutionary strategy, and concrete social intervention. This conception is developed from an internationalist perspective, yet is deeply rooted in the historical and social realities of Uruguay and Latin America. In short: an anarchist political organization to build a strong people.

The Organization is composed of groups organized according to their areas of engagement, and its decision-making body is the Federal Council. Additionally, a Congress is held every two years when, in addition to analyzing the current situation and making decisions for the period, secretaries are appointed for the various specific internal tasks of the Organization.

**6. The fAu is part of the Latin American Anarchist Coordination (CALA), which includes organizations in Brazil, Argentina, and now Chile. Could you describe the campaigns and activities you have carried out together?**

**fAu:** Fundamentally, we have shown solidarity with the peoples who are struggling and have shared some analyses of the reality in Latin America.

Likewise, one of the most important tasks is to advance the development of anarchist groups and organizations in other parts of Latin America, for which we hold regular meetings with comrades and organizations from various Latin American countries.

**7. Anarchist organizations in the organizational dualist model, in the mold of either (or both) **especificismo** or **platformism**, are presently**

***growing globally. Why do you think this is happening?***

The expansion and relevance of the various strands of organized anarchism are linked, above all, to their ability to offer solutions to political and social problems that persist in the contemporary world. Throughout the 20th century and into the early 21st, the experiences of the institutional left and authoritarian socialist projects revealed clear limitations. On the one hand, broad sectors of social democracy ended up integrating themselves into the administration of capitalism, abandoning prospects for profound transformation and restricting their horizon to partial reforms. On the other hand, experiences that placed the party above society reproduced new forms of domination, bureaucratization, and concentration of power, often in the name of popular emancipation itself. Faced with this reality, organized anarchism seeks to transform society without creating new structures of domination.

Recent decades have shown that major resistance to neoliberalism, imperialism, and various forms of exploitation did not emerge from political parties or state institutions. In many countries, it was popular movements, local organizations, indigenous communities, militant unions, student movements, and other forms of grassroots organization that led the struggles and resistance. This reality reinforced the importance of political approaches that recognize the oppressed sectors themselves as the protagonists of the struggle.

But, furthermore, historical experience has also shown that spontaneity and mere activism are not enough. Struggles require continuity, the accumulation of experience, strategic planning, and the capacity for coordination. The challenge lies in building long-term organization. It is precisely at this point where currents of organized anarchism, including *especificismo*, have sought to make their main contributions.

From this perspective, anarchist political organization does not seek to replace popular movements or act as a vanguard directing from above. Its role is to provide analysis, strategy, education, and the ca-

er ideological, theoretical, strategic, and tactical unity. In our view, this coordination of autonomous or relatively autonomous organizations, which was what existed within the CAB, was a factor that hindered the effective construction of a national anarchist organization.

For this reason, FARJ, OASL, RL, COMPA, and other individual militants decided to cease to exist as separate political organizations in order to form a single national organization: the OSL. Of course, we continue to recognize the different historical legacies, regional experiences, and political trajectories that each of these organizations has built over the years. These legacies remain fundamental to the collective construction of the OSL.

However, organizationally, we no longer operate as a federation of autonomous groups, each preserving its own lines. Our local cells and regions have become part of a single national structure, functioning under a common organizational framework, with unified instances, shared political lines, and collective mechanisms for decision-making and accountability.

This merger process involved several years of political and organizational convergence. Since at least 2021, our regional chapter of the then CAB (Southeast-Central-West) had already been functioning in practice in a highly integrated manner, unifying internal processes, political coordination, formulations, and work fronts. This experience concretely demonstrated the advantages of moving from coordination to a unified political organization.

The general guidelines of the OSL were developed during the different stages of our first congress (I CONOSL), where we debated and decided on issues related to organizational structure, strategy, theory, program, and national expansion. We understand this process as part of an effort to mature Brazilian anarchism and to build a more homogeneous, coherent political tool capable of consistently intervening in the Brazilian class struggle.

***2. Let's discuss organizational dualism. The groups which came to-***

da and publicly debate its ideas. During this period, anarchist organizations have openly resurfaced, a long and ongoing process of reconstruction that continues to this day. There has been no shortage of opportunities to put these ideas into practice. We have waged immense struggles, such as the anti-globalization movement of the 1990s, the rise of neoliberalism, and the repeated attempts to destroy everything that was built as a collective guarantee—such as our public education system, the Unified Health System, public energy and water distribution networks, and even the high-tech industry, where unions have significant influence.

The struggles over the years have strengthened the capacity of anarchists in Brazil, Latin America, and the world to confront the oppressors—those at the top—through the initiative, effort, and organization of the oppressed, those at the bottom. ■



## Organização Socialista Libertária

Libertarian Socialist Organization (Brazil)

*1. OSL is a new formation, but it is made up of seasoned militants from FARJ, OASL, RL and COMPA. Within OSL do these groups maintain their distinct identities, or have they officially fused to become federal chapters of OSL? If so, what did this process of fusion entail?*

**OSL:** OSL was formed precisely through a process of organizational merger among these organizations and collectives. Our understanding was that, in order to advance the construction of a national anarchist political organization, it was not enough to maintain merely a coordinating relationship among autonomous organizations; it was necessary to build a common organizational structure, with a deep-

capacity for coordination, strengthening the organizing processes of the oppressed and exploited classes without supplanting their leading role. The transformative force does not lie in political organization itself, but in the organized people.

We might add that the forms of exploitation, domination, and social control are constantly changing. Transformations in the world of work, precariousness, economic concentration, the advance of authoritarian projects, and new forms of imperialist interference demand political tools capable of interpreting each specific situation. This implies avoiding both dogmatism and opportunism: maintaining firm principles without turning them into rigid formulas incapable of engaging with reality.

The challenge lies in linking historical principles to contemporary problems, drawing on past experiences without mechanically transferring them to different contexts. The current relevance of organized anarchism is undoubtedly

linked to the political need for those at the bottom to build collective strength, organization, and transformative capacity through class independence, without delegating power to political elites or bureaucracies; to build a genuine resistance to the inhumane conditions of the capitalist system. ■



## Federación Anarquista Rosario

Rosario Anarchist Federation (Argentina)

*1. The city of Rosario has a long history of anarchist militants and organizations. How did the FAR come into being? Why, how, and*

***when did militants come together to form a specific anarchist organization?***

**FAR:** Rosario has a history of anarchist struggle and organization dating back to the late 19th century, with the participation of comrades such as Malatesta, Momo, and Matei, who helped found unions (bricklayers, bakers, dockworkers) as well as build political tools like the Anarchist Circles.

The 1920s and 1930s were no exception, with these processes reaching a peak. However, beginning in the 1940s, anarchism in this region entered a significant decline, reducing its practice to individual actions in workplaces or the founding of libraries and study centers, relegating anarchism to an academic or museum-like subject.

By the late 1990s, comrades dedicated to social struggle, who had made contact with the Anarchist Federation of Uruguay (fAu), founded the Anarchist Organization of Rosario (OAR). Although none of us were members of it at the time, we can think of the OAR as a precursor to the FAR. By the mid-2000s, there were already attempts to reorganize politically, between 2006 and 2008 we began to come together—the comrades who would give life to the FAR—first under the name Columna Libertaria Joaquin Penina.

The idea of an anarchist political organization stems from the need for a political space that allows us to think, study, analyze reality, and outline strategies for action to transform it, just as the first comrades who promoted anarchism back in 1880 envisioned. It was vital to establish contact with the Brazilian FAO but mainly with the fAu. Both the former FARJ of Rio de Janeiro and the fAu were pivotal in organizing our first congress in 2015, when we changed the name to FAR, and where we diversified our popular work fronts, giving the union front greater prominence.

Militants who had previously participated in different currents of anarchism (basic anarchism, synthesist, insurrectionist, anarcho-sindicalist) as well as from currents of Marxism (Trotskyism, Maoism,

emerged over the years are inseparable from the history of the CAB. The goal of this coordination, now embodied in the Latin American Anarchist Coordination (CALA), is to share an understanding of the political and social moment of our continent in relation to the world, the relations of exploitation organized by the bourgeoisie among our countries, and an active interest in supporting and structuring new organizations in every country and every place where there is a thirst for struggle for social transformation that guarantees us a socialist and libertarian society.

***5. The current of 'organized anarchism' appears to be growing across the world, including in Latin America, what do you think accounts for this?***

**CAB:** The advance of capitalism and its increasingly frequent crises impose a necessity on the peoples of the world: to create tools to unite our forces and fight for a new world.

A world with greater economic, gender, and racial equality among people—in contrast to the capitalism, racism, and patriarchy in which we live. A world whose relationship with the earth is one of care and balance—in contrast to the destruction of biomes and indigenous ways of life, and to mining and hydrocarbon extraction that pollute rivers, lands, and air. A world with guarantees of comprehensive and broad education, where access to art and leisure is not a luxury, where life is joyful and dignified.

In Latin America, these dreams have been persecuted and crushed over the past century by dictatorships imposed by the state and the bourgeoisie, terrified by the people's ability to organize and demand this necessary transformation. We are witnessing a major setback in the process of organizing anarchism and other strands of socialism on our continent.

Over the past 40 years, following a long period of resistance to dictatorship, clandestine organization, and the building of underground networks, anarchism has had the opportunity to resume propagan-

**3. *The Platform document published by Dielo Truda group is now 100 years old. Is the framework put forward in it still relevant for 2026? How does CAB relate to the ideas put forward in it?***

**CAB:** There is a widely held view in Latin America, supported by historical records, that the concept of “Especifismo” was an original creation of the Uruguayan Anarchist Federation, aimed at coordinating the specific anarchist organization with the region’s social movements within a model of horizontal struggle, in which the influence of the two levels would be mutual and continuous—a concept that could be described today as “Organizational Dualism.”

Throughout the development of anarchism on our continent and through contact with new translations of documents from various languages, anarchist researchers and activists could not help but notice the similarities between our development and the ideas and formulations proposed by the Dielo Truda group.

In recent years, an increasing number of activists and organizations have come into contact with the Portuguese translation of the Organizational Platform, which has had a significant impact on understanding the historical paths taken by various anarchist activists in different locations and has brought us closer to organizations with similar proposals around the world. The text is frequently studied and, along with Juan Carlos Mechoso’s book *The Strategy of Especificismo*, has become essential reading for understanding the propositions and paths of anarchism’s organizational strategy.

**4. *How does CAB coordinate and communicate with its sibling organizations across the South American continent? What work do you undertake together?***

**CAB:** The history of anarchism in Brazil is closely linked to organizations across our continent. The influence and support of the fAU in Uruguay, our ties with the Anarchist Federation of Rosario in Argentina, and all the other organizational initiatives that have

heterodox Marxism) and Peronism converged in the FAR, adopting our political and strategic approach. The influx of comrades has strengthened the territorial front, student experiences in student unions, and the diversification of the union front into unions in industry, services, and the public sector.

As we move toward the 5th FAR Congress, we have a very encouraging outlook, with an influence on the formation of local union coordination as well as on the political advancement of anarchism at the national level, being almost the only option for uniting anarchism on this national scale.

**2. *From a historical perspective, what have been the most visible manifestations of organized anarchism in Argentina? What influence has Dielo Truda’s Platform had on the anarchist movement in your country?***

**FAR:** First, it’s worth clarifying that FAR is not platformist but especificista. We studied platformism back in 2010 but then turned our attention to developing the especificista line. In Argentina, the Alianza Obrera Espartaco, an organization with dual organizational structures and a strong presence, particularly in unions like the construction sector, drew on elements of the Platform.

Through its organizing efforts, Alianza Espartaco played a leading role in the major construction strikes of the 1930s. Forty years later, Resistencia Libertaria took up elements of the Platform, combined with classic readings of anarchism (Bakunin, Christiaan Cornelissen) and Marxism. We understand that by the 1990s, the OSL, and by 2000, the LAC—both based in Buenos Aires—also incorporated elements of the Platform. However, we understand that they drew more heavily on the political axes of the French Platformists of the 1960s from Fontenis’s FCL than on original Platformism, which are distinct in their own right.

**3. *The Platform is now 100 years old—is it still relevant for the year 2026? How does platformism influence the practical activities of your organization?***

**FAR:** As we mentioned earlier, our organization studied the Platform in 2010, but it did not define our strategy or political line. While it shares elements with *especificismo*, such as the concern for uniting the scattered militant base; the conscious or unconscious disorganization promoted by other currents of anarchism; the promotion of responsibility, collective discipline, and militant self-discipline within the organization; the theoretical and ideological unity of the organization; and a common strategy, among others.

However, and always referring to original platformism and not that of the 1960s French FCL with which we have greater differences, there are nuances or perhaps some differences with that original platformism. First, regarding the centrality and place occupied by political organization in the strategy, the axis of the strategy regarding the construction of self-managed popular power—what Malatesta called the advance of the Popular Forces. Second, the development of federalism within an organization. Third, the primacy of a sector of the oppressed class in the strategy of building a Front of Oppressed Classes. In any case, it is worth clarifying that the Platform's proposal predates the emergence of *especificismo* in Uruguay by 30 years.

#### ***4. In which mass movements are members of the FAR active (e.g., labor unions, tenants' unions, social movements, etc.)?***

**FAR:** Our members are engaged in grassroots organizing and participating in unions—including, in some places, Agrupaciones that share our principles—in industry, the service sector, and the public sector. For example, among chemical workers, retail employees, media workers, restaurant and hotel workers, metalworkers, school teachers and university professors, state employees, judicial workers, legislative branch employees, postal workers, bank employees, and university administrative staff. We are also building a grassroots base among retirees in working-class neighborhoods across the region.

#### ***5. The FAR is part of the Construcción Anarquista Federal de Argentina (CAFA). Can you explain why this network was created and what its objectives are?***

nuclei, or by welcoming people and groups interested in our organizational strategy.

#### ***2. What areas of social movement organizing does CAB strategically prioritize? In other words, what areas of work are militants of CAB involved in?***

**CAB:** The three main areas of struggle around which the people in CAB organize are labor, student, and territorial movements: By labor struggles, we refer to organized groups of workers who fight for rights related to their workplaces, such as better wages, shorter work hours, and safety guarantees in the workplace, among other issues.

Student struggles generally bring together higher education students around issues such as ensuring the continued operation of public universities—whose budgets are frequently threatened by neoliberal governments—investment in improving spaces for the development of knowledge and science, as well as public policies to enable students from working-class and low-income backgrounds to remain in university, with assistance for food and housing.

In the territorial sphere, activists are united in the struggle to guarantee access to land, whether to work independently, preserve traditional ways of life, or ensure decent housing and access to community public services, such as healthcare, public transportation, or urban infrastructure. This field brings together agrarian reform, indigenous movements, neighborhood movements, community libraries, popular education initiatives, the struggle for reproductive justice, community radio stations, and urban art groups.

An important characteristic is the solidarity among these fields of struggle. Various spaces share an understanding of the struggles to be waged together and seek to coordinate their demands. Furthermore, CAB advocates for the creation of these spaces in close alignment with the construction of an anti-racist and anti-patriarchal society, seeking mechanisms to combat these forms of oppression on a daily basis within the spaces where we operate.

expansion of the organization throughout the national territory—ranging from more central cities to less populated and more rural areas—and the solidification of an ever-greater coordination with the organizations of our sister countries in Latin America.

Beyond these gains, an important task for a political organization swimming against the tide would also be to build the political relationships and capacities of its activists, and to allow such efforts to generate accumulated strength over the long term, despite the difficulties that political regimes and the mode of production impose on all of us. We have persisted and insisted on this task for over 30 years, which has taken on the significance of a historical process of uninterrupted construction of organized anarchism in Brazil, and, specifically, we have now been part of CAB for 14 years.

CAB is made up of several organizations in the various states and regions of Brazil. How were these regional organizations established? Initially, each of these organizations was established through its own dynamics, by individuals and collectives who came to learn about and study anarchism separately throughout their lives in their respective regions. From groups fighting to preserve the student structures that guarantee access to higher education in Brazil, to groups of workers organized to fight for labor rights, in general the first groups encountered anarchism through study groups on possible ways to confront capitalism and through inspiration from experiences such as those of the fAu, FAG, the Spanish Revolution, and the Organizational Platform, which were studied and discussed through dialogues among these activists. These ideas became the driving force behind organizing these people into an organic structure.

Throughout the organization of the CAB, there were various efforts to find groups of individuals in other locations with the same desire to organize. Each of the organizations focused on a specific geographic region to engage in dialogue and form small groups with the potential to build new local organizations. Today, we continue to seek to organize new groups, either actively, by seeking to bring together and organize anarchists in their territories through CAB

**FAR:** In the FAR, we believe that if we envision a social revolution in the future, the scope of our politics must match the scale of our aspirations. In that sense, spreading and promoting especificista anarchism throughout Argentina became a primary task.

We quickly encountered a series of difficulties in this task, given that Argentina is a vast country with a significant diversity of local characteristics and issues that we felt should not be overlooked in the search for a common political practice.

On the contrary, we understood that a dynamic anarchism must engage with the issues that particularly affect each region or province, striving to promote the highest degree of federalism.

That said—and taking into account not only previous local experiences but also the contributions of our sister organizations fAu and CAB—we found it useful to debate and reach consensus on a similar organizational structure for the organizations that form part of CAFA, while also sharing a common political-ideological framework.

Framed in this way, CAFA is a collective and federal working hypothesis aimed at developing especificismo in Argentina, seeking to enhance the precision of our analyses and our influence within social organizations across the country. The main objective is to promote anarchist (especificista) organizations. Another premise is to coordinate strategies for social engagement within trade union, social, territorial, and environmental spheres. Finally, it is necessary to strengthen the CAFA framework by opening the doors to participation for other especificista anarchist organizations in Argentina.

One point to clarify is that CAFA is not a national organization but rather a coordination of organizations in Argentina, shaped by the principles of especificismo, with identical charters, strategies for recruitment, and the same approach to and admission of members, making it easier to establish a dialogue when promoting joint policies at the national level. Furthermore, we understand that the

meaning of anarchism—both the word and the political idea—is in dispute. In this sense, CAFA focuses exclusively on producing and disseminating only the theoretical, historical, and propaganda aspects of especificista anarchism. We are convinced that this working hypothesis is allowing us to grow politically and in terms of social and union influence.

**6. *Additionally the FAR is part of the Latin American Anarchist Coordination (CALA), which includes organizations in Brazil, Argentina, and now Chile. Could you describe the campaigns and activities you have carried out together?***

**FAR:** CALA's primary mission has been to spread the word about and promote the formation of especificista anarchist political organizations in Latin America. Therefore, a significant part of its activity has naturally involved the sharing of materials, discussions, and analyses both among the coordination's member organizations and with a broad Latin American network of like-minded individuals.

Beyond these activities, another defining aspect of the Coordination is its policy of solidarity with a wide variety of struggles: With political prisoners in Brazil (2014), with comrades persecuted in the province of Santa Fe (Argentina) as a result of protests against pension reform; as well as in support of broader political processes such as the uprisings in Chile, the indigenous movement in Peru, the Bañados region of Paraguay, and the Palestinian people.

**7. *The current of organized anarchism is experiencing new growth, with organizations in the organizational dualist model appearing across the globe. Why do you think this is?***

**FAR:** After decades of neoliberal policies across the globe, we once again find ourselves facing a time of change. A present marked by ongoing genocides and wars, a global debt crisis that stifles people's ability to act, coupled with a widespread crisis of representation and mummified democracies incapable of meeting basic human needs—all of this compels us to reevaluate our politics and our strategy.

allenges of finding a common path for action in a country as vast as Brazil. This trajectory began with collaborations among diverse groups in Brazil, guided by a shared initiative: to build a framework for anarchist action grounded in collective organization and a direct connection to the struggles in the territories and spaces built by its activists from a perspective of popular and autonomous organization.

The formation of a Forum of Organized Anarchism (FAO) was realized based on the experience of these diverse organizations, seeking to understand how to pool their capacities to propose an analysis of the current situation and joint action with tactical and strategic frameworks, articulating the needs of various struggles and the understanding of Brazil as a diverse yet singular whole. At that time, the Forum already had broad representation from various states spread across Brazil's five regions.

Common understandings regarding the interpretation of the Brazilian political and social moment, as well as the need for joint articulation of political lines and tactics for each moment of transformation, were gradually built within these national spaces, which evolved over time into increasingly solid agreements and a search for more concrete standards for membership processes, forms of social action, and the construction of a "militant profile" and propaganda capable of presenting anarchism as a force for transformation within our context.

Each of these agreements, with varying degrees of influence on the day-to-day operations of the organizations, gradually shaped new organizational stages that were distinguished by different names, such as "Construction," "Forum," or "Coordination," the latter marking the organizational form by which we identify ourselves today. Gradually, the cumulative processes in the formation of nuclei, decision-making structures, and the establishment of executive and deliberative bodies allowed us to build a network whose scale has consolidated a national presence. Our plans include even more defined coordination agreements among each of our local chapters, the

BRRN has long maintained strong ties with organizations around the world and this is especially true when it comes to our relations with organizations and groups in South America. In fact, one of the first major efforts we undertook as an organization was to arrange a national US speaking tour for Chilean anarchists.

Over the years we've sent BRRN militants to strengthen our relationships with sibling organizations on nearly every continent, participated in international conferences such as ELAOPA (a semi-annual conference of autonomous and anarchist influenced social movements in Latin America), coordinated cross-border organizing campaigns, and raised solidarity funds for comrades in Sudan, Turkey, Syria, Kurdistan, and elsewhere.

We recently participated in the founding of International Coordination of Organized Anarchism (ICOA) which brings together nearly two dozen especificista and platformist organizations around the globe. While the coordination is still in its early days, it represents a significant step forward for the international anarchist movement. ■



## Coordenação Anarquista Brasileira Brazilian Anarchist Coordination

*1. Can you begin by describing the origins of CAB and various iterations that the project has gone through, starting back in 2002? Would you detail the differences between the 'forum' stage, the 'coordination' stage, and perhaps what the future trajectory will be?*

**CAB:** The changes CAB has undergone over time reflect the chal-

Traditional politics has been reduced to the almost domestic administration of resources, seeking to prevent the fiscal deficit from growing and allocating ever-larger sums to debt repayment, surveillance, and defense. In the face of this decline of traditional parties, our comrades in the parliamentary left still see hope in participating symbolically in the very institutions that guarantee and legalize austerity and anti-popular measures, devoting time and energy to this, rather than strengthening the building of popular power. Neither the traditional parties nor the party-based left are offering anything new to confront this face of capitalism. They are only concerned with securing their institutional place within this administrative system by proposing solutions within “what is possible” under the legal framework.

We see in the popular exhaustion that there is no longer room for political vanguards or professionals living lives of privilege; the way out of the current quagmire is from below and depends, to be successful, on the participation of a strong people, capable of taking the reins on fundamental issues such as war, artificial intelligence, migration, the climate crisis, productive restructuring, and the strategic sectors of the economy and services.

From this stems the relevance and power of especificismo in these times, as a current of anarchism that throws itself fully into the struggle, actively participating in unions, working-class neighborhoods, social centers, tenants' assemblies, environmental movements, academic circles, etc.

We are convinced that sectoral victories—at the level of every workplace, every neighborhood, every community—are absolutely strategic in the process of restoring confidence in the grassroots' power of self-management. That is why our political organizations do not focus on diagnosing and directing but rather on energizing conflicts, like a small engine, promoting the principles of direct action, class independence, solidarity, class-based feminism, and direct democracy.

This approach or methodology allows us great breadth and the ability to coordinate with a wide variety of sectors in the struggle. Hence, what sets *especificismo* apart is precisely its “militant profile”; in other words, it is not our proclamations that distinguish us but our concrete political practice, which is being referenced by a growing number of sectors of the oppressed classes, both locally and in different parts of the world. ■



## **Black Rose Anarchist Federation** Federación Anarquista Rosa Negra (USA)

### ***1. What is the history of Black Rose/Rosa Negra Anarchist Federation (BRRN)? When and how was it formed?***

**BRRN:** BRRN was officially founded in 2013 and announced publicly in 2014 following several years of discussion and debate between existing regional anarchist communist organizations in the United States. This began with a series of invitational Class Struggle Anarchist Conferences (CSAC), a multi-year process of building relationships and sharing our organizing work which then resulted in what was called the *rapprochement* process, which was a formal series of debates and discussions by delegates from each group.

Most organizations participating in conferences were new formations, though some, like Workers’ Solidarity Alliance, had been around since the 1980s. For nearly everyone involved, the dissolution of Love & Rage Revolutionary Anarchist Federation (1993-1998) and the anti-globalization movement were fresh in memory.

coherent organization today.

### ***5. What areas of mass work are members of BRRN embedded in?***

BRRN takes a sectoral approach to organizing, meaning that we engage in areas of mass organizing where there are identifiable actors of struggle who are similarly located within a structure of domination or exploitation, who share a common set of conditions, and who have the capacity to exert organized leverage toward the end of extracting concessions from those who oversee or benefit from their exploitation. Examples include workers in the workplace, tenants in the apartment complex, students on the campus, etc.

Members of BRRN are most active in the labor and tenant/territorial sectors. In the labor sector our members work in the building trades, public service, K-12 education, higher education, healthcare, food service, and others. Our approach to labor organizing centers around building a militant minority on the shopfloor. Where unions already exist we organize within them to advance our principles around rank-and-file democracy, class struggle, militancy, and internationalism. Where unions don’t exist we seek to organize the unorganized into official or unofficial unions. Ultimately, our aim is to build the confidence, militancy, and self-organization of workers through successive campaigns of direct action. In this way, we work to orient ourselves and our coworkers toward the long horizon of self-management and the abolition of class society.

In the tenant/territorial sector our members mainly organize within tenant unions or other experimental formations aimed at building power within a discretely defined geographies like neighborhoods or even certain city blocks. We seek to help build and strengthen independent, member funded tenant union formations, especially those that are associated with the Autonomous Tenant Union Network (ATUN).

### ***6. What relations does BRRN maintain with other anarchist communist organizations around the world?***

within the 1st International, organizational dualism asserts the need for two mutually reinforcing levels of organization: the revolutionary political organization and mass organizations.

#### **4. How has BRRN changed throughout its 10+ years in existence? What obstacles has it faced?**

**BRRN:** Despite the lengthy process of unification that led to BRRN's founding, it's clear to us that the organization came together initially without the level of tactical and strategic unity necessary to function as a serious political organization. Some of this was due to many of the above referenced concepts and frameworks not being known to us at the founding, while other aspects we needed to learn through experience. In the early stages of building the organization, we tended to place far too much emphasis on hammering out political consensus, but failing to construct a common strategic framework and set of tactics to enact our politics in the world. This produced a kind of fragile prescribed unity rather than a durable organic unity, as mentioned earlier.

Because of this we eventually faced growing internal disagreement on what direction the organization should take. Questions with seemingly self-evident answers, such as whether the organization should have a national strategic framework at all, became highly contentious. These contradictions fed into related internal disagreements over organizational culture—including competing conceptions of revolutionary feminism—combining with external pressures during the revolts and repression of the summer of 2020, all of which ultimately culminated in the departure of members from several locals.

Though painful and difficult, the debates before and after those departures spurred a process of radical reform inside BRRN. Part of this reform process was structural and cultural, aimed at more equitably distributing organizational work. However, the most significant efforts were aimed at finally constructing a shared analytical, strategic, and tactical framework. This is the process that produced our program and which has made us into a far more effective and

While participants drew a range of lessons from these events, most were in agreement that the substitution of loose networks for formal political organization was a dead end, as was the activist orientation to summit hopping protests rather than long-term deep organizing within social movements. Widespread pain and immiseration amid the aftershocks of the 2008 financial crisis—and popular upheavals such as Occupy Wall Street and the Arab Spring kicking off around the world—meant fertile ground for critiques of both capitalism and the state. The time was right for a renewed push for organized revolutionary anarchism.

Coming out of the 2010 CSAC meeting in Seattle, WA, a number of participating organizations established a framework to formalize the process for exploring unification. This included: *Worker's Solidarity Alliance (National)*, *Common Struggle/Lucha Común [Formerly known as North Eastern Federation of Anarchist Communists]*, *Four Star Anarchist Organization (Chicago, IL)*, *Miami Autonomy and Solidarity (Miami, FL)*, *Wild Rose Collective (Iowa City, IA)*, *Rochester Red & Black (Rochester, NY)*, *First of May Anarchist Alliance (Upper Midwest)*, *Amanecer (California)*, *Common Action (Pacific Northwest)*, and *Prairie Struggle (Canada)*.

By 2012, the question was called: was it now time to formalize the merger? At this point some organizations, such as Workers' Solidarity Alliance and First of May Anarchist Alliance, withdrew from the process. Along the way other organizations, such as Amanecer, Common Action, and Prairie Struggle dissolved, though many of their members would go on to join BRRN.

In November 2013, delegates from each participating organization met in Chicago for the founding convention of Black Rose/Rosa Negra. Early the following year the organization made its public debut.

#### **2. In recent years BRRN has developed its program—'Turning the Tide'—which the organization describes as a 'living document'. Why has this become a focus for BRRN? Why call it a 'living document'?**

**BRRN:** Having a shared program is essential for putting shared principles into practice. It's a reflection of our theoretical and tactical unity and a tool for collective responsibility that ensures that we are, as the Federação Anarquista do Rio de Janeiro (FARJ) said, "rowing the boat in the same direction."

The effort we undertook to construct our program, beginning in 2021, profoundly reshaped BRRN as an organization. In our first 7 years we tended to place a large emphasis on ensuring ideological alignment within the organization, using our mostly unchanging 'points of unity' as a sort of checklist of political positions that we believed put everyone on the same page. This was not the case.

We now center our unity around the program, which guides our analysis, strategy, and tactics. But the program is not a static document, it is remade on a yearly basis through the required participation of every member, local, and committee in the organization. Its much more holistic vision and framework guide our collective work in all aspects of the organization. Moreover, through its maintenance we generate the kind of organic unity (instead of prescribed unity) necessary for a political organization to function. Indeed, we've come to realize that in the early years of Black Rose, though we referred to ourselves as a political organization, we were functionally closer to a network. We see now that a political organization without a program is like a sailor without a compass.

As to it being a living document, there are aspects of our program, such as the structural analysis, that tend to have a longer shelf life but can change over time depending on our evolving understanding of these questions. Other aspects, like our conjunctural analysis and limited term strategy, are updated every year following discussion at our convention, so we are regularly trying to think about and examine how the conditions and political terrain are evolving.

***3. BRRN is widely recognized as an especificista organization, though the organization's earlier public documents mention that it also draws on the "tradition of platformism." Is this still the case and if so,***

***how? Further, is 'platformism' still a relevant framework 100 years after the publication of the document?***

**BRRN:** Especificismo has had a major influence on our ideas and practice, especially given that it is a living tradition with more continuity than "platformism." Beyond the starting point of the need for political organization and social insertion (which conceptualizes the role of anarchists in mass movements), many of the key concepts of especificismo have also profoundly shaped our thinking. This includes the sectoral approach to organizing and the concepts of transversal issues/organizing, the social vector of anarchism, and that of popular power. While not exclusive or specific to especificismo, through its influence we've incorporated methods of conjunctural analysis and concepts such as actors in struggle and the mass, intermediate and political levels.

Platformism at its core emphasizes that anarchism is a revolutionary social movement forged in the flames of class struggle, as opposed to an abstract or utopian philosophy conceived by individual philosophers or intellectuals. It is precisely because the Platform emerges from the direct experience of the authors in a massive revolutionary struggle that its lessons are so valuable. For us, the organizational principles named by the Platform continue to be guiding reference points for our organization: the need for political organization based around theoretical and tactical unity, collective accountability, and federalism.

Though especificismo does not come from the experience of participation in a revolutionary upheaval on the scale of the Russian Revolution, it similarly grows out of the real experience of organizing within mass militant social movements (including under dictatorship) in Uruguay.

Ultimately, though platformism and especificismo are each marked in unique ways by the social and historical contexts that produced them, both recognize organizational dualism as a core tenet. Traceable to Bakunin's effort to build the Alliance for Socialist Democracy