

ABOUT SOLIDARITY- SOLIDARITY ASSEMBLY ATHENS
(greece)



ABOUT SOLIDARITY

The Assembly for Solidarity came together in April 2010 as a result of the discussion that was developed at the anti-repression event on 16/3/2010 at the Polytechnic in Athens, but also beyond it. It is a mono thematic formation consisting of individuals and collectives of various tendencies and perceptions. Its aim is to focus with duration, continuity and consistency on State repression, recognizing it as one of the many fronts of the social war, which however reveals the nature of State savagery in the political field as well. The assembly aims for the organization and spread of solidarity, its transmission through the oppressed social body as a direct answer to State repression, as well as a weapon of the oppressed in the social war.

While it constitutes an autonomous formation that doesn't claim to represent anyone but those participating in it, it perceives

itself as part of the anarchist movement and informally seeks to coordinate with the different conditions it encounters. Even though we consider repression something multifaceted but unitary (an essential element of every mechanism of power), the combination of necessities that emerge forces us to select which aspects of repression we will deal with, in a word, to set priorities. Thus, our priority today is the cases of repression that present a political, revolutionary content. In that direction, over the months that we have functioned, we have organized dozens of struggles and interventions in a period of escalation of the attack (or counter-attack) of the State that is leading to a wider and wider spectrum of repressive blows. This situation has locked us in a permanent “practical rush”, at the same time as political problems from the past on the subject remain unsolved, while new ones are accumulating. The present text is an attempt by the assembly to define itself and face these problems. It does not constitute a text of values nor does it aspire to end discussion within the movement, which, though widespread, does not happen in a coordinated way and with difficulty produces results. **It is a recording of positions of value based and political dilemmas that we all continuously find ourselves faced with, but also an attempt for an organized spreading and deepening of this discussion.**

What solidarity and for whom?

We fixed as a priority solidarity in cases with a political, revolutionary content. Solidarity, that is to say, that should exist in the community of those whose words and actions bring them to a conscious rupture with the system of sovereignty and exploitation. A community that we perceive as value based, a

result of our own participation in the social war. This means that, independently of strategies or tactics, independently of tendencies and currents, we perceive the existence of a vertical (often faded) line that separates worlds. As the world of authority, despite the merciless conflicts within it, maintains for itself the fundamental and material unit of complicity, this we consider should also happen on the other side, that of a society that is being attacked. And even more between the parts of this society that fight. The vertical line of segregation becomes clear when the state imports its repressive violence into this struggle, each time that the terms or even the whole of the social contract are disputed.

Here is where (contrary to other fronts of the social war) the existence of this fundamental community cannot but be proven. In the name of consistency of values, words and actions but also from the fact that, whether we like it or not, authority will not forget, investing its individual victories, to improve its position in the social war.

The moment charges are pronounced (real or fabricated) concerning a political action (whether it is an expression of belief or for armed struggle) a conflict begins. To remain a spectator, unfortunately, does not mean that “you are not getting involved”. It means that you are taking the side of the more powerful.

So, “all the good ones” fit into solidarity?

No, but surely more than those who fit into the offices of a group or within the framework of a political assembly. When we do not have a set-up prosecution, obviously the matter is who will define and how, the political - revolutionary content. Often the defendant will give a political tone to the act (as e.g. in bank robberies), at other times the action itself has such political references and repercussions that it is no longer the “property” of the prosecuted and concerns everyone. In other cases it is the state itself that will politically color its violence, imposing the agenda that it wishes.

The Assembly for Solidarity is a live process and each case that comes up is examined separately. Having filled a series of ethical conditions, with the nature of the action turned against authority, and the prisoner maintaining a decent attitude, blocking the extension of repression and promoting his/her position in the social war and of course in the cases of fabrications and vengeful prosecutions, then yes, it is clear for us that we should mobilize.

Is the prisoner thus politically vindicated because he/she was caught?

No. Holy cows do not exist. Each act and choice will be evaluated, will be “criticized”, will go on the scales. No matter how much governmental violence is applied, no matter how proud the attitude of the prisoner, his or her political choices are in the arena, as are also the actions and the choices of those “on the outside”, in solidarity or not.

The question, however, is whose job is it to intervene in this criticism. We consider that this is the job of political organizations and individuals, it is the job of processes and structures that draw a policy, but also of the prosecuted themselves.

The job of a general structure of solidarity is to deal with the community in which all these are encompassed, it concerns a base value, a fundamental policy, not a strategy. If it makes the mistake of importing into its interior, making its presence dependent upon, factors of tight political agreement, then not only does it cancel itself but also functions negatively in its entirety in the struggle for subversion. It will achieve nothing other than its multiple splits, as well as the scorn of every ambitious argument of ours for solidarity among the oppressed. It will be a fast road to ridicule.

The attitude of the greatest part of the radical left concerning the prisoners of 17N (the 17th November Revolutionary Organization) is the precise description of what should be

avoided. The detached whistling, conspiracy theories, statements of loyalty... once again **proving how disastrous it is to examine repression while forgetting to put half of reality in the framework: the state and its targets.** It was proved yet again that authority manages to change silence into complicity, an always topical chant that we should all remember no matter how difficult it is. On the contrary, despite the fact that they were not “charmed”, particularly by the political aims and many of the actions of this organization, the attitude of the anarchists (the most part of them at least) was the one that not only rose to the occasion, but also socially rescued the prestige of anti-institutional practices and slowed down the spreading of repression.

For us, since the case is accepted in the first level that we consider concerns us, the disagreement or agreement with what the prisoner did, when he accepts his action, cannot go on the table of solidarity. Solidarity does not mean engagement. Even somebody that could consider specific choices of struggle completely wrong, has in the end the obligation to not allow the state to vindicate its own criminal choices, to not remove the state from the picture. If of course negative criticism becomes provocative or is drawn up in a repressive climate, then the thing changes. Whoever plays around with loyalty (or lunacy) has nothing to do with what is written here. They have made other choices.

About innocence and guilt.

Since we speak of a solidarity focused on political subjects in struggle, although as anarchists we refuse, totally, the social contract (and each choice of struggle is characterized first of all by the side of social war in which it is included), then the significance of legal innocence or guilt does not exist for us. Obviously, in the usual cases where a case is completely or partly fabricated by the authorities, things are much easier. Solidarity that seeks to be transmitted to as many as possible

wider layers of oppressed has a weapon: factual proof of the democratic lie of the regime.

It has also a “facility”: someone does not need to dispute the social contract in order to stand on the side of the persecuted. A “facility” of course, that carries the danger of being led to the support of a fantasized (but insistently propagated by authority) civil legality. On the other hand, when the prisoner takes responsibility solidarity becomes much more rupturing and has to place the question of choosing camps: not between the choices of the prosecuted and the state, but between the dominated that fight actively and power that claims the monopoly of violence. There, of course, the direct objective of solidarity becomes more difficult. **Because the direct objective cannot be any other than the release of the prisoner.**

Provided that he or she remains a fighter, “taking him/her from their clutches” is the heart of every single campaign. We have also cases where the attitude of the prisoner changes. Where they start off speaking of “innocence” and afterwards admit “guilt”. We believe that, despite the complex matters that open up with such an attitude, it is the absolute right of the persecuted to lie to authority even if this means that at the same time they tell lies to their own side. Such is the nature of every repressive attack: it creates such blackmailing dilemmas to everyone that it does not allow the creation of a *savoir vivre* of “correct attitude” in a prosecution. This does not eliminate the content of a reliable and proud attitude. On the contrary it reveals it.

Finally, however, we consider that (we repeat it, since it goes through the essential political filter) the line of defense is the exclusive affair of each prisoner separately. For solidarity, the moment of prosecution, the acceptance of each defensive line and movement is not a choice, it is a duty. Any other attitude threatens to play the game of authority that seeks such cracks.

Closing

The Assembly for Solidarity is an open formation within which coexist different, and at certain times opposing, political

perceptions. We consider that through this we are covering, in an organized way, an imperative need in the social war. And we are covering it by going beyond individual agreements or disagreements among ourselves or with those prosecuted. Also going beyond the logic of close friends and microcosms that often (and this should be recognized) carried the weight of important matters of solidarity in the past alone, without, however, the necessary continuity and totality that the current situation requires more than ever. Our interventions have a direct relation to our strength. This is why we are calling upon individuals and collectives to approach the attempt. And this text and our presence up until now give us a clear image of “where we are going”. From now on we are neither taking on the job of solidarity, nor are we those that “do the chores”. We are willing to collaborate (and we have done it) on the basis of clear procedures with other formations of solidarity for the carrying out of actions on a larger scale. **What is important is that we respond to the attacks of the state, to stand effectively on the side of its hostages, with our position clear in the struggle for social liberation.**

And this is how we will continue.

**The Assembly for Solidarity meets every Monday at 7.00pm
at the Polytechnic University**

*Assembly for Solidarity
Athens, January 2011*

TRANSLATED:boubourAs actforfreedomnow!