

BLOCKING

1 DEC. 2019

Can blocking be considered an effective strategy in the current power relations? What is the relationship between the movement that will begin on December 5 and those that are shaking the Middle East and Latin America? An attempt to describe in very general terms the forms that a global capital crisis can take.

In a way, the Invisible Committee is right about one thing: power is logistical, and it is a tautology platform, since power is the power to do things. But what the fact of pointing this out above all reflects is that "power" no longer negotiates, only in times of crisis it renounces even to appear as the neutral synthesis of the different class interests, to appear as what it is: the domination of a class. The fable of the general interest - democracy in its various forms - then vanishes in the face of the reality of the higher interest of the economy (which would then be the true social synthesis), that other fetish of class domination. Strike management then becomes a question of policing, and indeed a question of logistics. Consequently, those who contest are no longer adversaries with whom we dialogue, but offenders: radicalized. We must no longer negotiate, we must physically "unblock". Repression is the necessary corollary of the absence of dialogue, it justifies it at the same time as it manifests it.

But where the Invisible Committee saw a weakness, proof that the State could no longer produce symbolic legitimacy but "only" control the territory, it must also be remembered that, in the current balance of power, logistics is not only the strength of the State, but also the means by which it plans to continue to last forever: it took less than three weeks to clear the roundabouts of the yellow vests and stop the blockages. It is precisely because the State won the logistical battle (in the sense of the DDE) that the protest went back to the streets, where it is once again logistically treated by the police. And given the way all this is going, we must once again ask ourselves the question: can we fight the State on the road? Can we even really, in practice, not from a technical point of view but by taking into account the state of the forces involved, "paralyse the country"? And, finally, what for?

What happens in this situation is that with each major movement, those who enter into a struggle find themselves facing a wall that effectively reduces their action to a logistical problem. The ideological management of the issue by the State is then carried out solely with a view to restoring the normal flow of the circulating order of things: political disqualification of positions, marginalization under the qualification of extremism, immediate dispersion of any demonstration treated as a disturbance of public order, instant "unblocking", mobilization of non-revolutionary personnel to restore normal functioning, etc. "Normality" appears here for what it is, a permanent violence, but it only appears to those who have entered into a struggle because they are subjected to it. For others, normality is normality, period. The question then is: to what extent can the State, surrounded by those for whom normality is still desirable, continue to deny the existence of those for whom normality is becoming more and more unbearable? It is this dynamic of "dropping out" that invites us to think of civil war as always contained in the current situation, wherever in the world, from the worst dictatorship to the most established democracies. And here too, we tremble at the idea of being bogged down in a civil war in which the State retains all its logistical resources: Bashar-el-Assad's Syria is there to remind us of what a State capable of doing when it succeeds in uniting one part of the population against the other. This can last, and the duration here is the programmed overwriting.

That is why today every movement that begins to spread immediately enters an unknown, uncertain and rather terrifying area, with the only prospect of a return to a "normal" that is becoming increasingly unbearable, the crushing or chaos of civil war. For capital, the end of politics is never anything but war. Seeing these conditions manifest themselves in France, in a movement as "classic" as a fight against pension reform, seeing this destructive logic unfold its premises in what twenty or thirty years ago was reflected in a kind of ritualized nuptial dance between the "social partners" and the State, tells us enough about the depth of the crisis in which we have entered. What is being prepared in France obviously has nothing in common - quantitatively speaking - with what is currently

happening in Chile or Iraq, and each situation must be understood for its own sake, but it does indicate a general situation, which is indeed global. The common point between the way the French state envisages the movement against pension reform, and movements such as those taking place in the Middle East or Latin America, is this situation where the state has nothing more to give (and in the cases preceding the crisis of the extractivist and redistributive rentier state only manifests itself even more violently in this situation) and where nothing is actually expected of it, while nevertheless the only perspective of struggles remains: "the people want the regime to fall", everywhere, to infinity. Perhaps this is where the real "blockage" lies, in this endless face-to-face relationship with the State. Today, it would be foolish to consider it differently from the prospect of a global revolutionary crisis, and it would be nihilism not to consider the communist perspective in this context.

In this perspective, the struggles will evolve as they can, there is no vanguard that can give them direction. Radicality does not exist in ideas or people, it is in the situation. However, it would also be irresponsible not to point out this simple fact: the "traffic struggles" and the blocking strategy, as well as the pure riotous perspective, are doomed to failure. Their only prospect is to succeed in destabilizing the State in order to force it to improve the living conditions of the masses of proletarians that capitalism excludes or distances from its "normality", but such an integrating perspective is no longer on the agenda. In this case, all that remains for the State to do is to organize the unblocking and the return to order, which it has ample means to do. Whatever some dreamers may think, we will not be more efficient than the State in the field of logistics, neither by blocking nor by riot. At best, if the crisis becomes widespread, we can obtain a change of political personnel to organize the return to normal, at worst it is the crash. That's what the slogan "Let's block everything!" never says. What for? What for? For what "victory" exactly? And what are the chances of success? Faced with the prospect of this programmed failure, on the contrary, it must be said that a revolutionary movement that would begin to put itself in a position to win would have no choice but to attack production, to seize productive elements and begin to practice production without exchange, gratuitousness, to seize means of circulation rather than seek to block it at any price, etc., i. e. to immediately implement communism. It is only in this context, where the movement begins to make life outside capital possible, where the struggle is no longer limited to a murderous face-to-face struggle with the state, that riots and blockades can play a positive role. It goes without saying that we are still far from that.

Carbure blog