

Agustín Guillamón

THE COMMONS AND THE DANGERS OF A REACTIONARY DERAILMENT

Amorós in Rodrigo Mora's Looking Glass

Introduction

Over recent years, in certain libertarian and anti-capitalist quarters, the recovery of the communal tradition as a historical reference point and potential starting point for a revolutionary remaking of society has assumed a growing importance. The invocation of the open council, communal resources, local autonomy and certain forms of peasant cooperation thus are presented as a response both to the social atomization generated by capitalism and to the failure of the labour movement's political organizations, these having proved themselves incapable of achieving their revolutionary purposes.

From differing standpoints and very different political trajectories, Miquel Amorós and Felix Rodrigo Mora have helped circulate such themes. One should look for the connection between them not so much to an ideological sameness – there is none – but to a shared preoccupation – critiquing industrial society, the State and the whittling down of social emancipation to the winning of political power. Both have paid attention to historical forms of community predating or beyond industrial capitalism and have taken the view that certain past experiences can be of service in working out a radical transformation of the present. As far back in 2010 they were both involved in debates about the city, the rural environment and social frictions, with this very same concern with modes of living destroyed by capitalism's growth evident. But that is as far as the common ground goes.

The crucial issue is not whether Amorós and Rodrigo Mora talk about the commons, the rural community or the need to move beyond industrial society. The issue is **which social actor can effect that shift, which social relationships need to be abolished in order to render that possible and the place that tradition occupies within that process.**

Which is where a fundamental difference comes to light. In Amorós, the recovery of communal experiences can be understood as part of a libertarian quest for concrete forms of social autonomy. Whereas in Rodrigo Mora's case, by contrast, the reconstruction of the communal past tends to be more heavily emphasized: the past is not just a bank of experiences that might be harnessed in aid of a future revolution, but can serve as a normative model for the society we are out to rebuild.

And that is not a secondary difference. It impacts upon the very notion of revolution.

The aim of this article is not to argue that Amorós subscribes to the reactionary positions with which Esteban Vidal credits Rodrigo Mora, but instead to use the case of Rodrigo Mora to sound the alarm about a potential derailment contained within certain ways of idealizing the communal tradition and of rejecting modernity.

Communal tradition vis à vis capitalism

For centuries on end, communal resources, collective benefits and sundry forms of neighbourly management were an important factor in the economic and political life of lots of rural communities around the Peninsula. At different times and in various ways, their existence clashed with privatization of the land, concentration of ownership, disentanglement, State revenue-raising and the progressive subordination of communities to outside authorities and powers.

Rodrigo Mora has turned this very matter into one of the axes of his book. In *El communal* [The Commons] he depicts land, water resources and other resources managed by the community through neighbourly meetings as core factors in an historic tradition of autonomy. His interpretation credits the commons with a much more sweeping political importance than the strictly economical; supposedly, it spawned communal forms of self-governance and amounted to a historical experience of resistance to various forms of State- and property-based dominance.

There is an element of truth to that which no revolutionary critique ought to dismiss. Capitalism's history is not just the history of the growth of the forces of production. It is also the history of the **destruction of the commons**, the expropriation of collective resources, the **proletarianization of the peasantry** and the reduction of it to market- and wage-dependent individuals.

The problem arises when one moves on from that reading of history directly to a political conclusion: if certain communal practices were destroyed by capitalism, their reconstruction might, of necessity, point the way to emancipation? Not so.

A historical institution does not become revolutionary by dint of the mere fact that it was destroyed by capitalism. Capitalism destroyed community relations, but it also destroyed patriarchal relations, social hierarchies and forms of dominance that no sensible person would want to see restored. **There is more to the revolution than turning history on its head and reverting to the world as it was before capitalism. It consists of moving beyond capitalism without reintroducing the forms of domination that obtained under feudalism or under the ancien régime.**

That is a crucial distinction.

The open council was no democracy lost

Something similar goes for the open council of the 10th century. Historians have shown the existence and importance of forms of neighbourly deliberation in lots of medieval townships, as well as how, at rates differing according to place and time, these were gradually supplanted by closed managerial arrangements, local oligarchies and means whereby higher powers interfered. The shift from the open council to the closed council is therefore a genuine historical process. But it was not linear, nor was it the same throughout the Peninsula, nor can it automatically allow us to take the medieval council as synonymous with modern democracy.

This last point is a crucial one. Some contemporary commentators tend to project on to these institutions a current ideal of direct democracy that does not quite fit the social relationships that obtained within medieval communities. The participation by residents was conditional upon lawful status, property, gender, social status and other factors. Even the specialist historians have pointed out that the picture of an open council as full and egalitarian engagement by every resident is far too simplistic. So, for revolutionaries to reclaim the open council can only be of service if done in defiance of its **historical idealization**.

It is not a matter of arguing that our forebears had already stumbled upon the emancipated society and that all we need to do is resurrect their institutions. It is a matter of acknowledging that history has experiences of collective deliberation, shared management and local autonomy to show us that show something much more straightforward and much more significant: **society does not necessarily need the State, the market and professional political representatives in the organizing of every facet of its collective existence**. Now that is instructive where revolution is concerned. But it is a lesson, not a recipe nor a watchword, let alone a promise for the future.

Amorós: practical utopia and the break with industrial society

Miquel Amorós frames the issue in a different way. His criticism of industrial society and capitalist progress is not restricted to denunciation of economic exploitation. He also queries the destruction of territory, the subjection of everyday life to commodity and the eradication of the expertise and abilities that allowed communities to exercise a certain measure of autonomy.

In his 2026 text about practical anarchy and concrete utopia, Amorós puts the case for the need for a practical side to utopia and asserts the feasibility of community schemes capable

of testing different lifestyles whether in rural or urban contexts. In that regard he explicitly advocates a reversion to certain pre-capitalist expertise, traditional crafts and self-governing communal experiences.

There is an obvious thrust behind that stance when compared with an anarchism that has been reduced to sloganizing, bureaucratic organizations or propaganda activities. Revolution cannot be reduced simply to the chant that ‘another world is possible’. It has to start, in the here and now, on the building of different social relations.

But here again, resurrection of previous lifestyles also falls short.

A community may be autonomous of the State and yet remain oppressive. It may work its land collectively and yet replicate inequalities. It may reject industry, yet cling to patriarchal relations. It may defend its territory, yet exclude the outsider. It may be communitarian, yet reactionary.

Which is why the revolutionary yardstick cannot be the vintage of an institution, nor the measure of how autonomous it is of the State. The yardstick ought to be **which social relationships it reproduces and which it destroys. Two different ways of looking at the past.**

And here, in all likelihood, we have the essential difference between Amorós and Rodrigo Mora.

In Amorós, the communal past looks essentially like a battery of experiences that might feed into a break with industrial society. Interest in pre-industrial ways of life does not necessarily oblige us to resurrect them. They might afford us expertise, technologies, cooperative relations and historical examples that might be replicated in a revolutionary society.

In Rodrigo Mora’s case, by contrast, the commons occupies a much more central and systematic position. His reconstruction of history sets out to show that there was a peninsula-wide tradition of communal autonomy that was allegedly progressively demolished by the expansion of the State and private property. His case for recovery of the commons is therefore linked to the building of a brand-new society founded upon self-governing communities.

One does not need to deny the historical existence of that tradition in order to highlight the political issue inherent in that outlook. **A revolution in this day and age cannot look to a feudal or ancien régime tradition for its subject.**

Tradition may well preserve useful experiences, memories of battles and lost expertise. But it fails to struggle, to decide. To organize. It fails to tear down existing social relations. The revolutionary actor cannot be “the commons”, any more than it can be “the community”, “the people”, or “nature”. These are classifications that may well take on a liberating

content, but only through concrete human actors capable of collective action. And such actors live in the present.

Esteban Vidal versus Felix Rodrigo Mora: sectarianism, the far right and reactionary derailment

The most devastating critique of Félix Rodrigo Mora and the *Integral Revolution*, so-called, does not come exclusively from his political foes. It comes also from those with insider knowledge of that trend and who finished up severing ties with it. Esteban Vidal has framed that breakup in unmistakable terms [See *Unmasking the demo-fascists of Integral Revolution*]: he argues that Integral Revolution, which might initially have posed as a pluralist current critiquing the State, capitalism and industrial society, has turned into a **reddish-brown demo-fascist political sect**, riddled with conspiracists, ethno-nationalists, xenophobes and lurching in the direction of far right positions.

The accusation is too serious to be dismissed as a squabble between former comrades. Vidal is not just saying that Felix Rodrigo Mora is wrong on certain points. He argues that a **political mutation** has occurred: that behind the talk of revolution, the commons, direct democracy and the fight against capitalism, ideas proper to the radical right have been imported.

And that charge needs to be scrutinized in the light of Rodrigo Mora's own writings.

The first battle-ground is **feminism and abortion**. Rodrigo Mora is not content just with criticizing certain aspects of institutional feminism. His language goes much further and is a lot more aggressive. In his recent writings he depicts feminism as a profoundly negative ideology and expressly queries so-called "abortion rights", linking them to "immorality" and "demographic ruination".

There is a fundamental paradox here. It is one thing arguing that capitalism makes a commodity of the body, that the State oversees reproduction or that certain institutional policies keep women down. It is a very different matter turning female reproductive rights into a political, population issue and viewing abortion from the angle of a collective morality that winds up imposing an obligation upon women to reproduce.

When concern with birth-rates turns into a political obsession, woman is in danger of ceasing to look like an autonomous actor and turning into just a **reproducer of the community**.

Which is precisely one of the factors that sets the alarm bells ringing, given Vidal's accusation. Because the discourse is no longer merely anti-capitalist and is now beginning to

revolve around population replacement, native-born population, Europe's decline and the need for Europeans to breed.

The next battle-ground has to do with **immigration**. Here the rhetoric assumes an even more problematic complexion. Rodrigo Mora has published texts explicitly entitled No to Immigration into Euskal Herria and all of Europe and has developed a critique of immigration that links it to replacement of the European population, demographic reproduction and the supposed marginalization of native-born Europeans. Furthermore, in his own writings there is the insistence that "Europeans, male and female, must breed", as part of a political strategy for handling population and reproduction.

Here the issue ceases to be criticism of capitalism's migration policies. The issue arises when the immigrant worker stops being seen as an exploited worker and comes to be looked upon as a **foreign demographic factor** threatening the continuity of a given population. Capitalism may have a homeland: the exploited do not. Turning ethnic or national origin into a core category of revolutionary policy amounts to a lurch in the direction of counter-revolution.

The third factor is **Islamophobia**. Rodrigo Mora's supporters contend that his stance cannot be labelled Islamophobic and they contend that his criticism is directed at Islam as a religion, ideology and power structure, rather than at Muslims. That is a distinction to be taken under advisement. But on its own it does not resolve the issue, because Islam is depicted in exceptionally violent terms, as an extreme form of misogyny and domination, whilst it is posited that there is a clash of civilizations between Europe and the Muslim world.

A revolutionary critique can and should combat any religion when it operates as a power, authority or tool for submission. But there is a boundary that cannot be ignored: when criticism of a religion starts to slide into criminalization of a segment of the population as a cultural, demographic or civilizational threat, the argument ceases to be merely anti-clerical and become racist.

Rodrigo Mora has himself also resorted to language about **defending Europe and Europeans**, whilst simultaneously denouncing the far right for its demonization of Islam. The paradox is a worrying one: fighting the far right whilst seizing on its themes – immigration, demography, European identity, Islam – themes that that far right has turned into one of its main battle-grounds.

And here is the kernel of Vidal's accusation: **a discourse need not literally copy a fascist party's program for it to function as a gate affording entry to reactionary thinking into a revolutionary space.**

The fourth battle-ground is conspiracism. Vidal holds that theories about "the great replacement" and "white genocide" are part of the narrative of Integral Revolution and he links them with its demographic and ethno-nationalist thinking. This is particularly

important, because it turns complicated economic and political processes into the products of an alleged deliberate operation designed to replace one population with another.

At which point the critique of capitalism is cast aside. There is no longer the fundamental issue as to who owns the land, who controls the means of production, who determines the working conditions or who rakes in the profits. The issue is presented as **who is replacing whom**.

This is a politically explosive side-step because wherever class disappears and race is brought in, where exploitation is left out and identity brought into it, wherever capital disappears and the foreigner-as-enemy is brought in, the ground is being prepared for a reactionary politics.

Hence Vidal's use of the **red-brown** tag: a politically contradictory blend of anti-capitalist rhetoric, criticism of liberalism and critique of the State, social traditionalism, opposition to feminism, preoccupation with demography, identity-based nationalism and rejection of immigration.

The fifth battle-ground is **demo-fascism**. Vidal accused Integral Revolution of championing a notion of direct democracy that might lead to the tyranny of the majority. Which is not a minor issue. Direct democracy can be an instrument for emancipation, but it can also turn into a democratic fiction, if the community self-describes as a homogeneous whole that imposes its wishes on individuals and minorities.

An assembly does not become revolutionary simply by being an assembly. A community is not free simply because it describes itself as a community. And a majority does not stop being oppressive just because it has voted through its decision.

Add to that an organicist notion of community, an obsession with population reproduction and a differentiation between natives and foreigners, and the championing of the commons may end up being of a very different complexion from what it claims.

Which brings us back to the core issue of this essay: **the commons are not, in essence, revolutionary**. They may help to combat private ownership and commodification. But they may also be used in the building of a closed, patriarchal, traditionalist, inward-looking community. History does not hand out certificates of political purity. Neither does the commons of the past.

Vidal's charges are even more serious when we look into the issue of **sectarianism**. According to his complaint, Integral Revolution has supposedly moved on from being a relatively open association and endowed itself with an increasingly closed political structure that revolves around Félix Rodrigo Mora, wherein external criticism and internal dissent are construed as attacks on the movement.

There is more to sectarianism than just being radical. It consists of turning a given political view into the measure of one's belonging; of mistaking criticism for betrayal; of turning one's political adversary into a moral enemy; of building up an ideological mini-universe where one's own mistakes are explained away as resulting from the failure of others to understand and where contradictions are sorted out by expelling the challenger.

And that is especially serious when the person at the heart of that universe is possessed of tremendous intellectual authority, because the problem then stops being just Félix Rodrigo Mora. The issue become **Félixism**: the possibility of a revolutionary current's ending up organizing around the intellectual and moral authority of a leader, making his interpretations of history and politics into a sort of doctrinal ready-reckoner. A revolution in need of infallible gurus has already begun to lose the battle against authority. A revolution in need of heretics also has a use for inquisitors.

And a revolution that permanently splits the world into those who have grasped the truth and others infected by the system runs the risk of turning into the very thing it claims to be out to combat.

So Vidal's critique requires that we look directly into a contradiction that labels cannot resolve. **How can a school of thought profess to be the enemy of fascism when it itself incorporates speechifying about demographic decline, native-born population, immigration, European identity, reproduction and feminism which may well, in part, partly overlap with the baggage of the far right?**

That Rodrigo Mora also criticizes the far right is no answer. That will not cut it. Nor is it enough to point out that he condemns capitalism. The contemporary far right can be simultaneously anti-globalist, anti-oligarchic, anti-liberal in certain regards and ferociously hostile to high financial capital, without that preventing it from being of the far right.

The yardstick cannot be the mouth from which the word "revolution" comes. It has to be **what society one is out to build and who is excluded from it.**

So, issues such as abortion, feminism, immigration, Islam and demography are not secondary or "cultural" matters. They are precisely where the true meaning of the community being claimed is put to the test.

If a woman is duty-bound to reproduce the community, that is patriarchy. If the foreigner is primarily identified as a demographic threat, that is identity-based nationalism. If the Muslim is cast in the role of representative of an enemy civilization, that is Islamophobia. If one think of population in terms of genes, blood or replacement, that takes one on to the home ground of racism.

And if all of this comes wrapped up in anti-capitalist, communitarian, revolutionary language, then criticism ought to be all the more implacable, because the issue is not that Félix Rodrigo Mora has become “less of a leftist”. The issue, if Vidal’s accusations and the writings underpinning them are right, is a lot more serious than that: that a part of the far right is able to introduce into areas that are still considered revolutionary a brand-new language by which to slip in old ideas about closed community, identity, hierarchy, tradition, reproduction and exclusion.

That is where the real danger of the red-brown hybrid resides: that it manages to **talk about revolution whilst replacing the class struggle with the struggle between peoples, emancipation with identity, women’s rights with demographic breeding and internationalism with defence of a community conceived of in ethnic terms.**

And if that is where Integral Revolution has gone off the rails, then criticism should not be sparing. It must be direct because reclaiming the commons for the purpose of fighting capitalism is one thing but exploiting the commons, tradition and community as cover for a reactionary policy quite another.

The commons is not fascist. Community is not fascist. Direct democracy is not fascist. But none of them confers any immunity from fascism. And when revolutionary language starts to get mixed up with radical anti-feminism, obsession with demography, rejection of the foreigner, demonization of Islam, ethno-nationalism and racial conspiratorialism, we need to stop looking away because what we are not talking then about a tactical difference within the revolutionary movement. We are talking about **what sort of revolution we are working towards and whom it will serve.**

The problem of the revolutionary subject

It is at this point that a critique of capitalism centred on industrial civilization runs the risk of losing the actual social conflict.

Contemporary capitalist society is not just split between State and community, nor between industry and nature. It is riddled with the relations based on exploitation, ownership, wages, gender, territory, race, nation and power. The working class has not gone away just because its make-up has altered. It has been fractured, made precarious and scattered: its structure has changed and its organizational forms have changed. But millions of people remain dependent on selling their labour power in order to survive.

Which means that a revolutionary politics cannot substitute some abstract opposition between industrial society and the society of the commons for the issue of class. Nor can the idealized peasantry be turned into a replacement for the actual proletariat.

The revolutionary subject is not waiting for some reconstructed rural community, nor does it exist as an historic feature of a given social category. It is shaped through struggle, when those who suffer exploitation- and domination-based relations start to act against these on a collective basis and, in so doing, transfigure their own relations.

Which is why the commons only assumes a revolutionary quality once it ceases to be a matter of nostalgia and turns into a mode of organization of the struggle and social reproduction. We do not need medieval peasants dressed up as revolutionaries. We need workers capable of collectively recapturing the means whereby their lives are produced and reproduced: communities capable of managing their resources without owners or bureaucrats; individuals capable of doing away with the relations that turn them into commodities, consumers, electors or mere cogs in the machinery of production.

The matter of the State

Here there is another partial overlap between Amorós and Rodrigo Mora: the critique of the State.

The historical experience of the 20th century has proven more than adequately that **capture** of the machinery of State does not automatically lead on to emancipation. The replacement of one ruling class by another, State take-over of the economy or the creation of new bureaucracies did not do away with exploitation. In many instances, they merely replicated it in brand-new formats.

But rejecting the State does not mean taking shelter in community as if it were outside of any power relationship. Community needs to be revolutionized as well.

A communal organization can be turned into a bureaucratic structure. An assembly can be manipulated by a minority. Collective ownership can provide cover for brand-new hierarchies. Local autonomy can turn into particularism. Rejection of political representation can finish up leaving real power in the hands of those with the most free time, resources, expertise or informal authority.

Direct democracy is no magic wand. It is a disputatious procedure that requires material equality, decision-making capability and constant monitoring from the ground up.

Which is why communal revolution cannot restrict itself to resurrecting old institutions. It needs to demolish the material circumstances that allow for the emergence of brand-new elites.

Tradition's blind spot: women, immigration and exclusion

Uncritical resurrection of tradition becomes particularly problematic when it steps outside of economic organization and ventures into social relations.

Rodrigo Mora's public stances on abortion, feminism and immigration have sparked significant controversy. In recent writings, he has developed explicit criticisms of feminism and championed opposition to abortion rights, whilst in his writings on the subject of immigration arguments crop up that are centred upon the native-born European population and demographic reproduction, alongside a critique of mass immigration and blatantly xenophobic stances.

One does need to blithely accept the Islamophobic and anti-feminist labels employed by his adversaries to acknowledge here that this is a serious political issue.

A revolutionary approach to community cannot allow community membership to be defined on the basis of ethnic, national, religious or demographic yardsticks. Nor are women to be viewed chiefly in terms of their reproductive function. Community autonomy that clings to or reproduces patriarchal subordination is not emancipation.

Likewise the critique of capitalist immigration cannot be recast as championing of the "native-born" population against the outsider. Capitalism uses migration, borders and wage differentials to split workers and boost their availability for exploitation. The revolutionary response does not amount to pitting the worker born hereabouts against the worker born thereabouts, but rather of attacking the conditions that make such separation feasible.

On which score, tradition ceases to offer an adequate argument. Historical practice does not become fair just because of its age.

Beyond the sham alternative between progress and the past

There is, though, a symmetrical threat that would be equally serious: repudiation of all resurrection of communal tradition on the basis that it might be deployed for reactionary ends.

Capitalism's production-focused left has for too long made the mistake of taking emancipation as a synonym for growth of productive forces. Part of the workers' movement accepted that industrialization was inevitable and progressive and it came to regard battles against destruction of territory, loss of autonomy and the subordination of everyday life to productivity as secondary or even backward-looking.

The outcome of that was disastrous. Capitalism does not stop at exploiting the worker in the factory setting. It oversees the totality of social reproduction, demolishing eco-systems, marshalling population, imposing a growing reliance upon gigantic infra-structures and not

turns human needs into markets. Making a critique of industrial civilization, therefore, vitally necessary.

But a revolutionary critique of industry must never lead on to a bucolic mythology. The choice is not between the capitalist factory and the medieval hamlet. The alternative amounts to the **abolition of capitalist social relations and a collective decision-making as to which technologies, which sorts of production and which organizational formats we wish to preserve, alter or eliminate.**

Which is where the difference between revolution and restoration comes in.

A necessary critique of the idealization of the commons

The commons is of interest to revolutionaries precisely because it shows that there have been forms of ownership and management that did not coincide with individual property ownership, nor with State ownership. But that interest does not hinge upon those forms having been flawless.

The really useful thing is to look to them for glimpses of self-management, cooperation, collective decision-making and community reproduction that capitalism then dismantled or overruled.

The task today is to reclaim ownership of such experiences but in a modern context. It is not a question of resurrecting the medieval council, but of building assemblies capable of determining matters affecting collective life. It is not a matter of resurrecting communal assets as they existed centuries ago, but of taking over society's essential resources and turning them into authentically shared assets. It is not a matter of reverting to some idealized peasant economy but of **tearing down the separation into producers and consumers, between country and city, between manual labour and brainwork.**

A reversion to the past does not enter into it. The point is to **prevent capitalism from continuing to destroy the future.**

Conclusions

In some respects, then, Miquel Amorós and Félix Rodrigo Mora turn out to be kindred spirits whereas on other counts the kinship is strictly limited.

They have both helped place centre stage in libertarian debate issues that for many a long year were sneered at by much of capital's left: the destruction of communities, the reliance

upon industry, the loss of autonomy, the evaporation of popular expertise, territorial devastation and the need to build up concrete forms of collective living.

That contribution deserves to be taken seriously. But for that very reason it needs to be exposed to criticism.

Of itself, the commons does not amount to a revolutionary subject. The open council is no magical formula. Community is not necessarily emancipating. Tradition and freedom are not synonymous. Rejection of industry is not the same as abolishing capitalism. And opposition to the State falls short unless accompanied by a radical transformation of the social relations that reproduce exploitation and domination. And, in any event, the aim is never to capture the State, but to dismantle it.

Revolution cannot consist of a return to a pre-capitalist society, because that society never existed as some sort of paradise lost. Nor can it amount to preserving capitalism through the addition of a few cooperatives, a few assemblies and the odd community garden. Between reactionary restorationism and community-based reformism there is a third option: **revolutionary demolition of capitalist relations by means of thoughtful construction of free communities.**

Which means that we need to rescue from the past whatever might serve the purposes of our current fight, but also wash our hands of anything related to past forms of domination. Tradition is only of interest to revolution when it turns into a critical experience, and not when it turns into dogma. The commons is only revolutionary when it stops being a cultural legacy and turns into collective power. And autonomy is only deserving of the name when it affects the material conditions of life.

In short, the issue does not boil down to knowing whether we should revert to the medieval commons, but of establishing whether we are capable of **turning into a commons the world that capitalism had turned into commodity.**

The issue is whether Amorós's embrace of Félix Rodrigo Mora in his 2026 article "Practical anarchism and concrete utopia" has the potential of opening the door to a similar derailment of Amorós: jumping the rails from radical critique of capitalist modernity on to some reactionary idealization of the past. Therein lies the danger. Maybe it can be averted if we hold Rodrigo Mora's mirror image up to Amorós.

A reversion to the past does not come into it: **the point is to banish capitalism from our futures.**

Agustín Guillamón

Barcelona, 12 September 2026 <https://serhistorico.net/2026/09/12/el-comunal-y-su-peligro-de-una-deriva-reaccionaria-amoros-ante-el-espejo-de-rodrigo-mora/>

This is the 9th of a series of 9 articles by Guillamón between 13 July 2026 and 12 September 2026, amounting to a dialogue with Tomás Ibáñez and Miquel Amorós and released through a number of outlets such as Ser Histórico, Regeneración Libertaria, Portal OACA, Alasbarricadas, Indymedia Barcelona, Kaos en la Red, Redes Libertarias and centred on topics such as the proletariat, the subject of the revolution and kindred topics.

Two others have been translated into English and are on the KSL site as “Worldwide Proletariat and Concrete Utopia” <https://www.katesharpleylibrary.net/qz63fx> and “Ease up on the Death Notices” <https://www.katesharpleylibrary.net/905shk>. Trans. PS.