First appeared untitled in Attakattak (aka "feuille de chou(x)", "de Bruxelles" to be more precise for the cabbage enthusiasts), Issue 2

Because there are not enough words in this language to describe what I feel for you and what you mean to me. Because too often our love is considered as insubstantial and dispensable. I would like to say I love you. And I would like, if the others don't understand, that for once they shut up. Since there is not a word that really speaks of us, I would like to use for you those that seem to me the strongest, the most alive, the most passionate. I would like that the "I love you"'s also belong to us, that "love" is what we share, I would like to call you my beloved or my love without being asked questions or without our relationship being requalified in less powerful terms. I would like to be able to love you without making anyone uncomfortable, I would like to speak about love without conforming to all the characteristics that are associated with it. I don't have a definition of what love might be, I think it is expressed in 1000 different ways. Here, I would like to speak to you about what we share, about this feeling that I'm part of you forever without belonging to you.

Due to their shitty world, their rules about relationships and sex, it took me too long to understand that I love you, that it is that and yes, it is unique and crazy, that it is like us. It took me too long to understand, due to their romantic model, poetry and songs, that what we were living was strong and precious and that it was worth it to give it its space. I believed for too long that our relationship was a crutch and not a backbone. I believed for too long that what was between us was self-evident, instead of understanding that everything was still to be invented. We love each other as we can, with our shortcomings, our clumsiness and our silences, but above all we love each other as we want, without enclosing ourselves, without forcing ourselves, without deceiving ourselves. We don't share everything, we can tell each other no, we can even not touch each other or not see each other. We can do all of this because we love each other and don't possess each other. Because I think that love can only be lived in freedom, that a caged love is a love that conceals its dependence and its anxiety badly. I don't want that you love me because you owe it to me, because it is more moral or I don't know what bullshit. I don't want that you love me because without me you wouldn't have any reasons to live. I would like you to love me because it is doing you good, because you feel like it, because instead of limiting you, it multiplies you. I would like that loving me makes it so that you can love others. And vice versa.

I think that each person, each living being is unique, I think that no one could ever replace you in my life and in my heart, because no one is you. Your way of being unique fascinates me, I fell in love with it. I know you well enough, and I know myself even better, to know that I love you and your 1000 particularities. I'm not saying I love everything in you, that would be equal to loving nothing at all. This is what I'm trying to say to you; that I'm not dependent on our relationship, that it is your being and its complexity that attracts me and keeps me, that I make sure to love you and not only "us". Besides, our relationship and our commitments that flow from it change according to our desires and our movements. Over time, what one brings and what one asks have evolved, nothing is fixed, we are moving and so also is our love. As long as somewhere on this earth I know you're alive, that your being can always be what it is, then I know that everything is possible between us.

It is for all these reasons that the only promise I can and want to make you is that I will always love you. I know it is not a mathematical certainty, like it is not a certainty that I will be alive tomorrow, so many things can happen to us. But with what I know here and now I can affirm that I feel like loving you till I cannot love any more. Thus, it is not this crazy promise that keeps us in love, on the contrary, it is from our magnificent love that the desire to keep each other company forever comes. And so, if the reasons for which I hold you so dear to my heart come to pass, if our desires and our paths come to oppose each other, our promise wouldn't have any sense any more. Besides, if I wouldn't resemble any more the person that you loved, if my new identities come to contradict what you cherish in me, then I hope that you as well would leave... What is important to me is what I feel now, while promising to love you forever, I promise most of all to love you immensely here, as I'm speaking to you. That seems contradictory, but I think that in reality it is one and the same thing. I know that you also love me, all that is certain, what is not is life and it can change everything. I will not always be here, I will maybe not always love you exactly like you wish, you will not be everything for me and I will not be everything for you. But I have enough confidence in what you are to know that your being will always be dear to me because it is wonderfully unique and irreplaceable. Life without you would not be impossible, it would be terribly more empty and grey. As a life always and only with you would be cruel to me. But there is an unstable equilibrium between our promise, that sense of eternity, and our desires for somewhere else and for freedom, that equilibrium is our desire to love each other.

The year is 2018. Our living environment is increasingly interconnected and transparent. This is obvious for the digital reality but is also true for the physical – if the distinction between the two hasn't already become too artificial. These tendencies have reinforced the validation of the self through affiliation to a group and subjugation to its norms. Before our eyes identities are being constructed, clashes erupt in the scramble for a space to carve out and claim. A bonus for its members is that the enforcing of the norms now is horizontally distributed. As society becomes more totalitarian, the main feeling becomes anxiety. Will for one more day our imperfections pass unnoticed, or maybe just tolerated? And while we invest everything in this socially acceptable image of ourselves we have created, we become the role we were only playing. Is this life?
No, it is a defeat, and we should refuse it. To acknowledge the richness of our desires, to explore them, to feel the power in developing them. Nothing will make us repent of the choice for full life, the substance of which is autonomy, individual and collective. So we move towards the subversion of social relations.

A compilation of texts, a contribution to a correspondence between those who desire anarchy and subversion

The Local Kids

Summer 2018

Issue 1

Several points I didn't go into, some because of lack of (head)space and some because I don't know where to start. There's mention in the text of "world-soul" and "self-conscious animality". These are concepts I don't have a reference point for, and neither does the theory provide me one.

As always it is the points one doesn't agree with that trigger the most articulated response. Several parts of the text I did enjoy (partly recognizable here in some of the vocabulary I have taken on from Bellamy's text). If there weren't any I wouldn't make the effort of writing this text. So I would recommend people to get hold of a copy of Backwoods and read it for themselves.

- kidYELLOW

From the Ephemeral Library:

Nietzsche and Anarchy

Psychology for free spirits, ontology for social war

by Shahin

The title of the book suggests this is a philosophical dissertation on the complementary or adversary relation between Nietzsche's work and anarchist concepts. And although that is not incorrect, it is also not true. Because this is not a disengaged study of words, but an attempt at bringing certain ideas to life. Here there is no place for overblown respect towards the original theory (anyway I'm no expert in Nietzsche's work, so I'll not be the judge on such things as the validity of Shahin's representation of his ideas). Taking a plunge in these pages is challenging yourself. What more can one desire from a book?

From the introduction:

"There is no end in sight, no new world to come. There is only this world, with its pain and cruelty and loneliness. And also: its delights, all its sensations, encounters, friendships, loves, discoveries, tenderness, wildness, beauty, and possibilities.

This is the key idea of Nietzsche's philosophy: affirm life, say yes to life, here and now. Don't try to hide from struggle in fantasy worlds and imaginary futures. Embrace life's conflict, and yes you can live freely and joyfully.

Of course, it's not easy. It involves danger, and also hard work. We face enemies in the world around us, institutions and individuals that set out to oppress and exploit us. And we also face forces within ourselves that work to keep us passive, conformist, confused, anxious, sad, self-destructive, weak.

To fight these forces effectively, we need to make ourselves stronger, both as individuals and as groups of comrades, friends and allies. And one part of this is striving to better understand ourselves and the social worlds we are part of. Ideas are tools – or weapons. But many of the ideas we learn in contemporary capitalist society are blunt or broken, or actively hold us back. We need new ways of thinking, and developing these can involve exploring the work of past thinkers – not as sacred masters but as 'arsenals to be looted'.

One source of idea-weapons, which I at least have found very helpful, is Nietzsche. I am writing this book to explain some of these Nietzschean ideas, as I understand them, both to clarify my own thinking and to share them with others."

There are some rumours circulating that this book is out of print. So if you want to read it, you'll have to liberate an existing copy from its assigned place (at least for the time it takes to read it) like me. Or printing more copies could also be an option...

line between the reformer – "who might imagine himself the staunch social critic" – and the deserter – incremental but still partial – the anti-civ cadre?

The concept of "desertion" doesn't bring us closer to self-realization, because it is based on an illusion. That "attentat" (no idea why Bellamy has a preference for that word instead of "attack"; to me it smells of the People and/or Revolution mythos) is something hypothetical, that it "may well be necessary and appropriate to resist more confrontationally at certain junctures". May? At certain junctures? Why not now? Let me clarify myself. Insurrectionary moments have a value to me, but they are not my telos. The projects I want to engage in – the instruments of my self-realization – have two guidelines; direct action (acting without mediation) and self-organization (having an understanding of our differences and acting together with respect towards them). If for anarchists direct action also includes to attack, this is because given the existing social relations wanting self-realization means conflict. This conflict can express itself in different forms and mostly we'll be reactive towards it. But to be able to negate the repression/self-alienation spectrum, we'll have to choose ourselves a moment and place to act. Thus, to go on the offensive. Not making conflict an integral part of our projects, can lead us to being unarmed when repression and/or self-alienation become an existential threat to our projects (and arguably then it's already too late). Unarmed as well on a level of critical thinking; being able to recognize where one is complicit, as on the level of action; how to stop retreating. How can we not accommodate and compromise when repressive relations are imposed upon us if we didn't create the conditions for another response? On a side note here; making conflict part and parcel of our projects goes a long way in avoiding sterile discussion with those for whom anarchy is just a pose or an opinion and opens up possibilities to meet people who have started to act without mediation and on their own terms (again, there's no expectation to discover latent anarchists, only a potentially enriching encounter).

At one point Bellamy argues that in opposition to most forms of sabotage and attack, "desertion does harm the ruling order by depriving it of the resource on which it totally depends: the daily submission of slaves". Society might depend on submission, that doesn't lead it to depend on my submission. Then maybe does BF propose a generalized desertion as a sort of boycott of civilization? Does victory over civilization look like a strategic retreat? He contradicts such a position further on; "it is a modern, utilitarian moral calculus that measures the value of a course of action in terms of its expected quantitative consequences".

What Bellamy forgets to mention is; where are the wild places? No places in Europe (and presumably also in the US) are outside of this society. Places that we could appropriate are more likely the ones that have been pushed to the margins of society (instead of overlooked – by property rights? by pollution? by capitalist profit-seeking? by land use rules?) and these can be found in urban environments as well as in the countryside. This probably implies developing to some extent new knowledge and skills. Being in the margins also implies that society didn't disappear and might impose itself sooner or later in full force. Refusing to be instruments of this recuperation will certainly include offensive practices.

I do think we should attempt to create the conditions for self-realization. This can mean looking for less hostile surroundings (what defines as hostile depends greatly on the project and on the individual). But I don't think our projects will take shape totally outside of the existing social relations. And while the concept of desertion may be based on the illusion that there is a safe place to escape to, I don't want to reject all of the practices it contains.

Endnotes.

I concede this is a theory we are presented with. But more than being a "whole way of seeing" (as Bellamy defines it); a theory is based on generalizations and abstractions. At the best of times, a theory can provide us with tools to find a more conscious relation with what is surrounding us. Mostly though, theory produces crude categories that are imposed on complex beings and dynamic realities; reductions that are counter-productive to understanding. Moreover, a theory that is not understood as having its limitations and shortcomings (and thus, as being a peculiar way of seeing), but instead as forming a complete picture produces its own mystifications and idealizations. This is not a postmodernist stance. The values and ideas I hold, are true. For myself. And I'm willing to act upon them. But I don't hold them as universally true for other people embedded in situations I don't fully grasp and don't have influence over. Even so, I do want to communicate with others (through conversations or stories), to understand my motives better, to deepen (or alter) my critique and to sustain my empathy. As I said before, anarchist critique criticizes authoritarian relations wherever it encounters them. The most important of these encounters are part of my own experiences, the least important happen in theoretical abstractions and history teachings.

To Start Over

"The possibility to act as anarchists, on our own. But in order to go much further than ourselves."

First appeared as Recommencer *in Avis de tempêtes (Bulletin anarchiste pour la guerre sociale), Issue 1, January 2018*

To start over, always. That is the prospect, which can seem kind of tragic, of all those who are at war against this world of infinite horrors. Along the way some fall under the blows, others don't resist the siren-song that calls to resign oneself and get back in line, some even make an outright U-turn. The others, that persist in fighting – with ups and downs – have to find strength and determination to start over again each time. However, on second thought, the tragedy is not to start over, to start from scratch, but to abandon and to betray oneself. Conscience, always individual, can be a heavy burden to carry and becomes cruel when one betrays it without having enough anaesthetics at one's disposal. This world doesn't lack anaesthetics, and even distils them at will. A little alternative career for your own good, Sundays to marvel at a natural park, a humanitarian or cultural project. Even harder drugs; screens of all varieties, virtual reality and relationships, a total stupor. No, such a prospect frightens us more than all the distress, than all the difficulties connected to the failure to destroy authority.

So, to start over. To sharpen conscience in a world that has taken aim at it by launching its deadly poisons at it. Because what is accommodation, resignation and submission other than the quenching of one's conscience, justified – or not – by the conditions we're all mired in? "They are too strong", "people are too stupid", "surviving is already too hard", "it's too far from my nest" are some of the classics. So, to sharpen conscience, means also to redevelop a taste for ideas that allow us to see, to distinguish more clearly the contours of those that pour cement on freedom. And, at the same time, to open up horizons so as to be able to look – even if only a peak – beyond the walls and the antennas, beyond the prisons and the laboratories, beyond the massacres and the soldiers. Ideas are not bought in supermarkets and are not deepened on the internet. It is each individual that appropriates them step by step till cherishing them, and that defends them also through thick and thin. Above all so in our times when democratic, mercantile and technological totalitarianism aspires to eliminate each fervour, to install slaveries and dependencies even more deceptive. Somehow it is the most important treasure of the anarchist; the conviction that there is no compromise possible between freedom and authority, that they exclude each other, always and everywhere. Thousands of institutions, organizations, ideologies try to destroy this treasure. As well a state that drowns in blood the – at last roused – cries of yesterdays oppressed, as the technocrat who talks about freedom to design a technological system that expands every day its hold to the four corners of the earth. As well the next leaders who seek to call the shots of a movement of anger, as the clever acrobat of rhetoric who tries hard to remove all significance of the attacks carried out against this world. If we talk about starting over, it is to express our will to take up – once more – the deepening of our ideas, to make them toxic for all the authoritarians who try to approach them, and stimulating for all the lovers of freedom who embrace them. It is to start over again – inside contexts which are born to us and which have changed a lot over the last years – to elaborate our lifelong anarchist project; to destroy oppression and exploitation. Over time, as we plunge into it, other experiences will arise, other attempts, other defeats. All of them are part of our baggage, our heritage if you will, that – instead of making us sink into a dark melancholy – can reinforce us to rebuild an individual and collective project of freedom, a revolutionary perspective. Certainly, it is impossible to avoid errors, to not find oneself at times in a dead-end, to not be shipwrecked in the stormy seas, but these failures are an integral part of our journeys. Like that anarchist from the beginning of the 20th century said: "*We move with ardour, with strength, with pleasure in such a determined way because we're conscious of having done everything and being prepared to do everything for it to be the right direction. We give study the biggest care, the biggest attention and we give to action the biggest energy. (...) To precipitate our course, we don't need mirages of an imminent goal within reach. It suffices us to know that we're moving... and that, if sometimes we reach a stalemate, we don't get lost.*"

But ideas alone are not enough for us. To know that authority is our enemy, and that all who embody it is a target, from politicians to cops, from technocrats to officers, from capitalists to supervisors, from priests to snitches, is one thing. To project oneself into the necessary destruction of the social relations, the structures and the networks that allow them to exist, is something else. The communicating vessels of idea and action are at the heart of anarchism. So that ideas don't wither, you need actions to invigorate them. So that actions don't go round in circles, you need ideas to animate them. Ideas to corrode the mind-sets of obedience, the ideologies and submission. Actions to destroy the structures and persons of domination. And if it is always the time to act, to strike what exploits and oppresses, acting cannot be a simple conditioned reflex. It cannot be content with responding (re-acting) on a case by case basis with rage and vigour. So that acting really becomes to act – in a revolutionary and anarchist perspective – the initiative has to be ours, in an offensive that starts from our individualities, our imaginations, our analyses and our determination. Because to act is not a given and it doesn't fall out of the sky, reflecting on how to act is indispensable. It is for this reason we have to bring again to the table the question of projectuality, our autonomous capacity to project ideas and actions directly into the field of the enemy. Waiting for "the people" - that hollow abstraction, here to substitute the deceased proletariat – to become conscious and to desire freedom, endeavouring to "educate", doesn't befit us. Not only because it wouldn't work, but also because such a perspective is now totally obsolete (if it hasn't already been always) in the face of a constant bombardment of minds and senses by domination. To advance gradually, struggle by struggle, social movement by social movement, towards the big moment where everything finally converges to announce the total upheaval, doesn't suit us neither. If in every revolt against what is imposed upon us, is always dormant the potential of a challenge to everything beyond its starting point, too many checks, repetitions, channelling are at work inside this kind of social movements to prevent the dykes bursting and the unknown of subversion opening up.

That leaves us with – forgive us for going a bit fast – the possibility to act as anarchists, on our own. But in order to go much further than ourselves. Striking back is a basis, to elaborate a projectuality to not only strike, but also to destroy the dykes of domination is an extension more than desirable. It is here that we enter again the spheres of insurrection; the perspective of making the dykes burst, of unleashing the evil passions as another said, of opening a rupture in time to strike more crushingly against the state and capital. Evidently there are no recipes for insurrection, in spite of the veiled calls of modern Leninists – recycling under less patched-up costumes the old recipe of the seizure of power (this time from the bottom-up). But having no recipes doesn't prevent us from reflecting on, putting to the test and exploring anti-authoritarian hypotheses; from a struggle against a specific project of authority to an autonomous intervention during a bout of social fever, from the paralyses of infrastructures that allow the daily reproduction of wage slavery to the bold and sudden upheaval against an enemy in the midst of a restructuring with an uncertain outcome. To experiment in one's own life these insurrectionary hypotheses on anarchist bases, even on a small scale (our own), takes us in any case far away from the tedious barracks of militancy, the same old guesswork about what "the people" think or not, about what "the milieu" does or doesn't do, far from the expectation of the next social movement, and so on and so forth. That means taking yourself the initiative of attack following your own approach and itinerary.

Conceiving of an insurrectionary and anarchist perspective leads us necessarily to the question of how to organize ourselves to advance on such a path. That labour unions, also the more or less libertarian, will not be appropriate instruments is rather obvious. Certainly so in the current times where old "communities" based on work have been neatly severed and dissolved by the advances

and psychically". This leads further to autarky; "the knowledge and practice of providing one's subsistence [...] for and by oneself in an unalienated relationship with one's habitat and in voluntary cooperation with others with whom one freely associates". The outcome of desertion and autarky is re-inhabitation; "it is, in the most profound sense, being somewhere", "a sense of place requires a sense of belonging". "To truly flourish as organisms in communion with our habitats, we must live in a way that nourishes the human psyche: in small, sustained, face-to-face, autarkic communities of kinship."

The picture presented here is a bit too harmonious for my taste. Those that grew up in a small village (or a close-knit community inside a city) know that "face-to-face" relationships come with their own vicious feuds and relentless norms. And for those who managed to leave these suffocating places, a statement like "our culture of late modernity, where one can disappear into anonymity and find a new social group at the first sign of conflict or disappointment, is the grotesque antithesis of healthful human relations" would set off all the alarm bells (besides, I would say that a lot of people are stuck into destructive relations because they fear to be alone in a world where it is extremely difficult to make true friends). But that is in this world. And BF is talking about another world, one where "a true union of individualities could grow" while "it would be possible to know everyone's story, to count on another, and to be united in a common purpose". Bellamy insists that "such a group would not be a suppression of individuality through stifling and incessant collectivism". I guess I'm not so easily convinced by (certain specialists of) anthropology, neurobiology and ethnography that such a thing exists, could exist or existed. And although Bellamy also acknowledges "human conflict and suffering", he directly brushes it aside as "misfortune" (dealt with through a culture based on "the combination of loving and shaming that comes from sustained intimacy"). Ironically, the reproaches from Bellamy directed at insurrectionaries, could also be applied to desertionaries. Do you expect people to be latent anarchists, just waiting to be in a context of small face-to-face groups with a sense of belonging and purpose to start behaving with respect to each other? Surely desertionism must be "afflicted with the most poisonous sort of magical thinking and optimism about human beings". And, indeed, there are some who already have created a "collective mythos" on the same theme, namely the Commune (see 'our friends' from the Committee and Party). And they are quite honest about the suppression of individuality (according to them a modern invention and thus, to be abandoned) and the patriarchal character of a family and a tribe ("less preferably" as labels than "a band society", according to BF).

While the full weight of history is thrown against the false critiques of civilization, the proposal of desertion is presented to us as something completely novel (otherwise it might have to be discarded with the rest as futile or complicit?). Are there no past experiences to learn from? We don't need to go too far back in time, since at least the end of the 60s lots of drop-outs (from society and the protest movements) turned their backs to the cities to have their own experiments with face-to-face communities and self-sufficiency. History books don't have to tell us much about these (not so spectacular) moments, but the people that were/are part of them still can. From their accounts it transpires that it is not that evident to desert self-alienation and repression, nor to create autarky. Which territories can we inhabit? Given the relations of power, probably not the most hospitable ones. Are these places not always precarious? Threats from infrastructural projects, bureaucratic rules and regulations, hostile neighbours, are real. How to avoid a relative and self-chosen isolation becoming inescapable and suffocating? How free is free association when there are no other places to go to? Even with all good intentions, relations can turn sour. Until which point should the project be defended in spite of the persons involved, or vice versa? A current publication like *Nunatak* (Revue d'histoires, cultures et luttes des montagnes) talks about issues of living in the mountains and the conflicts with society it comes with (leisure industry, infrastructural projects, food and health regulations, etc.). These questions raised might not be enough reasons to abandon desertion, but – at least – to be less affirmative about all the blessings to be expected.

What does it mean that "desertion will not and cannot be quick or total, but it can nonetheless meaningfully be incremental and partial, pushing toward ever-greater withdrawal"? Where is the line between partial desertion and – for example – just being a part of local, artisan economy? Isn't it conceivable that a part of the so-called "creative classes" forced out of the city centres by the so-called "gentrification" they were once part of, turn to "pockets of happiness" as a kind of alternative, more satisfying suburbia? Or is it that, since to a certain extent there is still a need for money (to pay the rent for example), it is just convenient that a small amount of time is dedicated to a well-paying, skilled job done over the internet? Who draws the

Others experience daily the emptiness of what society has to offer them. Probably more shift between these positions on a regular basis. Anarchists don't have models that people can follow to overcome alienation, only experiences that give a taste of something different. Neither do I hope others to be latent anarchists (whatever that means), but I cannot stop myself from recognizing myself in others when they struggle with their contradictions (isn't that the empathy Bellamy was looking for?). More so when they express their unrest through acts of rebellion against their repression and self-alienation.

Acts of rebellion come in multiple shapes and forms. A lot can be said about them. Rioting can be one of them. A lot can be said about it. How it can be used as a symbolical threat to social peace by a reformist group to gain more negotiation leverage. How it is necessary for people to understand the risks they are taking and to avoid unnecessary ones (what is an unnecessary risk is up to the persons involved to define). How repression against rioters is framed to legitimize or delegitimize their ideas (martyrs for the first, mindless criminals for the second). Etcetera. It would be a bit too easy to present these as conclusions already reached and not discussions to have inside specific settings. Like in other situations I would like people to be consciously active in it (which can also mean to not take part). Intentions are diverse and outcomes are not so clear-cut as BF presents them (is it about material damage vs arrests?). I can share my critical thoughts with others but it's not up to me to decide for others if it is all worth it (what I could consider foremost as a potentially self-destructive act might be primarily self-realizing for someone else, that doesn't mean that I'm a coward and neither the other to aspire to be a martyr).

Victimization is not the privilege of rioting. Neither does repression need an insurrection to humiliate and stamp out people. Insurrection wouldn't be the original "deeply traumatic experience" for those who desire to be mere followers. Authoritarian society has its own catastrophes which legitimize the existence of its leaders. Trauma and powerlessness are bound together. There is something quite contradictory in insisting on a bleak image of civilization with its all-encompassing repression and self-alienation, and the impossibility of the majority of "slaves" to be something other than slaves; and on the other hand, to warn against acts of rebellion because they might provoke or not be able to overcome repression and self-alienation. A theory tends to come up with logical explanations for every phenomenon it encounters, and becomes deterministic on the way (it is what it is, it was what it was and it couldn't have become something else). So eventually everything can only be futile against or complicit with domination. But then who is this Bellamy Fitzpatrick that he against all odds is ready "to rise to the terrifying responsibility of freedom"? Why is he not one of those who "have been born and bred as slaves" and thus "are far more likely to feel comfortable becoming a new kind of slave"? What is his secret and why doesn't it belong to the possibilities of others, namely "people" aka "slaves", to do the same?

It seems that it is the frustration and disappointment stemming from the ineffectiveness of reform and revolution to defeat civilization, that leads BF to reject them. But is there even such a thing as a definitive victory over repression and alienation? I have this nagging idea that the desire to dominate others and the desire to submit oneself are intrinsically human. The social system we're living in promotes – or rather imposes – these desires over all others. So for those who have the desire to self-realization, it is necessary to create situations where these are pushed back. What can be such a situation?

3.

The proposal of Bellamy (and Backwoods) is desertion, meaning "moving toward the abandonment of civilization, both materially

of capital. The same goes for the formal anarchist organizations; with their branches, congresses, resolutions and initials. Maybe less evident is the fact that big assemblies (that are adorned with the adjective "horizontal") are also inappropriate. We're not denying the importance of open and contrary discussions inside struggles and revolts, and so the eventual interest to take part in them, but anarchists shouldn't confine themselves to participating in these moments of exchange, but also organize themselves outside of them. The best element to ensure the communicating vessels between ideas and actions, to formulate a real autonomy of action, is the affinity between individuals; mutual understanding, shared perspectives, willingness to act. Next, to develop more incisiveness, to expand possibilities, to elaborate a vaster projectuality, to coordinate efforts, to lend support to potentially crucial moments; there can grow between the affinity constellations – always depending on the necessities of a project – an informal organization. Meaning self-organized, without name, without delegation, without representation... And to be clear: informal organizations are also multiple, according to objectives. The informal method doesn't aspire to bring all anarchists together in a single constellation, but makes it possible to multiply coordinations, informal organizations, affinity groups. Their encounter can happen on the terrain of a concrete proposal, hypothesis or a precise projectuality. That makes all the difference between an informal organization with necessarily "vague and subterranean" outlines (so without being in search of the spotlights), and other types of fighting organizations for whom the most important is almost always the affirmation of their existence in the hope of influencing the events, giving indications on the path to take, being a force that is part of the power equilibrium. Informal organization projects oneself elsewhere: avoiding the attention of the guard dogs of domination, it exists only in the facts it fosters. In short, it doesn't have a name to defend or assert, only a project to bring about. An insurrectionary project.

So that is where we start over from. In this day and age where revolts hardly erupt and are more on the defensive than on the offensive, where war moves in parallel with the technological caging of the world, where the control grid closes in on everyone and so also on anarchists, where the adherence of a lot of oppressed to the system is – as always – the best defence domination can arm itself with, we persist in wanting to propagate our ideas of freedom through a struggle without compromise with authority. Outside the well-trodden paths, by affinity and informal organization, conscious of the necessity of social revolution regardless if it seems close-by or far-away, to transform fundamentally the social relations on which this authoritarian society relies. To propagate ideas and echoes of destructive attacks against the structures and persons that embody oppression and exploitation, so as to open up insurrectionary horizons.

Tools to Capture, Tame and Restrain
Against the IT-giants and their world

First appeared as Imod IT-giganterne og deres verden ***in Orkanen (Anarkistisk blad), Issue 3 – Volume 1, August 2017***

In terms of language, there are sometimes words that mean more than one might think at first glance. Take network, linking and connection, for example, words that we use everyday without wondering about their actual meaning, words that indeed represent our way of life in the age of the internet. All these concepts describe tools to capture, tame and restrain – maybe it's not a coincidence after all.

The similarities don't end with the language. The internet consists, despite its ethereal appearance, of a network of cables and wires. This infrastructure is maintained, developed and controlled by states and international IT-companies like Facebook, Apple and Google – companies who work their way towards an omnipresence in our lives, and thus are enemies of freedom. In time, they might also re-

place the traditional authorities in favour of their smart world, where everything is determined by algorithms, while control is ever so present and no authorities are in sight.

Such a nightmare will probably be applauded by certain 'anti-authoritarians', who haven't understood the connection between freedom, body and individual. I am nothing without my living, pulsing body, whose limited expiration date creates the frame around my existence, a frame that can't be replaced by a virtual identity. Freedom is to be who you are, and to be yourself, you also have to be lonely. Only in silence and darkness, face to face with yourself, you'll be able to look deeper into yourself and make crucial decisions. Free association, which is fundamental for me as an anarchist, is also the freedom to discard association. With an internet connection you are never alone, but always a little bit at work, a little bit together with family, a little bit under surveillance (by your 'friends', police, or commercial companies...). If you finally succeed in turning your eyes from the screen, you'll see your fellow human beings chained to their phones, always connected. Who can still deny that this network really has captured us?

In Foulum close to Viborg* the American technology giant, Apple has begun to built a new data centre which is supposed to be finished in 2026. There is also a plan for erecting a centre in Aabenraa, where the first part of the construction is estimated to finish by 2019. Both centres will be around 166.000 m², and are thereby amongst the largest in the world. In Odense, Facebook plans to built a data centre of 55.000 m² which is supposed to be fully done by 2020. In Fredericia, Google has bought a piece of land of 73.000 hectares, which will possibly be used for a server complex. The centres are going to support the European markets of these companies.

According to an estimation from energinet.dk – the public company which controls electricity and gas – three of such centres will together consume an amount equal to around ten percent of all of Denmark's consumption of electricity. The fantasy surrounding the green digital society cracks down in the face of such numbers. To run and built the necessary infrastructure demands enormous amounts of energy and exploitation of people and natural resources.

The internet is obviously not a 'free' space, but a product of concrete and specific exploitation. Hidden behind a stylish touch screen. It is no more egalitarian and 'environmental' than the factories where people drag out their lives by producing computers and smart phones.

In connection to the centres, Apple will finance wind mill parks to produce enough electricity for both of theirs. Facebook, too, talks about renewable energy, but it is less clear where the electricity they need will come from in reality. Is this all about appearing 'green' in the eyes of the consumers (legitimized by useful idiots such as Greenpeace)? No, it is most likely a question of the guarantee of supply. Today, the rich and powerful are dependent on the energy that runs through the existing cables. With an ominous transition looming on the horizon, the most prudent agents move toward renewable energy sources, so they don't loose their grip. In this transition, which involves a certain insecurity, a potential for rebellion lies, but as always, crisis and states of emergency also give the rich and powerful an opportunity of consolidating their power. The green and plugged-in society of the future is a totalitarian and collectivist dystopia that has nothing to offer the individual longing for freedom. A life that is lived in constant connection is not worth living. In untamed freedom and immediate rebellion, one finds a self-explanatory joy.

But why has Denmark, of all places, been chosen as a construction site for these IT-giants? Among other reasons, it is due to the political stability, guarantee of supply, the cool climate, the highly developed renewable energy infrastructure and, of course, the direct fibre optic connection to the US. Denmark is an important junction for the transatlantic communication, which flows through the cable TAT-14. Through this cable, data is transported between the

psychic side is reification and the voluntary submission to authority. I would suggest that some of the (problematic because alienating) characteristics ascribed to civilization may also be found – for example – in historical accounts of groups of people accumulating wealth through plundering or people living in clusters of villages that together make up a self-sustaining territory. Were they not capable of reification? Also, in most civilizations a significant amount of people living inside its physical boundaries were nevertheless outside of its economy and not particularly influenced by its reifications. That some social systems get labelled civilization and others not and thus the first deserve more of our ire seems unwarranted from a position of critique of authority. Further on BF argues that "the anti-civilization critique goes far beyond that on offer by the Left, the Right, or the majority of the anarchists." I would argue that the anti-civilization critique is only a more comprehensive version of an anti-capitalist, anti-fascist etc. critique since it criticizes a specific crystallization of authoritarian relations. Anarchist critique however criticizes authoritarian relations wherever it encounters them.

2.

I have never used the adjective insurrectionary for me or the projects I was taking part in. Anarchist suffices. So it can be fairly true what Bellamy says about the majority of insurrectionary kinds (self-defined as such or labelled by BF), that they are just promising Revolution 2.0 (decentralised and with users' participation) or Revolution Zero – Without (Authoritarian) Additives. But it is far removed from the reasons I feel an attraction to insurrectionary moments.

Instead of the first baby steps of a coming revolution, insurrection means a rupture. It is when normality is not normal any more and other possibilities open up. Already now we are refusing to submit, finding loopholes – alone or with friends. But we bump into limits of overcoming alienation and repression. An insurrectionary moment is a qualitative leap, a negation of existing social relations on a whole other level. From there ugly things can happen, beautiful things also. What has changed is our power to make things happen. Surely repression (in old or new forms) will try gathering force to hit everyone back in submission. And will surely succeed since death always has the last word. History says so too. In the end, life is self-defeating. But to start from there must be a misunderstanding, because insurrection is exactly the refusal of history and the affirmation of life.

There are those invested in the politics of insurrection, working in the tradition of the authoritarian Blanqui. An Eric Hazan and his Factory (producing theory for the aspiring intellectuals) have measures to implement, the (not so) Invisible Committee has the strategy (tested before and failed) and its (not so) Imaginary Party has the cadre (wannabe politicians) and the infrastructure (thanks to wealthy lefty benefactors). Cynical people willing to manipulate others to realize their authoritarian projects. Nothing new there. It's up to persons with anarchist sensitivities to recognize these intentions and subvert them (if they care enough). Admittedly, a lot of the radical milieu got seduced by their mystifications. If it's still needed one can take a look at *To Our Customers* (although the English version lacks the playful and scathing tone from the French one) criticizing the political theory and rhetoric of the Committee and *The Movement is Dead, Long Live... Reform!* (A Critique of "Composition" and its Elites, from the ZAD in Notre-Dame-des-Landes) criticizing the political practices of the Party members and their allies. So I'll leave the remark of Bellamy about "the cadre of insurrectionaries" in their corner.

To attack authority you don't need to be an anarchist (unconsciously or consciously). You just need to be able to situate the source of your misery. Lucidity and irony are more helpful at that than anarchist theory. All of us are alienated to some extent and contribute ourselves to that alienation in some measure. Some might be content with the toys they are given and the mirages of material comfort they see appearing before them.

A Handful of Objections

A Response to a Proposal for Desertion

This is a jotted-down reflection of some thoughts triggered by the reading of *An Invitation to Desertion* by Bellamy Fitzpatrick; the first article in the first issue of Backwoods (A journal of anarchy and wortcunning, Spring 2018). In order to develop my own objections and rejections of the theory (named as such by the author), I will break it down in circumscribed parts. This partly corresponds with the sequence from the original text, partly it is my own imposition on it since the author wanders off from time to time. Deconstructing the theory to digestible bits, is something I do at my own risk (of missing the point, and consequently being off mark with my critique) and it is neglecting the text as a creative work (since all the literary qualities are thus dispensed of). But it is also a necessity to make way for my own trail of thoughts to develop.

The parts this theory consists of are; (1) a framing of this society as "civilization" (an outcome of its historical process and a continuation/deepening of it), (2) the shortcomings of the critiques against it (the reformist as well as the revolutionary ones – left, right and anarchist) and (3) a proposal for its negation (or its bypassing?). This seems an improbable feat to accomplish in one article and indeed the text is rather condensed and at times feels like a compilation of arguments instead of an argumentation (a mould I have, admittedly, not been able to escape from...).

1.

When Bellamy describes the current situation as "largely decided for us, overdetermined by existing social norms that we can influence only minutely, allowing us only a little room to maneuver in decisions about how we want to live and what values we want to pursue", I feel it as quite accurate since it's close to my own experiences. It is interesting though to see which statements about society apparently call for a reference (academic in lots of cases) and which not. I'm not against listening to what people who have chosen to study a specific field are thinking. But these quantifying and categorizing exercises are not my first way of understanding to go to, and they shouldn't have to be. Are we not witnesses to the destruction and pollution of our surroundings? Is there a need for statistics to talk about the current crisis? Do we want to reproduce definitions and categories used by specialists? For example: depression. What do medical professionals understand as depression? Is there a default state of happiness? How can it be compared over time; did we always reflect on ourselves with the same criteria? Isn't more measuring, measuring more? From the moment a medical diagnosis (with which kind of criteria?) and treatment (effective or not, and to what end?) has been created, the numbers will increase. So, if 17% of Americans are afflicted by depression; what does that mean? If you describe to me how you feel and how you understand others around you are feeling, I will probably be able to recognize that (wholly or partly, in myself or in my friends). That is more meaningful to me than how many times a box was ticked in a survey. I'm not saying we should only talk in truisms, but while the conclusions of scientific research are supposed to be just accepted, talking out of personal experiences makes a conversation possible.

But maybe that's not enough for someone who wants to talk about "civilization". The rejection of the simile of life offered by this society and the exploration of yourself and your relations, will lead one (better sooner than later) to make an attempt at understanding the obstacles on the way (the authority of one over the other; would be – in short – an anarchist response). There's a difference between this effort to analyse the social system (and its crises) and the apparent need to go back hundreds of years to a point in time and designate it as the nexus of the problem. Necessarily there is no first-hand experience of before or during this moment of transformation that can be or has been communicated, only contemporary interpretations and extrapolations based on few elements. In what way can we understand the qualitative difference in relations from before and after? And why do we care so much? Do we think we can recreate the before? Probably not, but why then construct this spectre that transgresses my faculties to grasp reality? Isn't Civilization another disguise of Empire, or Capitalism? Hovering over our heads, always there but impossible to grasp in everyday relations (on a theoretical level maybe yes, with the help of some specialists), let alone defeat. There's a lot to learn from history, but I become a bit wary when history teaches us.

Summarized it goes something like this; civilization means cities, cities mean agriculture. Or the other way around. That's the material side of it. The

European countries and the US, and its landing site is a small red building in Blåbjerg, in the municipality of Varde (Jutland, western Denmark). Thus, the omnipotent and unfathomable internet consists of some very concrete locations, which are crucial for it to function.

The data centres, which are now being built, are important junctions in the network that holds us captive in the order of hierarchy, but they don't stand alone. They need unlimited access to energy, and they need stability. As control is divided up, possibilities of sabotage and attacks are created all the time for everyone who keeps their eyes open. The grid is tightening around us, but its individual components are still vulnerable and easily accessible.

- L

* [Places mentioned in the article are provincial towns and cities of Denmark.]

Where Is The Leader?

First appeared as Onde está o líder? *on the walls of Porto*

All of us are uncertain, **nobody knows for sure how life should be lived**. But, strangely, we assume that there are people who know and, thus, are capable of leading us.

This longing for an all-knowing person is cultivated; we could enumerate a long list of people that profit from it and make their profession in it, of institutions that base their existence on it. Not less significant are the time-consuming and costly procedures for the selection of leaders. Democracy is, by far, the most notorious. The business community has a whole cult of leadership courses and seminars. The Vatican resorts to white smoke. These procedures contribute to the belief in the leader. This is necessary, because **without faith there is no leadership**. Time after time we hope that someone has the solution for the problems that emanate from our personal life, for the unstable existence of this organization we are part of, for the chaos that – by definition – we're living in together.

That it is impossible for such a person to exist seems evident. But we're not able to fully grasp this. Without overblown self-importance, nobody would aspire to lead. Without the longing to deliver us from uncertainties, nobody would put confidence in a leader. **Misery and catastrophe are lots of times the consequence. The excesses are the norm**; leaders who get a surplus of self-confidence and lose touch with reality, people who put all their faith in the hands of charlatans, demagogues and tyrants.

In current times, the call for leadership is again shrieking in our ears. But **every leader only builds castles from thin air**. Constructions to the detriment of many and, when the sea washed away all illusions, to the disenchantment of the believers.

There exists an other possibility; to desert the multitudes of followers, to discover the paths of acting for your own and to confront those who want to submit you. **To jump into the unknown**. Disdain authority.

Smoke Signals

A conversation in the aftermath of the G20 in Hamburg

First appeared as Ein Gespräch mit einigen Militanten über die informelle Koordinierung im Vorfeld der G20 ***in RauchZeichen (Worte und Taten gegen die Welt der G20), Fall 2017***

At the end of the summer of 2016, several communiques propose an informal coordination of radical groups in the run-up to the G20 summit in Hamburg. You took part in it. What interventions were you aiming for and which perspectives did it entail for you?

[Chuzpe] On the occasion of several big events like the G8 in Heiligendamm in 2007 or around the Destroika prior to the inauguration of the European Central Bank in Frankfurt in 2015, there have been similar proposals and radical campaigns. It is not a very new idea. Starting from an anarchist analysis, I see the necessity of a permanent conflictuality and I'm sceptical towards this staging of a political play where everyone has its role. Focusing on such an event leads often to the side-lining of everyday struggles. But at the same time, I see the possibility of a tension opening up in such moments, in which the scope of our interventions can amplify. Towards this end, I think that a focus on the practice of radical actions rooted in local struggles while referring to each other, can be a good way to resolve this contradiction and to work towards sustained action. Meanwhile, the practice of direct actions inside the mobilisation gives the possibility of showing this means of struggle, which can motivate and inspire other people.

[Peter Pan] I think that a lot of the actions that happened during the year are part of specific struggles. Each specific struggle is valid on its own and is important, but the articulation of shared points gets lost. To create a certain ambience, but more so, to find shared points in the different strategies and analyses, points of reference are important. Which are created rather well with this kind of coordination. Individuals, groups, but also movements, that don't know each other, can in this way communicate and get in touch.

[HoodLum] The aim was to go beyond a political campaign and to set out lines on a European level, on which to work together. Events like the G20 mean that texts are more translated and diffused than normal. Through these, it becomes possible to affirm affinities towards other struggles or structures and to build upon them. For example, currently the actions against the construction of new prisons in Switzerland are inspired by the struggle on a similar topic that took place in Belgium. We have to express our utopian dreams. Or at least can we develop our dreams more if we know we're not the only ones working to bring them about. I think a lot of groups reconsider their offensive when they don't see immediate results, and that the feeling of isolation and futility of radical actions proliferates. Coordination like the one of the G20, the Greek call for a Black December, or from before, the campaign against the Olympics, can find a resonance beyond the event. If it is formulated well.

Can you give some examples of what resonated in the run-up to the G20 or of shared points between different struggles?

[Peter Pan] Good question. The G20 was probably itself the biggest shared point, that also explains why there's always a certain calm after such an event. But I think the context of the "campaign" against the G20 has created the possibility of different tendencies to focus on the same topic. Before, each tendency put forward different positions. Now, through the coordination, a shared position was developed by different tendencies. One of the most evident shared points was the choice of method, expressing the incompatibility with the rules of the state and the values of society which have been indoctrinated. It's from there that we consciously encountered each other.

[Chuzpe] I have the impression that there was a stark need for an international dimension, which is also rather evident with a topic like the G20. A point of reference – one that was soon to emerge after the first attacks and that became clear through the choice of targets, as well as in the texts through the analyses and research – was the attacks against big companies that are known to be profiteers of crises through the rule of the Troika and the managing of German imperialism. This can also be considered as a continuation of the discourse expressed prior to the inauguration of the ECB in Frankfurt. Besides companies like Cosco, Telekom, Hochtief, Deutsche Bank, Allianz

Against the Racist Undercurrent
To Pose Different Questions

First appeared as Das rassistische Grundrauschen ***and*** Andere Fragen stellen, ***alongside each other on the walls of Berlin***

The racist undercurrent filters through our everyday life. Those who have a migration background will be abundantly confronted with it. Whether from the cops, politicians, authorities or passers-by. Racism is structural and a technique of governing, it concerns all of us.

All – but especially the well-paid managers and bosses – profit through the low-cost production in inhumane, foreign factories and through the sale of weapons and military technologies, also to dictatorships. At the same time prejudices are stirred up against people who come here and at whose expense we have for a long time lived. While politics and science cause flight, politicians present themselves as supposedly worried about the well-being of refugees. On the other side they implement criteria to categorize people and select some as "good commodities" and return others as "defect commodities". Detention camps, increased control and border surveillance keeps the system on course.

We refuse to accept these manufactured borders and categories.

By using racism as an outlet of frustration for the exploited, it actually pits against each other those who have to toil everyday for some arsehole, or who have to bear their portion of sadism at the office.

Racism turns us away from searching the reasons for our problems in oppressive social relations. Simplistic enmities serve to enforce laws that aim to ensure the most unconditional exploitation and social insecurity of precarious workers, especially migrants. The fear of impoverishment and destruction of our alleged securities has to be redirected, because otherwise they could turn into anger. An anger that obviously should be directed against politics, companies, persons and structures that promote our exploitation and control.

To encounter people as individuals, without prejudice, can mean to find accomplices. To fight shared problems; the exploitation and the exploiting authorities.

The questions of the politicians and their ballots don't interest us, because they contain the acceptance of their rule. Why not make a totally different starting point for our desires, instead of a reality full of fear, competition, hate and envy? Do we want a society, that controls, isolates, exploits, alienates, criminalizes and humiliates people?

Surrounded by commodities, lifestyles and new technologies, in a continuous digital noise, such questions seem to be smothered in the mental vacuum of everyday life. As if one does not want us to dare to pose ourselves the question of the appropriation and self-determination of our lives.

For a life of solidarity and self-determination, without papers and property!

Our questions are based on a liberatory and anti-authoritarian sensibility, on self-organized solidarity: nobody should be locked up, controlled and exploited. Everyone should be free to organize their lives themselves, instead of putting it into the hands of domination.

However, this requires a permanent rupture with this normality and its constraints. The everyday revolt against all authority, wherever it is, is a matter of self-determination. Our determination can only be a declaration of war on the existent.

I decide whether I look away or intervene in controls and surveillance because they restrict us all.
I decide whether I accept ownership or steal, redistribute and share to expropriate those who have more than they need.
I decide whether to categorize people or simply get to know them to live relationships on an equal footing.
I decide to attack exploitation together, to make our lives our own.

Unleash the rage against all authorities – Nazis, deportation structures, rulers, war profiteers, capitalist and dominating structures!

spectives are connected to knowing each other better, knowing our ways of acting, and the cities and situations from where they arise. We should confront our – frequently too abstract – theories with their workings. For example, what our affinity really means. After a long period of moving around to riot, the coordination of the struggles also has to advance. We should be able to talk concretely about things and not only through public texts. It could be the next phase if, throughout Europe, we can coordinate on a topic or companies against which to act. Or to find each other next time in the streets without public call. We have to destroy this feeling of a "Heimat" [a specific German word that could be translated as "home", "homeland" or "nation", but always with connotations of tradition, identity and territory] and be ready to be everywhere to take part in struggles. For example, I was surprised that in March there was a riot in Copenhagen for the 10 year anniversary of Ungdomshuset's eviction, and that almost no one knew about this in advance. It could be a development to share more plans and discussion prior to this kind of actions, so as to have more people participating.

[Peter Pan] I share this feeling of not being well prepared to face repression now and also in the coming times. But I think some letters and statements of prisoners have been encouraging. From certain statements, we can understand that the struggle doesn't stop with incarceration, but on the contrary, is part of it. Also, a lot of solidarity actions with those afflicted by the repression show that connections made prior are continuing to take shape. The actions in Hamburg, but also the actions from before, as well as the media frenzy, show that the ambiance we invoked earlier, cannot be stopped from a certain moment on. Then the state can try to do whatever it wants... I think the campaign in the run-up has created a nice perspective to continue connecting different intentions and forms of actions in everyday struggles. Maybe this will continue?

[Chuzpe] The terrain of repression provides us, in general, with a good target. Especially now, when the digitalisation of surveillance and security technologies is developing fast and when big events are used as testing grounds for counter-insurgency methods. This could be taken as a challenge to expose the shit that is going on and attack the companies that profit from it. Law enforcement is being outsourced already for a long time. And the cops are dependant on the technology of private security firms who provide the useful software. That can be seen very well for example in Hamburg. Never in the history of criminality in Germany has there been such an abundance of images and video material obtained by the authorities. On a snitching portal specifically set up for this occasion by the cops, there have been 7,000 files uploaded apart from the ones of the cops. Before, because of the overload of data, it would have been impossible to find a needle in a haystack. While now, with the help of facial recognition software – like the one from Cognitec, a company from Dresden – the data can be analysed in a small amount of time. That is a new level of repression, which we cannot ignore. We have to have discussions and share information to be able to develop counter-measures, but also to integrate in the struggle against repression on a practical level. Something that already happened during the yearly police congress in Berlin, but was also focused on in actions in the run-up to the G20. I see perspectives there of how to oppose the repression with an offensive response in a concrete struggle. Furthermore, I share what has been said before about continuing to be mobile. After Athens, Frankfurt, Milan, Paris, Hamburg, there will be other places where to meet and conspire. Outside the metropolitan areas, there are lots of interesting struggles that also contain this possibility. Like the Hambach Forest, Bure or Notre-Dame-des-Landes, and still more places where there is an autonomous zone to defend. These moments of coming together are very important and make it possible to together accentuate and develop projects which can continue on a local level.

Thanks a lot for this conversation. I hope to see you soon in the streets, on the barricades, or at Rewe.

[There has been a significant intervention during the process of translation. When in the German version, the interviewees use the term "militant" (and its variations), here this has been translated as "radical". These two terms have both a similar generic and ambiguous character while "radical" avoids the immediate negative overtones the English "militant" would garner. In a German context this term is still widely used, although also – notably – consciously rejected (as a positive thing) by some. Specifically here, the insistence on speaking of "militants" can be seen as a symptom of the vagueness about what constitutes the bases of the desired informal coordination. - TLK]

and others that profit from the privatisations in Greece, also multinationals like ThyssenKrupp, Thales, Actemium, Sodexo and much more have been targeted. What I find interesting, is the international scope that has been developed. This creates the possibility of correspondence with other struggles elsewhere and most of all, in resonance with it, the expansion of terrains of struggle. For example, there was the burning of a car of a French diplomat in solidarity with the ZAD, or a police station that had its walls blackened by flames in solidarity with Greek prisoners.

[HoodLum] Those who follow texts from other regions, will notice that, for example, the security industry is, worldwide, more and more attacked, and that sabotage of cable connections and antennas increases. In texts, there are often comments that imply that people are aware of what is going on in Germany and vice versa. That is the precondition that will allow people to really meet, that discussion will take place and that something like a strategic orientation can be found. Furthermore, the people who participated in the direct actions in the run-up of the summit, and who were partly also in Hamburg, are evidently a target of political pressure in their regions and cities. Pressure from the side of our political enemies from the Left. In Italy or in France, there have been many times fights in demonstrations with labour unions or their security stewards. In Greece, there is a dispute over the right moment and objectives for radical actions. The dissociations and, hopefully also, ruptures after Hamburg make it more easy to find conditions that entail shared points. For us this means that we also wanted to strengthen the tendency that some might call insurrectionary or nihilist, which are not adequate terms. Through the communique from the attack on the police station in Zografou (Athens), it becomes clear that some have taken up the call to do something in their own city if they're not coming to Hamburg. I think that is great!

It seems that the international dimension has played a significant role to you. At the same time, there was also a lot embedded in struggles on local levels. In which way does it make sense to combine such projects with a mobilisation like the one against the G20?

[Chuzpe] I think we should never only concentrate on the dates set by our adversary, like the G20, because we get often stuck in an abstract relation. In this sense I think it is important that we try to connect our struggles – in which we are engaged and which are directly related to our lives – with such moments. In the run-up to the summit, there were mostly struggles against displacement of people and redevelopment of cities that are in lots of places a terrain of permanent conflict. But in the end it is about the question of the development of a revolutionary perspective. With only an event, how good it might be, these question don't find their solution. Therefore this means that without a daily practice, we will never be able to experiment with our theoretical reflections and to question them. The mobilisation against the G20 cannot be seen as more than a fragment. One that allowed us to create situations to encounter each other and to have shared experiences in the streets. I don't think we can consider this as different projects that take place detached from each other.

[Peter Pan] The G20 meeting is a meeting of the self-proclaimed elites of the world to discuss different topics of world politics. Decisions that concern different themes all over the world are prepared or finalized there. So this happens also on the side of resistance. Different spheres fight on different levels for totally different areas. A shared reference point is what is lacking at times without a polarizing moment. To make this coordination permanent, it could be useful to focus it in something concrete.

[HoodLum] Between us, the discussions of the last year have been concentrated on not having a typical campaign with an occasion, a beginning and an end. We rather wanted to try to provoke a permanent state of attack, that maybe already exists if we look attentively at the daily messages of resistance worldwide. Lots of things are only visible on a local level, either because the participants don't diffuse them, or because they get lost in the information stream. The G20 was for us only the vehicle to use to propagate that what we practice every day. And that also got more attention and resonance due to the behaviour of the cops during July in Hamburg. There are regularly calls to radically act about something, but most of the time such calls are last-minute and very specific, which makes it difficult to respond to them. The anarchist call against the G20 summit in Hamburg was diffused from August 2016 onwards and was quickly translated into several languages. And it was rather open, which invited a lot of persons to participate. The radical campaign against the G8 in Heiligendamm from July 2007 started even sooner, namely with the first attack during the summer of 2005 against the CEO of Norddeutsche Affinerie, Werner Marnette. But these were very specific attacks, that raise the bar high on the level of research and explanation. Without having in mind the texts of that time, I think there were other main emphases made. For Hamburg it was more important to us to make the practices of resistance that are already present more palpable.

Do you see a possibility that the calm – that has set in after the summit – dissipates, and that the dynamics from the run-up to the G20 can be taken up again? Also, to respond to the desire that the coordination doesn't vanish into thin air after the end of the event?

[Peter Pan] I think that for a lot of people the summit, but also the period of the run-up, was very impressive. It is very probable that for a lot, especially youths, it was the first time to see whole units of riot police fleeing in panic. Even for the older, lots were impressed by the ability from all these people to coordinate and organize and to not keep quiet in the face of, on one side, an apathetic and disinterested society, and on the other, a highly militarised and repressive state. These are the kind of experiences one doesn't forget easily. Personally, but also collectively, this summit will be remembered and in some years we will be still able to build upon it. The period after the G8 in Rostock was not characterized by a blaze of activity, but it lay the first building blocks for the following mobilisations, for example the one of 2009. Also, some persons who weren't pleased by the clashes in the Schanze quarter or who took it personally when the connection of their mobile phone was interrupted due to attacks on antennas, have asked themselves why this happened and have looked into texts for explanations. That this entails a potential danger, seems to have become clear to the state. This will also have been a reason for the taking down of linksunten.indymedia.org.

[HoodLum] This perception of calm is also relative and surely subjective. It is clear that for some months there have been less things going on in Hamburg or Berlin, but that doesn't matter so much. Neither sabotage, nor riots recognize borders. Since the G20 there has been worldwide a big part of the capitalist structure fucked up, and in numerous riots cops have been attacked. We have to stop measuring our effect or potential on a local level. The statement of Panagiotis Argyrou from a Greek prison, is for me more meaningful than the rhythm of attacks in Germany. Through this we see the proof of an emergence of affinities based on the combination of words and deeds that are spreading to more hearts in fortress Europe. The rulers can shut down internet sites, diffuse false information, or bring out their servants dressed in magistrate robes to enforce their law; there will certainly be other attacks. The formulations of coordination will not disappear when we get into the habit of putting as much importance into the follow-up as the preparation, when we make the effort of translating the texts from us and our international friends, when we are able to put into practice the necessary solidarity with prisoners and, finally, when we practice what has for a long time been deformed by some; riot tourism. All the talk about international coordination is useless when we don't find ourselves together with our people from other regions in the streets or the forests. We have to broaden our horizon and experiences.

[Chuzpe] I think we have to be careful to not fall into the illusion that only the amount of direct actions says something about the condition of our struggles. We would be making the same error as

lots of others, who tire themselves with counting heads and for whom the motto "More is Better" becomes a paradigm. This way of thinking comes from a capitalist logic and is not suitable for us. We should rather examine things based on our principles and convictions, and take care that the way we fight and the perspective it holds, indicate a bit towards our utopian dreams. That does say something about the quality of our actions. If there is now a bit less things going on, it could be because people are in a process of reflection and are questioning themselves about how to go on. I think that also for this, you have to take time. And it would be wrong to fall into a blind activism, only to maintain the illusion that everything seamlessly continues.

The G20 is over now, and the experiences have surpassed our expectations. Would you say that they are also the outcome of the actions in the run-up?

[Chuzpe] It would be too flattering to locate the origin of the collective rage during those days in the mobilisation through radical attacks. Of course, these have contributed to an ambience and motivated some milieus to travel to Hamburg. But I think that the events just before the week itself; like the generalized state of emergency in Hamburg, the rude expulsions of the camp, the brutal repression of the "Welcome to Hell" demonstration and other episodes – that were supervised by the police boss Dudde & co – were surely more important factors. We know from other mobilisations that the idea of actions by small groups are not the ultimate thing and that we have to be able to question its limits. With a sober look, we also have to admit that the desired proliferation of certain types of intervention doesn't last in the long term. At the same time, we can see that this practice can provide us the necessary skills to face the police apparatus. Certainly in Germany, where the power relation in demonstrations is seldom in our favour and where a riot can only be provoked with considerable risks and efforts. Several times it would have been useful to have the know-how to realize decentralized actions. I think that during the G20 there was a good mix of different forms of action that interacted with each other, which led to the loss of control on the side of the state. On one hand, the spontaneity of the masses, on the other, pin-pricks well-prepared by small autonomous groups or wild, swarm-like demonstrations like on Friday morning in the Altona district. Ultimately, we could say it's because of this mixture that a police force of 30,000 was pushed to its limits. But also thanks to the fact that there are groups who have a practice of attack during the whole year and that bring with them a certain experience in these situations.

[HoodLum] Absolutely, as always for such type of mobilisation, it's about creating a certain ambiance. It seems that we were able to transmit to a lot of people in Germany and Europe, the feeling that in Hamburg – despite the high level of risk – there was something possible. The conditions were present. On one side, the determination for confrontation. On the other, the capacity to attack highly secured places and to put out statements that speak to the hearts of many. There have been also mobilisations that produce negative resonances. For example, the yearly Munich Security Conference (SIKO). Prior to the event, there is the eternal communist babble that ends with a march, that is eventually hemmed in. In such circumstances, there's nothing that could have happened and that would be appropriate to the topic. But in Hamburg, there are also youths and other dissatisfied who haven't been perfectly assimilated by the system and who – traditionally – are close to the radical left or chaotic resistance. They always came to the block parties in Schanze and look for any occasion to get back at the state for their daily humiliations. The fact that a lot of people were up for it, is partly thanks to our agitation but also to the media scare prior to the summit. When the media write that on this day and at that place, there will be a lot of stones hurled at the cops, then lots of people will turn up to do exactly that. That the media reinforce this message through their propaganda, contributes to the mobilisation; we don't demand anything, we only want to attack the state and the society that legitimises it.

To conclude, a look towards the future. A lot of persons are still in prison and will be sentenced to quite harsh punishments. We can also expect more investigations. On that level, there will be for a long time a shadow cast on the G20. How to go on? How to deal with repression and which perspectives can we envision from these days in Hamburg and the preceding days?

How we see it, there are already some groups that are busy with gathering funds. Our task is in showing to prisoners and other accused that we not only support them through words and materially. We have to continue to push forward the struggle of the prisoners. There are already letters from those who assert their positions. Ideally, our message is that their repression will not stop people from acting. It will increase tension and people who otherwise wouldn't have met, will come together. But in general, we're not very well organised on a level of repression. In Germany there's more of an individual approach than elsewhere. I doubt that it's clear for everyone that more resistance will entail more prisoners. For me, the per-