archist ideas can be shared by masses of people today?), will end up being satisfied with the *representation* of such a strengthening. The mirror-effect easily incites exhibitionism, quickly emptying the struggle to replace it by an image that one mistakes for the real. In the end, such a perspective generally ends up banking above all on the strengthening of the *anarchist identity*, in order to come to blows... with the other inhabitants of the forest. In order to do so, this identity then tends to have an inflated sense of self, to replace the quality of substance by the prominence of form, by ending up measuring itself by comparison, in the mirror of representation, with all other identities.

However, other paths are still possible, though certainly a little more murky or dangerous. Paths that are not made for those who are too afraid of the mud or who can't stand working in the shadows. Paths at the end of which no guarantees exist, no recognition awaits us, which do not take the mere existence of anarchists and their survival as the alpha and omega of subversion or anarchy. This is the path that climbs, digs and sneaks to derail the train of Progress and of the current society. Without renouncing the diffusion of our ideas (by various means), without underestimating the usefulness and necessity of anarchist criticism, the path we are talking about here aims above all at contributing to the upheaval of the situation, to the insurrectionary rupture, to the breakdown of what maintains the productive and social structures in place. This project, this projectuality, does not aim at the numerical growth of the anarchist movement, nor at reinforcing its popularity, but at precipitating conflictual situations towards a wider upheaval, because working to the uncontrolled multiplication of actions and to unanticipated disconnection could allow the emergence of freedom, or better, it is one of the faces that the freedom that is surging today takes.

The fact that some people whose motivations we don't share are also involved, that others whose motivations we don't know at all are also active, doesn't inspire us with paralyzing fear, nor does it lead us to participate in an exhibitionist one-upmanship (a trap as old as the world, known and set by all the intelligence services of yesterday and today), but rather pushes us to hone our suggestions, our projectuality, our ethics. And above all, to push further, with our means and modest capacities, the urgent demolition of the current society.

•••

STORM WARNINGS

| Virtual Reality |

Does anyone still remember the phenomenon, during a few months of the year 2016, of nearly 500 million players in more than a hundred countries suddenly colliding with reality, with their noses riveted to a phone screen, in search of small colorful characters to capture? A game that had even put the head of the *Directorate for the Protection of Military Installations* (DPID) in turmoil, faced with repeated intrusions of civilians onto army grounds, noting bitterly that *"to date, several sites of the Ministry, including highly sensitive defense areas (HSAs), would host these virtual objects and creatures"*. And which also raised the lively objections of the people in charge of the former Khmer Rouge prison, Tuol Sleng, transformed into a museum of the Cambodian genocide, as well as those of the former Polish extermination camp of Auschwitz-Birkenau, whose sites were invaded by intrusive *Pokémon* hunters, obsessed by the fictitious apparitions being randomly superimposed onto a most tragically real environment. And

if, on the other hand, we could have cynically laughed at the morons who fell off a cliff in Encinitas (California), or at those who wandered into the middle of the minefields of Posavina (Bosnia-Herzegovina), always in order to catch this imaginary prey, this moment marked the repulsive diffusion of not only smartphones, but especially their augmented reality applications.

Five years later, this game developed by *Niantic*, a start-up from *Google's* incubator designed to exploit and massively expand the merging of phone, internet app, camera and geolocation, has certainly lost its glory like any other fashion, but it goes without saying that other attempts to definitively blur the boundaries between the real and the virtual are once again filling the pockets of technophile sharks. Everyone has certainly already had the bitter experience of the passivity of crowds of captive zombies immersed by a screen in public transport, or noticed to what extent social relations

have undergone a new assault of complacent virtualization during the various confinements – and not only within the framework of wage slavery. In the same way, some populist politicians were able to appear in hologram form during simultaneous meetings, while some old popular singers on the comeback were planning to organize a concert tour in the same way. But it all still sounded a little too fake, when the giant *Facebook* made the sensational announcement on October 18 that it would create 10,000 jobs in its labs on the old continent (Munich, Paris, Zurich, Cork) to "*invest in new European talent to help build 'a metaverse.'*"

Contraction of *meta* and *universe* from science fiction, this grotesque concept is the flagship project of the pioneer of online exhibitionism, consisting of nothing less than developing a sort of digital double of the physical world in an unlimited and persistent way, which would interact in turn with the real in the form of a parallel universe. Going far beyond the world of games on screen, its first expansions, which aim to shift part of the sensory experience into a dematerialized universe by partially replacing the real, already involve 3D visits of museums from the couch, or boring remote-work meetings in digital rooms, all while directing your *avatar* with a virtual reality helmet fixed to your skull. But computer developers all over the world are of course also working on other types of "*immersive realities*" based on "*augmented*" helmets and glasses, especially in terms of remote-learning that would take place entirely in an unreal world (human interactions and object manipulations), or trying on brand-name shoes with your pixelized double in the stores of the *metaverse's* cities... before receiving your order at home.

As for *Microsoft*, which is never outdone, it has just embarked on another type of fusion of a virtual universe with very real functionalities, such as the creation of "*digital twins*" of sensitive infrastructures, such as virtual clones of "*energy distribution networks or complex factories*", where each machine and system is identically reproduced (part by part), in order to permanently predict the wear and tear of equipment or to anticipate the replacement of a device. This also implies equipping everything with sensors so that the two dimensions can interact simultaneously in parallel. Finally, in the other direction, last April the U.S. Army bought 120,000 IVAS (*Integrated Visual Augmentation System*) helmets from *Microsoft* for 22 billion dollars, where they will no longer be used solely for training soldiers by recreating and virtually modifying combat conditions, but will become effective in missions to combine real-time display and information sharing, automatic toggling of vision modes (thermal, infrared), map

that such attacks should at least be accompanied by political attestations of good will ("social justice" and "progressive emancipation" rather than the unleashing of freedom, "against the dominants" but always showing understanding towards the submission and adherence of the dominated). In fact, they only demand the continuation of the good old opportunist tradition, which is certainly willing to use the weapon of sabotage, but only if it serves as a vehicle and megaphone for their *political* aims.

What if anarchists here and elsewhere end up doing more or less the same? By demanding explanations for acts of infrastructure sabotage, by distancing themselves from any act that is not claimed as "anarchist", by seeing only the hand of Nazis, of conspiracy theorists – and why not, it was a classic of the last century: foreign secret services – behind acts of sabotage whose authors decide to remain in the shadows? They would then end up rejecting any vision or will that wishes and works for an *uncontrolled* multiplication of the sabotage of telecommunication, energy and logistic infrastructures, in order to only accept and value their multiplication *under* ideological control. Does this mean defending freedom, or rather fearing it?

The fact that fash/conspiracy theorists or even monks have attacked some relay-antennas does not make it any less relevant to attack these structures, to encourage sabotage against them, to wish and work for the uncontrollable multiplication of these attacks. On the other hand, it could perhaps compel us to think more about why these actions can be suggested, why we really desire their diffusion, that is to say to reflect in order to sharpen our perspectives. If deserting the terrains where others are also active is not an option, if systematically stamping actions does not solve the question of the "same terrain", it is because we have to look even further: in the perspective that we give to our action, in the ideas that we dissemi-

nate, in the methodologies that we suggest, in the projects that we elaborate.

What freedom?

"To unleash freedom is to accept the unexpected that disorder carries with it. It is to accept that if freedom is not always sweet, but can also have a bloody face, we still want it. We do not want freedom emptied of risks, nor do we want to demand that freedom bring us its certificates of good life and morals before welcoming it. That would not be freedom, it would be domestication camouflaged in libertarian clothes, the best ground for the seed of authority to start growing again."

The forest of action, April 2021

What perspectives should be elaborated then? We could perhaps start here with those that we can understand, but which inspire us the least. For example, the one that often slips between the lines but has difficulty in making itself explicit: it is the perspective that posits the existence and the qualitative and quantitative strengthening of the anarchist movement as the main goal. A stronger, larger, better organized movement, which would know how to face the obscure forces of fascism, the conspiracy theorist manipulations of genuine anger, the leftisms whose role seems to be to accompany capitalism and domination towards more sustainable, more technological, more equitable futures. A movement that dares to take itself as a point of reference, and develops a capacity of diffusion, of attack and of relevance sufficient to constitute a real force, capable of weighing in on the public debate, of making the difference in intermediate struggles, of chasing the Nazis out of the demonstrations.

In such a perspective, there is a strong risk that the quantitative strengthening of the anarchist movement, even if difficult to imagine (after all, do we really think that an-

consider the claim as a kind of magic solution, a bicarbonate that should solve all the problems posed by acts and their possible interpretation.

Left, right, left, right: out!

> *"That leftists have been hitting the streets hand in hand with fascists/conspiracy theorists for weeks should alert us to the danger of the idea of common struggle, which means that we don't care who we struggle with as long as we have the same practices and the same target. We forget that these people whose actions we applaud or who we demonstrate with have positions opposed to ours on just about everything, and that we would be their target in other contexts."*
>
> *Antagonists in solidarity*, in their claim for an *Orange* vehicle in Grenoble, September 2021

For several months, a large part of the opposition to the government's restrictive health measures seems to be led by right-wing figures. In other countries as well, such as Italy, the Netherlands and Germany, Nazis have taken to the streets in large numbers and have made their presence clearly felt in what are otherwise very heterogeneous mobilizations. On several occasions, anarchists have even been attacked by fascist groups, and fortunately, the opposite has also happened. However, being in the same terrain of conflict does not necessarily imply appropriating the indigestible vocabulary of opportunists in search for "common fronts" or theorizing "objective alliances" as a political strategy. While we always have the possibility to slam the door and to abandon a terrain of struggle which does not seem to us to offer any possibility of subversion or of action that carries freedom, no conflict will ever totally correspond to only anti-authoritarian criteria. To act on a conflictual ground which is not "pure" (but which ground would be?), obviously does not mean to support the authoritarianism which can be present there,

and the question will always remain much more about *how* we act, and with what *perspective*.

On the other side of the Rhine, there are large parts of the radical and libertarian left who accuse those who defend anonymous attacks on telecommunication or energy infrastructures of "joining forces" with the Nazis, or at least of playing their game (since Nazi activists are generally not very fond of claims and also theorize about attacking infrastructure to precipitate *Day X,* the Day of Societal Collapse and the beginning of the "race war"). Since, in addition, much of the terrain of 5G opposition seems to be occupied by openly conspiracy-minded ("*Querdenker*") and far-right-friendly committees, attacks on infrastructure are no longer seen as sabotage of the technoworld, but as evidence of Nazi virulence. From on high in the antifascist collectives and circles of the movement, disrepute is then cast on unclaimed actions, once the para-police principle that "unclaimed action against infrastructure equals Nazi action" is established. All the more so since some of them, as good followers of collective and civilizing progress, generally cannot conceive of the subversive significance of attacks on this "common good" that would be, in their eyes, electricity or virtual connectivity.

In the face of the current technological restructuring of domination, and by whatever means it is received, a little sentence of Orwell – certainly not an enemy of all authority – remains disturbingly topical: *"The real division is not between conservatives and revolutionaries, but between authoritarians and libertarians."* Across the Rhine, these voices of the German radical and/or libertarian left not only accuse the anarchists of wanting to unleash a "civil war" through attacks on infrastructure (whose main goal is to create disorder and to undermine technological chains, practices inserted or not in an insurrectionary projectuality) and then, the accusing finger raised, they insist

overlay and enemy identification, all of which will be continuously computed in the cloud, in order to "*make tactical decisions and engage targets*", as is said in khaki Newspeak. Similarly, the Ethics Committee of the French Ministry of Defense officially gave the green light in December 2020 to research the "*augmented soldier*", which is no more and no less than a step towards the integration of subcutaneous chips enabling sending or receiving information, the surgical operation on ears to hear very high or very low frequencies, or the integration of implants "*enabling taking control of a weapons system*".

This development of a *metaverse* where humans would be loaded with devices equipped with sensors for part of their day, in order to interact with each other in a more or less virtual form within a reality shaped and managed by algorithms (for work, consumption or leisure), ultimately only prolongs the social relationship already amply produced by the various electronic leashes, where the perception of reality is only apprehended in an indirect way. This new productive offensive towards derealization intends, little by little, to target the entirety of our senses. Faced with this, if we are only left one to cultivate, it is obviously not the *good* one that enhances this supplemental mutilation of our sensory experience, but its opposite, the one that leads to the unleashing of all the bad passions, starting with the desire for the *destruction of everything that destroys us*. And as nothing virtual is achieved in this world without very material infrastructures – from the thousands of *Starlink* satellites that require terrestrial bases (located in Gravelines for the North, Villenave-d'Ornon for the South, and Saint-Senier-de-Beuvron for the West) up to the famous *data centers* guzzling electricity or the antennas and fiber optic cables – everyone certainly understands what remains to be done.

•◆•

| By Fumbling... |

Alone in the forest?

"Isère: Conspiracy theorist and angry with the State, he set fire to relay antennas"
"Drôme: The Pierrelatte arsonist: anti-5G but not anti-fiber optics"
"Rhône: Two monks arrested for setting fire to 5G relay antennas"
"Paris: Anti-vaccine, he sabotaged 26 5G antennas to save France from the plots of Covid-19"
Headlines from the last months

State services have counted hundreds of acts of sabotage against telecommunication infrastructures since 2018. Arsoned relay antennas, severed fiber-optic cables, burned switchboards, ransacked telephone cabinets: these practices have spread throughout the territory and have clearly seen a quantitative increase in the last two years. The quality of the saboteurs' nocturnal activities also seems to have grown: there have been actions affecting particularly sensitive nodes, others that have been coordinated or repeated in the same geographic area, some aimed at disrupting the communications of a specific structure, in a specific area or at a specific time... In short, despite repeated warnings from the authorities, cries of alarm from operators and a not insignificant number of arrests, attacks continue to target these infrastructures, which remain difficult to protect from a stealthy blow or a nocturnal fire.

While these actions undeniably target the veins of technological domination, the particular motivations and broader aspirations of the hands that carry them out often remain unknown. Repression, one of whose primary tasks is of course to identify the perpetrators of mischief that disrupts the smooth functioning of society, has, however, revealed something of the diversity of the people who engage in these moonlit strolls. While remaining cautious with the information published in newspapers or "quotes" by journalists from those convicted, and not adopting the "profiles" and "categories" established by the state services for the purposes of mapping, record keeping and repression, we have seen in recent years quite different people being convicted for attacks on permanent connection. During the peak of the Gilets Jaunes, a number of small groups carried

If, for example, the acts of others as diverse expressions within the "social war" are continued to be appreciated – from attacks on the police in the periphery to the anonymous sabotage of infrastructures – then obviously another way of doing so has to be found than simply weighing them on the small scale of anarchism. Or else, we will definitely have to resolve to exclusively evoke actions that are duly claimed by anarchists, the only way to avoid any risk of speculation, hasty appreciation and unhealthy inquisition at the root – knowing that this would only remain temporary, since the anarchist who accomplished a beautiful action yesterday can always turn out to be a scumbag today in their daily relations, or a turncoat tomorrow...

In any case, it is important to take the time to critically examine our relationship with other beings in the forest, as well as our way of acting. On the other hand, if there is indeed no recipe to be applied nor jargon to be recited, neither can instructions exist that must be respected on "how to do" things, under penalty of being accused of wanting to hide behind vile Nazis and other wingnuts. *No one*, not even the most narrow-minded, can try to subject their companions to the obligation to explain their actions, to present and justify their project in detail, to label their actions according to certain prescriptions, just to avoid the bitterness of some chronicler of the social war. It will always be up to an individual to act as they see fit. Even if it means leaving some in ignorance and misunderstanding, and preserving the shadows to cover the activities of others. Even if it means disappointing some by an exhibition considered too indiscrete, and inspiring others by the clear and precise affirmation of ideas and feelings that have inspired an action.

For in the end, *do acts really speak for themselves*? On the one hand, *yes*, in the sense that they are the manifestation of a concrete attack against a concrete structure or

person. The destruction of a relay-antenna is the destruction of a relay-antenna, no matter how one wishes to interpret it. On the other hand, *no*, because they cannot by themselves express all the motivations, tensions, orientations that pushed the author to carry it out. Thus the acts are what they are, a destructive material fact that can inspire or open the imagination (or not), no more, no less. At the same time, it is also all these acts that make up the panorama in which one acts, and of which one is a part. They also take their meaning in a context, and not only thanks to the possible explicit expression of the authors. By disturbing, shaking up, questioning the lives of other people, they can never be the exclusive property of their authors, just as the authors will never be the only ones to give them meaning (no matter if it is to appreciate or to condemn them). Faced with this, the fact of claiming or not claiming an action does not radically change the situation. The "others" are not simple passive spectators who undergo both the acts and the meanings that their authors sometimes want to give them without flinching: they are directly implicated, given that their lives are modified (in a more or less ephemeral way) by the act, given the disgust or the enthusiasm that it often inspires in them, etc. etc.

So, can a claim help to understand an action? Of course, just as it can also make it incomprehensible to its readers, by being so inflated or backed up with so many words that the statement almost end up drowning the action and burying the simple suggestion it always contains: *let's destroy what destroys us*. And by the way, does the fact of claiming protect us from being lumped together with unsavory people? Given that the forest is vast and that acts resonate far beyond our own words (the "effects" of propaganda, whether through anarchist newspapers or through anarchist claims, will always remain relative), one would be inclined to put this into perspective, and in any case not to

of the company *ICT Devoteam*, an international leader in digital strategy consulting, technology platforms and cybersecurity, including cloud, automation and data processing.

7/10, Isbergues (France). In Pas-de-Calais, the deputy security officer of the town hall resigns after his garden sheds were deliberately set on fire twice on his property.

8/10, Milan (Italy). The local branch of the *Democratic Party* (left, in power) loses its windows in the Ortica district. "*Active solidarity with the anarchist prisoners all over the world*", says the communiqué.

9/10, Fontenay (France). In Yvelines, two personal cars belonging to cops of the night service are set on fire with molotovs around 11:30 in the parking adjacent to the police station.

10/10, Châteaubriant (France). In Loire-Atlantique, a dozen *Keolis* school buses lost their windows during the night.

12/10, Berlin (Germany). The autonomous group Peter H. claims the arson of all the vehicles of the auxiliary police (*Ordnungsamt*) stationed in their parking lot in the north-east of the capital, in anticipation of the eviction from the Køpiplatz.

motivations as the *only* reference, as the *only* indicator of reality, but as *one* among others. The need to establish a genealogy to the "acts of revolt", to probe the motivations of their perpetrators is less felt here – as is the need to systematically provide explanations of one's own. The explanations of singular acts then leaves room for the elaboration of a projectuality that tries to go beyond each of them, and the fact that this projectuality has insurrectionary aims (the unleashing of a situation of rupture) or others, does not necessarily make a big difference. It is true, as some critics point out, that this can lead to completely dismissing the weight of motivations, at the risk then of blinding oneself to this factor, which is indeed not the only one, but which remains one all the same. In this case, if the "motivations" behind the acts of revolt are not the exclusive element that could interest anarchists in what they generate, this should not lead to the complete denial of their influence in the reality of the social war.

Acts that speak for themselves?

"Nothing that is expressed can seem as threatening as what is not."

Stig Dagerman

In the complex reality that we inhabit, things are of course even more complicated, and even end up plunging all schematics and understandings into a beautiful mess, calling for some additional reflections.

On the one hand, if the silence of the insurgents can sometimes end up obscuring their motivations, on the other hand, it also responds to the practical need not to provide clues to the statist enemy. In the same way, if on the one hand the need to clarify reasons in a confused context is hardly in doubt, such as a context of bitter discontent that joins with a strategic projection of neo-fascists (as with the current opposition to the health pass and the attacks against structures such as vaccination centers), on the other hand it is also necessary to remain lucid on the relative weight of words and of what they succeed in expressing and conveying. This is obviously true for any linguistic expression, from a poster to a leaflet, from a discussion to a newspaper or a claim: all of them are conditioned by the capacity of the other to understand what is written or said.

out sabotage within the framework or on the margins of this movement of heterogeneous revolt. Other who were convicted specified in court their ecological orientation, their opposition to 5G for its harmful effects on health and the environment, their leftist affiliation or their refusal of control. Still others, even when confronted with incriminating evidence and finally conviction, refused to engage in lengthy explanations in court or in the press at all.

Behind their stubborn silence, visions that are not very liberating could certainly hide, but it is not because of a refusal to express oneself in front of a cop or a judge, because no sense is seen in explaining one's tensions and ideas to a journalist, that one would necessarily have no "*problem being associated with conspiracy theorists or the extreme right*". In the same way, it is not because of a lack of belonging to any more or less "militant" milieu, or having a "solidarity committee" to defend your ideas when the cops come knocking, that no public letters are written to explain your actions, that we are then automatically part of the "Nazis" who plan the outbreak of a racial war by spreading chaos, or of the "conspiracy theorists" who fill their head on the digital web, or of the "fundamentalists" who identify technological innovations as the work of the devil.

In recent months, however, headlines such as those mentioned at the beginning of this text have challenged what some might call the "benevolence" of the silence of the perpetrators of these attacks, sometimes even provoking a *fit of existential fever* among companions. The reasoning seems to stand upright: if behind all these anonymous acts – yes, it must be said, the vast majority of attacks against telecommunication infrastructures have not been followed by any communique, and have not provided any clues of ideological affiliation to investigators or to the suspicious guardians of genealogy – there have obviously been people who are sometimes not to be recommended, such as God's enlightened ones, patriotic activists, or particularly confused beings who are always looking for something in the wrong place,... so every anonymous attack should be treated as something possibly, or very possibly, from dubious people.

The logical error obviously jumps out at you, but reasoning, arguments, critical evaluations or explorations are put aside, when it is easier to believe that we are alone in the forest than to perceive that other non despicable people can also sneak through the undergrowth, whom we don't know and who perhaps have visions and orienta-

destroyed with a garbage bin fire at around 4 a.m., causing tens of thousands of euros worth of damage.

26/9, Berlin (Germany). Three cars are disabled in front of the villa of Tatjana Korcistij-Gerlitz, manager of the hall *La Festa*, who wanted to host a meeting of the far-right party AfD.

27/9, Belfort/Danjoutin (France). Two car-sharing vehicles of the *Optymo* service are deliberately set on fire overnight in the span of less than a week.

9/27, Montreuil (France). In Seine-Saint-Denis, a van of the cage manufacturer *Eiffage* goes up in smoke in the night, in solidarity "*with Boris, with Toby Shone, imprisoned in England, and with the three Italian anarchists currently on trial*".

28/9, Koungou (France). In the colony of Mayotte, following the eviction of a shanty town of 350 people, the town hall and three cars of the municipality are ravaged by fire during an enraged demonstration, while the police station narrowly escapes.

28/9, Hamburg (Germany). A car belonging to the French advertising company *JCDecaux* was set on fire. "*We chose to attack instead of going to the polls,*" the arsonists said on the eve of the parliamentary elections. "*Greetings to the anarchist prisoner Boris, who is still in a coma in the hospital of the Grand Est in Metz, after a fire in his cell! Greetings to all the ungovernables of the world!*"

29/9, Limburg (Belgium). At three different parking lots, the tires of 135 buses of *De Lijn*, public transport company, are punctured

during the night.

9/29, Bern (Switzerland).
A vehicle of *Protectas*, the Swiss subsidiary of the private security company *Securitas* which manages the asylum camps, is set on fire. "*Let's sabotage their tools, offices, movements... until everyone is free!*"

9/29, Montreuil (France).
In Seine-Saint-Denis, about thirty people take to the streets leaving posters, tags, and broken windows against the architectural firm of prisons *archi 5, Orange* and the prison engineering office *EGIS*, "*in solidarity with Boris, and against this world of surveillance and confinement.*"

30/9, Labège (France).
In Haute-Garonne, a 3 to 5G relay antenna of *Orange* and *Free* deliberately goes up in smoke overnight.

OCTOBER 2021

1/10, Flensburg (Germany).
Three cars of the real estate developer *Dutschkewitz*, which razed a forest (previously occupied), to build a hotel, are burned. "*Those who raze the forests sow hatred and reap the flames*" says the claim.

1/10, Barcelona (Spain).
The headquarters of the squat eviction company *Fuera Okupas*, close to the Nazis, is targeted in the morning: windows broken, tires slashed on the service car, and the tag "*Nazis out of the squats*".

2/10, Berlin (Germany).
In the district of Prenzlauer Berg, night-time saboteurs set fire to a footbridge under a railway bridge, where electrical and district

tions very different from our own, who even are likely to. Alone in the forest, alone as anarchists, pure servants of a lofty ideal, without contradictions in our lives, without "stains" on our patrimonial coat of arms, without doubts in our thoughts and without "faults" in our relationships and way of living, clear as a full moon and without any "revolutionary" or "insurrectionary" illusion. However, although it is always possible to lie to ourselves, although it is always possible to build houses of cards that the first wind of reality will blow away like sand, there are also other paths that do not make abstractions of the world around us, that do not need to put our ideas and those who embody them on a pedestal above all possibility of error, in order to give meaning to the struggle and meaning to our lives.

For *we are not alone in the forest*. We are not the only human factors of disorder, just as humans are not even the only factors that disturb the fragile equilibrium by which this crumbling world seeks to proceed. Other people act, with ideas perhaps less developed than yours, with orientations perhaps more honed than mine, driven by an immediate desire for retaliation against a mortifying system, by a somber revenge against a life deprived of meaning, as well as by an ideological or religious belief in conflict with the technological march of the world.

Why

"Because ultimately, the essential question is not about the supposed motives of complete strangers who we will never know anything about anyway (except in the case of arrest, which we don't wish on anyone), but how we want, in the midst of the social war, to make acts resonate that speak to us and resound with our ideas. Whether they are collective or individual, diffuse or specific, widely shareable or wickedly heterodox, completely anonymous or labeled subversive, in the shadow out of the spotlight or publicized by their authors in different ways."

Wanted interconnected, July 2021

Faced with the fact that the forest is not only home to anarchists, there are basically two possibilities, with, as usual, a thousand intermediate nuances.

The first one consists of thinking that nobody else shares

anarchist ideas (at least in their completeness that differentiates them strongly from ideologies that can be more or less cut into pieces according to the situation and the inclination of the moment), the entirety of "acts of revolt", "news of disorder", "fragments of the social war" or whatever we want to call them, certainly make up the panorama in which we act, the background of the frame, but we must be careful not to lend them motivations. Then, as motivations escape from the darkness of the forest and give a particular color to these acts, a color that on principle will never entirely please us (given that anarchists are the only ones who share anarchist ideas), the more there will be need to affirm or clarify our intentions and motivations faced with those of others. For any silence on our part could give fuel to motivations we do not share. We are then forced to light torches in the middle of the forest, and to make sure that the bonfires we light burn even stronger, higher and brighter than those of others. There is a strong risk that the *anarchist identity* becomes our main concern, that we end up establishing (even within our own circles) a kind of catechism that ticks off the good and the bad points, ultimately failing to conceive of the diversity and richness of individuals as a fruit of freedom, but rather as a terrible threat.

The second possibility is always to start from ourselves, from our ideas and aspirations as anarchists, but to understand the other "factors of disorder" not as things to be assimilated or presented as if they were – unconsciously and subterraneanly – inspired by the sacred fire of anarchy, but simply as elements that have their weight and their meaning in the *concrete* (and not platonic or idealistic) war waged by humans. A "social" war, if you like, in the sense that it crosses all society and always revolves around the question of power (in all its variations), and where anarchists are those who defend the necessity of the destruction of power rather than its reorganization. This "social war" is not the expression of the tension towards "total liberation" nor towards "anarchy", it just forms the conflict from which social relations emerge and are modified, which in their turn shape the modalities of this "social war". The motivations expressed, tacitly or explicitly, by those caught up in this war are then to be placed in their historical context, and not to be extracted to compare them to the pantheon of abstractions.

Without of course denying their weight, this second possibility (excuse the crude schematic) does not take these

heating pipes run. The huge fire caused a power outage in the district until 3pm the next day. 15000 homes in the capital are affected, no more traffic lights, many stores and banks closed because they could not open their metal screens and cash registers, no more cell phones because the antennas on the roofs were no longer powered, many electric cars disabled, no more computers, TVs or household appliances working in homes.

4/10, Berlin (Germany).
A stone's throw from the Køpiplatz, an occupied historic site in the German capital, a *Google* office loses its windows, "*part of gentrification, co-responsible for the upcoming eviction attempt [of the Køpiplatz].*"

4/10, Aulnay-sous-Bois (France).
An *SFR* fiber optic cabinet is burned, depriving the neighborhood of internet for several weeks.

4/10, Rivière-Salée (France).
In the colony of La Martinique, the building housing the courthouse is completely reduced to ashes around 1am.

5/10, Rome (Italy).
A communique announces that on August 28, during the *International Week of Solidarity with imprisoned anarchists*, a car belonging to the technology company *Sirti* was deliberately set on fire. "*Solidarity with all imprisoned anarchists around the world! Strength and closeness to Boris, in a coma in France after a fire in his cell! To all those who continue to light up the nights with their actions!*"

6/10, Zaventem (Belgium).
An arson attack causes extensive damage to the office building