



ANARCHISTNEWS.ORG SERIES 1



**Interview of ITS
with the Mexican press**

original interview found on the Facebook page of
Mexican journalist **Ciro Gómez Leyva**
comments from anarchistnews.org

Interview of the In the Morning (Por La Mañana - EPM) Team with the group "Individualists Tending Toward the Wild" after it took responsibility for the murder of José Jaime Barrera Moreno, Head of Services in the Department of Chemistry of the UNAM (National Autonomous University of Mexico)

July 1, 2016

EPM: Why kill?

ITS: Why not? Is it a sin? A crime? Is it bad? Someone certainly said, "yes" to one of those questions.

We respond to be clear that we kill because this is WAR. We do not recognize any other authority but the authority of our pagan deities tied to nature and against Catholicism and the Judeo-Christian god. These gods push us toward confrontation.

We kill because we do not recognize any other law but the natural laws that govern the whole of this dead world. We kill because we reject all morality that they seek to impose on us. We kill because we consider it neither "good" nor evil" but rather it is a response from our individuality to all of the destruction that human progress generates. Within the specter of terrorism, killing can be a strategy, a call, or a warning for what will follow...

Getting to the main point, we killed the head of Chemical Services of the UNAM to remind people that we can attack anyone at anytime within this university. It is to show that our objectives have widened since 2011. At that time, we targeted the scientists and investigators. Today the entire university community can be and are the target. Why? For the mere reason that they form part of the student community of this institution of higher education devoted to progress.

We warned the UNAM authorities in past months that if our actions continued to be silenced, there would be consequences. The result was this scandalous death within the University City that serves as a lesson. It doesn't matter to us

that it was just a worker. It would have been the same to us if it had been a student, or a teacher, or best case scenario, a renowned scientist. The real target, the UNAM, was struck again, the authorities are demoralized by it, and we have another death to our name.

EPM: How can you prove that this was done by your group?

ITS: The proof is in the facts of the case. There was nothing missing off of his person. It wasn't a robbery. The body was found in a place where there were no cameras. This indicates a direct assault and that's it. We know that the Mexico City police is already preparing its incompetent and idiotic "investigation" (like always) to indicate that it wasn't us in order to not cause alarm among the university community.

We thought of scalping him as proof but that wasn't possible at the time. As we wrote in our communiqué, that'll be for next time. You and everyone else can think what you like, that it was a common mugging, a personal vendetta by people from his neighborhood, that it was a mistake, etc. But our record doesn't lie. This isn't our first time doing this, we have a reputation. We have demonstrated with this and other actions that we aren't playing around.

EPM: How many targets do you have?

ITS: Our concrete target is all of civilization, the universities and companies that train slaves so that this system keeps growing, as well as malls and institutions that fill minds with garbage and make sheep that go directly to the slaughter. (By that statement we aren't supporting "mass society," which by its very existence threatens the Earth with destruction.) We attack the symbols of modernity, religion, technology, and progress. We attack directly those who are responsible for the spread of the urban stain that swallows up the last surviving wild places.

In summary, we, the eco-extremists, are against human progress that corrupts and degrades all that is beautiful in this

world: that progress that makes everything artificial, mechanical, gray, and sad. We don't tolerate it, so we have been at war with this civilization and disgusting progress for some years now.

EPM: They've never arrested anyone from your group?

ITS: In 2011, after blowing up two investigators from the Tec of Monterrey Atizapán Campus, we said that the PGR (The Office of the Attorney General) and the other security institutions were a JOKE, and we'll keep saying it. Up until now, no one from our group has ever been arrested.

EPM: To what are you referring when you mention the attacks of April 25th and 8th?

ITS: We have to clarify here that ITS was NOT responsible for the attack on April 8th at the University City. This was the work of another eco-extremist group from our tendency, and we mentioned it in our last communiqué to show that the university authorities silenced these attacks. On the other hand, the April 25th attack was part of a coordinated operation of ITS groups in Mexico, Chile, and Argentina.

- April 6th: The "Mystical Horde of the Forest" abandoned an explosive device in the Department of Physical Sciences and Mathematics at the University of Chile in Santiago, although they found the device before it exploded. This generated a great deal of commotion among the university community in the country of earthquakes.
- April 12th: The group, "Ouroboros Silvestre" detonated an explosive in front of the University of Ecatepec in Mexico State, only a few meters from the Municipal Palace in downtown San Cristóbal. The device exploded but no further details are known.

The same day the same group abandoned a timed explosive device in the Comunidad Educativa Hispanoamericana in the same municipality. The device exploded and wounded one of the security guards at the institution when he picked it up. This act was silenced by the media and the authorities

of the municipality, who stated that the device exploded without any casualties and only resulted in material damages.

- April 19th: The Group “Fury of the Lynx” detonated a home-made explosive device at one of the entrances of the Tec de Monterrey Mexico City Campus in Tlalpan, without more details being known.
- April 21st: The Group, “Wild Constellations” abandoned a package bomb within the National Technological University in Buenos Aires, Argentina. No further details are known due to the silencing of the action by the authorities.
- April 25th: The “Hidden Fury of the Lynx” group abandoned a timed explosive device also at the Comunidad Educativa Hispanoamericana in Ecatepec, but this time in the Architecture Department, which detonated but no further details are known.

The same day, the same group abandoned an explosive device of similar make in the Engineering Department, specifically in A Building, but further details are not known. All of these attacks were carried out by groups affiliated with ITS and responsibility was taken for them in our seventh communiqué.

EPM: Who were you attacking?

ITS: The April 25th attacks in the University City in particular were symbolically and materially against the UNAM and any person in that university who happened to be in the vicinity when the explosives detonated. It's false what the media is reporting, namely, that the April 25th attacks were against the Chief of Chemical Services in particular. That's a lie.

EPM: If you don't believe in a better tomorrow, and are not revolutionaries, what are you asking for? What is your goal?

ITS: We're not asking for anything. We don't have demands and we aren't petitioning for anything. Can we negotiate concerning the loss of our natural human roots that resists the artificiality of civilization? Of course not. There's no negotiation here

or roundtable talks, none of that. We don't believe in revolutions because these are always directed to "solving problems, to constructing something "newer and better". Let's just say that the era of "revolutions" and "revolutionaries" is over. There is no "revolution" that can change a negative thing into a positive one since all today is corrupted. Everything's for sale, because what drives the world today is not political but economic power. Revolutions are a thing of the past, and we've understood this quite well. We don't want to solve any problems here, we aren't proposing anything to anyone. We aren't trying to change the world, and we don't want the masses to join us. Enough with the bargain basement utopias! Enough with the thinking that we can have a better world! Look around you, we are surrounded by the horrors created by this civilization, by an alienating technological reality (social media, telephones). We breathe the thick air of this dirty city. The roads full of cars; see the masses pressed up against each other on buses and on the metro. You can see on their faces that they've had it up to here with more of the same. Economic power is had by the few; they live in luxury and are surrounded by money and comfort. The media is sold to the highest bidder. If people protest, they are disappeared and killed. Social tensions heighten, and when it seems like things are finally going to explode, it all returns to normal, or another kind of "normal" at the most. That's why we've stopped believing in a better tomorrow, because the decadent present is all we have, and in the present, all that we see is progress without brakes leading us over the civilized cliff.

Civilization is rotten and it keeps corroding but advancing at the same time. We would love it if we could make it collapse with our own hands, but that would be another childish desire. We're not betting on the collapse of civilization, nor is its destruction one of our goals. Let that be clear.

On the philosophical front we are pessimists since we have seen all that is beautiful to us, namely nature, be lost, and it is being pushed closer to extinction. There's nothing for us

to fight for, except for our own individualities. We continue to be human and not robots. We are the Wild Nature that is left, the last of the last. We continue to consider ourselves part of nature and not its owner. We eco-extremists are rescuing our primitive roots. Among these is confrontation, the struggle that has identified us as the people of this land, sons of the mesquite and the coyote. We are at war with those who seek to domesticate us, just as our wildest ancestors were, who did not allow themselves to be subjugated by the Europeans who invaded the Gran Chichimeca.

Eco-extremists are domesticated animals who still retain their instincts. For most this will surely be “incoherent” as we say all this yet still use technology. We state that we don’t hesitate to use it to achieve our immediate goals. This is a fact, it doesn’t matter to us one bit if we fall into “inconsistencies” here. We don’t care what anyone thinks, really. One of ITS and eco-extremism’s goals is attack, it’s to return the blows that Wild Nature has received without fashioning ourselves as “revolutionaries”. We do this disinterestedly guided by our egoist impulses. Eco-extremists are like the bees that sting leaving the stinger in the victim, knowing that they will die in the process. In this case, the victim is civilization, and we know that we aren’t going to come out of this war victorious.

This will seem to you like we are “mentally disturbed or unbalanced”, but look, nihilist eco-extremism is a tendency that was practically born in Mexico. It has since been taken up by individualists in Chile, Argentina, and Europe. So we’re not the only crazy ones here at least.

Perhaps this leaves more questions than answers at this point, but one thing is clear: what’s done is done.

For the internationalization of the Eco-extremist Mafia!
For the extreme defense of Wild Nature! Death to the hyper-civilized!

Individualists Tending Toward the Wild
Mexico

Tags:

ITS

Eco-extremism

22712 reads

Comments

Anonymous

Mon, 07/04/2016 - 01:53

Murdering someone you don't have an interpersonal group grievance with is the very definition of being hyper-civilized. Why not kill your boss first? Or your undoubtedly rich parents?

Anonymous

Mon, 07/04/2016 - 21:14

If someone indirectly contributes strongly to the thing(s)/ event(s) that make(s) your life shit, why do you have no grievance with them? Why does the interpersonal relationship matter?

Anonymous

Mon, 07/04/2016 - 03:52

"They killed someone OMG they must be cops! They have rich daddy issues... What, someone lit some garbage cans on fire? That's totes legit. That's real anarchy..." LOL modern anarchism is such a Judeo-Christian religion it's not even funny anymore. You should just elect a Pope and be done with it. I'm sure Zerzan wouldn't mind the honor.

Anonymous

Mon, 07/04/2016 - 07:46

Seriously, you killed someone for anti-civ reasons, therefore you (somehow) must have rich parents, therefore...you're a bad person or something? What in the living fuck can that mean? You anon critics get more pathetic and less coherent by the day. Your book says that the *meek* shall inherit the Earth, not the moronic. Anarchists bray and bray for some imagined violent uprising, then turn tail and point the finger when someone actually does something violent.

v

Mon, 07/04/2016 - 10:40

Oh for fuck sake, knock it off. If ITS had killed the Mexican President or the head of a large corporation, no anarchist on here would be 'turning tail' or wringing their hands over it, they'd be celebrating and commending it.

These ITS idiots are just killing random people for 'no reason' (their own words), no different than a serial killer. I'm sure you can't wait till they starting raping elderly blind women.

P

Mon, 07/04/2016 - 21:24

You are strongly reifying the state if you think the mexican president/big time ceos actually have more control over you than the average joe individual. The state is a complicated series of social relationships and nothing more.

v

Tue, 07/05/2016 - 19:44

Please tell me oh wise one, how does an "average joe individual" have more control over my life than a head of state?

P

Tue, 07/05/2016 - 21:14

I did not say that an average individual has more control over anyone than a head of state. But control does not work as you seem to think it does.

Let's Head of State creates Situation H. Individual \$ decides Situation H does not apply to them. Individual Pops is on the fence. Individual Pops could also decide Situation H does not apply to Individual \$, in which case Individual \$ gains more freedom. Or, Individual Pops could decide Situation H does indeed apply to Individual \$, at which point they could either take personal action against Individual \$ or they could bureaucratically attack Individual \$ by telling Law Defender Corps 00004 to go after them.

Head of State has no idea who Individual \$ is. Individual Pops could make all the difference in Individual \$'s life.

Obviously, if every individual stopped believing in the reification of Head of State, Head of State would have no power. It is the

relationship that each individual has with Head of State and with each other individual (and non human) they encounter that gives Head of State power. Head of State cannot enforce their power without many individuals. Each individual can choose to believe in the reification of Head of State and therefore to enforce the power of Head of State or they can choose to exist in other ways.

N

Wed, 07/06/2016 - 07:53

I know what to do! - let's try: Logic!!

Saying "the mexican president/big time ceos [sic]" does *NOT* "have more control over you than the average joe individual" IS NOT THE SAME AS

Saying "an average individual has more control over anyone than a head of state."

It's like: A is not greater than B does not mean
 Therefore, B is greater than A

Anonymous

Wed, 07/06/2016 - 12:21

You are playing semantic games. But it doesn't matter. The statement "the mexican president/big time ceos does not have more control over you than the average joe individual" is false anyway. The head of state does have more control over people's lives than the average joe individual. And their death would be welcome by anarchists, which is the point I was making.

N

Wed, 07/06/2016 - 14:03

Not that I'm usually this aggro about logic, but yes, we're both correct, sort of, if you changed 'ordinary joe' to 'average Mexican'

P

Wed, 07/06/2016 - 22:48

N got it right. Situationally, who has power varies quite drastically, and in each individual situation that occurs in mexico, the head of state of mexico probably doesn't have any direct power. This is because they are not involved at all in most situations that occur in mexico. The only reason they have any influence is because other individuals buy into the things they say. It's the

other individuals who often, but obviously not always, have significant power over each other. Clearly also there are many individuals and reified organizations other than the 'other individuals' mentioned above who also are believed in by the 'other individuals'.

v

Thu, 07/07/2016 - 23:46

No he didn't

Your vague abstract sophistry doesn't impress me. Looks like I have to break out the crayons. The President of Mexico (or any president) is part of the government, in fact, the head of the government. The President is the leader of the governing party. He helps sets policy of the party, and the policies are implemented by the government. Implementation of policies is done through law enforcement, and law enforcement means cops, who enforce the laws on average individual joes. Now, if you are suggesting that governments somehow have no more power than the average joe individual, then you fail anarchy 101. The President also has all sorts of license to invoke things like emergency powers, appoint judges to the supreme court, and pass executive orders directly from him.

No average individual joe has anything like those kind of powers. To say otherwise is insane.

This is not 'reifying' government, it is accurately describing the powers relevant to the government, powers that manifest upon average individual joes in ways that average individual joes have no counter force to. The President may only be one person, but he has more power via an array of institutional forces than any ordinary citizen.

I'm shocked at the level of your IQ if you can't understand this basic thing.

P

Fri, 07/08/2016 - 21:46

Once again, any special or emergency powers and any day to day decisions made by some high up person are extremely unlikely to directly affect the majority of the population, This is because

the high up person is only one person and cannot possibly interact with millions.

You seem to be unaware how much individuals self-domesticate and perpetuate their own submission. Here's a different sort of anarchy 101 that isn't interested in your tired old inversions of dominate narratives: <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/columbia-anarchist-league-disarm...>

If nearly everyone stopped believing in government tomorrow, "it", i.e. those who still believe, probably politicians and maybe some cops, would be so severely outnumbered they would either surrender or be eliminated in a day. This is not to suggest this sort of popular front would be possible or desirable, but simply to illustrate more accurately that the state is based on nothing but social relationships, especially relationships of belief. There are many examples of small or large groups of individuals who stop believing and achieve interesting things. Despite their faults, the the paris commune and rojava are very well known examples. In each of these and every other case, if more people had remained committed to government, less success would have been had. The opposite is true as well.

Additionally, detournement campaigns have historically subverted power through semiotic take-overs:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Orange_Alternative

Anonymous

Fri, 07/08/2016 - 22:57

"Once again, any special or emergency powers and any day to day decisions made by some high up person are extremely unlikely to directly affect the majority of the population, This is because the high up person is only one person and cannot possibly interact with millions. "

Yes yes yes... and that's why State politics and their "democracy" exist, dumbass.

The State is an organized and instituted web of relations, not the Man pushing buttons from his luxury lair in the Alps (even tho sometimes...).

Anonymous

Mon, 07/04/2016 - 11:59

"Perhaps this leaves more questions than answers at this point, but one thing is clear: what's done is done."

Here's the summation, in their own words. Basically the same POV as their critics, a hint of doubt and slamming the door on any serious self-reflection. The problem isn't necessarily a moral one, more about what military jargon calls "soft targets" and that nagging feeling that you're just one more narcissistic asshole which is THE problem with civilization (the sum of its parts). The solution is to shift the crosshairs away from people and on to their most expensive toys, that road actually leads out and away from the trap. Nothing wrong with self-defence but collective punishment? Plenty of a-moral critiques there, along with the obvious ones. The enemy uses collective punishment, we do not.

O

Mon, 07/04/2016 - 12:45

Indeed

There is also the case of dubious definition. All is fair game by their definition. But we are all complicit in what is happening now. So ITS can invoke their moral high ground, which perhaps is not a reason to reject them, but says a bit about their impotence. They go on about wild nature and such, but have a rather anthropocentric logic. What is wild nature? Who's is it to defend? They sure pull a cultist line, what with their whole 'pagan gods' and all. If that is not a slippery slope then I do not know what. It sounds more like blood feud / blood sacrifice than war to me. As they say they act on behalf of their pagan authorities (or at least that is the one authority they recognize). Behold the new priesthood! I do not see how we need more religious fanatics with a blade to wet, nor how this has much to do with previous acts of violence in a revolutionary struggle.

I'll happily support violent struggle, as I'll support non-violent ones as well. But ITS is bullshit and by their own admission has little to do within an anarchist (non-authoritarian) tradition and belongs firmly within the authoritarian tradition.

Anonymous

Mon, 07/04/2016 - 12:55

Yeah, students of history know that before the conquistadors showed up, there was already a powerful elite established in the region, spilling blood to please their "gods". I'm not a pacifist either and I've seen my share of death already, literally smelled it. It's nothing but a sobering reality unless you're a sick fuck or a poser. Those are your only two choices.

e

Mon, 07/04/2016 - 13:31

the POV of nihilist eco-extremism is the POV of civilization; i.e. it is rational judgemental in a binary us-versus-them sense. this us-versus-them moral judgement on the part of the nihilist eco-extremist is dressed up as 'instinctive' by the notional 'purposeless' aspect, which is compared to the bee stinging 'instinctively', without thought of winning.

'without thought of winning' is an anthropomorphism that doesn't come into it in the case of nature/the bee. the bee's behaviour is relationally induced rather than rationally directed. it's like the man who tries to fend off a pushy crowd that is encroaching on his pregnant wife and child trapped in a constrained space, or the mother bear fighting off encroachment of others into the space in which her vulnerable cubs are situated. bee, man and bear will 'sting' anything that is encroaching on their vulnerable activity. in this sort of relational-situational dynamic, there is no rational analysis to categorize the encroaching thing, that makes a moral judgement as to whether it is good and one of us or bad and one of them, ... and there is no deliberate plan set up to 'take him out'.

the 'stinging without the motivation to win' does not merit the label 'instinctive'. it is an 'anthropomorphism' that paints a thin, transparent glaze of pseudo-naturalism over the top of the usual rational-judgemental mechanics that have brought, and continue to bring us 'civilization'. nihilist eco-extremists are no way "the Wild Nature that is left, the last of the last.", they are another one of civilization's aberrations.

'instinctive action' may be without a final goal in mind (e.g. in the

sense of natural amor fati), but action without a final goal in mind does not define 'instinctive action' (i.e. in this case it is more in the unnatural sense of odio fati, which comes from the dualist ego-self's reaction to the knowledge that, in life seen as winner-loser competition, he will never be able to win the result he wants so he may as well 'go out' as sore losers do, by throwing a wrench into the works of those who appear to him to be 'winning'))]

P

Mon, 07/04/2016 - 21:42

This is the only interesting critique of ITS/RS that I have ever read. However, it seems to be only a critique of ITS/RS and their specific ideas and actions, and not necessarily all potential "nihilist eco-extremism". If ITS had spent some time studying the situationists, this critique would not apply.

w

Mon, 07/04/2016 - 13:20

They are the product of civilization and of anarchism's general failure to offer an alternative. They are the product of catholic Mexico and of Nietche's deicide. I don't have any criticism beyond the possibility that they suggest that their approach/analysis/tactics should be widespread. In my view every little corner of the world has to respond to our enslavement and the destruction of our habitats in whatever way each area/group/person/clan chooses. I would not join them. I have my own ideas and activities as an anti-civ/post-left person. I could argue point by point with them, but then again I could do that with folks from every tendency. No one sees the whole mountain. Every anarchist who is frightened by their amorality, misanthropy, megalomania, etc., should realize that it won't be in debating with them that they might alter their course. They are not interested in that. Those opposed can only pursue their own internal/external anarchist undertakings with a similar passion, true to oneself, critics be damned, until the necessity or interest in a change of direction and outlook forces one. In this way the total sum of activities and relations within anarchist circles will be altered and perhaps then ITS will be affected somehow.

Anonymous

Mon, 07/04/2016 - 15:50

This entire thread is bs. It's just moving goal posts on ITS just because. People are treating this like an indiscriminate attack. How is stabbing the head of services for the chemistry department for the largest university in Latin America INDISCRIMINATE? You know what chemistry departments do right? You think that guy was innocent fine, then who's guilty? His boss? The department chair? The university rector? The people who fund them? Face it, you're just butthurt that you're never going to carry out your ideal action so all you got is lazy criticism because you think THEY should. Funny thing is if you carried out that action ITS would be the first to applaud, they aren't nearly as sectarian as you think they are. But you're not gonna do shit so their criticism stands.

Anonymous

Mon, 07/04/2016 - 16:58

The indiscriminate thing is a longstanding criticism based on their own rhetoric from earlier attacks. You don't think anyone here is stupid enough to post something like - Stabbing university administrators is where it's at!
Their target selection still seems really bizarre to me but it's discriminate, I'll give you that.

EE

Tue, 07/05/2016 - 12:35

Did Emile Henry wring his hands over who was sitting in Cafe Terminus on 9 December 1893? Did Ravachol give any visible fucks about who was walking by the house of the judge or the prosecutor of the Fourmies defendants (March 11, 1892, March 22, 1892, respectively) when he planted his infernal devices?
"Question two: do you really really O'Really think that anarchists are that stupid, as to be supporting that BULLSHIT? You're dealing with rationalists for the most part here... not some cultist sheep/drones." Both men, and hundreds of others of our terrorist comrades who have bombed, expropriated, shot, assassinated and poisoned have been supported by the anarchist community, globally. And I guess following your logic that Goldman, Berkman, Makhno, Sacco, Vanzetti, Durruti, Ascaso, Kropotkin,

were all just stupid to voice support.

Anonymous

Tue, 07/05/2016 - 10:56

some individual must be identifiably guilty, so we can simply kill him. it can't be the system and our relationships. it can't be what's inside me. can it??

Anonymous

Tue, 07/05/2016 - 00:22

"Judeo-Christian" is an annoying term

Why y'all dragging Judaism into it. You wanna make a point that whatever is like Christianity ("modern anarchism", as said one commenter above), that's chill. But Judaism is kinda not comparable most of the time, at least not without also talking about Islam, in which case y'all should use "Abrahamic".

/pet peeve

Anonymous

Tue, 07/05/2016 - 19:17

The Christians are judaeizing everything. Who do you think Christians are anyway?

sh

Fri, 07/08/2016 - 05:59

What even is "judaizing", dude.

And: Christians are, at this historical moment, a religious group that is actually quite distinct from Jews, despite the fact that the earliest group of people we can reasonably call Christians - like, really really early - can be considered a Jewish sect.

There has been close to two millenia of divergent theological development. Not that there's never been crossover back and forth, but it really isn't enough to constitute the reality of anything "Judeo-Christian". So yeah, this word is, most of the time, just a way to say "Christian" but to clumsily lump Jews into that group as well, erasing difference.

It's annoying.

Anonymous

Wed, 07/06/2016 - 17:36

Definitely aware of all the propaganda-of-the-deed icons (like

Ravachol) and I'm not sure why anyone would suggest that people are critiquing propaganda-of-the-deed out of ignorance of anarchist history.

I'm an unrepentant militant, I've been one of the kids in the black bloc that get fetishized by people like EE and demonized by almost everyone else, many times! I'm not interested in declawing struggle at all, far from it. I think we're actually safer when the power structures consider us to be a moderate threat because it makes them think more carefully about attacking us. I offer all this as context for this simple statement. The ITS approach is a dead-end, just like most passive reformist activism. They're the two extremes of the script that keeps everyone alienated and easy targets for the counterinsurgency forces. The more interesting territory lies in the middle.

Anonymous

Wed, 07/06/2016 - 22:55

The ITS approach is a dead end for who? Themselves or you/ mass movements?

Anonymous

Wed, 07/06/2016 - 23:30

For anyone IMHO. A lack of imagination is on display, just like with activism. Tired script.

Anonymous

Wed, 07/06/2016 - 23:40

Good comparison. As ITS definitely is some kind of activism's evil twin. Or a negative mirror image, if you may prefer. Contrasts are reversed, yet the voids are still full of nothing.

Anonymous

Thu, 07/07/2016 - 07:29

Certainly not for themselves, and maybe not for their supporters. They have found an odd sort of liberation not possible elsewhere, though it's not likely this will spread beyond these people.

In the interest of showcasing not only the formal writings of anarchists, but also the intelligence that happens in dialog, even (or sometimes especially) in dialog with anonymous strangers, anarchistnews.org presents this series: a collection of interesting original pieces, followed by some of the best of the responses to them from commenters on the website.