



Everything has bias.  
The bias of anarchistnews.org is to promote an anarchist culture by providing a non-sectarian source of news and commentary about and of interest to anarchists.

*original publication and author given when available*

## Hommage to Aleppo: What it means to me here

*from The Hamilton Institute*

After four years of autonomy, East Aleppo, the rebellious city, has fallen. As I write this, buses full of evacuated people are arriving in areas controlled by non-Assadist armed groups in the Idlib area, to the south-west, and some ambulances carrying seriously injured people are crossing the border into Turkey. In the past few days, over a hundred thousand people had their homes, already destroyed by months of intensive bombardment, captured by the the Syrian military or (more likely) allied armed groups, such as Hezbollah (1). Some of these people have been killed in the streets, others divided up by sex and sent to internment camps or conscripted into the military to serve as cannon fodder. The others wait, watching as more soldiers arrive and their neighbours be sorted, wondering what's next.

What has been lost in these past few days, for those of us not directly touched by the violence? As I hide in the bathroom at work and flip through images of people burning their cars and furniture so that the army can't loot it, what does it mean to me that Eastern Aleppo has been captured? These are some thoughts and reflections I have, as I watch the Aleppo revolutionaries be

be crushed, about the importance of this moment and what we, as anarchists based in Western countries, might learn from it. (2)

What does revolution mean? Is it still desirable?

The story of revolutionary Eastern Aleppo raises many questions for anyone who finds themselves in struggle against systems of domination such as capitalism and the state, the first being the desirability or possibility of revolution as it's traditionally understood. Already in Spain in the 30s with Germany's intervention, or even in the Paris commune sixty-five years earlier, we've seen the limitations of a revolutionary population finding itself in armed conflict with the state — with modern weapons of war, the state simply withdraws from the territory, destroys it from outside, then deals out victors justice among the ruins. Many of us call ourselves revolutionaries, but is a revolution like the one in Aleppo even desirable? There is no easy answer to this question and I won't try to offer you one.

As described by Aleppan anarchists in the Hourriya editions text, Revolutionary Echos of Syria, (as well as in other accounts) the armed liberation of Eastern Aleppo came as a surprise to many of the

selected stories from [anarchistnews.org](http://anarchistnews.org)

# Digest of the Anarchist Tubes

compiled from December 2016

volume 3, #2

# ATUBES

people most active in organizing demonstrations there in. This reduced the less-armed activists (who often had more liberatory political projects) to the role of aid workers, as well as trying to build a popular counter-power that could impose some level of control over the increasingly fragmented armed groups. These radicals suddenly found themselves in a completely novel situation that they struggled to engage with, to build a popular counter-power that could impose some level of control over the armed groups.

We often dream of the moment when our tactics will generalize to a point that we are overtaken by the pace and scale of events, like what Greek anarchists experienced in 2008. But in Aleppo, it was different — the shift to armed struggle represented a fundamental break in the tactical and strategic priorities of anarchists and other autonomously-minded people, rather than a precipitous escalation of them. Many ideas of revolution imagine some sort of escalation of conflict towards armed, territorial struggle against the state, but in Aleppo, this armed struggle became the motor for counter-revolution. What does this mean for our romantic visions of defending the barricades?

Read more: <https://tinyurl.com/h4lxvq4>  
plus two comments on txt on back two pages

## **Not My President!** **By Wayne Price, from** **Anarkismo**

*The New Resistance*

In demonstrations across the United States, protestors have raised signs saying, “Not My President!” Obviously they are not denying that state machinery has given Donald J. Trump the position of head of state and commander-in-chief of the armed forces, ruler of the mightiest and wealthiest state in the world. What they are denying is Trump’s legitimacy for the position, his moral right to claim the presidency.

Under the capitalist system, electoral democracy serves several purposes. One is that it permits factions of the ruling capitalist elite to struggle over their different programs (based on differing interests) and to make final decisions—without civil wars or establishing a dictatorship (both of which can be costly).

Another major purpose of capitalist democracy is that it fools the people into thinking that they run the country. It lets them think that they are free people, not subjects of a very rich minority. It distracts them from the fact that the day after an election, most adults go to work (those who have jobs) and take orders from unelected bosses. This goal requires that they see the government as legitimately representing the voters.

That became an issue even before the end of the campaign. Expecting to lose, Trump insisted that the election was “rigged.” He refused to say whether he would accept the results if he lost. Politicians and pundits, Democrats and Republicans, were aghast! They

cried that it was contrary to the whole system to not accept the election results. It was essential to peacefully hand over power. They reminded us how George W. Bush had lost the popular vote to Al Gore, but that the Supreme Court majority had given the election to Bush—and that Gore, as a loyal supporter of the system, had not fought it. Even earlier, Richard Nixon believed that he had lost to John F. Kennedy only because (Nixon told close friends) the Daley machine in Chicago had fraudulently overcounted votes for Kennedy. But Nixon did not make a fuss. That was supposedly the American way!

### **The Rigging of the 2016 U.S. Election**

The most obvious aspect of the unfairness of the 2016 election results is that Hillary Clinton won the popular vote. She won almost 3 million more votes than Trump. Due to the distribution of the votes, however, she lost in the archaic Electoral College. In the 18th century, this was originally created to be a buffer between the voters and the election of the president, to be a compromise between large and small states, and to strengthen the power of the slaveholders. The distorting influence of the Electoral College is increased by the “winner take all” rules of almost every state, so that Democrats in Texas and Republicans in New York might as well stay home. No other capitalist democracy has such an indirect system; in all others, the “popular vote” is just the “vote.” Despite its obvious injustices, the establishment has never made an effort to alter or abolish the Electoral College.

*Read more: <https://tinyurl.com/zgta88e>*

a comment:

*Wayne said on 12/19/2016:*

### **A Serious Question**

Generally I do not respond to comments which themselves are not related to my essay, especially on Anarchistnews. (And I never understand Emile anyway.) But Professor Rat raises an interesting point. In the split in the First International, between Marx and the followers of Bakunin, there were a lot of issues which are unimportant a century and a half later. But there was one key issue which lasted. Marx sought to turn all the branches of the International into workers' political parties to run in elections, and the anarchists opposed this. In my opinion (as almost all anarchists), historical experience shows who got it right.

The professor notes that Marxism is supposed to be a system of total explanation. The economics with the politics with the philosophy etc. A total class view. This was indeed Marx's conception (in the footsteps of Hegel.) However, anarchism is a much looser conception. So Bakunin could disagree with Marx's electoralism as well as his centralism and statism, while still accepting Marx's political economy. And so do I. Similarly it is possible for anarchism to learn from radical feminism, Queer theory, Black nationalism, ecology, radical psychoanalysis, or whatever--accepting aspects and rejecting other aspects--=creating a better overall anarchism. Anyway, that is my perspective.

and an unrelated silly comment:

*Anonymous said on 12/20/2016:*

"We don't comment on serious news. Don't disrupt the tradition please."

## **When Christmas starts, anarchy ends...**

*From contra info / translation*

### **Politics begin where anarchist ethics end**

It was only a few years ago, on December 13th, 2013, when some hooded ones burned the Christmas tree located on Avenida Reforma[1]. This action took place during manifestations against subway ticket hikes, that tragically ended between the reform and recuperation by NGO's and governmental agencies of social welfare; however at the same time these occasions witnessed spontaneous actions, autonomous organization and sabotage from the oppressed and exploited. After this symbolic anti-capitalist act, one friend still remains in prison accused of setting the Christmas tree sponsored by Coca-Cola on fire. The -symbolic- burning of the tree from Coca-Cola, wasn't just meant as an attack against the symbol of North American[2] capitalism, but also as an attack against the culture of consumerism, an attack against religious traditions imposed by those who believe they're the owners of the world, an attack on patriarchy, against power and all religious and moral authority.

The State in an obvious communion with the aberrant moral ideologies imposed by the Catholic Church, or by Christianity, responsible for keeping alive religious-patriarchal traditions of the family, that are a piece of the puzzle of domination, that fit perfectly within capitalism and consumerism, turning itself into a product to be sold. In the Germanic language, Weihnachten[3] or Christmas Eve means a night of blessing, is an instrument of domination and social

control, that functions like an instrument of subjection by means of the concession to the State and Capital, while giving the exploited "freedom" to consume, at the coast of their own exploitation. Christmas is also an instrument of force today in moral submission that continues to perpetuate the idea of a patriarchal family (or matriarchal as it might be) and brings a little bit of social peace and comfort the mass tormented by the horrors of the State and Capital. It is a glutinous party of total consumption, a day of neighborhood gatherings, a day of hypocrisy, a day of falsehood, a feast for capital. Capitalism and the Church are those who celebrate when the "anarchists" lose their ethics and principals, fulfilling traditions that have been established at the expense of blood, death, feminicide, and the exploitation of animals and nature.

Today, there is the almost mythical manifesto of the anarchist Bakunin entitled, God and the State,[4] which has been one of the most important books for the development of anarchist thought that is unfortunately being overtaken by the Christian-pacifist doctrine of Lev Nikilayevich Tolstoy[5] -in an assertion according to millenarian anarchists-. This millenarian pollution has plagued anarchism by the presence of this person who was never fully vanquished, and in these times and places when the perspective of conflict has started to be revived from the ruins, to be seen and put into practice; it also also been revived and exists among us.

A libertarian Christmas party is simply the reflection of this aberrant religious pollution and deviation from an anarchist ethic that

seeks the destruction of all power and authority. It is evident today that the many efforts of "good thinking" aim to bury the insurrectionary perspective, we now know that insurrectionary thought was not born a few years ago from the theses of Alredo Bonanno and so many other friends, but the perspective of attack, of conflict, and the permanent insurrection has been and still is present, even with multiple strains. This effort to supplant ideas and practices focused on the destruction of the State and power, by the followers of the absurd anarcho-Christianity, are simply and always will be ill-defined

### **and a comment on txt:**

*from rbs on 12/25/2016:*

Organizing the masses against various forms of life that "the church" supports strikes me as a war against common people, akin to attacking workers for failing to avoid complicity in the reality of capitalism. Why is one good and the other heinous? Are priests like bosses or workers? If like bosses, how? What of monastic priests that want nothing to do with civilization, the state, property, and capitalism? What about franciscans? Organized political religion is fucked, granted; but the messianic moment against law speaks to a form of life quite consistent with cynicism and anti-materialism. The early church lived in opposition to the state...

### **and some christmas cheer:**

*from SamFantoSamotnaf on 12/25/2016:*

<http://dialectical-delinquents.com/christmas-cheer/>

## Issue #9 Avalanche editorial

*From Avalanche*

Internationalism is the perspective that tries to get rid of the imposed concepts of borders and states, since the struggle and the solidarity of the enemies of all domination has to be carried beyond all barriers and borders of power. Internationalism means considering the international dimension of local incidents and processes as well as it means the internationalist dimension of the anarchist idea - that of a liberating perspective for each human being no matter in what place, no matter where she comes from. Since in this world liberation has always something to do with destruction, the ground on which we can get to know each other and discuss and meet far away from identities and cliches, from masks and shame, is also the ground on which we tell about our struggles, about struggling for freedom and about the destruction of our oppression. Where we talk about how we try to express our hostility against all domination in practical terms and dynamics.

The idea of this publication is to gather different contributions in which the authors speak from their own perspective and viewpoint about struggles and developments taking place where they live, thus making it possible for an internationalist readership to comprehend them. Avalanche is at the same time an attempt to stimulate a reciprocally feeding discourse and to be a frame for eventually developing correspondences. Correspondence in the sense of the idea and possibility to take up questions and

perspectives of other contributions and spin and carry them further in direction of the own reality or criticizing and questioning them. Like this can arise potentially a stimulus, an intensification of perspective and a clarifying of ideas. But this is although a big challenge, because it needs the active participation of different comrades. Maybe exactly this is fundamental for internationalism: Relationships don't just come to life where one is pleasing and consuming each other, and one still stays separated through distances, no, but rather where one is challenging each other - and one is confronting oneself with the challenge of coming together to deal with each other, to honestly and directly express the proper ideas, proposals and critiques.

In this sense we want to confront ourselves with the reality of the internationalist relationships and see, from whom contributions - so new texts or already published texts with a short introduction - are getting sent, and with whom it is possible to discuss about possible contributions - also interviews - instead of artificially constructing a participation by publishing articles from other publications or the internet. And for sure it is more likely possible on the basis of real relationships to ask and dig deeper for contributions to this project. Maybe this digging deeper for something is an important aspect that gets lost in many ways in the world of the internet. A digging in direction of "what's happening at the moment? Where do we want to go? And how and on what ways?" Fundamental questions that should be at the beginning of any project

and affinitarian relationship, and with which one is confronted again and again. And exactly 'cause these question are something basically individual, the "answering" of this questions can be done by nobody but ourselves. Those that are really in place and involved in the struggles can probably say and reflect best what's going on and where they want to go. The role of those who think they can explain everything to others or recuperate struggles for themselves, opens the door for ideologization and delegation. A relationship cannot be developed on the basis of prefabricated frames of explanation and a prejudged perception, on the abstraction of concrete realities and the objectification of individuals, but only where everybody speaks for oneself. This is the basis where we imagine this project and the basis on which we call all those, that feel affinity to this project, to contribute to it.

*Read more: <https://tinyurl.com/hcldmwz>*



### **and a random comment :**

*from radhominem on 12/26/2016 on txt  
turkish anarchist editor jailed:*

According to your arbitrary standards \_\_\_\_, which people have endlessly critiqued. The only real issue is people like you and \_\_\_\_ always speaking in absolutes.

## Black and Green #4

Opening Editorial

Unrelenting heat.

That feels like the summation of the world right now: like being in a boiling cauldron and the temperature just keeps escalating.

I'm talking about the climate. I'm talking about society. I'm talking about politics. I'm talking about the economy. I'm talking about ecology. Every facet of the world we face feels like it is on fire. This is literally the case as record-setting wildfires overtake chunks of the map and as constant bombing campaigns continue to devastate others. 2015 was the hottest year on record and 2016 is on track to surpass it.

This is the future unfolding before us: the consequences of industrialized growth and technologized expansion extrapolating the caustic downfall of a globalized civilization. And that is the overwhelming feeling you get every day when you wake up and open your computer or turn on your devices, opening yourself to the flood of seething anger and impotence.

But we do it.

We carry on. We get lost in the sea of reactionary reiterations. We fall into the crushing waves of the mutual assured destruction of our own empathy. We are willing to accept the destruction so long as we are right.

Why? How are we able to do this?

How do we simultaneously bask in the endless cycles of perpetual call-and-response of social media and ignore the world as it becomes only further engulfed in catastrophic and systemic destruction?

We do this because we shut off. The atrocities of civilization are simply too much for our regionally based hunter-gatherer minds to comprehend. This is existence with implications that we were never psychologically prepared for because neither we nor any other being is physically capable of causing them. Not without technology.

This is beyond our realm as empathetic beings, so we stop our minds from going there. This is our mind in survival mode: solely able to address the immediate fight-or-flight impulse, redirected through technological intrusion. We double down. We embody the ethos of accepting reality as it is and fragmenting our experience of life into individual issues. We plant ourselves and we defend that position until the next thing comes along.

We define ourselves by our own acts of active defeatism. We immerse ourselves in the immediacy of technology so we no longer have to keep the totality in our minds. We are just reacting.

Meanwhile, the predictions for the earth are dire. The potential for human extinction looms heavily underneath a perpetual loss of ecosystems and species. The thresholds once considered tipping points for endemic climate shifts are being surpassed.

If we start to unplug, we can see it, but it is no less overwhelming. The New York Times recently released a site that charts the high and low temperatures of 2015 by city against what has been considered the baseline temperatures for each place based on 160-year-old data.

*Read more <https://tinyurl.com/zou94b7>*

## a comment on Aleppo txt & 2012 student strikes:

Anonymous writes on 12/20/2016:

I can see that you're one of the last few people who care about building an understanding of the "Printemps Érablé" instead of having accepted its mind-warped authoritarian Hollywood ending, and more importantly the Summer debacle. And I always respect the inherently-antiauthoritarian behavior of trying to back-analyze history like a... chess game.

I guess this does provide with a sort of analysis model that CAN be applied potentially to the Syrian civil war... of how anarchist tendencies will help out greater mass movements subjected to statist hierarchies just before they end up being fucked by these (or maybe not so much). At least for the angle of insurgencies being turned into false oppositions by several affluent authoritarian organizations/agencies, in the absence of a consistent and live critique of those coming from the anarchist elements, or one that succeeds in cracking through the dominant discourse. You can look at the recent Black miners insurgencies in South Africa that revealed how blasting the established unions in the same shuffle as resisting the big capitalist parasites can be incredibly efficient. But in 2012 just like apparently in most of the Syrian rebellion, you didn't had such a sharp rejection of established statist forms (religion wasn't rejected by the most well-known rebel groups, just as reliance on the more "radical" union back in Quebec 2012... while those are two completely different political forms under even more different contexts, the "insurgents" have maintained a similar unmovable relation of dependency to these,

where the latter ended up defining the dominant discourse and the end game).

Looking at both from the perspective of authoritarian manipulators and their interests -not their respective propaganda- kinda makes things way easier to understand. There was nothing novel with the student politics of 2012... the only thing novel was the generational conflict, that got way more intense than during previous strikes. In other words this was just another class struggle of upward mobility, as one big new generation -the Millennials (i.e. yours)- went on to move upwards in the socio-politico-cultural ladder, filling up positions in the Larger State machine, insuring themselves a "better future" in society, thus ensuring society's future at the same time. Win-win deals are big these days.

So you got this huge political hot air being generated for months, where an illusion of power was created down the street level as a counter-balance to the illusion of the established power, gone way out of balance pre-Summer 2012.

This paved the way for the creation of a new somewhat grassroots-based capital, mainly of the arts and culture as diffused institutions which relate to the "hard" elitist established institution, where "art" is more than ever a social device of capital production. Tons of anarchoid collectives and projects in this artsy-fartsy town fell for it, without knowing they were actually just being better servants/worshippers/priests/workers of this Spectacle industry.

So, nothing really new here... just the major intensification of a

social trend that's been there already, since the day Malcolm McLaren went into doing street fashion, early '70s, BOTH in revolutionary support and reactionary countering of what his Situationist buddies created as a movement.

#### **Another comment on Aleppo:**

Anonymous writes 12/18/2016:

Hey smoke, hey anon,

I can see why things that happen on the other side of the planet might not feel important. But so many of the most inspiring moments of anarchist uprising involved people from lots of different places converging. Definitely this one has been harder because it is a lot further away than Spain or France and because fewer anarchists speak Arabic or other regional languages. As well, for your image of defending barricades in North America, one of the goals of this article is to challenge that kind of thinking -- Aleppo threw up way better barricades than you're ever going to, but it didn't necessarily produce a liberatory situation.

For what the heck material solidarity means, yeah, that's tricky. Especially for folks outside of Rojava, where there was no trustworthy central body (fuck the opposition in exile) to co-ordinate distribution of money, it was hard to get money to the right people. But then again, some Syrian anarchists compiled lists of organizations they considered trustworthy and that support grassroots work, usually of a charitable nature though. And by the time the Syrian conflict reached the point where it was dominated by war, it was probably already too late to organize any sort of international contingent to rebel-held areas -- though the international contingents organized by the regime were huge

propaganda coups, and the presence of internationals in Rojava has also been important.

Maybe it's just a tragedy. But I do think if we started working on it now, three years from now, we could be in a better position to offer some kind of material solidarity. I would say the biggest barrier to that is the confusion -- are the anarchistic currents outside Rojava? Or is everyone just an islamic terrorist? We didn't do much to educate ourselves, let alone each other, about the revolution and got swamped by mainstream media and the pro-fascist left, which produced a lot of confusion. That's where things like anarchist presence at demos and discussions could actually make a difference, because raising the political consciousness of folks around Syria is probably a precondition for being creative enough to offer meaningful support.



**About ATUBES** ATUBES is a sporadically produced digest of some of the articles and commentary featured on anarchistnews.org, illustrating some of the breadth of anarchist thinking

<https://anarchistnews.org/>