

ZÜNDLAPPEN

Anarchist Journal from Nowhere – English Compilation

SUMMER 2022

3 **Targets that do not Exist Anywhere Else**

8 **On Speculation**

13 **A Book to Slay White Supremacy**

26 **In Pursuit of the Invisible**

31 **Anarchy in the Mirror World?**

34 **On Communiqués**



ON COMMUNIQUÉS

The question of claims and communiqués has been and still is heavily discussed. In our opinion, in the German-speaking world, communiqués are written far too often and, above all, far too elaborately on attacks that are either self-explanatory or could be explained in just a few lines. As editors of a newspaper, in which we naturally also want to present various attacks on authority that we feel affinity with, we are faced with the problem that, on the one hand, we respect the decision of those who attack who write communiqués and want to reproduce them as unabridged as possible, but on the other hand, we do not want to contribute to the dynamic that attacks which are not accompanied by communiqués are drowned out simply by the space they take up in comparison to long communiqués. We have therefore opted for a very pragmatic solution: the longer a communiqué, the smaller the font size in which we print it, without any consideration for readability in the case of doubt. Of course, there may always be exceptions, because of course there may be communiqués that seem necessary to explain the context and motivations of an attack. However, it is probably fair to say that this only applies to an absolute minority of cases.

Of course, we will not report on attacks that are claimed in ways that seem incompatible with our ideas, despite basic affinity.

And while we're on the subject, we'd also like to briefly mention the dangers that we believe are inherent in writing communiqués:

- With the help of stylometric studies, the BKA is working on matching communiqués, as well as other texts of certain milieus, in order to get clues about crimes, as well as perpetrators.
- It is extremely difficult to avoid any traces when publishing communiqués, be it in the classical form on paper or on the Internet. Even if communiqués are written in a non-persistent form (e.g. using Tails) and published using anonymization software (e.g. Tor), there are a number of factors to consider that can still lead to the capture of perpetrators.
- Even if the publication of a communiqué has worked out so far, it has happened in the past that people were observed during this activity and even if the cops did not see what exactly they were doing on their computer, they were still able to attribute this activity to them afterwards.

TARGETS THAT DO NOT EXIST ANY WHERE ELSE

A counter-proposal to *targets that exist everywhere*, and another critique of the militarization of the anarchist attack

Who would've thought? You would like to finally achieve something, would like to finally kick off the social revolution with your own actions. So you go out at night, alone, in pairs or with a whole gang of accomplices... and when you wake up the next morning, you realize that once again it was only the big shot's or yuppie neighbor's car that you've messed with, and that the visible traces of the deed have already been swept up by the city's cleaning service. Maybe you even meet the neighbor himself, who greets you joyfully from the open second or third convertible before he sets off to buy a new, fancier car. Well, it is perhaps less frequent that the big shot neighbor's car gets got and if so, then it nevertheless usually gives substantially more cause for satisfaction, because the city cleaning up a charred car wreck is nevertheless somewhat more overtaxed and even the richest elites nevertheless are a bit annoyed, yes sometimes even a bit fearful that someone set fire to her car. Most of the time it is rather the cars of some big corporations that are globally or locally involved in gentrification, prison construction, war, camps, border and the deportation industry and sometimes also in the expansion of the smart, technological prison in which we all find ourselves. And of course my heart also leaps for joy whenever I spy a burned out, flattened, painted or otherwise demolished vehicle of this kind on the side of the road, even when I read about it in an anarchist newspaper/brochure from a place near or far, and sometimes even when I learn of such an event in the not-yet-entirely-irrelevant expanses of the Internet. And yet: when I hear the proposal to "cross the threshold from symbolic resistance to material damage to the enemy infrastructure" and this expression of will is backed up in this context by listing arson attacks mainly against vehicles of corresponding companies as examples of a practical expression of this proposal (to be found in the brochure "Targets that exist everywhere - a strategic proposal for building a common front against the profiteers of war and repression"), then considerable doubts creep over me as to what extent the declared goal can be achieved in this way at all.

In fact, I have often wondered to what extent certain recurring targets of attack - and these certainly include the company vehicles of the various firms that are identified as existing everywhere - do not rather contribute to ritualizing the attacks on domination, i.e. above all, to make them a symbolic act that, while perhaps expressing a certain anger, opposition, etc. in a relatively irreconcilable way, is far from causing material damage of any significance and so also becomes, to a certain extent, calculable, predictable, offsetable. This does not mean that such an attack has no value. It can restore one's agency or, perhaps just another name for it, one's dignity, it can encourage others, it can intimidate, unsettle and make the right people think. It can make both the oppressed and the rulers realize that acts of aggression are always possible, no matter how controlled and ordered a particular

space may be, and it can be an act of satisfaction, of revenge. All of this has its value, all of this can even ignite or incite a gigantic potential in certain situations that can result in uprisings and revolts, even if this can very rarely be predicted. And yet, a burning van belonging to a prison construction company, a logistics company, a car dealership, a technology company, etc., however much it may be a symbol of certain struggles, is only rarely more than that, is only rarely capable of disrupting processes so significantly, of hitting the infrastructure so violently, that it would or even could create a moment of departure worth mentioning, that the logistics of rule would be disrupted decisively enough, production sites would come to a standstill, construction sites would stop running, and supplies to the front lines of war and repression would fail to arrive. This much realism is necessary if one does not want to lose oneself in a self-referential, ideologized and ritualized practice.

Where is the creativity in identifying worthwhile targets, one wonders, flipping through the pages of the "Targets that exist everywhere" brochure? The answer seems to be provided by an otherwise unremarkable note at the beginning of the proposal: "It should not be enough for us [...] to search each time anew for suitable solidarity actions, but we propose to collect information about the enemies of freedom and to disseminate it in such a way that they become known everywhere." But why shouldn't we always reconsider where to start our attacks? Simply attacking more and more of the same targets, with the same methods, seems to me to be a quantitative argument that also ignores the fact that this is - even if the authors of the brochure seem to overlook this - a strategy that has been reproduced persistently and relatively comprehensively over the past decades, which would be difficult to increase quantitatively anyway and which, moreover, has not really led to the collapse of domination as of yet. The fact that companies avoid certain regions because they are attacked there may seem like a success at first glance (and it is, just not in an absolute sense), but it also means that these companies set up their locations elsewhere, where they remain relatively unbothered. This has only moderately harmed power itself, even in the regions that were originally avoided. It is not my intention to minimize the successes of this strategy(s), only to object that such a strategy takes the place of the actual goal it is intended to achieve. Although, for example, DB Schenker trucks repeatedly go up in flames, the company continues to successfully transport armaments and other products. If only more of these trucks would burn, some people might revel and wait for others to join the campaign. Another might go out and look at the freight tracks as they run all over Europe, try out here and there what effect fire has on signaling systems and switches, think of ways to block tracks, cut cables, etc., while someone else might figure out how to identify the group's deliveries that are relevant to the arms industry and then specifically make them harmless. A third person who lives in a region where DB Schenker has its trucks serviced, on the other hand, might have figured out how to sabotage that one factory gate so that the trucks can't drive out of the workshop parking lot again for a day after they've been serviced. Superglue in the lock might have accomplished what butyric acid in building ventilation might have done elsewhere: shut down production site and workshops for an hour, a day or more.

potential companions no longer even notice what takes place beyond the cybernetic network, while we ourselves - not that we want to change anything about it - only ever learn about their discussions there from the stories of those who enthusiastically scour the Internet in the (desperate) search for other anarchists.

So if today, as in the future, we will not completely avoid the Internet, it is only because we hope to find a companion or two in this technological minefield or to be found by them. But for us it is unmistakably clear: anarchy remains something real, anarchy cannot be digitalized and certainly not virtualized.

That's why the Zündlappen, with the exception of this issue, is only available in print. Passed from hand to hand, from comrade to comrade, and sometimes perhaps even via the mailman. However, we will also publish individual articles on a blog, if we think that they fit into the discussions that we track down in the depths of the cybernetic network. Because who knows, sometimes some of the greatest tensions towards revolt arise from the unexpected ...

insults, but people do not have to look each other in the eye, nor do they have the opportunity to express their emotions through *more solid arguments*. A world that may once have been a mirror of the other, but which has now developed a life of its own, has separated itself from its material substrate in many ways, and in which there is nevertheless lively discussion even of anarchist positions. Although there have been many attempts to blur the boundaries that separate one world from the other, and some projects have certainly had some success in doing so, discussions increasingly remain within their respective spheres. This may be out of convenience - or because there is more separating us than might sometimes appear. Whether there may have been, are or will be moments of departure from a debate on the Internet that lead to something real, is certainly not something we can judge conclusively from our point of view, but we have considerable doubts about it.

At the same time, the recent past has undoubtedly confirmed what has always been certain somewhere: using the Internet to spread ideas opens up many new possibilities for the various forms of repression. Because everyone, not least regardless of their own location, can indiscriminately access what is published there, from the anarchist to the pig, from the leftist to the right-wing enemy, from the journalist to the amateur detective, from the undercover to the social justice warrior, and all of this without even having to muster the courage to set foot over the threshold of one of those rooms in which one encounters genuine anarchists. The texts published on the Internet can also be analyzed, classified, evaluated and subsequently defamed, persecuted, (apparently) assigned to distinct milieus and people, etc. much more easily, while at the same time the inhibition thresholds seem to decrease to voice groundless accusations or even denunciation in the form of (only supposedly informed) speculations or information gained from the gossip of certain subcultures, which is still increasing on the Internet, or these inhibition thresholds never existed with all the people reached on the Internet to begin with. But even if these clearly negative aspects of the shift of anarchist discussion to the net certainly play a role, if we have lost interest, these considerations will not be pursued here any further.

In any case, we have considerable doubts that the cybernetic network can be used for our goals, namely to intensify the struggle against domination and, in doing so, to establish relationships that strengthen us in this and allow us to catch each other in those moments when our own strength leaves us. Yes, even to the development of our analyses the discussions of the Internet have contributed little in all these years. It is not our world that flickers through the fiber optic cables and we therefore have little interest in letting our ideas degenerate into a dull flicker at the end of the line.

And yet: Reality is ... digital? Cybernetic? No, not yet. We still meet real people and not just robots and drones when we distribute our ideas as newspapers and flyers on the streets of the cities, some people still look up from their smartphones when we paste up posters and pause for a moment to read what is written there, and we still do not conduct discussions exclusively in the circle of the few remaining anti-technology holdouts. But if we want to remain realistic, it is also true that many

Naturally, these are only a few, very roughly elaborated ideas that I can and will present here, but I think that one thing should become clear: the creative potential of a few individuals, who work towards a common goal and do not commit themselves to a methodology determined in advance and according to some 'rad' criteria, can have a much more effective influence than the call of those "blatant" super arsonists, measured according to the same criteria, who desperately hope that more and more people will imitate a method practiced by them and elevated to an ideal, because it alone is effective in their terms. [1] Of course, there is nothing wrong with collecting knowledge, communicating knowledge about supply chains, weak points, methods and more. But it's not like you always have to write a communiqué for that... Even without such communiqués, inspiration can be drawn from the attacks against the infrastructure of domination documented in both anarchist newspapers and on various blogs on the internet, indeed even without communiqués, attacks and struggles relate to each other in what they choose as their target, how and when they are carried out, etc., etc.

Targets that exist everywhere... Well, sure, it's handy to torch a few vehicles of the technology multinationals and the profiteers of jail and war in your own neighborhood, where they stand around unguarded. And I certainly don't want to advocate not doing that. But when we talk about how we can move from symbolic attacks to a practice of inflicting material harm on our enemy, it seems to me that these ubiquitous targets pretty much embody the opposite: aren't they symbolic interventions? The difference between material damage and symbolic intervention, after all, is not usually the amount of damage caused. Even if there are exceptions, of course. Rather, the question is whether an attack succeeds in paralyzing authority for a while. And in this, the approach of targets existing everywhere must ultimately fail... at least if it is assumed that it will not be reproduced en masse - which experience shows beyond doubt. Because with the vehicles of a handful of companies, we are primarily targeting individual technicians in the logistics of these companies, who are also often only slightly restricted in their mobility - because a replacement car can be found quickly today, at least if it needs to be. Even the few materials and tools stored in the vehicles can usually be replaced quickly. There may be exceptions here, of course, such as when elaborately equipped special vehicles are hit or construction equipment such as excavators, cranes, etc., where replacements cannot simply be ordered from the nearest car rental company but must first be brought in, but even though this equipment may also be widely available, we are already moving away from the ubiquitous targets here, at least in terms of approach, because it is precisely the non-omnipresence of these targets that is being exploited here. To be fair: the brochure "Targets that exist everywhere" does not lack such examples. For example, the attack on a crane at the construction site of the planned Amazon logistics center in Achim near Bremen is listed, as is the attack on the entire construction vehicle fleet of the Eurovia group in Limoges, as well as several other attacks on fleets of vehicles that are difficult to replace. And yet, it seems to be mainly a collection of individual vehicle arsons, precisely "targets existing everywhere" that the brochure presents and wants to suggest to us.

But what if the motto were reversed for once? How would it be if, instead of targets that exist everywhere, targets that exist nowhere else were brought into focus for once? Because domination penetrates the space neither evenly, nor uniformly. Each of its infrastructures has nodes that are of particular centrality, while some territories are more strongly marked by this infrastructure and others by that. Globally, for example, the high-tech metropolises, with their research, financial, armaments, and high-tech production infrastructures, can be distinguished from the more extractivist and agriculturally exploited periphery. And even within the capitalist metropolitan regions, of which the "Everywhere Targets" seem to be primarily concerned, a closer look reveals quite different infrastructural emphases. While one region is characterized by lignite mining and the energy generated from it, elsewhere the high-tech computer industry sits above all, and still elsewhere the biotechnology industry has pitched its tents, while the automotive industry and chemical corporations have for almost an entire century organized entire cities and regions according to their needs, port cities form important commercial metropolises, and sometimes individual military sites and even individual radio masts are of international (military) importance. In the midst of this network, very different and often unique points of attack can be identified, which are capable of inflicting much more material damage on domination than perhaps the arson of vehicles with the same logos on them over and over again. It may take some effort to identify them, sometimes they may be better protected, sometimes perhaps worse, than the targets that exist everywhere, and one may be forced to give free rein to individual creativity in identifying and destroying these targets. Nonetheless, or precisely because of this, I think that these targets may provide the more interesting starting point in the struggle against domination. Not least because they are ultimately also based on a more precise analysis of how domination works than the abstract specter of global corporations, police forces, and armies that seem to be equally latent everywhere.

Finally, the pamphlet "Targets that exist everywhere", ends with a call for the formation of a "Network of Revolutionary Violence", another proposal to abandon any individuality of the anarchist attack and to gather humorlessly, grimly and with self-discipline under the banner of yet another revolutionary organization, the "Direct Action Cells". In other words, once again the proposal to militarize the anarchist attack.

It is difficult for me to recognize such proposals, especially when they are introduced so bluntly with quotes from authoritarian organizations - whose model they follow, after all - as anti-authoritarian at all. And I can't help but recognize in this proposal just that grimness which I also believe to recognize in the undoubtedly quantitative attempt of the targets existing everywhere. Because this proposal can only be successful if the masses join it, one finally falls into an vanguardist position, from which a large part of one's energy is wasted on telling others what they should do and, if they do not do this - or not in the required way - denying them the seriousness of their anarchist ideas. Because you have decided to bang your head against the wall, to give up your own individuality, the uniqueness of your own

ANARCHY IN THE MIRROR WORLD?

Why the internet as a "place" for anarchist debate is of only moderate interest to *Zündlappen*, and what we focus on when we participate in the debates that take place there

much more fruitful discussions that we have face to face, Internet exchanges can hardly be expected to produce tensions, affinities, as well as enmities - the latter perhaps already in the form of a very outlandish *social media gossip*, that these discussions would somehow further one's own analysis, or that they would at least be fun. And although the Internet is said to bring people from all over the world into exchange with each other, it is striking - and who is really surprised? - that the few relationships that ultimately found their beginnings mediated by the Internet could just as easily have been initiated in the real world, because they had already run into each other here and there without realizing it.

At the same time, however, we can note that in the depths of the Internet, often in those depths that few of us has ever penetrated, one or the other exciting discussions seem to take place, even for *those less progressive stiffs among us who are fundamentally hostile to technology*, which revolve around the same or very similar topics that also occupy us. What is interesting is that these discussions often take place in complete ignorance of each other. Sometimes translations of texts that were translated years or decades ago but can hardly be found anywhere except in the very real anarchist archives emerge on the Internet, sometimes even translations of texts that are still actively distributed in print emerge. But even if the tendency outlined here, namely that the Internet and the discussions taking place on it are mainly ignorant of the discussions outside of it, which seems to me to be quite dominant, there is conversely also an ignorance of what is published and discussed on the Internet all the livelong day and what will never reach the printing presses except for the isolated printouts of those *weirdos* who consult the Internet but do not read texts on screens. In short, there are two worlds. One in which people meet face to face, in which newspapers, brochures and books pass from hand to hand, in which posters are pasted and graffiti is painted, in which people insult each other, and in which - and one should not underestimate this aspect - you must look your counterpart in the eye, just as you can make use of other means of communication instead of words or in addition to them. And a world in which texts, images and videos reach their readers and viewers primarily algorithmically, in which everything is always potentially available at the same time and therefore the impression quickly arises that you know everything, one in which many things are expressed in memes and slogans, in which actions exist only in the form of their image, in which there are

To varying degrees and from different points of view, we have participated in anarchist debates that have taken place on the Internet in recent years, observing them and relating our experiences through this kind of discussion. In the process, the question of meaning arose again and again for us, because contrary to the often

well as in the suburbs of Khartoum, among the Indian rural population, and the deadly high-tech raw material mines of the war-torn Congolese territory, but especially in the Mapuche areas of Chile, the land (re)occupations on the territory of the Canadian state, in the French colonies, and everywhere else where indigenous people resist the continued colonization of their land and the (cultural) genocide perpetrated against them. Whether by sealing off Europe's external borders with drones, barbed wire, and 'push-backs', or by establishing cybernetic social credit systems modeled on China's that set up checkpoints far inland, the relative stability in metropolitan areas is becoming increasingly independent of the unstable periphery. Would nuclear bombs be dropped on cities if only there were a suitable occasion? Perhaps. More likely, however, I think, is that in the future we may have to increasingly deal with out-of-control, lawless and warlordistic peripheries whose populations nonetheless continue to mine for raw materials or even toil in factories [1] in order to exchange the results of their labor for the breadcrumbs that are thrown at them from the stable metropolises at gunpoint.

Revolts breaking out in the periphery are one thing, but whoever wants to encounter the rulers who will try to manage these revolts will have to go to the metropolises sooner or later, they'll have to cut off the supplies to the fronts and find a way to sabotage the highly equipped, overpowering, technological war machine that keeps the revolts away from the many centers of power. Those who are already in the centers of power today, who can (still) move around the metropolises, could be tasked with pushing open the gates and letting the *barbarians* into the city. In concrete terms, this may mean attacking and paralyzing the logistics of domination. The experience that, when in doubt, bombs are simply dropped on cities where control slips away from domination teaches us a lesson in solidarity with the uprisings in the periphery. The overpowering high-tech war apparatus must be confronted where we do not face it as a front line, because it will crush us along with the rest of the insurgents. Solidarity with the insurgencies in the periphery today consists perhaps in particular in interrupting the supplies to the (not only military) forces of the rulers and so giving the insurgents necessary air.

So that not only the police stations of the periphery burn, but with them the entire empire and its deadly production!

[1] As was and is the case throughout the entire Syrian civil war; and it should not be forgotten that it was also a central concern of (really only allegedly) revolutionary forces such as the PYD to maintain oil production in a de facto alliance with the Assad regime and to maintain control over it; in 2014, for example, around 40,000 barrels per day were produced under the supervision of the YPG in the al-Hasakah region. Throughout Syria, workers in the oil fields alternated between being Syrian state employees, Nusra Front employees, or even paid by IS, almost without interruption, depending on their respective supremacist positions.

context and possibly also the fun of a life lived against domination, and henceforth to follow a boring, uniform organization ("Unity" is one of the slogans of the Direct Action Cells, along with "organization" and "war"). There is nothing left to suggest to oneself but that others do the same, that is, also turn their backs on their individuality and the unique contexts in which they move, and henceforth wave the flag of the Direct Action Cells.

But what possibilities does that really open up? Are we - and who is this we anyway - really stronger just because we unite under one flag? I have already stated that I do not think that the anarchist attack makes strategic gains by narrowing its focus to targets that exist everywhere. It is not difficult to guess what I may think of fighting united under one flag, indeed under any flag at all. I do not think it is a coincidence that this concrete proposal also follows the example of authoritarian communist organizations. And this is ultimately the only value - or rather for me it is not a value - that this proposal is able to create: unity. But what do anarchists get out of uniformity, loyalty to a flag, grimness and devotion to duty? Correct: nothing. Rather, it is the surrender of the anarchist project. Because the anarchist attack cannot be militarized!

[1] I would like to note here that it is not my intention to devalue spectacular arsons or other spectacular - or let's rather say tremendous - attacks, and certainly I too have a kind of fetish to intuitively exaggerate such attacks a little bit. My point is rather not to let this fetish, or more neutrally, this fascination, become an ideal, to step back and take a closer look at attacks here and there, forgetting neither that attacks that don't take this huge, spectacular form, can be very effective - for example, because they hit just the right spot to paralyze production in a very unspectacular way - nor the fact that not everyone is always able and not everyone is always willing to put as much at stake or as much effort as most of these more spectacular attacks require.

ON SPECULATION

Possible consequences of speculating about the authorship of attacks and the like

At first, it may seem unnecessary to write a text about speculation, since there doesn't seem to be much new and exciting to say about the topic. Nevertheless, in recent years it has been apparent how speculations about actual or alleged perpetrators (millieus) of concrete attacks on authority became rampant in the fringes of anarchist scenes, but especially in the leftist scene, which is rarely clearly separated from them. Especially when an attack was controversial, these debates about whether the attack was reasonable, "media friendly" or (morally?) reprehensible seldom passed without someone feeling compelled to (even publicly) point a finger at certain groups and sometimes even concrete people, suspecting them of having committed these acts. Everything relevant to this topic may have already been said, nevertheless it seems urgent to me to raise some essential considerations on this subject again and to put them up for discussion.

First of all, I would like to say a few words about the initial situation: not only thanks to technology and the largely successful self-surveillance of people with smartphones (a trend which unfortunately is increasingly true for anarchists as well), it is to be expected that within what might be called, both for lack of a better word and in view of the fact that this designation is unfortunately not fundamentally inaccurate, the "anarchist scene", i.e. within a circle of anarchists and those who might be close to them as sympathizers, which is neither limited by affinities nor can be described as accessible to everyone without restrictions, even the state enemy is latently present, eavesdropping on our conversations and more. Perhaps even compiling and evaluating the information from the most diverse conversations in different places and between very different people. Smartphones, telephone conversations and the like may make it easier for the cop, nevertheless, he will certainly - as all the cases testify in which corresponding evidence has been found - also bug rooms, vehicles, apartments, etc., and sometimes even certain areas of parks, in order to eavesdrop on our conversations, he will tap telephones, turn smartphones into bugs, stalk us with directional microphones, and much more. Sometimes we realize we are being eavesdropped on, most of the time we are probably unaware. So we can (and should) just become aware of the omnipresent, abstract danger that it's possible that everything we do in anarchist spaces, in homes, in repeatedly used spaces, in the presence of a cell phone, on the phone itself, and to a certain extent also in more frequently used places outdoors or within earshot of a stalking pig, could, with a little bit of bad luck, end up directly on the desk of a pig eagerly digging in our shit for information, who is keenly interested in some of the things that are being said.

When I describe this as the initial situation, as the reality we have to face as anarchists and those who move within what might have to be called an "anarchist scene", it is not to stir up paranoia, to call for treating every "stranger" with suspicion

At first, it may seem unnecessary to write a text about speculation, since there doesn't seem to be much new and exciting to say about the topic. Nevertheless, in recent years it has been apparent

Certainly, in the struggle for life, allies are found neither in science, that torture chamber of life, nor in those who make pacts with it and consequently with domination. If the *Invisible Committee* said this in 2007, then it certainly stole this idea from those anarchists who - just to throw an earlier date into the room here - analyzed this at the latest in the 80s, but actually always. But what these anarchists also said:

"[...] If in our social action we strive to overturn the logic of institutional integration, we must be aware of the ever-present need to attack, in a situation of permanent conflictuality, all the structures, large or small, of the state and of capital, scattered in the territory where we live.

The same attitude must be adopted towards the mass media, without falling into the trap of their power of persuasion, and in order not to also end up as victims of the produced spectacle.

A destructive and constructive logic must be united with the desire to fight which knows how to weigh the different objectives from time to time and identify those capable of shaking the structures of domination. So we have to attack these targets while, at the same time, we take care among the companions and proletarians to develop that sense of dispersed and horizontal projectuality that does not allow centers of leadership to form in the field. All this, while at the same time invalidating the procedures that aim to reproduce partisan characteristics in the struggles, struggles that must always preserve their self-managed character. Moreover, it is important to acquire the indispensable information and knowledge to ensure that subversive communication translates into a moment of connection between the various fragments of the antagonist movement, which uniformly strives to make its revolutionary action take a qualitative leap."

Pierleone Porcu in "Journey into the Eye of the Storm" (1987), emphasis mine.

And why should you adopt one idea but not the other?

By the way, "without cops there is no state" depends very much on how the police are conceived of. What good will it do *to chase the cops to hell*, if afterwards some "community accountability" police will serve more or less the same purpose and keep the subjects under control, maybe with, maybe without racist violence, so far as they continue to accept their existence as subjects? But I think here there could even be agreement with the author of the post-Covid Riot program. In any case, it should be kept in mind that a modern state usually has different police apparatuses and that it can (though restricted locally) occasionally do without the so called formal-repressive one.

V

To understand the revolts as they occur in the periphery erupting in ever shorter cycles is only one side of the equation. And yes, this periphery we find near and far, in the banlieues, the suburbs of Brussels, the "traffic circles of forgotten France", as

background and so a career is taken up as an (unpaid) journalist or rather his-torian, for whom the written word is nothing but the lifeless material from which the shroud of all living revolutionary awakenings is woven into the theoretical framework which is held? And I really do my best not to slide too much into the polemical and to look at the matter fairly. Because of course, there are also attempts to translate, to spread the written stories of those in revolt who actually recorded their own stories, in an attempt to draw inspiration from them, which I would not accuse so viciously as being identical to the gravedigging of the his-torians, but in this case the words *we* and *our* occur a few times too often in connection with stories that are quite obviously not those of the author(s)!

IV

In the insurrectionary process, *we* must destroy everything that stands in the way of unmediated relationships between individuals. The *Invisible Committee* has already shied away from this in 2007; perhaps because a *committee*, whether visible or invisible, would consequently also have to be destroyed? If the left may be caught up in the imaginary of the storming of the Winter Palace - and I would be inclined to agree - there are also those who may be caught up in the imaginary of the "Syrian Revolution". They may be able to join the current uprisings (from afar?) because they may better understand their essence, but they shy away, as the left has always done, from proposing anything other than appropriating the means by which information can be transmitted, suppressed, and manipulated. They claim that they want to intensify the exchanges among the insurgent factions, but in reality, they want to use the media for the propagandistic purposes of bringing all insurgents into line, to "develop", as they call it, "a common idea of how to 'storm heaven'". Because the media serves many things, but certainly not communication and exchange eye to eye, but rather indoctrination. And to make it concrete: certainly, communication tools such as social media (Facebook and Youtube), which were appropriated by actors in the Syrian Revolution (without being able to gain control over them) to spread the images of brutal, deadly violence against protesters worldwide, have served a certain purpose, according to the assessment of two anarchists from Aleppo, but this should not be confused with the fact that nothing but discussion can ultimately be used to develop common perspectives among various insurgent individuals, unless one is interested in using the propaganda machinery of the media to manipulate the masses into behaving in a certain way, i.e., just like the rulers. That is, to lie to and deceive them as well as the rulers. It's a dynamic that quickly becomes counterproductive, among other objections: "And the thing that happened was people in Homs started at some point exaggerating what they were doing, even exaggerating the number, the toll number of people who actually died in order to keep this role that they are the ones who sacrifice themselves, they are the capital of the revolution, in order to keep up with this title that has been given to them. They actually fabricated a lot of news and this cost the revolution to lose a lot of credibility in the eyes of even other Syrians who were hesitant about joining the revolution or not. Because they saw the regime lying but also the opposition, so they are not really that different from them." (Revolutionary Echoes from Syria)

and adopting a habit of what is ultimately just pompous secrecy, quite the opposite. My preferred way of dealing with this, is rather to be clear about this initial situation, to gain a clear understanding of what this means, and then, leaving behind any rituals, to overcome the insecurities that may come up in the face of this, individually and collectively, so as not to let our relationships be overshadowed by a feeling of paranoia. In any case, it is only the latest craze to infiltrate the relationships of anarchists (and not only those of anarchists) with the help of technology, and of course there are still all kinds of informants whose presence must be reckoned with. What I propose to counter this situation is basically ancient: relationships based on (individual!) trust. And trust has to develop, through common discussions, experiences and finally actions. By getting to know each other, by having intimate relationships with each other based on shared ideas. This article is not the place to go into this process in detail, it is different for everyone anyway. I just want to make it clear here that I'm not interested in reproducing what I consider to be a counterproductive scene habit, where codes, rituals and matters of style give the impression of security and clandestinity, but often don't even prevent people from blithely gossiping about things it's better to keep quiet about, and often don't even formulate a critique of this, and instead create an in-group and out-group experience, with all the hierarchies and illusions that accompany it.

This being said, my proposal, and it is the same one that anarchists formulated more than a hundred years ago, can be summarized very simply: *it is exclusively up to those who have committed an act to decide whether and, if so, in what form they want to claim it.* And I would recommend everyone to limit such claims, if they are absolutely necessary, to a one-time anonymous declaration and to otherwise keep silent about responsibility.

And perhaps to supplement, a quote from the *Communist*:

What one can do alone, let them do alone, and speak of it to NO ONE, for this is necessary for their safety. In the case of a collective action, we would like to warn, for the sake of safety, not to involve more people in the affair than are necessary. In particular, we warn against letting a woman know something serious that is not unavoidably necessary, for women are almost always considered perfect, and all too often it is they who betray us.[1] In order to preserve anonymity, one must not, of course, be a drunkard who drinks and hangs around in clubs, societies, and pubs.

- From Der Communist No. 10, 1892, quoted in Namenlos: Contributions to an Anarchist Discussion on Anonymity and Attack.

But if, against the backdrop of our initial situation, we actually want to give the freedom to the perpetrators of a crime to decide for themselves to what extent they reveal themselves, then it is automatically forbidden to talk about who we suspect is behind a crime. And why would one care about that anyways? On the one hand, isn't it possible to have an excellent argument about a deed without knowing its authors? And on the other hand, can't an act be welcomed just as well, perhaps even better, if

the identity - and what else would be behind it? - is separated from the perpetrator? Isn't it even boring to limit someone's individuality to identity categories that can be grasped with language and small-minded intellect and to transfer this ridiculous game even to situations of action?

And what about speculations about which (anarchist) milieu - and beyond that, whether it was anarchists at all - an act could have originated from? It is not even important whether such speculations are well thought-out and generally plausible, whether they are merely the ignorant gossip of the eternal gossipers or whether they perhaps reflect an assessment that every anarchist would confirm anyway. For the cops, such an assessment is worth its weight in gold: after all, the cops and the state they work for are less interested in arresting people for concrete crimes than in arresting anarchists for being enemies of the state. It is an anarchist strategy within what is called constitutional state/democracy to use some of the ideological pillars of that state to their advantage as a form of cover, namely that individual guilt must usually be proven in order to bust someone. However, we should never make the mistake of believing that this is anything more than a deception. If need be, the state does not abide by laws that limit it. It is merely afraid of arousing the ill will of relevant sectors of the population, afraid of having its lies exposed. If, however, anarchists take over the work of assuming that certain, ever-smaller milieus are responsible for criminal acts, and if the state, or its cops, notice this, then they will gladly accept this gift. Whether you raid dozens of anarchists or put them all in pre-trial detention, as long as repression has the desired effect, the state doesn't care if it meets its criteria of the rule of law, that's no secret.

Speculations about who could have committed a crime, even if they *only* refer to certain milieus, can therefore be convenient for the state regardless of whether they were ultimately a hint in the "right direction", or whether they have sprung entirely from the imagination. And precisely because they are useful for repression, I expect all anarchists and those who move in their environment to refrain from them!

Neither guilty nor innocent. This is a more sympathetic slogan than the authoritarian imperative of "Anna and Arthur shut up!" [2] but it amounts to the same thing. If we, as anarchists, are willing to support any attack on domination to the point of embracing its direction (of impact), and if we are willing to defend one another against the henchmen of the state, then this means that we reject the police logic of punishment, of guilty and innocent. And certainly this logic has no place in our relationships with each other, where it enters far too often in the form of such speculation!

With all these considerations, I am ready to recognize that a careless remark, as annoying and serious as it can be, does not testify to the intention of a person to bring others into danger and is probably a constant process of improvement for all of us, in which mistakes happen, just as they are reflected upon and this surely also requires a certain tolerance with one another, as well as the readiness to admit mistakes. However, I cannot avoid casting yet another view on those contemporaries,

not only entered into negotiations with the state, but also accepted conditions over the heads of their former companions (no caravans, forest huts, etc.) and subsequently pressed for their implementation, even implementing them themselves by force and in the exercise of police functions explicitly directed against their fellow militants?

In short, the left is the (democratic to communist) wing of the political spectrum that struggles for power in order to establish a rule around - and legitimized by - its subjects, traditionally the industrial proletariat. This, of course, also includes self-proclaimed anarchists, whose ideological bonds have always stemmed more from these spectrums than from an enmity against any form of domination. The leftists, therefore, could never have been allies in the struggle against any domination, and there have always been anarchists who recognized this and acted accordingly.

If it took the "covid era" for some to realize this, fine. Better late than never, one could say. However, the mistake should not be made of glorifying this realization as something fundamentally new, something unprecedented, otherwise the perspective on the actual causes are obscured and will possibly fail in being freed from the leftist ballast that may have been carried around until now.

II

Our uprisings? What is this "we" supposed to be? Who is this *we*? An *invisible party*? Or merely one of its *committees*? And if so, why is it not clearly named as such here? If those riots "reject all claims of representation", how could they come to be called one's own? And, I assume, without having participated in them at all? It is true: no insurgent likes the left. In general, none of the excluded, whose exploding rage expanded into those revolts that may have been watched spellbound in recent years, have an interest in these left-wing vampires acting as the spiritual leaders of their revolt, and they are all better advised to chase away politicians, left-wing as well as right-wing, but also *invisible party cadres* from the very beginning.

III

And what is this crap about writing history? Who writes down history in the name of a *we*, what distinguishes him from those historians who do it in the name of authority? And yes, I have thought about it, whether I have not got a mere label mistaken, and must deny this decidedly. The proof: when our dear *invisible* history scribblers rise in a fit of paternalism over the rioting youths in Stuttgart: "Maybe they still lack a bit of experience in writing down their own history, but at least they don't seem to have forgotten how to riot [...]". Well, perhaps our *invisible* historians still lack a bit of experience in how to write down *their own* history, maybe because in recent years they have become accustomed to speaking in the '*majestic plural*' because of all the left-wing buffoonery, and this has led to states of mental confusion in which they confuse themselves, watching rioting with the help of the media, with historians or also because, if one "write[s] down *our* history again and again", the moments of rioting that you actually participate in could fall a little into the

IN PURSUIT OF THE INVISIBLE

A fragmentary critique of the Post-Covid Riot Prime Manifesto

This text refers to the *Post-Covid Riot Prime Manifesto* published in *Sunzi Bingfa* #27. Online it can be read here:

<https://non.copyriot.com/post-covid-riot-prime-manifest/>

For a better understanding of this critique, prior or parallel reading is always recommended.

end of the world over a few cool drinks" and those who will choose to take to the streets. But why deal with that as an anarchist? After all, I've been enjoying cool drinks on the street for years, after every attack on authority, while the leftist defenders of the existent have theirs slipping out of their hands in shock and outrage. But this manifesto is perhaps not so much the specter haunting the minds of the renegade, drink-spurning left, rather, it awakens some old ghosts. And so I find this manifesto - as it is with programs - altogether very poor in proposals, while I would not even disagree too much with its basic sketch of an analysis, but as an enemy of any authoritarian thinking, as a purist, so to speak, I am still disturbed by one or the other detail, in which I believe to recognize the possible revival of a certain authoritarian, insurrectionary thinking. The following fragments should make this clear.

I

The left, they are truly not allies, so far so good, but did it really take the "covid era" to realize that? That the left (and not only the white, western variety) has only "spoken of "solidarity,"" in the covid era, while it made "a de facto shoulder-to-shoulder with power, calling to cease, to suspend all fundamental class struggles, all maneuvers of social warfare from below", that is an open secret among anarchists. Didn't those "anarchists" who apparently thought so little of their alleged ideas that they allowed themselves to be elected as a member of the government, together with the communists in Spain in 1936 and the various, also anarcho-syndicalist trade unions, call for further subjugation in labor under (alleged) self-management? Didn't various leftist politicians around the recent riots over the murder of George Floyd not merely call for a retreat, but also make efforts to denounce and slander those who were driven to the ongoing attack on authority? Or what about those very specific leftist wankers who, in the occupied ZAD of Notre-Dame-des-Landes in 2018,

There's a specter haunting Europe... No, just kidding. Not in Europe. Also it is only going around among leftists, or merely among those who, in the face of authoritarian unmaskings by the pandemic reality shift, have turned out to be its more sympathetic part. It is the specter of the post-Covid Riot Prime Manifesto. A manifesto? Do people even write such things anymore? Well, from the looks of it... But it's not one of those. Or maybe it is? Ultimately, perhaps more than anything else, it makes clear the split between those leftists who will enjoy "the

who require a different response by making public remarks to the press or on the Internet as well as by the practical police work of speculations in the direction of specific people.

It may have become a certain common habit for the bullshit that spins around in brains to be emptied into the depths of the Internet, especially on so-called "social media". And it's no secret that everything that's written there, every picture and video that's posted, and everything else imaginable, can easily be read by the state's repressive authorities. This applies to Twitter just as much as to supposedly "secure" chat groups on Signal and Co. How often, after the (mass) confiscation of cell phones during demonstrations, have the logs of some "secret" and supposedly secure chat groups turned up in the files of the public prosecutor's office? Perhaps there are two completely different worlds that meet here, that of the plenum-goers who conscientiously put their cell phones in a cooking pot all together beforehand, but later put the notes of their meeting in the Signal or Telegram group for all those who weren't there or fell asleep from boredom, and who perhaps have to fear, above all, that the cops will find out about the secret structures of their internal bureaucracy, and then there are those who believe that the situation described at the beginning of this text has some relevance to them and therefore do not just adopt a certain "style of clandestinity", worthy of the worst movies. In fact, one can only hope so. But that doesn't mean that the bullshit in such chat groups doesn't stink. Whether you put speculations on the internet, tell the press (and yes, also "I don't think that was someone from my peer group, we are all quite peaceful people" is also a speculation and can be used by the pigs working according to the principle of exclusion, occasionally even quite successfully) or directly tell the police their own assessment, such behavior does not happen just by accident. Whoever does such things is as a rule quite conscious of the fact that this behavior endangers other people. Just as a person who tries to point to a specific person with his own speculations leaves no doubt that he is doing the work of a cop. It may be true, these people behave in such a way because they do not feel any solidarity with those whom they suspect of a certain act, and they prove that in this case they are willing to cooperate with state repression.

I consider it a danger that, even if only indirectly, relationships with such people exist in some form and, moreover, consider it indispensable to draw a clear line of separation from such figures. If necessary, also by breaking off all relations to those who continue to hang out with them.

[1] And because this passage has already been criticized in the past, perhaps due to an exaggerated reflex of political correctness, in terms of the obvious - whereby, according to my interpretation, perhaps it was more a classifying footnote that was the cause of the excitement - I want to note here that it is possibly - at least that is how I interpret it - about women who are not involved in the crime, for example lovers or those who are desired as lovers. And of course no one should be so naive as to think that just because you sleep with a person - or perhaps would like to - that you should therefore somehow act differently than you would otherwise.

[2] "Anna und Arthur halten's Maul" is the name of a popular leftist campaign against cooperation with the cops since the "Startbahn West" protests [translator's note].

by those who speak such big words, but at the end of the day will have settled quite well into a supposedly anarchist niche of academia and from that ivory tower think they can either direct or comment on the struggles of others, but one should not confuse those contemporaries with Bakunin or Kropotkin or almost any of their role models from long ago with themselves. While Kropotkin may have philosophized a lot and may have thrown few stones, he also engaged in subversive (journalistic and organizational) activities to the extent that he went to jail, organized support for other anarchists, and, like many other anarchists, devoted his life entirely to revolution. I may very often disagree with Kropotkin's positions, but I don't think you can say that he didn't try to live what he did, even against all odds. And what is true even for a Kropotkin, is even more true for a Bakunin, who literally chased after revolutionary events...

[3] And especially where an identity is to be created around indigenous anarchists, some people's hair will certainly stand on end. For example, the text "Locating an indigenous anarchism" by Aragorn! (incidentally, shortly before the publication of *Schwarze Saat*, in June 2021, a translation of this text also appeared in a brochure under the title "Locating an Indigenous Anarchism" together with the text "A Non-European Anarchism"), after it had been reprinted in *Black Seed Issue 8*, certainly met with a certain amount of criticism, which, for example, was expressed in the highly recommendable brochure *Unknowable: Against an Indigenous Anarchist Theory* by Klee Benally, which can perhaps be roughly outlined with the following excerpts: "When anarchism speaks we locate an affinity in our hostility towards those who have imposed themselves upon us. But we resist to be reduced to political artifacts, so this has also made us hostile towards anarchist identity, though not entirely to anarchism. When it is asked, "how can we locate an Indigenous Anarchism" and "how can we heal and live our lives free from colonial constraint?" Our first response is an extension of our hostility; there is no Indigenous anarchist theory and perhaps there never should be." And, "We anticipate the deeper exploration of Indigenous Anarchism to go two ways: one way will be by activist scholars (both Indigenous and settlers) from an anthropological and philosophical perspective that is totally out of touch with those closer to the fires of autonomy in our lands (and clearly this is the path we reject), the other way will be messy, bold, fierce, experimental, full of contradictions. It will be shared in smoke around fires, speaking dreams. It will be found between shutting down pipelines, smashing corporate windows, and ceremonies. It will be in hooghans and trailer parks. It will be something that refuses with all its being to be pinned down, to be brought into the folds of the knowable, to be an extension of the colonial order of ideas and existence. It will make itself unknowable."

[4] The current head of the Nation of Islam, a nationalist who advocates complete racial segregation and who also knows how to use anti-Semitism as a conventional driving force of nationalism for his Black nationalism when he casts the Jews as the culprits of the oppression of his superior but oppressed *race*.

Schwarze Saat can be sucked up as a PDF from the depths of the internet, including from the website feralfire.noblogs.org. It is unclear to me whether printed editions are currently still available due to the fact that the publishing *Schwarzer Pfeil* [Black Arrow] has been discontinued due to state repression. However, certain mail orders specializing in selling off anarchist scene identities and fair trade colonial goods (such as clothing and coffee) continue to list the book in their shop for the purchase price of 13.12 Euros.

[1] Whether the whole thing had to be called *Schwarze Saat* [Black Seeds], which gives the impression that more than a few texts are translations from *Black Seed* (and I think my discomfort here is that just the syndicalist and progress-oriented stuff would hardly ever have made it into a *Black Seed* issue, for good reasons), remains to be seen.

[2] So yes, I understand very well the resentment in such statements, especially in the face of certain "anarchists" within what sees itself presented as German-speaking anarchism, who don't have much to contribute except bringing anarchism into the academy, but who nevertheless keep interfering in the struggles of (black, as well as white) anarchists and think that they have to delegitimize the very real attacks on domination as non-anarchist with this or that philosophical hair-splitting. There may also be a tendency for figures like Kropotkin, Bakunin, Proudhon, etc. to be recited

A BOOK TO SLAY WHITE SUPREMACY

A review of "Schwarze Saat -
Collected Writings on Black and
Indigenous Anarchism"

If, like me, based on the title you were expecting a book about something like, say, the Maroon communities or even anarchist varieties of a kind of *Rainbow Coalition*, you're going to be a little initially disappointed when you take a look at the table of contents of *Schwarze Saat*. No, the book is actually a collection of texts on various topics, written by anarchists who can be located along the identities "black" and "indigenous". From the often-quoted Lucy Parsons to the later anarchist faction of the prisoners of the Black Panther movement, not forgetting the Nigerian (syndicalist) anarchist Sam Mbah, to some of the indigenous and black anarchists and anarchist/autonomous organizations of today's movement in North America, all the well-known and a few lesser-known black and indigenous anarchists are represented. That many voices openly contradict each other seems to be by design. [1] Elany, the editor, translator and author, justifies the compilation in the book's preface by wanting to contrast the narrative of anarchism as a white, Eurocentric movement with the voices of black and indigenous anarchists. I have no objection to this, but it seems to me that the problem faced in this endeavor is that there are very different narratives of the anarchist movement in today's spectrum of German-speaking anarchists. The organization-fixated anarchists seem to have settled on the venturesome hypothesis that anarchism is the inheritance of the anti-authoritarian wing of the First International and study, according to its authoritarian counter-wing, alongside (its actual adversary) Marx, primarily the writings of Proudhon, Kropotkin and occasionally Bakunin (yes, I am polemicizing and yes, there's also Malatesta, Rocker, Goldman, Landauer, even the already mentioned black anarchist Lucy Parsons etc., whose names are at least known in these circles...). It is difficult to develop a clear continuity of anarchist history in the absence of the carcass of a unified anarchist organization that stinks of decay but nevertheless survives the times - and not all of them want that at all - and so the more informal organized anarchists mostly refer to only loosely connected events, publications and social milieus, and it is not at all uncommon for the anarchists more hostile to organization to refer to the somewhat less theorized, more popular movements. Maroon communities may not fit with an anarchism of the international, but I, for example, found Russell Maroon Shoatz's "The Dragon and the Hydra: A Historical Study of Organizational Methods" (a German translation can be downloaded from anarchistlibraries.net), as well as the engagement with various millenarian sects or the Luddites, to be always more interesting than listening to the parliamentary debates between Marx and Bakunin or reading the boring and progressive revolutionary administration plans of a Kropotkin (but whether even these "white anarchists" "only philosophized", I would leave open [2]). *Schwarze Saat* does not commit itself here, perhaps trying to add black and indigenous voices to various narratives without distinguishing these

narratives from each other, and on the one hand perhaps misses the opportunity to really contribute a new, black or indigenous perspective to one or the other narrative, or to add entirely new narratives to the anarchist collection (although I understand very well that many indigenous people, but also black people have always refused to let the stories of their ancestors be added to an *anarchist historiography* as is done by some organizations or individuals, but at least when I talk about a collection of anarchist narratives I mean something else), while on the other hand it seems to me, whether intended or not, to provide an opportunity to establish and/or defend a general identity of the black/indigenous anarchist. But what would a "we, black/indigenous [3] anarchists" provide, other than the potential for separatist organizing?

The Continuing Appeal of Black Nationalism

A recurring concept in several texts in *Schwarze Saat* that I really have a problem with is that of *Black Nationalism*, often discussed critically but with far too little hostility for my taste. Lorenzo Kom'boa Ervin, the Black Autonomy Federation, Ashanti Alston, Saint Andrew, and other authors ultimately refer positively to some aspects of nationalism, which I will discuss critically using Saint Andrew's "National Liberation & Anarchism: Reactionary or Revolutionary?" and Ashanti Alston's "Beyond Nationalism, But Not Without It", at the risk that I will make many a "Black anarchist TIRED of primarily white anarchists just totally dismissing nationalism" (Ashanti Alston, p. 195). A killer argument if you ask me, and certainly in a flurry of tokenizing I could now drop at least a dozen *black* critiques of nationalism in return, but this game is too stupid for me. Ashanti Alston begins by describing his experiences with Black nationalisms as a teenager that "saved his life". That "we must primarily look to ourselves to free ourselves", that it was not "necessary to 'check in' with The White Man (from the ruler to the revolutionary) to see if it was okay" (p. 196), which at first sounds like a critique of leaders and collective coercive relations that resonates all too well with (my) anarchist thinking, but that this sentiment, which Ashanti Alston describes as a realization imparted to him by the Black Nationalism of Malcolm X, the Black Power movement, and the Black Panthers, among others, culminates in the slogan "WE MUST CONTROL OUR OWN COMMUNITIES" which then resonates considerably less with my ideas. True, much of what the Black Panthers did at their base is compatible with (my) anarchist ideas of self-organization, and certainly not all supporters of this party or even movement can be lumped together, as the numerous critical voices of later anarchist members, including Ashanti Alston, certainly prove, but is that an argument that nationalism (not just that of the Black Panthers) is therefore compatible with anarchist ideas? Just because countless mutual aid initiatives emerged at the grassroots level will not change the fact that the very nationalism to which Ashanti Alston attributes this development also produced police-like structures to "control their own communities", harmonized with the authoritarian ideologies and practices of the party leadership, and produced solidarity with supposedly revolutionary, nation-state movements. That "even the nationalism of a Louis Farrakhan [4] is about

"Wildpunk develops no program for the future and thinks nothing of pre-made blueprints.[...] As you read this, think about what resonates with you personally and what doesn't. Make your own manifesto. Wildpunk is as wild as anarchy itself."

So nice, a program in quotes that not only says it's not a program at all, but also invites you to reject programs, including it, and think for yourself instead. So after all only a literary artifice without authoritarian intentions. The *imaginary party* could take a page out of that book.

But what does this non-program tell us now? Quite a lot of nice stuff, actually. I would note a fundamental disagreement with the importance given to "Desert" throughout the text (as "likely the most important anarchist work in recent times"), especially since it merely rehashes a few old theses without proposing any concrete struggle, but that aside, it gives me pleasure to see that others also place the destruction of industry and the sabotage of the (technological) infrastructures of domination at the center of their perspective.

"The central point of attack on capitalist civilization is industry, which has poisoned the Earth and our bodies. Wildpunk does not fight to take over the means of production but rather to seize the means of destruction and fucking sabotage and burn them down."

And Elany and Samuel also have something important to say to all those climate activists who have yet to fall for one of the central lies of green capitalism, and have pinned every hope of averting the climate crisis while preserving the Western, civilized way of life on it:

"Wildpunk recognizes that supposedly green energies are not green. No matter what the rulers put on the menu, all of these energies are rooted in an unprecedented ecocide. Energy infrastructure, even the supposedly green, is another weak spot for attack on domination."

All in all, *Schwarze Saat* is certainly a book to browse through, a book in which one or the other discovery can be made, a book in which one can definitely find many exciting texts that have been translated into German for the first time. And certainly *Schwarze Saat* is an uncomfortable book for all members of the local ally-industrial complex, or, as I prefer to call them, cowards ("Another Word for White Ally is Coward"), who are looking for the voices of those token black people who want their alienating "anarchist" utopias, which in substance hardly differ from today's reality of Western ways of life, who will be inevitably confronted with those positions that anarchists have always learned, or at least could have learned, from indigenous peoples and numerous black communities: that all of civilization is a single advance of domination.

He who conquers bread conquers and defends industry

One of the bearded prophets of a certain variety of anarchism had a vision at that time. *The conquest of bread* should bring *prosperity for all*. In short: *free bread for all*. And who would have anything against that? Well, why conquer bread when you can eat cake, one might think, but I fear the objection formulated by ziq, "Burn the Bread Book" (p. 515), will also unravel the cake-instead-of-bread nutritional doctrine. The objection is almost banal in character, yet immediately obvious: to bake bread requires, on the one hand, sufficient grain and, on the other hand, a lot of wood to heat the ovens. In other words, it is necessary to clear forests in order to fire the ovens and to grow the grain, with all the well-known consequences, namely that the soil is poisoned and washed away and that the animals that once lived on the land largely die out. In other words, you don't need to bake bread for too many years at all, and you will eventually notice that the fields are yielding less and less. So you have to clear even more forest, the one on the land of your neighbors, who in turn are robbed of their livelihood, and so on. And so piece by piece of nature is destroyed, which was once able to feed all humans and the actual cause for this destruction will not even be recognized.

Whether bread production is capitalist, as it is today, or communist, makes no difference to this problem. And because the indigenous neighbors of those who may be anarcho-communists with the best intentions "won't give a shit that the bulldozers are now owned collectively or that the land they've lived on for millennia has now been designated as belonging to "the people" (the civilized voting majority) instead of to the state or to capital." certain conflicts will arise in which, in order to continue producing bread, it is impossible not to resort to drastic measures:

"If people won't consent to being displaced from their ancestral lands to work on the industrial farms and factories that fuel the destruction of their homes, they're branded "kulaks" and "counter-revolutionaries" and "reactionaries" and are systemically genocided, usually by destroying their food sources."

As anecdotal and seemingly banal as ziq's argument may be, it is immediately obvious. And a little embarrassed, you have to think of all the words you have used to attack industry and its defenders. But it could have been so simple ...

And now?

Schwarze Saat ends with a "manifesto" written by translator Elany and her father Samuel in quotation marks, a "wildpunk 'manifesto'". Admittedly: I hate manifestos, programs, etc., and it always reminds me of *Tiqqun* and the *Invisible Committee* when authoritarian terms are put in quotation marks to assure the reader that the author is aware of the authoritarian character, only to go on to tout that very authoritarian character. No, a "manifesto" is just as much a *manifesto* as an *imaginary party* remains a *party*. But even though I strongly object to participating in this neo-communist, occult game about time-honored institutions in quotation marks, the invisible or the imaginary, I don't want to be unfair. After all, the first point of this "Wildpunk 'manifesto'" reads:

saving my people", as Ashanti Alston writes, I don't doubt, just as I don't doubt that anarchists, even "the specific anarchist movements within a specific country are racist", but is that really an argument for Black nationalism?

"It is easy to sit back and intellectualize about our nationalism from the modernist, eurocentric framework of rational, scientific, materialist models. While one does that, it is our nationalism which constantly rally our people come together, remember our history, love ourselves, dream on and fight back. Black anarchists and anti-authoritarian revolutionaries understand the limitations of nationalism in terms of its historical sexism, hierarchy, or its modernist trappings in general. But we also recognize anarchism modernist trappings in the form of American racist privilege when it comes to people of color."

Ashanti Alston writes in his text (pp. 197 f.). Fredy Perlman, trying to understand how a family member, after fleeing the Nazi genocide of Jews in which another part of his family was annihilated, could face the Quechuas he grew up alongside with such racist hostility, describes a rather opposite experience:

"My relative's contempt was my first experience with racism, which gave this relative an affinity with the Pogromists she had fled from; her narrow escape from them did not make her a critic of Pogromists; the experience probably contributed nothing to her personality, not even her identification with the Conquistador, since this was shared by Europeans who did not share my relative's experience of narrowly escaping from a concentration camp. Oppressed European peasants had identified with Conquistadores who carried a more vicious oppression to non-Europeans already before my relative's experience."

My relative did make use of her experience years later, when she chose to be a rooter for the State of Israel, at which time she did not renounce her contempt toward the Quechuas; on the contrary, she then applied her contempt toward people in other parts of the world, people she had never met or been among. But I wasn't concerned with the character of her choice at the time; I was more concerned with the chocolates she brought me."

- Fredy Perlman. Anti-Semitism and the Beirut Pogrom.

A short time later, he formulates his thoughts on this, as well as on revolutionary movements adopting nationalist mobilization strategies, more succinctly in *The Continuing Appeal of Nationalism*:

"Industrialized nations have procured their preliminary capital by expropriating, deporting, persecuting and segregating, if not always by exterminating, people designated as legitimate prey. Kinships were broken, environments were destroyed, cultural orientations and ways were extirpated."

...

"The idea that an understanding of the genocide, that a memory of the holocausts, can only lead people to want to dismantle the system, is erroneous. The continuing appeal of nationalism suggests that the opposite is truer, namely that an understanding of genocide has led people to mobilize genocidal armies, that the memory of holocausts has led people to perpetrate holocausts. The sensitive poets who remembered the loss, the researchers who documented it, have been like the pure scientists who discovered the structure of the atom. Applied scientists used the discovery to split the atom's nucleus, to produce weapons which can split every atom's nucleus; Nationalists used the poetry to split and fuse human populations, to mobilize genocidal armies, to perpetrate new holocausts."

Flower Bomb expresses a basically similar idea somewhat differently in the text "Really Though, Not All "Black" People Give a Fuck About "White" Dreads" of which a German-language translation is also circulating as a handsome pamphlet:

"The shared experience of being "black" under capitalism is only limited to identity. Just 'cus people share the same institutionalized form(s) of oppression don't automatically mean they share the same visions and objectives on how to destroy it. These are important differences that shouldn't be flattened. While these groups continue their mind-numbing attempts to create a new system of race essentialism within the shell of the old, some of us are having fun destroying all the systems. My anarchy is an existential expansion of individuality beyond the limitations of racial (and gendered) social constructs. When they say "black and brown" unity against racism and fascism, some of us have been sayin' every body against racism and fascism, as well as the fixed identities that makes them functional. Where chaos blooms with emancipation and the limitless potential that follows, individuality becomes a weapon of war against control and categorical confinement. [...]"

A more nuanced discussion of nationalism, in my opinion, that does not simply brush aside the very real experience that the Black Panthers supported authoritarian black-led nation-states that, in effect, continued the colonial exploitation of their populations almost unabated, with what I consider a weak argument that nationalist propaganda helped many blacks to avoid seeing themselves as inferior, is provided in Saint Andrew's essay "National Liberation & Anarchism: Reactionary or Revolutionary?" (p. 173).

Saint Andrew defines a nation as "an imagined community of people formed on the basis of a common language, history, ancestry, society, or culture, who are conscious of their autonomy." Therefore, for him, the "national liberation struggle" is a struggle against the relationship of exploitation and oppression imposed on such a nation. And so, a struggle of one nation against its oppression by another, and this can take the most diverse forms, although one particular form, that of *nationalism*, is defined by him as the one in which, as a rule, an independent state is to be formed by the members of the nation, or precisely those who presume to speak in its name.

This does not invalidate what Lorenzo Kom'boa Ervin, the Black Autonomy Federation, and others analyze broadly as the driving force of racism in the texts reprinted in *Schwarze Saat*, namely that the oppression of Black people and other POC as it is prevalent in North America today, still represents the reform of historic slavery, and Black people are still forced to do those deadly, health-destroying jobs at marginal pay - or, in the case of prison labor, virtually none at all - from which some white elites continue to profit. When applied to the context here, this is no less true. The anti-racist movement in this country, as in much of North America, however, often ignores the global context of this racist oppression: namely, that colonialism has never ceased, that political administration has in many cases been ceded by white colonial masters to local black despots who continue to subjugate the black population in the name of the white colonial masters, that World Bank loans and the supposed "aid programs" of various so-called philanthropists have forced these national administrations into dependency, that population policies, be it sterilization attempts or famines induced by industrial agriculture and patented seeds, serve to drive the populations of the former colonies into the raw material mines and plantations and to keep them there, where they eke out an existence as slaves, while war breaks out around them between their national exploiters over who may be the slave driver, waged with weapons from the West. And those who flee from this unspeakable destruction of entire habitats end up in the various refugee camps that serve to intercept the streams of people far from *Fortress Europe* and let them die far away from the eyes of the Western population, while those who manage to escape these camps either drown in the Mediterranean, are imprisoned at the borders of Europe or are deported at the first opportunity back to where they began their flight.

The entire capitalist system is based on this colonial, racist oppression of entire populations and the ecocidal destruction of where they live. While the anti-racist movement here - and this is true to some extent of those in North America - talks about cultural diversity and works to hide racism against people already living in the West behind language reforms and quota posts in politics, economics, and culture, this system is increasingly destroying the actual diversity of ways of life worldwide.

It is not that some contributions in *Schwarze Saat* do not also voice this critique of colonial racist oppression; ziq's texts in particular, but also Elany's text "Tools of Anarchism Part 2: On Decolonization (and the Technological Components of Colonialism)" (p. 359) are unsparing here. Given the ever-advancing ecological destruction in the Global South and the involvement of capitalist actors here at home, the development of concrete anarchist perspectives as well as strategies in the struggle against this form of colonial racism remains to be seen, but as Elany suggests, perhaps the threads of these struggles could be picked up where anti-civilizational analyses have exposed the industrial machinery of death and anti-technological struggles have begun to destroy technology.

virologist, the racist and the patriarch, as well as the slave, the worker, the beauty princess, the patient and the believer who are also there. And yes, anyone who has ever taken this seriously knows that this is a painful and constant process. However, I think that it is never conducive to this process, and I also see this here with Ashanti Alston, if we judge and condemn each other in the process, if we make a competition out of who can make the most "sincere" (and that actually means most *self-pitying*) speeches about our own weaknesses and damages, if we overlook the fact that in every sincere action that emanates from the flame of freedom still blazing in our hearts, there is always also that very attempt to destroy the "ghetto inside there". For then we are ultimately satisfied by living with our so-called weaknesses and damages instead of first accepting them in an act of strength and then overcoming them as such.

Reflections on Racism

What I have often asked myself when reading those texts that develop their analyses around an examination of racism is to what extent this North American context can actually be transferred 1:1 here, to the German-speaking area, indeed to the Central European area in general. I don't want to say that there is no racism here, for heaven's sake... Certainly not. Here, too, black people and people of color are murdered by cops, murdered by neo-Nazi groups, they often have the lowest-paying and most unhealthy jobs, are discriminated against when looking for housing, are much more often the victims of police checks than whites, are expelled from the country if they don't have a job and don't have a German passport, are crammed into camps and reminded in thousands and thousands of ways that they don't belong to the white *master race* and therefore have to endure all this harassment. But: formally, the openly expressed and individually lived out racism is considered unseemly in large parts of society. Every child knows today that one does not say *Negro*, companies prove their progressive thinking by including a quota black person in their supervisory board, the NGO-driven administration of refugees euphemized as *refugee aid* is booming with volunteers, rich big shots are pleased to hire black servants and still pay them the full starvation wage, it is good manners among the left-wing bourgeoisie to brag about their black friends at every opportunity, while an allegedly anti-racist fair trade movement uncritically trades in colonial goods and sells colonial art made by "children in Africa" in order to donate the proceeds to NGOs that use them to finance their population policies in the global South. Does this change anything about the racist conditions? Certainly not; rather, it conceals them. But assuming, as liberal anti-racist activists might strive for, that a black person in this country would actually be treated the same as a white person, would racism then be defeated? Although I personally doubt that ideologies as deep-seated as racism in a society can simply be reformed away, I think that the current focus on discrimination and privilege in analyses of racism within this (Western) society distracts from the much more brutal, deadly, and constantly advancing racist processes that are going on outside the walls of *Fortress Europe*.

Actually, therefore it is clear that anarchists cannot have anything to do with nationalism. Saint Andrew, however, shies away from this absoluteness and brings Revolutionary Black Nationalism into play, which he attests has a place in the struggle against patriarchy, capitalism and the state. He also cites the PKK's Kurdish national liberation struggle as an example of national liberation that would have simultaneously opposed a state.

I think that although Saint Andrew tries to pick apart what about national liberation struggles is compatible with anarchist thought and what is not, he fails, must fail, to develop an anarchist perspective primarily because of the baggage of what he has previously defined as a nation. If one defines a nation as an "imaginary community", then in my opinion this also shows the problem with this construct: it is precisely an "imaginary community", that is, a construction created to stand above the individual and, consequently, will always be an instrument to justify authority. Perhaps this is particularly visible in his example of the Kurdish national liberation struggle. One can certainly argue a lot about when something is a state. Personally, I would question whether a constellation like the one in Rojava is not a state just because there is no formal binding of various parliamentary, police and legal institutions - all of which exist in Rojava - to a constitution or something similar (but there is certainly a "party loyalty"), and just because there are partly competing police forces, parliaments and judiciaries. Nevertheless, this question is irrelevant for me, because something is not anarchistic, i.e. without rule, just because there is no (formal) state. The problem with this can certainly be found in the constructed Kurdish nation, for it is merely an imaginary community. In reality, however, there are hundreds, even thousands of real Kurdish communities that are united under the flag of one nation (and the same is true for the African-American communities that are considered as one nation in Black Nationalism). And when a particular community (the PKK, or its corresponding armed and unarmed wings) now more or less claims to speak for this imaginary Kurdish community, to make and enforce decisions, etc., then again communities and individuals end up being oppressed.

In all of this, of course, I agree with both Saint Andrew and Ashanti Alston when they see the struggle of black people against their oppression as a struggle of significance. I do, too. But must we therefore sweep under the rug the problems of national/nationalist thought and its inconsistency with anarchism?

Is anarchy democratic?

The break with (black) nationalism, which in my opinion is only half-heartedly carried out by some anarchists (including the *Black Autonomy Federation*), is possibly also to be found in the text "The Commune: Community Control of the Black Community" (pp. 52 ff.) of the Black Autonomy Federation which, in my opinion, has extremely unsavory proposals of a police-like parastate. At the center of this is the formation of autonomous, but federated, black communities, which, thanks to a confusing twist of words, glorifies financial state intervention, which has already pacified, disintegrated and recuperated black liberation movements since the

1960s, as a kind of bank robbery (instead of simply proposing bank robbery as a means of fundraising! A practice that is anything but foreign to the black liberation movement), and which should even receive state funding. Not only does this commune envision democratically elected councils, but not least, a school indoctrination apparatus, while a federation of these communes would speak "with one voice on all matters". While the question of a *Black police force* within these communes remains simply unaddressed, this text makes it rather obvious that the usual repressive institutions of a state would of course also exist within this commune when there is talk of "hold[ing] Black consciousness-raising sessions in schools, community centers, prisons and in Black communities all over North America-which would teach Black history and culture, new liberating social ideas and values to children and adults, as well as counseling and therapy techniques to resolve family and marital problems [...]". Those who want to preserve the institution of family and marriage by means of therapy and the like will already know why it is preferable to simply avoid the subject of jails and the police.

Even if I personally think that texts like this have no place in an anarchist collection, such democratic abuses are rather an exception and do not remain unchallenged. "Do Anarchists Support Democracy?" (p. 167), asks ziq, for example, concluding:

"Democracy has forever been synonymous with class based societies. It has split entire countries into two barely-distinctive political parties (conservative and "progressive") that are nevertheless permanently at each other's throats. Even in its most libertarian-friendly forms, it has constantly failed to avert hierarchy, coercion and the authoritarian machinations of majority-groups. You can't strive to replace an artificial system as brutally hierarchical as democracy with a supposedly more egalitarian version of the same thing and call it anarchy. You have to throw the whole rotten system out."

If the reader "Black Anarchism" published by the *Black Rose Anarchist Federation* may possibly have been one of the original inspirations for the text collection *Schwarze Saat*, it can be argued, generalizing but nevertheless containing a certain truth, that it is precisely those contributions that are not included in the English collection and that, moreover, break with the perspective fixated on anarchist organizations that it upholds for obvious reasons that, in my opinion, constitute the most exciting perspectives in *Schwarze Saat*.

The revolt begins with ourselves

That the upheaval of all conditions begins with oneself has really become a truism, which is repeated far too often like a mantra and deprived of its actual content by some eternal grumblers (often in the form of a discourse of privilege) against those who propose or practice attack on something other than their eternal "lack of reflectiveness" without constantly praying about this truism prior. It is all the more gratifying when the call for more engagement with one's own domestication (and gendering - gender is, in my opinion, alongside "Against the Gendered Nightmare" from *baedan* Vol. 2, one of the more fundamental categories into which we are

"domesticated") is able to present a clear analysis and shed the liberal reflex of positioning itself as the opposite of a revolt against external coercive relations.

In "Childhood and the Psychological Dimension of Revolution" (p. 405), Ashanti Alston describes the domestication process in which every child in this society is broken and indoctrinated with the rules of society. Starting with the child being broken and learning to OBEY through the family and the education that takes place within it, Ashanti Alston describes how each child creates a mask for themselves in the process, through the reactive attempts to deal with the traumatic experiences of the 6,000 to 10,000 year old culture they are forced into. This mask "serves to bind up and distort the righteous streamings of living energy into socially acceptable, pathological thinking, feeling and acting ... characterizing a society oriented to race-ism, class-ism, sex-ism, imperial-ism, profit-hunger, war and other anti-humanistic tendencies." Stripping away this mask, Ashanti Alston contends, "is preparatory and inescapable IF we are to eventually be successful in realizing our high verbally expressed goals." But how can that be accomplished?

"First is by realizing that in this today's phase of scientific capitalism, the repressive (psychic) domination and (social) administration of society becomes an advanced "1984"-scientific, productive and total. When Malcolm X spoke of their powers to manipulate us and have us thinking that our true friends were our enemies, and vice versa, even he knew how deep the manipulation reached into our very souls. It went deep enough to make us think that we were doing our own thinking and acting. And Malcolm had only penetrated THE TIP of the iceberg.

No one is immune to the psychic domination this oppressive monster, or "god", has over us. The invisible Mask maintains that domination, that blind addiction to authoritarianism. It represses the instinctual freedom desires of a person. This is true even when one is ALONE with NO VISIBLE political or police force near us. Like the slave who will not, WILL NOT run away from Massa when unchained and no physical obstacle in sight. [...]"

So *kill the cop in your head*? Well, I guess Ashanti Alston doesn't want to let you off that easy.

"Anyone whose attitude is that s/he is already revolutionary (or human) enough and don't need to go through no more changes is obviously a self-enslaved person who is satisfied with remaining stuck in the same old mold. That type of person cannot, and more than likely WILL NOT, help him/herself nor allow others to help her/him unless that particular negative anti-freedom attitude changes to one that is indicative of an OPENING to the world of positive "stimuli," goodness in people, enriching, liberating experiences, and the like."

I would tend to say: anyone who thinks of themselves as being in an ideal state (be it revolutionary or human or any other) is just a dogmatist and as such, in a sense, naturally self-enslaved. Yes, *kill the cop in your head*, and also kill the politician, the