

When the Whole World is Ill...  
... I don't know if I even want to  
be healthy

That the Tide Turns!

Disturbing Public Peace

Without Detour

Destruction or Political Ritual?

Without Victory, Nor Defeat

Experiment

Hiding Behind Words

The Struggle Is Over,  
Or Everything Continues?

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



Autumn 2018  
Issue 2



It occurs, sometimes, this feeling of being in the right spot. Then someone says or does something that upsets the perceived balance of things, and the moment evaporates. For only a moment it was. And it begs the question; can belonging in a place be part of an anarchist life? Resisting to go with the flow of this society, contradicting hierarchical relationships, refusing to take part in clichés. Not exactly characteristics that go well with the seemingly effortless fitting in that this age of selfies advertises. Feeling estranged, sensing a distance with your surroundings is recurrent. And at times so chronic that leaving becomes a first, necessary step to being present again somewhere (else). But mostly one holds on to a place because besides all that repulses there is still more that attracts. Then the art is to not smother its contradictions in indifference or to smooth them out in illusions of unity, but to turn them in open confrontation based on the proposal for a different, liberated life. And maybe it is in these subversive relationships, that one can find a place.



# **When the Whole World is Ill...** **... I don't know if I even want to be healthy**

*First appeared as* Wenn die ganze Welt krank ist... weiß ich gar nicht, ob ich überhaupt gesund sein will... *in Fernweh (Anarchistische Straßenzeitung, München), Issue 24, February 2017*

In this society, certain feelings of suffering, such as persistent depression, inner dissatisfaction, emptiness and numbness become commonplace. Because these feelings are not just something exceptional and temporary for many people, but something permanent - they become relative. Because these phenomena appear in so many different people - and do not just disappear again - the suffering becomes something normal, perhaps without reason and cause, something one can come to terms with and treat. Or you repress it, try to deceive yourself about it and so you can perhaps suppress these feelings.

We have to function, keep working, stay fit, hold on, grit our teeth - that's what counts. And if there is a work accident and a cog in the machinery no longer feels well, there is always a way out of the crisis, of illness, burnout, depression and whatever, because after all, we are all ill from time to time. It's not going that well for all of us, the main thing is finding a way to deal with it, finding a way to compensate for all the pressure and stress, whether in a fitness studio, in a spa, at a party or on an adventure holiday. In the constant crisis management, trapped between work, stress and leisure industry, everyone learns to find a way to deal with their own emotional crippling... the church consoles us with a paradise waiting for us and offers us a community of faith and traditional values and rites that offer us a bit of support. And even more modern is the spiritual trend that finds its expression in esoterica and meditation yoga or Zen Buddhism mania and wants to let you know that you can be happy in any circumstances, no matter what your life situation. All just a matter of training... but happy work slaves, is that what we want to be? Do we really not have any greater demands of life, of

our lives? Take everything for granted, accept everything, always in search of your own centre, always controlled and self-disciplined, always in line... so that the permanent illness, the constant grief and frustration, the prison of wage labour and nuclear family, all the deflecting and artificial cheering up, yes, this whole society that smells of death, seems normal and alive.

I think that not only do people have certain basic needs, which include vibrant social relationships and emotional ties, but also certain fundamental needs to shape their environment and society and to be creative. These needs are individual and I think that they are thoroughly passionate in nature, which means that they need to find the opportunity and necessary freedom to realize themselves. By creative activities we understand nowadays almost exclusively arts and crafts or various scientific, IT or hobby activities. But the need to change and shape the things around us, like the city, or the structure and roles in this society, can at most be channelled into alienated and specialized activities such as those of politicians, bureaucrats, or inside bleak associations and organizations. Everyone must discover for themselves what these creative needs are, but I think that here and now we are not capable of unleashing the whole extent of our creative passion, since the social prison surrounding us has from the start robbed us of our imagination of what is possible once we get moving. Perhaps a lot of emotional misery in this society is due to the fact that these needs for creation are simply unsatisfied.

However, I think that these passions in us not only have a "positive" creative side, but also a negating side, a negative, that rejects what keeps

us from fulfilling our wishes and which impulsively resists what imposes itself on us, puts itself above us, oppresses, subjugates and hurts us. This not only means resisting and defending oneself, but also destroying what denies us the freedom to realize our needs and ideas. Suppressing this passionate impulse in oneself can also be a cause for inner suffering.

But democracy teaches us each day that putting these “evil” passions into deeds is generally one thing: crazy, sickly, irrational. The very feeling of hostile, hateful feelings is pathological, yes, mentally ill, because after all... there are no real reasons for the suffering, for the hatred, for the hostility. Declaring as illegitimate the resisting, rebellious acts - especially when they are carried out on their own - takes place mainly on a pseudo-medical, scientific level, in order to unquestionably support that it is illogical, as a result of self-perceived suffering or as a result of oppression and perceived injustice, to act offensively... But I wonder if it cannot be a logical decision to reject the everyday little tyrants and attack your own

oppressors, their institutions and structures? We are told that with it one would risk one's life, one's freedom... but is it not a much greater risk to live a life that is perhaps not worth living? Hoping too often after waking up that the week will pass as fast as possible? In which there is no room to breathe, no place to think and above all no freedom, no real freedom, for the exploration of our needs, for the unleashing of our passions?

Let us not be persuaded that it is normal to lie on the ground and that it is pathological to want to get up. Only we ourselves know who we are, what we want and who and what keeps us from developing and passionately shaping our lives. Let's see it as a challenge to attack that which tells us that we are small and weak, incapable and ignorant. Let's fight against our oppression and invent our own language of joy and revolt, in which we can discover our ideas and feelings, our euphoria and enthusiasm.

Let's get rid of the causes of our suffering and let our passions run wild.

# That the Tide Turns!

---

*First appeared as* Que tourne le vent ! *in* Avis de tempêtes (Bulletin anarchiste pour la guerre sociale), Issue 6, June 2018

---

*"The industrial wind turbine is nothing but the continuation of industrial society by other means. In other words, a relevant critique of electricity and energy in general cannot be other than a critique of a society for which the massive production of energy is a vital necessity. The rest is only illusion: a masked endorsement of the present situation, that contributes to maintaining its essential aspects."*

- Le vent nous porte sur le système, 2009

A night of thunderstorms. Lightening illuminates the sky while the thunderclaps seem to announce

the end of the world. Even if the latter didn't happen the first of June 2018 in Marsanne (Drôme, France) something did happen that night, or rather two things. Two things that met an unexpected fate; two wind turbines were attacked. One burned totally, the other is damaged. The dismayed cops and the RES group [multinational energy company] could only take note of the signs of break-in on the two entrance doors of the giant columns, on which the generator and wings of these industrial monsters of renewable energy are perched. Two at least, on a total of some thousands erected in

France during the last decade. Or rather three, if we include the burning of that one on the plateau of Aumelas, not far from Saint-Pargoire (Hérault), four days later, by one of those coincidences of the calendar that sometimes does things the right way.

That these wind turbines don't have anything to do any more with the quaint windmills of yesteryear – that, we mention in passing, were for the most part important sources of accumulation for the more or less local landlord, often attracting the farmers' wrath – is without doubt obvious. But then, why do the states of numerous countries promote the establishment of these “wind farms” on the hill tops, in the valleys and even in the sea? It's maybe not only because of calculations exclusively mathematical. Even the engineers cannot change all the statistics and have to admit that wind turbines don't function more than 19% of the year (a capacity much lower than the nuclear power plants that achieve 75% or the coal power plants, between 30 and 60%). It cannot be because of a will to transform the whole energy supply into “renewable”, given that is simply impossible when holding on to an equal amount of consumed electricity (for France that would mean a wind turbine on each 5 km<sup>2</sup>). It cannot be because of a concern for the “environment”, unless if one is duped by the smart discourses of a clean technology, given that only the production and installation of the wind turbines (without taking into account the centralised electric network to which they are connected) entails the mining of very rare and very toxic materials, the ships that are big consumers of oil to transport the minerals, the huge factories for producing them, the highways to dispatch the parts and so on and so forth. Finally, it cannot be because of putting a spanner in the works of the big energy multinationals – that have accumulated wealth notably with oil and gas – because it are the same companies that invest massively in renewable energies. No, in this way we're not going to understand anything, we have to look elsewhere.

Let's do away also at once with all the environmental and ecologist posturing, now not only displayed by the citizens on duty, but also by each company, each state, each researcher. There is no “energy transition” going on, there never was one in



history. Whatever the cherished employees of the technology start-ups say, the exploitation of the muscle power of the human being has never been abandoned... The generalization of the usage of oil has not provoked the retirement of coal. The introduction of nuclear energy by force didn't signify at all the disappearance of the “classical” plants working on gas, oil or coal. There is no transition, only addition. The boosted research of new energy sources is only consistent with strategic interests, and certainly not ethical ones. In a world that is not only dependent on electric energy, but that is hyper dependent on it, the diversifying of means of producing it is at stake. To heighten the resilience of the supply – of an essential importance in a connected world that functions just-in-time on all levels – the motto is to diversify and multiply the sources. Also to cope with the famous “peak demands” that – for technical reasons – only can be dealt with by only one type of energy production (nuclear plants, for example). Therefore not only the development of the wind turbines and solar power, but also of power plants on biomass fuel (genetically modified rapeseed as biofuel – what acrobatics does the language of the techno-world provide us with!), of new types of nuclear plants, of nano produced conductive materials that promise to reduce (by tiny micro percentages) losses during the transmission of electricity, and the list goes on.

So it's not surprising that from the three fields referred to by the European research programmes funded in the framework of Horizon 2020, one is energy.

But then, what is this energy, and to what relates the energy question in general? Like numerous struggles in the past have highlighted – notably those against nuclear technology – energy is a kingpin in industrialised society. If energy means production, production allows for profit through commodification. If energy means power, power allows for war, and war means power.

The power granted by control over the production of energy is huge. The western states have not waited for the 1973 oil crisis – when their dependence on the oil producing countries, that wanted to follow their own power plans, became clear to everybody – to realize that. It was one of the main motives for several states, including France, to justify the multiplication of nuclear power plants. To have a relative energy independence and to use it as a weapon to compel other countries to not break ranks. But one thing might even be more important, and it is there that the critique of nuclear and its world allows us to grasp to the fullest extent the role of energy for domination: nuclear technology confirms that only the state and capital should possess the capacities to produce energy. That these capacities represent a relationship relative to the degree of dependence of the population, that every revolutionary surge wanting to transform radically the world will have to confront these energy juggernauts. In short, that energy means domination. As a very backed-up critical essay from some years ago emphasized, linking the question of the nuclear to the wind turbines: “the bulk of the energy consumed currently serves to make function a subjugating machine from which we want to escape.”

Yet, to bring up the question of energy frequently generates – including amongst the enemies of this world – at least a certain embarrassment. We indeed easily associate energy with life. Like the energetics specialists who have hugely contributed to the spread of a view that explains every vital phenomenon through transfers, losses and transformations of energy (chemical, kinetic, thermodynamic...). The body would only be a cluster of energetic processes, as a plant would only be a set of chemical transformations. Another ex-

ample of how an ideological construct influences – and is in its turn influenced by – social relations, is the very contemporary association between mobility, energy and life. Moving continually, never remaining, “seeing the world” by jumping from a high speed train to a low cost air plane to cross hundreds of kilometres in the blink of an eye, is the new paradigm of social success. Travel, discover, adventure or unknown are words that appear now prominently on all the publicity screens, destroying by a fake assimilation a whole set of human experiences, reduced to fast and risk-free visits of places developed specifically to that end. Even staying in the room of someone unknown to you is duly controlled, protected and exploited by the profiling and databases of a virtual platform. That’s maybe as well why the cheeks get red or the lips start to tremble when someone dares to suggest we should cut the energy to this world.

To overcome this embarrassment is not an easy thing. State propaganda warns us permanently, with images of war – real enough – as evidence, about what the destruction of the supply of energy entails. Nonetheless, a small effort to get rid of the spectres that hound our minds will be a necessary step. And this, however, without developing “alternative programmes” to resolve this question, because – in this world – it cannot be resolved. The modern cities cannot do without a centralised system of energy, regardless if produced by nuclear power plants, nano materials or wind turbines. The industry cannot do without devouring monstrous amounts of energy.

The worst – and that’s already partly happening, not only inside the struggles against the energy management and exploitation of resources, but also against patriarchy, racism or capitalism – would be that out of concern for being empty handed in the face of an uncertain and murky future, the research and experiments of an autonomy will fuel the progresses of power. The experimental wind turbines in the hippie community of the sixties in the US maybe took some time to make an entrance on the industrial stage, but it is today an important factor in the capitalist and state restructuring. As a recent text, sketching perspectives of struggle inspired on the ongoing worldwide con-

flicts around the energy question, resumed: “Admittedly, unlike in the past, it is possible that in this third beginning of a millennium the *desire for subversion* intersects with the *hope of survival* on the same terrain that aims to hamper and prevent the technical reproduction of the existent. But it is an encounter that is destined to transform in confrontation, because it is obvious that *one part of the problem cannot be at the same time the solution*. To do without all that energy mainly necessary to the politicians and industrialists, one has to want to do without those that are seeking, exploiting, selling, using it. The energy necessities of an entire civilization – the one of money and power – cannot be called into question just out of respect for hundred-year-old olive trees, for ancestral rites, or for the protection of forests and beaches already in large part polluted. Only *another* conception of life, the world and relations can achieve this. Only this can and should challenge energy – in its use and false needs, and so also in its structures – by calling in to question society itself.”

And if this titanic society is indeed going down – reducing or destroying on its way all possibilities of an autonomous life, all inner life, all singular experience, devastating the lands, intoxicating the air, polluting the water, mutilating the cells – do we really think it would be inept or too rash to suggest that to harm domination, to have some hope of opening onto unknown horizons, to give some space to a freedom unbridled and without moderation, undermining the energy foundations of that same domination could be a most precious trail?

\*

Think of what we have in front and around us. Everywhere in the world conflicts are ongoing around the exploitation of natural resources and against the construction of energy structures (wind farms, nuclear plants, oil and gas pipelines, high voltage lines, biomass powered plants, fields of genetically modified rapeseed, mines...). All the states consider these new projects and the existing energy infrastructures as “critical infrastructure”, meaning essential for power. In light of the centrality of the energy question, it is not surprising to read in the

yearly report of one of the most renowned agencies for the observation of political and social tensions in the world (funded by the global giants of the insurance sector), that of all the attacks and acts of sabotage reported as such on the planet and carried out by “non-state” actors – all tendencies and ideologies mixed up – 70% took aim at energy and logistics infrastructure (namely pylons, transformers, gas and oil pipelines, cell towers, electricity lines, fuel depots, mines and railways).

Admittedly, the motives that can animate those fighting in these conflicts are very diverse. Either reformist, ecologist, related to indigenous or religious claims, revolutionary or simply to strengthen the bases of a state – or a future state. Far from us the idea to neglect the development, the deepening and the spreading of a radical critique of all the facets of domination, but what we want to emphasize here is that inside a part of these asymmetrical conflicts is spreading a method of autonomous struggle, self-organized and starting from direct action, joining *de facto* the anarchist proposals on this field. Beyond the insurrectionary potentials that the conflicts around new energy projects can have, that maybe give us a glimpse of a more vast and massive revolt against these nuisances, it is clear that the production, storage and transmission of all the energy this society needs to exploit, control, make war, submit and dominate, depends invariably on a set of infrastructures spread out over the whole territory, favouring the dispersed action in small autonomous groups.

If the history of revolutionary struggles has an abundance of very suggestive examples concerning the possibilities of taking action against that which makes the state and capitalist machinery function, taking a look at the chronologies of sabotage during the last years demonstrates that the here and now is also not lacking in suggestions. Getting rid of embarrassment, looking *elsewhere and differently*, experimenting with what is possible and what can be tried. Some paths to explore. Nobody can foresee what that can give, but one thing stays certain: that it pertains to the anarchist practice of freedom.

After the riots in Hamburg on the occasion of the G20 summit in July 2017 the authorities were under intense pressure: Thousands of investigations followed, as well as public calls for denunciation, the publishing of photos of hundreds of wanted persons, several - partly trans-national - waves of house-searches and now also international arrest warrants and extraditions (in October a comrade was arrested in France and transferred to Germany) were launched. The revenge of the Justice system is targeting also those who continue to defend the rioting and keep on antagonizing the state after the turbulent weekend in Hamburg.

This May the anarchist library Kalabalik in Berlin as well as two private flats got searched by the cops to prosecute the pasting of a poster, which showed the photos of some politicians in Hamburg, some G20 responsables and some cops in the style of a "wanted terrorists" poster. In August a trial took place against a comrade who was accused of pasting a poster. The prosecution assessed this as a "disturbance of public peace" and attempted to

prosecute the pasting as a "particularly serious case of civil disorder", since the poster was not only approving of the rioting, but also calling to reproduce it. As a result in Berlin several events and discussions were taking place around the topic of how the state can be faced with an offensive attitude in the context of repression and trials. Thus it was attempted to tackle the trial on a collective level to not put the question of guilt or innocence, conviction or acquittal in the center of attention, but to put the focus rather on the strength and complicity which can grow out of a common process of action and discussion. Only those can create the circumstances which give us the courage and determination to encounter the state offensively and minimize the fear of consequences which this can result in. So the posters kept on appearing on the streets of Berlin and different calls were published to be present during the trial which unexpectedly even ended with a discharge.

This declaration was read out at the beginning of the trial:

# Disturbing Public Peace

First pronounced in a courtroom in Berlin, 8th of August 2018

For me, the court, this building of authority, is not a meaningful setting for anarchist and revolutionary confrontation with domination. The struggles for a world without exploiters and exploited take place in everyday life and on the streets. A trial is an imposed snapshot that seeks to weaken current and past struggles and to deprive them of their fellow combatants.

In a way, however, I involve myself with this juridical spectacle by sitting in the dock today. I could have simply paid the fixed fine to avoid this trial. But to pay for what? I am here today to create a certain publicity that should show that state repression can be counteracted by combative deeds. Therefore, it is not my intention to negotiate with the prosecutor and to enter into the discourse of innocence or guilt. It is perfectly clear to me that if I am convicted - as in principle is true for all accused - I will be convicted as an example, to deter others from committing the reproached deeds. I doubt that in this case the intent of overall repression and oppression will have an effect, because I do not feel attacked as a person, but mainly for my idea of

a human coexistence without any domination. But this idea does not solely belong to me. Thousands of comrades showed this clearly in July 2017 in Hamburg - among other dates - where for a brief moment state control has failed altogether, despite massive security measures. During this moment, the will to create a rupture with the existing order has moved and inspired many people to act in solidarity.

That today a public prosecutor will judge me, is to me an admission of the vulnerability of the state. In that sense, I'm certainly not the one who is justifying himself with this trial and judgment, but you: who must defend your blood-soaked power and submission to the state and capital!

Because of my views, I certainly do not insist on the right to freedom of expression, because the language of the law is not mine. Accordingly, I expect and demand nothing from this court and its servants, because as I have already said: the struggles for a liberated society and against the existing order will be fought elsewhere.



---

# Without Detour

*First appeared as the editorial of Sans Détour (journal anarchiste apériodique),*

*Issue 0, June 2018*

It's useless to deny it or to look away: with each flare of lucidity we have the feeling of living in an age where cynical realism and disillusion reign. A time where relations are increasingly mediated by technologies, leading to the loss of meaning and the belief that nothing can be changed about it. A time of generalized dispossession and collective apathy; where nothing much opposes the domination of money, the exploitation and commodification of every element of the globe, of every piece of life (down to the most intimate), the devastation and poisoning of the earth, the growing hold of the police and army on our lives. For the rich, the bosses and the statesmen, business prospers. Whereas a part of the exploited - not believing anymore in the tales of democracy and progress - seems attracted to the nationalist pest, to the identitarian dogmas and to the religious straitjackets - preaching exclusion and a return to traditional values. Weighed down by the mental idiocy, the social cannibalism and the reactionary ignorance, revolutionary horizons seem to recede from our existence.

Nonetheless, a flicker stays glowing. For those who know to look for them - here and there - revolts and conflicts disrupt social peace, attacks break through the night, rebellious solidarity is forged. So breaking with the routine of obedience and resignation, and arousing our will to continue to fight, to hope and think that nothing is lost. As anarchists we hold a stake in these diffuse conflicts. For us, anarchism is neither an identity, nor a cocoon woven with certainties in which one can settle comfortably, looking down on a world that doesn't belong to us. It is an idea we carry in our hearts, a tension that navigates our actions, a will that drives us. In short, a relation to the world that cannot be developed but in disparity with this one. *There is an other world, but it is in and staunchly against this one.*

Hostile against all authority, recalcitrant against all political strategy and manoeuvre, contrary to delegation and passivity, we endeavour to reflect upon, to understand the reality that surrounds us to sharpen the arms of critique and to search new angles of attack. Because this other world we should cherish, defend, grow, spread. And to this end we need space, to sweep away this one.

In an age of continuous connection, of virtual social networks, of flicking through and superficiality, we want to make an effort, to challenge ourselves and others: to evade the bright lights of the ongoing spectacle, breaking with the urgency of being part of it. In order to take the necessary time to exchange and confront positions, deepen ideas and nourish subversive perspectives and projects. To get rid of preconceived thoughts, reflexes conditioned by habit, to move away from roads already marked out. To venture onto unforeseen paths. But also to take on and amplify the multiplicity, by undermining the superficial and hypocritical consensus and unity that are always needed by the politicians and recuperators of revolt.



So a journal to bring forward ideas that don't belong to a homogeneous and monolithic group, but that emanate from individuals. Forging them along their imaginaries, their experiences and their respective tensions.

A journal that – recognizing the scourge that constitutes any collective identity – doesn't look for any other interlocutor than the stray individuals in search of freedom, thinking far away from the shadow of a chapel.

A journal that isn't dependent on the current events of the “movement”, but that searches to interact with the rebels of its time. Bringing to the table, on occasion, suggestions for the ongoing struggles.

A journal that doesn't want to cling on to all the social conflicts, but that at times sees there a terrain favourable to subversion.

A journal that digs recklessly through the arsenal of distant subversive experiences, in time and space, as to enrich our present perspectives.

A journal that – attached to this anarchist principle according to which all separations between what is said and done should be abolished –

doesn't want to take part in the forum of sterile and inoffensive opinions, but undertakes to strengthen the bond between thought and action.

A journal that is also this; an opportunity for those who write it, an invitation for those who read it.

We are a minority in the minority. But that doesn't bring us to renounce a part of ourselves, to silence our disagreement or to feint agreement in order to grow in numbers. Because the quest for quantity at all costs is irreconcilable with authenticity and singularity, real precious sprouts that have to shoot up in all domains of life, and so also in the complicities that we want to concoct.

The upheaval of this world will not arise from objective conditions, political strategies or alliances between different social groups. But rather the propagation of surges of freedom, rage and disproportionate dreams, the abundance of individual initiatives and of fights to undertake in chorus. And it is to this that we want to contribute. With hate and love, poetry and humour. But, straightforwardly.

# Destruction or Political Ritual?

First appeared as *Déstruction ou rituel politique ? in Sans Détour*  
(journal anarchiste apériodique), Issue 0, June 2018

*“Instead of large snail-paced processions, insurrection prefers scattering, drifting, and moving fast. Looking not to take hold of power, but to disband it by negating all authority, all privilege of caste, it chooses its targets by their psycho-geographical proximity: scores to settle, rich residences to loot, symbols of slavery to demolish. It doesn't look to engage in battle nor to militarise the confrontation; by its omnipresence and vibrancy, it aims for the annihilation of all separations.”*

The passion for destruction is also a creative passion, said an anarchist revolutionary – an unres-

trained promoter of tumult and insurrection, enemy of all authority irrespective of the colour or ideology that legitimized it. He wasn't talking of the destruction caused by armies – bombarding, pillaging and raping on their way – but of destruction as an act that makes *tabula rasa* of the values and symbols of power, breaking up the social bonds of submission and dependence, upending the roles assigned by society. He wasn't talking of the attempt – from the side of power – to destroy every form of life, every rebellious or non-conforming existence, but of destruction as an individual act of awareness in a world where we get used to passiv-

ity and delegation from childhood on, to paternalism and the omnipresent eye of the state. Not of the destruction of one's own - provoked by the infernal spiral of social cannibalism, alienation, maladjustment, exclusion, depression and addiction. On the contrary, of destruction as an act of will and of individual resistance - a necessary action that implies to bring down on its path every thing that allows the perpetuation and reproduction of domination, exploitation, misery, alienation of a subdued life and not a lived one, the representations that forge our most intimate and profound being and that tear up our repressed existence. Destruction, finally, as the only act not to be recuperated by the progressive and humanist tentacles of a power that is capable of changing face a thousand times while preserving its essence. As a passion, a liberatory drive; it foils strategies, it doesn't make calculations, it is far removed from politics. However, it is not synonymous with blind irrationality if it is moved by a liberatory fervour.

Since some time, in several demonstrations in France, a certain destructive joy seems to have shaken up the political forms of consented dissent, ritualised and inoffensive, that - today as well as yesterday - serves to legitimize and reinforce the democratic robes of domination. A joy that dresses in black, appears suddenly in demonstrations to shatter windows and burn some cars, that seems to want to do away with democratic representation. Yet, in the sequence of masked moments and those with faces uncovered, in the heterogeneous ensemble that is called *cortège de tête*, it transpires



clearly now that there are forces that want to control, channel, represent and steer the dancing.

For example, the force of a party - increasingly less imaginary - that issues bombastic communiqués to celebrate its potency and galvanize its troops. A group that performs excellent acrobatic pirouettes to maintain an insurrectionary face - to seduce the rebellious youth - while keeping a political credibility towards the friends and allies of the institutional left, towards the intellectuals, the syndicalists, towards the associations and towards the journalists. Besides, beyond this "party", it seems that behind the masks are hidden several small groups and individuals that are sincerely democratic, always concerned about maintaining a *legitimacy* for the public opinion. A whole range of texts explaining that the *black block* is nothing more than a spatial strategy, that its aim is only to "attack symbols of domination". They define limits, normalise these moments of collective revolt. And we sometimes saw some of these vandals physically blocking other demonstrators from attacking an office from Emmaüs - a humanitarian association that collaborates with the state in the managing of migrants - or from snatching the cameras of journalists, auto-media or spectators producing images useful for repression and contributing to transforming the riot in a spectacle. Or, more, intervening when it is not a bank or a McDonalds that loses its windows, but a big bar for the bourgeois in the 5th district. Of course, because "the people" will not understand and they will not agree with us!

So, let's go for the passion of destruction, but within certain limits, limits set by the *strategy*. But who gets to decide the strategy? After all, we arrive again to this place. The cancer of politics reappears, the thirst for freedom and revolt has to give way to the quest for consensus. No looking for complicity between exploited, marginal, pissed-off, potentially rebellious individuals. But rather the will to appear credible towards fantasized revolutionary subjects; "the workers", "the popular neighbourhoods", "racialised persons" etc. etc. Brands most of the time identified with different components of the reformist left: labour unions, citizen organisations, associations... We also arrive at serious authoritarian excesses: on several occasions we

have seen political groups organizing real steward teams [*services d'ordre*] inside the *cortège de tête* or physically assaulting individuals or other groups that didn't respect their *instructions*. These authoritarian excesses don't seem surprising to me, they're part of the will of these groups to channel the desires for revolt in a view on struggle that makes its central axes from *composition* and strategy. More disturbing on the other hand, is the almost total absence of critique, passivity that allows these groups to establish their strategies.

These moments of revolt end up losing their subversive character to re-enter in the ranks of the political ritual and the spectacle. This with all the elements specific to them, even if they are camouflaged by informality and masks; leaders and followers, beginnings of steward teams and media representation. We could ask ourselves if, in fact, these dynamics are not intrinsic to a tendency towards centralization, to wanting at all costs take part in the "social movements" in the hope of radicalising them. For being more visible, for gathering a greater quantity of forces, we end up sacrificing the most important part of ourselves and to serve, sometimes in spite of ourselves, as a radical workforce for political forces with which we share neither perspectives nor methods. Incapable of tracing an

autonomous revolutionary path, we go from one demonstration to another, on terrains chosen and negotiated by the labour unions and the prefecture. So the voice of anti-authoritarian individualities disperses in this collective euphoria, engulfed by the ultra-consensual hymn "Siamo tutti antifascisti!" (sic!), implicitly or passively accepting the role of the new little leaders of the radical movement. And if we would decide to undermine the normalising and ritualising of revolt? If we would try to be really uncontrollable, outside the ranks and the appointments of the parties? What would happen if hundreds of persons would organize in small groups, everywhere, during the night, without troops or leaders, to attack domination in its multiple structures? If anti-authoritarian groups and individuals would decide at times to coordinate to act together, for example to sabotage the flux of economy? But that has to necessarily go through a critique and surpassing of the political rituals, including the most radical ones. The point is not to oppose collective action to that from small groups, but to oppose the centralizing logic that tends to steer, channel and often recuperate revolt. It's about deepening the creative potential of destructive action, by freeing these actions from the limited horizons in which some want to enclose them.

# Without Victory, Nor Defeat

*First appeared as Sans victoire, ni défaite in Avis de tempêtes (bulletin anarchiste pour la guerre sociale), Issue 7, July 2018*

"Anarchists have always lost, they never won anything." It is not seldom one hears these words, even amongst the enemies of authority, with great reluctance or remorse. These kind of final sentences even sometimes interrupt the discussions on recent struggles, if they don't interfere with certainty in the discussions about the contributions of anarchists during uprisings, insurrections and revolutions of a past already bygone. Musing about proud

columns of joyful anarchist militiamen – brandishing weapons, flags and striking up songs to arouse the heart – leaving Barcelona during that July 1936. One heaves a sigh of nostalgia that takes us straight to melancholia, very characteristic to many anarchists – according to a famous singer – to conclude fatally: "We always lose, we are the black sheep of history."

Nevertheless, even if hope can sometimes inflame the tender hearts of anarchists, we cannot forget that despair has also been an agony that has gone with many of their journeys. Lovers of the idea, they hated equally the oppressors. So it is that a passionate love that inflamed their lives of desires went alongside a ferocious hate that could strike ruthlessly and spill the blood of tyrants, their minions and their worshippers. But why talk in the past tense? That universe, that vocabulary, that inner world of anarchists, did it really change? Are the hopes not inflamed when hundreds of thousands of people have risen up against the ruling regimes in many countries some years ago, during the so-called “Arab Spring”? The despair of seeing these uprising liquidated by a multifaceted reaction, did it not arm the hands of several of them to strike, once more? Nevertheless, no fatalism in that. That is elsewhere, as we will see...

If the anarchist idea proposes the destruction of authority and the social relations it induces, that doesn't forcefully imply a belief in the famous “dawning of liberty”, final and irreversible. Actually, contrary to the logic of victory and defeat, anarchy is above all a tension, a practical idea that seeks evermore the destruction of all power. “Belief” hasn't got anything to do with that. If the horizon of anarchy doesn't stop at revolt, but also opens up towards social revolution, it is to destroy from top to bottom power. An addition of individual revolts is not enough. Certainly, the one who talks about “social revolution” while denying individual revolt that is its base, has a corpse in his mouth. And will probably be between the first to cry foul when an individual – or a fistful of individuals – combine ideas and action. But, on the other hand also, thinking that the perspective of a social revolution amounts to nourishing a blind faith in a final solution, only reintroduces the notions of victory and defeat, while deleting all tension or adopting the dreadful Marxist determinism (that made the communist proletarians of the past century accept the worst in the name of “inevitable historical necessity”).

If an uprising, an insurrection allows the tension towards freedom to accentuate, deepen or possibly generalize, why would we not strive to hasten, to trigger it? Faced with historical amnesia, with tech-

nological stupor, with the flattening of the minds and hearts, can we not defend that insurrection is maybe even more necessary, more desirable than ever to be able to put things in perspective? The same refrains on the material and social conditions that are not similar to those of the beginning of the previous century or on the fact that the state is now over-equipped, rather sometimes tire the discussion instead of bringing it forward. Melancholic indeed would the anarchists be until a point of only seeing the many obstacles on the path, even ending up forgetting that the question is how to confront them ourselves, right here and now in an anarchic perspective. If not, it would not be called struggle or revolt or nothing at all, but – borrowing Marxist jargon – only the observation of the mole that digs; and is dying [Marx used the metaphor of the “old mole” to symbolize the necessary maturation of social forces beneath the surface of society that will eventually erupt in revolution].

\*

Lets return to the initial problem: are the anarchists, with their idea of freedom and destruction of authority, doomed to lose? Meaning to see all their efforts, sacrifices, initiatives being wiped out, during relative peaceful times as well as during massive revolutions? “It has always been like that in history”, the pragmatics say. “Shouldn't believe in the revolution and the masses”, the cynics say. Nevertheless, an other possibility may be closer to anarchists. Contrary to cats, we indeed only have one life, and we dare to say that it is during this life



– the only one we have – what matters is to fight, to live that tension towards the destruction of authority. It's by moving, moving on the path we have chosen, that we realize ourselves, *that we become what we are*. It is the quality that bursts into our life, the quality of the action and the idea that go together. Victory or defeat have nothing to do where there is only persisting or abandoning, perseverance or resignation, passionate love and hate or political obliteration. Irredeemable dreamers, yes, a lot of anarchists are. *"To act is to not only think with the brain, it is to make the whole being think. To act is to close in the dream, in order to open up in the reality, the most profound sources of thinking"*, said Maeterlinck. Effectively, anarchists are dreaming with their eyes wide open. Which means to arm their desires, convictions, choices to realize them. It may be that other exploited, once their thirst for destructive rage is quenched, turn back to admiring a leader, to bow down for a god, strengthening a new power. It is possible, and the reaction will do everything to make it happen. But that doesn't render null and void the initial attempt, that doesn't invalidate the efforts of anarchists to deepen the rupture, to destroy authority at its root. Even if it would only be some days, weeks or months. But such an opportunity to taste, feel the thrill, live to the full the quality, cannot but passionately attract all the lovers of freedom.

On the contrary, when anarchists give up this quality, this tension towards freedom against all authority, to replace it with a logic of victory and defeat borrowed from politics, then the fatal descent has begun. That all the foundations of the anarchist idea erode, collapse and dissipate. That the first to come, dressed in more or less libertarian clothes (and who doesn't give himself that adjective today?), takes it all by flaunting a strong organization, a massive work of the masses, an alleged formidable military efficacy, the end of "isolation". That the anarchist weary of going to prison "for nothing" or so little, tired of an unfulfilled love that burns his heart, exhausted by the hate that nourishes him and that encounters so little complicity, disappointed the lack of understanding of his fellows in misery, takes the poisoned hand extended to him. Thinking that – finally! – the old rigidity and ideological blockage have been

overcome. *There resides the only fatalism that is: the anarchist who renounces anarchy while trying to make it rhyme with the concept of victory and defeat.* The love for the idea is thus seen and rejected as youthful folly, beautiful and passionate, but far from practical.

On the other hand, the life of anarchists also doesn't have to necessarily look like the passing of a comet that is consumed upon few seconds in the atmosphere. Certainly, each to his or her own. It is without doubt better to go up in flames than waste away waiting for the Revolution. But let's not erect absolute oppositions where none have to be there necessarily. If in the past certain anarchists have gone in head first, we doubt if their plan was that it would be for as short a time as possible. Why hope for a rapid end to hostilities when we can try to prolong them without disavowing oneself? If the time has closed in rather fast for certain anarchists in the past, it was because what have surrounded them – notably the repressive forces – have struck fast, too fast. Not because they had the desire to finish the fastest possible or because they seek a tragic ending on principle.

The passion for life can collide, including too fast, with forces that want to annihilate it: the hate for oppression can lead us to come close to a death that prowls. It is the consequence of putting your life at stake, of living instead of surviving. Rebels par excellence, anarchists shouldn't however develop a cult of blindfolds. We have a brain to think, a heart to feel, arms to act. Why to go without one of those faculties? Between living in the moment and longing for a brighter future, there is a sea of possibilities. When we throw ourselves into battle, ferociously if needed, it is not blindfolded but with the world we want to destroy in our sights. Ferocity is not to be measured by blindness, but by the perspectives that drive our lives, that we insert in our efforts. If we have to be comets, very well, but let's not precipitate their end. Our passage on this earth is short; let's satisfy it by exhausting all possibilities, all potentials. What is fatal, is not to bump into rocks, but to realize that you don't have a compass in your pocket when the storm breaks. Against the logic of victory and defeat, against the fatalism of an alleged efficacy that cancels all anarchist ten-

sion, it is still possible to think about our steps, to orientate our explorations, to project our efforts. The love for the idea and the hate for authority go perfectly together with a projectuality, a reflection in the middle- and long-term to give a more sufficient, greater,, more daring breath to our passage on the surface of this planet.

\*

At the turn of a past century, an anarchist with some accomplices developed a formidable plan. After some more or less successful thefts, Alexandre Marius Jacob looked to a farther horizon. A crazy idea came to his mind: rather than being content with a nice bit of thievery here and there (not bad already), why not work out a massive project of expropriation through the whole country (even better)? In the end these *workers of the night* were hundreds

and burgled hundreds of houses of bourgeois. They planned meticulously their hits, logistics, means (even setting up a silver and gold foundry, an antiques shop and a hardware store to order legally the latest of safes to study them in peace). Alexandre Jacob could have been content with some occasional thefts, and that would have maybe spared him a deportation to Guyana. But he wanted to fly higher, to shine brighter and longer. Nothing has been easy on this journey, no effort was spared, certain hopes were frustrated and the generalized expropriation has not happened as he had wished for so fervently. So what?

Let's not step back in front of what is difficult, let's confront them guided by our perspectives. Let's dare to embark on the most limitless projects, let's live anarchy.

# Experiment

First appeared as Experiment in Aufruhr (Anarchistisches Blatt, Zürich),

Volume 1 - Issue 10, August 2013

We want a rupture with this society. This society, which consists of totally institutionalized relationships which are completely exposed to exploitation by the market, and which keep us from experiencing free relationships. We want a rupture with this society, to put an end to it. And to make room for the experiment. For the free experiment in all areas of life and on a social level. For an experiment that is possible only in open hostility with the dominant society (and its defenders), which allows the experiment only in a closed framework, and only for as far as money can be made from it.

We say that free life is possible only in and through an experiment, a permanent experiment that blows up the boundaries of domination (and isolation). On the grounds that the dominant civilization sets before us, the only possible free social

experiment is that of its destruction. The destruction of all the institutions that make our oppression possible.

The experiment that we want to make possible - but which, in a sense, is already brewing today in every revolt - is an insurgent and revolutionary one. The outcome of each experiment is uncertain (but this is equally true of the authoritarian projects from those who believe they can control everything). Although, with an experiment, we also really mean that the significance lies not only in the success, but also in the failure. In failing; to learn and go further. That the significance lies in the attempt, in the persistent attempt.

The experiment that we seek in the rupture with this society is that of the free development of each

individual. Through and in association with others. And through the destruction of all obstacles, therefore: of everything that is or wants to become an institution. Institution is just standardized development, domination. That I have spoken before of social experiment, implies precisely that something as static as the society becomes impossible because something like the institution and the passivity that goes with it cannot take root. Clearly everything always tends to establish itself,

to become static. What we need, therefore, is a completely new approach to life. One that does not allow the institutionalization of relationships. One that throws overboard the whole of morality and the prejudices that we learn during our upbringing. So that the terrain is free for the individuals. So that everyone can find the strength to throw overboard everything that turns out to be another form of bondage.

## **Hiding Behind Words**

### ***Language between the world and me***

The process of writing a text can be agonizing. It is almost a test for yourself and the thoughts that inform your daily behaviour. Thoughts that you have come to consider as self-evident, you now have to re-examine. The white sheet demands a structured exposure of your thoughts that have mostly a chaotic flow as they erupt in your mind and get interrupted by other thoughts, impressions, events. So these thoughts, do they still appear valid when put in a more logical sequence? Glueing together scattered thoughts leads more often than not to discarding them all together. And even if the exercise succeeds and there appears a consistent body of thought, the most difficult of questions arises – what do these words actually mean?

Between the thoughts I hold and the words that are supposed to reflect them on paper there is a complex interplay. While a certain distance or separation is always inevitable, sometimes a feeling of alienation sneaks in. It seems as if these words need a permanent re-appropriation. Do they really correspond to my reality? There is the danger that the internal logic of the text takes over. The words

are written because they flow with the rhythm of the text, even if they drift away from the real thoughts and actions of the author. Wordplay can be seductive, but also a lie. In formulating thoughts there are paths that are more easy to take. Commonplace arguments don't need to be reflected upon. Some statements feel almost unavoidable because they will resonate with others. Some are left out because they will be stumbled over.

In my effort to communicate with others – do I prioritize the effect my words have on others or the exposure of my thoughts to others? A reductive dualism, maybe. The idea of correspondence is close to this project. That means that texts are part of an ongoing conversation and are an expression of an anarchist life and the subversive projects it contains. They are laying bare a position and its choices. But a lot of radical speech aims to produce an effect on others rather than assuming a position. The words become tools in shaping a discourse that begins to live a life of its own. Mostly the sought after effect is that of mobilizing people. This can take different forms. For example rhetoric



that speaks in statements that are more meant to be felt than understood. Or a myth as a bonding experience on semi-fictional grounds. Or a theory that constructs its own enclosed conceptual framework and historical storyline.

The production of theory has become firmly entrenched in the world of academia from where it dissipates to other institutions. In as far as its members have passed through the most advanced levels of formation in this society it is difficult to apprehend how theory that calls itself radical can emerge from there. The figure of the dissident intellectual untouched by the rat race of this society, a freethinker with no responsibilities but to be critical, is the complete opposite of the reality of academics. Assuring the reproduction and the continual progress of this exploitative society is its role. A sceptical approach to knowledge deducted from the academic world seems a wise option.

Aside from this, although often referring to academic sources, also anarchists have attempted to construct theories in past and present. As many theories have been abandoned or deconstructed to get a total makeover while others never managed to stir up anything, the activity itself is questioned (or more often, met with indifference). So there is a need to defend the necessity itself of theory as a specific method of understanding; namely devising a framework of concepts and demonstrating the links between them to explain a phenomenon in its totality. But the arguments in favour of theory often blur the lines between thoughts, ideas, values and theory. Its definition becomes as broad as meaning any form of brain activity. "You can't go downtown without having some idea, or theory, of where downtown is." ("Critical Self-Theory" by Jason McQuinn in *Modern Slavery* #3) A theory of where a city centre is located would involve a knowledge of processes of urbanization in the past of that specific place, an analysis of the relation between suburbs and centre, and from there a mental projection of the lay-out of that city. This combined with visual observations and subsequent deduction of the type of neighbourhood where one is, can lead to a theory of where the city centre is and which routes lead there. But generally people have an experience of where it is or just asks someone who has



(or rely on a technological applications that gives them directions – mostly not because of a pro-technology theory but because it ‘works’). To overcome a lot of problems theoretical activity poses – a split in practice and theory, in value and knowledge and the inherent mystification and alienation – a differentiation could be made between ideological theory and self-critical theory. “Critical self-theory is a continually evolving attempt at the conception of theoretical and practical unity. It is a dynamic totality under construction, always dialectically transcending (abolishing, yet preserving) itself.” But theory as a permanent, dynamic activity grounded in practice might better be called thinking. McQuinn’s theory about critical thinking (self-theory?) adds seemingly unnecessary confusion and replaces relatable words with abstract concepts. Precisely my point about theory. There are multiple examples of theories promoting confusion (post-modernist academia abounds with it). While theories that sharpen our view on the world do so at the cost of not questioning fundamentals (about the partial validity of facts, the approximative nature of the methodology, the subjective position of the observer etcetera), if not, the grounds become more shaky again and the theory just another opinion, more or less preferable according to the tastes of the moment. Some basic anarchist ideas, in the sense of principles (few but clear and firmly entrenched), are better guidelines to navigate a repressive society that pushes constantly for ‘realistic’ strategies (that always come with their own theories as legitimization).

Myths thrive in our contemporary society. Meritocracy (everyone being rewarded based on their own merits) makes us accept capitalist, exploitative relations. Democracy (composed of myths like the will of the people, anti-fascism etc.) makes us swallow oppressive relations. The existence of myths seems inescapable so why not create our own? An example of the attempt to breathe a new, emancipating myth to life can be "The Witch's Child" ("This is your story, child. This is why it seems you have everything, but you feel you have nothing... those feelings of anguish and rage are the same itch the seed feels in the last days of Winter, before it bursts open and sends out its buds into the world."). Centred around Mayday it is actually more convincing than the habitual repetition of the historically anarchist roots of Mayday to give it a radical significance today (which only seems to demonstrate that anarchists missed out on the last one hundred years). Taking apart a mythical story wouldn't in any case do it any justice. But as beautiful as this story can sound, the attraction of a myth lies greatly in its (perceived) power to shape reality. The existing myths of this authoritarian society are hard to compete with on that level. Consciously creating a new myth – which means not only diffusing it, but making it a shared point of reference and attaching it to a practical reality – entails a certain amount of self-delusion. To still echo the myth of the Commune (the most popular in radical milieus the last decade) requires a blindness to all the political games being played in certain zones of radical activity. If such a myth has its effects nowadays, it is because people want to be mobil-



ized by others and need a (semi-fictional) demonstration of collective power to counterbalance their own sense of powerlessness, to adhere to something that transcends them. And also because some are intentionally painting this mirage with deceiving words and erasing disturbing elements from the story, denying a contradicting reality and imposing a fake unity. Characteristics that deprive this myth (all myths?) of a subversive potential.

Still, our words should be able to appeal to the imagination if we don't want to stay stuck in this dull society. Some of the phrases painted on the walls of European cities during the revolts of the sixties and seventies possessed this quality that subsequently has disappeared from the streets. Partly because of being separated from action in the inner circles of poets and artists, or because ideological recruitment became the overruling theme. Nowadays slogans are more found in manifestos than on walls. Texts that consist mainly of sloganeering language are not as much communicating anything than trying to allure. A part of the seduction is that these coded words seem to give access to the circles of the enlightened. This is a language assembled out of strategies of persuasion. The same tricks are applied in assemblies where organizing means winning over, where fabricating consensus drowns out understanding differences.

What a theory, a myth, a sing-along chorus do provide, is a sort of origin story that gives order to the whole world and/or the feeling of being part of a bigger picture that give sense to small (from the viewpoint of history) acts now and here. They are capable of mobilizing energies. But at the same time they are forms of speech where it is easy to hide behind for to those who master the language of disguises. A language that is similar to the language of PR campaigns which is only effective for a moment till it loses all its artificially added flavour and a new strategy has to be implied before the consumers leave for a more promising product.

"Comment vivre une vie passée à parler dans une langue autorisée?" (La chute du langage, October 2017) What would it mean to not speak the language of authority?

# **Fantasma**

## ***From everywhere and nowhere***

In September the second issue of Fantasma was published. This anarchist newspaper consists of experiences, thoughts, debates around the choice of clandestine living. In Europe the repressive institutions increasingly tend to harass, threaten and imprison for relatively “small” offences. Pretrial detention has become an all too easy way to lock people away, while the European Arrest Warrant with its bureaucratic time-lags adds to the extortion. So also increasingly, ways to oppose the imposed isolation of comrades must be explored. A response can be to not comply and disappear from their radar (for a specific or for an unlimited amount of time). A choice that needs to be thought through and debated between those engaged in subversive actions, preferably at an earlier moment. A choice that depends on the specific situation and of the possibilities that thus are or are not opened up for the individuals involved. Above all, also a choice that has to be supported by the habits and attitudes in broader circles that prevent them from being too transparent to repression. For example; not spreading rumours, not depending on phones to meet and organize, knowing how to move unnoticed etc. But also habits and attitudes that support clandestinity as a choice going against social isolation – by keeping persons part

of the conversations (direct or indirect), not creating a wall of silence around them, taking care of friends and family etc.

From the editorial of the second issue:

“[...] Deep inside of me I know though that I am still falling. So I am searching for hold and orientation on the outside. I grab a droopy liana to straighten myself up. It feels real, consistent, certain. I hoist myself up on it, hoping to see some other lianas, that can help me to blaze a trail.

In unsteady times, like we are experiencing now, the fantasma embodies this liana, real, consistent, certain. Through it we have created a possibility for us to get in touch with comrades from all-around to exchange notes on the specific issue of clandestinity. About all the different facets, angles of view, consternations and perspectives, which such a situation brings with it. And in the best case scenario this newspaper can open up mental connections, can encourage comrades to deal more intensely with the possibility of going underground, can offer an anonymized platform for speaking about the unspeakable. [...]”

# The Struggle Is Over, Or Everything Continues?

First appeared as Der Kampf ist vorbei, oder alles geht weiter? as introduction to the Anti-Google Café: face2face of Saturday the 27th of October 2018 (in the anarchist library Kalaballk, Berlin)

Google will for the time being not move into the Transformer in Kreuzberg, but will rent the 3,000 square meters to two social organizations, Betterplace and Karuna. How to see this change in strategy from Google, will probably become clear some time soon. Nevertheless it cannot be denied that the continuous actions against the Google Campus have contributed to it being not that easy for them to come to and implant themselves in Kreuzberg. The damage (to its image) inflicted lately on Google by small and bigger, mostly informal, actions has led the giant corporation to conduct a charm offensive as to ward off more damage. The pictures of the bosses of Google in Berlin - that show Rowan Barnett as a "social angel" handing over the keys of the Transformer to some social organization - have to cover up the negative expressions articulated in the streets of Kreuzberg over the last two years. Google as the responsible "Big Brother" that doesn't only know what is best for humanity, but also for the inhabitants of Kreuzberg and Berlin.

The critique on the Google Campus wasn't only about displacement and rent hikes, but more and more also about the role Google plays in improving domination and control. This technological progress, that is to say attack, is not only contained in a Google Campus, but is omnipresent in the prevailing discourse, from the new tech companies in Berlin over Industry 4.0 to the political agenda of all parties. The struggle against Google & Co is a struggle against the existing domination and how it manifests itself. The unmasking of the lies of politicians and self-appointed neighbourhood spokespersons is not important here, since it is their job to maintain the status-quo and to pa-

cify protest. For a strength of the struggle against the Google Campus is the shared refusal to engage in negotiations and to give control over the struggle to political windbags. The change in the plans of Google was not fought for in the offices, but in the streets.

In the course of the last two years a struggle developed grounded in obstructing the Google Campus and aimed against the technological attack and restructuring of power. The target of the attacks was not only Google, but the whole tech scene, domination and those who promote and defend it. During these two years it was attempted to develop an antagonistic project on our own terms against the world Google & Co dream of. A struggle that is sustained through initiatives of the individuals involved, through creativity and self-organization. A struggle with the perspective of the subversion of relations, and not of "merely" the obstruction of the Campus.

And what does this mean now that Google has officially put the Campus Berlin project on hold? To discard everything and find a new "opponent"? To abstain from the critique and attacks against Google and other tech companies now that Google doesn't come to Kreuzberg? If it wasn't about the target, but about the path itself to get there, then what matters is to build further upon that. We will be looking back on the last two years, the forged relations, the intense discussions, the conflicts, the more or less collective attacks, the acquired experiences, etc. Which raises the question; wie all dies weiter spinnen?

That the fires of the revolt burn!