

“Finally, we want insurrection. Insurrection is simply when the exploited start knowingly participating in the social war, and start striking back. We want our rage and our joy to guide us, we want to unleash our anger and strike back against those who would force us to grovel in order to survive. We will rip their world apart, as we build ours. Our world is the dagger in the heart of theirs, all we must do now is sharpen that dagger. The time for hesitation is long past, so sharpen your knives and begin to live.”



Towards Action Without Hesitation

Insurgent planning and anger.



Fig. 41



Anti-Copyright: Distribute and Inspire.

even in the same vein as defending your land, your communities, your autonomy by force as is happening all over the world. We understand that to someone who is completely shackled by this system the novelty of these actions: letter writing, petitions etc. may seem appealing, but to repeat them year after year is clearly insane. It is not a marketing slogan when we say "solidarity is a weapon!" we mean it quite literally.

We don't want any sort of mediation, of any kind. We are sick and tired of having to listen to green party fools and other state-sponsored activist speak for us with a sticker covered megaphone. Most of all, we are tired of our other anarchist telling us to be patient and to bear with them. That shit ends now. We do not see any of these liberals-voting marxist tools as our "comrades" we aren't in the same movement, they are simply enemies out of power, and as soon as they are we will fight them with the same vigor and hatred as we fight fascist and cops. Too long have we been attached to these groups, we use them and smile and wave so we can use their buildings and their money. As long as we are dependent on these groups, we shall forever be incompetent. Their "friendship" guarantees our subordination to the state.

Finally, we want insurrection. Insurrection is simply when the exploited start knowingly participating in the social war, and start striking back. We want our rage and our joy to guide us, we want to unleash our anger and strike back against those who would force us to grovel in order to survive. We will rip their world apart, as we build ours. Our world is the dagger in the heart of theirs, all we must do now is sharpen that dagger. The time for hesitation is long past, so sharpen your knives and begin to live.

Towards action without hesitation.

"What about someone," Said Miro, "who can't kill, and can't die, and can't live either?"

"Don't deceive yourself," said Ender. "You'll do all three someday."

-Speaker For the Dead. By Orson Scott Card.

Where are we going? Are we even moving? Amongst the confusion, misinterpretations, and wild rumors, we wish to clarify. A lot has been said of these insurrectionists, this new wave of hatred and revolutionary impatience. We are not concerned with the complaints and accusations of the pundits of the so called moderate center, who babble on about a new youth politic, and desperately try to dress up the archaic practice of voting as something "hip". These annoying, prattling voices simply make us laugh manically, and smile under our masks.

We also discard the old guard of the political left, clinging pathetically to their smashed idols, kissing the pieces scattered on the floor. A weird landscape of hippies, old unionists, professional revolutionaries cum university professors, speaking a dead language. We don't address these sad ghosts, because frankly we expect as much. However, we feel that we must take the time to defend ourselves against the attacks from various proponents of anarchism, ranging from those who make a cult out of selective capitalism, to those who are so mired in esoteric web of analysis that they equate direct action with yelling shame at objects. So why write

these words you may say? If we are against the possible mystifying effect of over-analysis, why bother running the risk of furthering this process? The answer is quite obvious: We cannot move until we know where we are. We cannot act until we know what “to act” means. We cannot walk if we don't know where we stand. Anyone who has studied the art of self-defense knows that the first step isn't to learn how to strike, but how to stand. Without this, your strikes are simply wild swings, a flash in the pan, a brief spark. Your attacks will lack balance, they lack real thrust and direction. Perhaps even more important than this is to learn how to fall, how to take a hit, and understand how to take and regain balance. These words are written when we are simply learning how to stand, so we may one day walk and even strike.

We wish to reach a state of non-hesitation. To see what has to be done and to do it. This is not to say that we want to adopt a shoot first, ask questions (and write apologetic books and polemics) later policy. With a correct stance, our strikes will need no long and drawn out explanations and thoughts. We will simply be able to act, quickly, joyfully and intelligently without hesitation. To act blindly is just that, blind. This is not our aim. Then what is our aim? In the broad sense of the word, it could be causing and expanding a social rupture in the system, causing stress and tension to enflame and intensify the already existing social conflict raging all around us. We could further go on to say that we want to build methods of living free of authority, police, control and surveillance. But this all very nice, as the introduction of any essay, book or communique will tell you. The problem is when we begin to actually build this world. This is when people will be appalled when the pigs

another spot, and we start all over again. This is the logic of attack, this is action without hesitation.

We want solidarity to be a word that haunts the oppressors. We want solidarity to be synonymous with dynamite. Too long in North America has the word solidarity been associated with meaningless demonstrations, yelling shame at buildings which supposedly hold those responsible, or writing long and outraged articles about the social injustices of the world. Clearly, there is not even an attempt on behalf of these activists to be even remotely effective. Prisoner writing has proven to be effective in that it keeps the prisoner connected to the outside. Writing to a mining company that what they are doing in Chile is destroying people's livelihood is NOT effective. No exploiter has ever ceased to exist due to a strong worded letter. This single venture into common sense and logic seems to be have escaped activists, as they repetitively try the same thing over and over again.

However, we do not believe this is due to a simple lack of common sense or understanding. We believe that it is more malicious than that. By repeating actions that have proven to be inefficient, they achieve the facade or illusion that they are contributing or giving back, while in reality do nothing to attack the system that creates and protects their privilege. They create a pseudo-link with the oppressed, believe now that they are “struggling” together against the same system. We think it's high time we told these people to fuck off. We cannot think that holding a rally outside of a consulate (with a permit!) is the same or

us to attend various banal institutions, schools, work, churches, military services etc. They make existence outside this walls very difficult, isolated and unrealistic for the majority of people. Crimethic's former call for a movement of homeless punks who dumpster dive and shoplift all the time may sound romantic, but it is completely and utterly plagued by privilege that only now choose to confront. To ask a single mother to suddenly abandon her house and sleep on 7-11 rooftops with her children is not only ridiculous but also dangerous. We need to take back our time in order to use it for our own purposes, to live our lives on our terms. In order to do this we need space. There is not a single piece of dirt that is not owned by someone. Everything is bought and sold, including us.

Even when we play by their rules and buy a building, we still are enslaved to their rules. We need to spend more of our time in order to pay off the massive loan, until then, the bank owns it. And even after all that, even if we play by the state's rules to the letter and really "own" the building, we are still subject to their laws. The building, if found to be used for "unlawful purposes" meaning anything that may threaten the state, it can taken away. You play by the rules and you will always lose. The only way to take back space and therefore time is take it by force. Occupying a building, barricading inside of it and meeting any state forces with maximum retaliation is the most logically course of action. No negotiation, no purchases, simply an ultimatum: Fuck with us, and we burn it down. We must make the price of eviction so high that it becomes economically viable simply to ignore us. From there, we can begin to create the new world we want. Communes that manage gardens, clothing workshops, bike workshops etc. From this base, we spread like a virus to

dismantle their gardens, raid their squats and harass everybody even remotely connected to these things. They're only defense is that yell "who are the real terrorists?" "This is what democracy looks like" or some other ridiculous slogan. A witty sentence proves nothing. The ironic part is that these groups always puke out this "radical" rhetoric about how the state doesn't have our best interests at heart, the police are fascist and corporations are the worst thing in the universe. They always seem the most surprised as the boggy men from their own nightmares suddenly come to life and are knocking at their door with a warrant. If they knew that this was going to happen, why did they not prepare for it's eventuality? If they call police fascists, why are they surprised when they act as such? The answer is clear: they never really thought it could happen to them, and they thought repression only existed in textbooks. Why? Because the vast majority of these "community organizers" are middle-class white people who see repression and violence as bad things that happen somewhere in the world. They know it in theory, but when it happens to them they are totally unprepared. And when they are, the only solution they seem to offer is to sit back, yell incoherent babble and "bear moral witness" and other bullshit. Basically, they sit there as the police bash their faces in, and they pat themselves on the back afterwards. Our aim is then to avoid this stage of naive surprise, and to move to a condition of intelligent, spontaneous and constant attack.

This is not another essay stressing the divorce of anarchism and activism, many have made this point clearer and much better than we. But it is important that we talk about the disconnection between the experience of the majority of these "activists", and the oppressed. One of the main

reasons why middle-class white activists are usually pacifists is because of their slanted and moralistic view of violence. Violence is seen as an event that upsets the usual condition of peace, meaning that in general things are peaceful until a violent event upsets this balance and then the situation is violent. Non-violence is the attempt to change something without upsetting this balance, so non-violence can be understood as a way of avoiding conflicts that will cause violent events. They reduce the entire question into an infantile chant: Violence bad, not violence good. There are two main problems with this. The first is that this is simply not the case for the people at the bottom of the ladder. Working class communities, communities of color and queers, women and trans-folk have never experienced this state of “non-violence”. Theirs is a violent world, where police, bosses and bigots unleash a constant stream of violence. To speak of non-violence, then is to speak of nothing. It sounds like either suicide or a bad joke. Time and time again, we have seen not activist but a-political excluded peoples develop a much broader understanding of police and society. They (this is a loose term, and we simply mean ones we encounter in the streets) are not outraged when a cop beats them up, they KNOW that this is common practice. This is why we object so strongly to the vanguardist notions of activism, that some scholars, state-funded organizers, professional activists know more or better than the masses of oppressed. In fact, it is reversed. While activist carry a moralistic martyr complex, a sort of self-loathing/narcissistic love of their “awakening”, it is they who live in a fantasy world. Better said, they have been living in a fantasy world and are only starting to wake up, while the oppressed were born with eyes wide open.

it with some other eco-friendly word, and people who gobble it up endless and chastise anyone who doesn't buy their bullshit. It is an insane idea. This is not to say that we don't bear ANY responsibility for the conditions of today. Capitalism and the state only exist now (in relative peace anyways) because we've allowed it to. Our complaint here isn't against action, but only inaction masquerading as such. We won't buy out the out and we aren't going to out consume capitalism, we can only destroy it externally and internally, by any and all means necessary.

We acknowledge the fact that everything said here so far as been only about what we are against. We also acknowledge that everything said has been said before, by others and said much better. We feel that we wish to re state this positions instead of giving a long list of suggested readings or references. However, to understand our position you have to understand our critique. To understand why we roll our eyes at the absurdities of activism, you have to know all the bullshit we have been subjected to. In short, we long for a movement with teeth. A movement that sees growing a local garden and burning a police station to the ground as two equally important activities, and in fact part of the same activity of attack. A movement that stops claiming to be anti-state, and actually move physically against that state. To say that we want to declare war is redundant, the war is raging all around us. We simply wish to recognize this social war and strike back.

Occupy everything right now. This is not a hyperbole, nor is it a an exaggeration. Capitalism can only exist by control the two base elements that make up our lives: Time and Space. They enslave our time by forcing

This culture of holy commodities and select consumption reveals a bizarre and twisted psychology, a duality: A massive guilt complex and holier than thou addiction. This impossible escapism reflects an attitude of blame the victims. The earth is being destroyed because working class people don't have florescent light bulbs (which sums up Obama's plan to save the planet), because you take too long in the shower or because single mothers carry their groceries in plastic bags. It is we, the unrulling consumers who must bear the guilt of ecocide. CEOs and corporations then become the VICTIM of our demands, they are "forced" to provide us with harmful things because we demand them. This disempowerment is hidden by a pseudo-empowerment, the illusion that we control our lives, and therefore our lives become a sponge of guilt. So, we "vote with dollars" and consume things that relive this guilt, we are now buying things that are part of the "solution" and not the "problem".

Nobody seems to notice or care the glaring privilege in being able to afford this shit, which means that everyone who can't make the cut are part of the problem. Thus, working class families, communities of color and colonies (both external and internal) become public enemy number 1 for the bourgeois. The ladder of consumption based on social status has been replaced by one of guilt. You climb because you want to be less guilty than the ones below, it is a race to a sustainable consumption that doesn't exist, a never ending climb. You will simultaneously feel good about you self, and hate yourself for not trying hard enough to reduce your impact. You will always lose, and they will always win because it is ultimately their game and they write the rules. They could continuously raise the price of anyone of these products, and they would simply justify

The second problem is that even in the quiet middle-class neighborhoods, or even in the rich gated areas, there is never a state of non-violence. Every moment that capitalism exists is a moment of violence. The smooth functioning of the very system that we find ourselves surrounded by is by it's very nature violent. Zizek calls this "objective" violence, and it is much more dangerous and destructive than the firebombing of a Starbucks.

The day to day speculation of commodities, information, lives and labor cannot exist non-violently, because it is ultimately based on coercion. However, we wish to avoid a moralistic argument here. It would be easy simply to say that because the violence of the oppressed is a drop compared to the ocean of violence of the system, it is justified. Although this is true, we don't think that if, theoretically, the violence of the system was contained so it only affects ONE person, meaning that we have reached a state where their violence is smaller than ours, we can't do anything. This isn't a calculation, and we are not interested in moral formulas for divining correct or incorrect actions. Our reaction should be to destroy wherever this system exists, however it works, regardless of what it takes.

This is why we are confused by so called "anti-violence" activists. We are aware that this term is usually put on people who organize against domestic violence, but the term is misleading. Violence is an important part of the universe, it is everywhere. Violence is not merely striking someone, or insulting them. It could refer to any force (lethal or not) that is physically, mentally or emotionally inflicted on something without

consent. A wolf devouring a deer is violent, a tornado is violent, death, disease, aging are all forms of violence that are simply part of existence. Now, to claim that anti-violence activists are against these things would be to build a straw man (a ridiculous one at that). We don't actually believe that they are against these things like they are against domestic violence. However, the ramification of simply saying anti-violence is the distortion of the fact that violence isn't one singular thing. All states are based on the fundamental concept of the monopoly of violence. In order to rule, a state needs to become the sole dispenser and owner of violence, it criminalizes all others. The only reason a police or army exists is because this monopoly is in the process of being attained or is already held. When the PLO moved from an armed group that was born in flames to a political body (the PA), one of the first things it did was to create a security force, a police. This was to attain to gain the monopoly on violence, and this is why leftist-statist groups are constantly fighting each other: they want to be the new owners of violence, you cannot share it.

This also why we are baffled and stunned to see these so called pacifist claim that the sole avenue for revolutionary activity is fetishizing certain commodities, to elevate them above all others. Riding a bike to speculate capital becomes less of crime than simply driving there, because the bike is a holy commodities. Although there are some obvious advantages to riding bicycles, both in terms of health and sustainability, the idea that we should replace the massive consumption of cars with the massive consumption of bikes is ludicrous. Obviously, there would be less car emissions from bikes (narrowed down to simply the rider exhaling) but the cost of massive capitalist production remains the same both in terms

of ecology and in terms of labor: it is still a relationship of exploitation. It matters not WHAT is being produced, but how it is being produced. As long as capitalist relations still exist, there can be never be a truly "sustainable" (or whatever the word of the week happens to be) commodity. In short, we hate bike cops with the same rigor as pigs sitting in a car, the only difference is bikes are harder to evade on foot and much harder to set alight.

No one who has ever been skull fucked by a cop has ever whispered between their shattered teeth "at least they rode they're bike". This is why we stress the separation of revolutionary praxis and conflict from selective capitalism. This is not only a reference to so called "bike culture", to all forms of sub-cultures as well, punk, hardcore, hip-hop etcetera. All sub-culture are based specifically on selective consumption of clothing, music and other commodities, the values they profess are only superficial and are dumped whenever they challenge the inherent privilege of consumption (or whiteness, whenever appropriate). This is not to say that people who ascribe to these sub-cultures should be barred from any sort of anarchist or revolutionary gatherings/activities. But we shouldn't based any movement on the basis of this selective consumption, and we shouldn't have any illusions about our own consumption: Being a "punk" doesn't mean that suddenly you are not contributing to the massive system of violence, shopping a Value Village or thrift store isn't a revolutionary statement. It's time to grow up, shed off this pseudorevolutionary Addbuster friendly capitalist nonsense, and get on with it.