



# *Avalanche*

**Anarchist correspondence**

July 2017 ————— issue **11**



Uruguay

**Anarquía**

*periodicoanarquia.wordpress.com*

Chile

**Contra toda autoridad**

*contratodaautoridad.wordpress.com*

**El Anárquico**

*periodicoanarquico.wordpress.com*

**Sin Banderas Ni Fronteras**

*sinbanderas.nifronteras@riseup.net*

**Cimarrón**

*revista.cimarron@riseup.net*

Argentina

**Rebellion** (Buenos Aires)

*publicacionrebellion@riseup.net*

**Alta tension**

*boletinaltatension.blogspot.com*

Mexico

**Negación**

*negacion\_revista@riseup.net*

Italy

**Finimondo**

*finimondo.org*

**Tairsia** (Salento)

*tairsia@gmail.com*

**Stramonio** (Milano)

*malacoda@distruzione.org*

**Brece** (Lecce)

*peggio2008@yahoo.it*

Spain

**Infierno**

*revista\_infierno@yahoo.com*

France

**Séditions** (Besançon)

*seditions.noblogs.org*

**Paris Sous Tension** (Paris)

*parissoustension.noblogs.org*

**Blaspheme** (Paris)

*blaspheme.noblogs.org*

**La Pétroleuse** (Clermont-Ferrand)

*lapetroleuse63@riseup.net*

**Du pain sur la planche** (Marseille)

*dupainsurlaplanche.noblogs.org*

**Subversions**

*subversions@riseup.net*

Belgium

**L'imprévu** (Bruxelles)

*imprevu@riseup.net*

**Salto**

*salto.noblogs.org*

Netherlands

**Roofdruk**

*roofdruk@riseup.net*

Germany

**Attacke!** (North)

*attaque@riseup.net*

**Fernweh** (Munich)

*fernweh.noblogs.org*

**Chronik**

*chronik.blackblogs.org*

Switzerland

**Dissonanz** (Zürich)

*dissonanz-a@riseup.net*

Austria

**Revolte** (Vienna)

*revolte.blackblogs.org*

Sweden

**Upprorsbladet** (Stockholm)

*upprorsbladet@riseup.net*

UK

**Rabble** (London)

*rabble.org.uk*

Canada

**Wreck** (Vancouver)

*wreckpublication.wordpress.com*

**Montréal Contre-Information**

*mtlcounter-info.org*

USA

**Rififi** (Bloomington)

*rififibloomington.wordpress.com*

**Trebitch Times** (St Louis)

*trebitchtimes.noblogs.org*

**PugetSoundAnarchists** (Pacific Northwest)

*pugetsoundanarchists.org*

**Wildfire**

*wildfire.noblogs.org*

+

**Contrainfo**

*contrainfo.espiv.net*

**Tabula Rasa**

*atabularasa.org*

**Act for freedom now**

*actforfree.nostate.net*

**Voz como arma**

*vozcomoarma.noblogs.org*

**Publicacion Refractario**

*publicacionrefractario.wordpress.com*

**Por la tierra y contra el capital**

*porlatierraycontraelcapital.wordpress.com*

**Brèves du désordre**

*cettesemaine.info/breves*

**Le Chat Noir Emeutier**

*lechatnoiremeutier.noblogs.org*

**Aus dem Herzen der Festung**

*ausdemherzenderfestung.noblogs.org*



## Editorial

---

*June 2017*

To be in conflict with power doesn't mean to be generally hostile towards power. The hostility towards power begins with scepticism – the scepticism questioning its existence and necessity. A rational matter, on the one hand, which persuades us to develop rational analyses about the functioning and transformations of power. Although purely abstract, whereas the putting into practice of our hostilities towards power also means to move on to speaking about oneself and about considering one's own life as the field of projection for the own ideas. An irrational matter, on the other hand, a matter of heart, a matter of acting, an individual moment of rupture. A rupture, which overcomes the passive attitude of scepticism and creates by means of the own ideas and comrades projects that are attempting to push the hostility towards power in the direction of a permanent revolt and a generalised rupture with authority.

In the development of mutual projects also always arises a moment of "we", a moment of identity, which is kept together by a minimal common perspective. A "we" that with good reason induces the sceptics to prick up their ears. Constructing a "we" is a matter, which often springs out of the will for power, prestige and norms. Because if something like an anarchist identity is existing – on what is it based? What is constituting the movement, which is taking up this name? The number of groups, followers and spaces – a matter of structure? Or the ideas, the history, the discussions – and therefore the theory? Or the attacks and the forms of action, which the hostility against authority is taking on – so rather the practice? Or all together?

In contradiction to a perspective, which is only driven by the hunger for new followers for the own identity, our projects – so the diverse and different projects of the several individuals sharing this project – are aiming at something different. The attempt to launch and develop insurrectionary dynamics and relations, is an attempt to

break up the isolation of our ideas and methods within the conflict against power, to experiment with the possibilities for a generalised rupture with the social reality surrounding us. Because being only a few comrades doesn't mean to be isolated. As well as the quality and the uncompromising way of a stance within a conflict can also be something shareable. Because our relations and struggles are not dependent on the sharing of a fix identity, of a name or a formal (physical) structure, but rather on the way how we want to fight against power. Which means that in our struggles we are not only leaving bonds to formalities behind us to base our relationships on real affinities and experiences, but also that we are putting our struggles on an anti-political basis. Because for a method to potentially spread, it must be grounded upon the analysis of specific social conflictualities, on the reality of conflict with power.

Moreover in our struggles we want to go beyond a mere reacting to the strikes of power to self determine our struggles and the terrain on which they are taking place – and through this build them on the basis of our own analyses, own proposals and individual rhythms.

In this sense collectivity for us means the coming together of different individual perspectives with the aim of organising the necessary things for a project – and where this organisation is only maintained as long as it means and enables the individual enrichment and getting closer to own perspectives.

Comrades, who are welcoming an international correspondance between comrades about their projects and struggles and who are considering the Avalanche as a useful tool for this, we are calling to contribute to this project with own texts, translations and the distributing of this magazine.

*Some anarchists living somewhere in Germany*

---

<https://avalanche.noblogs.org>  
[correspondance@riseup.net](mailto:correspondance@riseup.net)

---



## Some thoughts on the summit of the G20 in Hamburg and the revolt

---

May 2017 - Hamburg

*The following texts are a small insight into discussions that some anarchists in Hamburg have been engaged in over the last weeks and months.*

*The first text is the try to put the implementation of the summits of the OSCE and G20 in context with developments of this city and the steps anti-authoritarian individuals have decided for. It has been written before the weekend of the G20 summit.*

*The second text is an intermediate extract of discussions that have taken place at kitchen tables and library hours among comrades in the week after the disruptive incidents of the days of the summit around the 7th of July.*

\*\*\*

In 2016 it was finally set: the summit of the OSCE will take place at the end of 2016, the G20 will be held in July of 2017 in Hamburg, in the very North of Germany. Since a long time this is the first summit of state authorities in an European metropole. In the context of the fact, that the Olympic Games won't take place in Hamburg, because a referendum concerning them ended with a "no", it's no wonder that the authorities of this city are longing for another possibility to impose their interests of international credibility and inner armament.

This way of imposing projects of displacement, gentrification und authoritarian armament with a well planned mixture of repressive arrogance and "classic" tactics of democratic pacification, does have a certain tradition in this context. For sure you can find this pattern of carrot and stick-tactics in numerous places of this world, but Hamburg works well as an example for how cities are being developed in the exclusive interest of the rich, of consumerism and pacification.

There is quite a number of situations which can show clearly, that the continuous, sometimes really subtle development of the city of Hamburg towards a city of the rich and of authorities has an openly visible need for specific, punctual projects of authoritarian intervention

for preparing the ground for the desired expansion of consume and profit.

I am speaking of highly aggressive and offensive projects of displacement of undesired parts of society from different places at different times on one hand and about the implementation of a state of emergency by the police in situations, in which the authorities fear to lose control. Especially in the open displacement of drug users and dealers from certain neighborhoods, carried out through large campaigns of police control, clearly show the authoritarian and in most cases also racist practice of the police, working in the interest of the state and the capital.

When in the time between Summer 2013 until January of 2014 conflicts around the questions of displacement and control ended up in a dynamic of nights and nights of unannounced, sometimes wild demonstrations, the attack against a central police station and a big demonstration in December ended up in the largest riots this city has had seen for years, the response of the cops wasn't surprising, but nonetheless distinctive.

Another attack against the same previously damaged police station, at which allegedly a cop was seriously injured, worked as their reason for expanding the state of exception on the whole neighbourhood, in police-jargon a "danger zone". It's neither provoking surprise nor indignation, that the whole story of the second attack was completely and evidentially made up by the police – still this isn't completely irrelevant for the evaluation of these incidents.

It became very clear that the cops and authorities are always ready to use their widespread arsenal of methods of intervention if needed for keeping the control and that showing off their will and capacities is an important reason for them to act the way they do.

For a lot of comrades, individuals in struggle in my context these experiences were highly important – learning,



---

that despite the state of emergency, with police on every corner it is possible to take the streets, confidently and often wildly and angrily. Realizing that the best response to a situation of expansion of repressive control is to become uncontrollable, to act diffusely, informally and spontaneously; to appear in numerous different parts of the city, block traffic and launch attacks. It was a very revealing experience to reduce their sometimes old-fashioned, centralistic perceptions of domination to absurdity – in these ways. From this short time of uncontrollable moments there remained all in all two insights: on the one hand a remarkably greater self confidence towards the cops and authorities in this city in general – before it was said to be not possible to be wildly and unannounced on the streets, now this practice has developed itself as the realistic option of intervention. Besides this, the end of the conflicts in St. Pauli made clear how important it is to struggle offensively against the recuperation and pacification of social conflicts through every kind of political actors.

The end of the uncontrollable clash was marked by an authorised demonstration of various political organisations of the leftist milieu that demanded a “political solution for political conflicts”.

When the political recuperation of this conflict culminated in a court categorizing the practice of establishing “danger zones” as “against the constitution”, the dynamic around this situation was fading away. Of course the cops have kept their instrument of the state of emergency – but now it is just not called “danger zone” anymore, but “dangerous place”.

Now we are about to get involved with incidents in this city that could not – for many reasons – be separated from the situations described before. This nevertheless opens up questions for me, which could not be answered easily.

The carrying-through of the summits is happening in the fair halls of Hamburg – directly in the city, in sight and in throwing distance of neighbourhoods, in which not only a small part of my life is taking place. This circumstance I share with the most of my fellow comrades and this text is an attempt, to give an insight into discussions, that we had and have in the context of the summits. Quickly it became clear, that it's not going to be possible to ignore these events. Even if this impulse was strong, to stay away from the political staging of all parties involved, from the politicians of the G 20 states, to the leftist mobilisations, it is difficult or absurd, to fail to recognize the social relevance of the conferences. Until now it must be acknowledged, that nearly all, who had something to say about these summits have exactly behaved, as it could have been predicted.

There are invocations of the big NGO's, begging for an improvement of the worldwide misery, there is the militant campaign of the radical left for the mobilisation

of the black block and the stitch-up of the preachers of “civil obedience”, for example.

The institutions, that are administering the city in one direction or another, from the press to the cops, are making use of the predictable rhetoric of the rabble-rousing against the hordes of protesters, who are willing to use violence on the one hand, and of the importance of peaceful protest on the other hand.

Parts of the city have developed into places of state of exception since shortly before the summit of the OSZE. The fair halls are day and night surrounded by cops and after several attacks on cop cars many cop stations in the city area are fenced with NATO-wire. At this point it is maybe important to mention, how happy I am about the obviously rising willingness for direct attack against the institutions of power, even if it is a pity to recognize, that an imposed big event seems to be necessary for such a dynamic, while the misery of all day life could lead to enough motivation to attack, not dependent on such obvious provocations of the authorities.

Apart from the institutionalised processes, that are taking place in largely calculable ways, there are also moments that – due to their social relevance – could be important for a continuous struggle in my context, orientated towards conflict, if we are posing the right questions.

If we are facing the imposed fixation on the days of the summit in July with a deeper analysis of their meaning for the terrain, on which we struggle, courses of action can become apparent, in which our ideas of self-organisation, informality and attack are not at all out of place. In the light of this we have to see the desire and the thriving for a more collective moment of revolt of unrest and riot during the days of the summit in the context of continuous projects and processes, that are also existing after these days and can be developed further by us. To counter their staging of comprehensive control during this time with experiences of collective attack and loss of control could create moments, whose dynamic reaches beyond these specific days.

The residents of the Karolinenquarter, a relatively accessible quarter in the neighbourhood of St. Pauli, are affected concretely by the carrying-through of the summits, already since the preparations for the OSZE-summit. The fair halls, in which after the OSZE also the G20 shall take place are bordering the quarter in the north and in the east. The Karo-quarter is what can be called “alternatively shaped”. Since the 50's it is shaped by poor, mostly migrant workers. The Karo-quarter developed in the classical way into a quarter, in which after and after more fancy botiques, Cafés and other shops opened up and in which the rents rose continuously. Nevertheless the processes of gentrification proceeded in this specific quarter less rapidly. A continuous presence of occupied

---

houses, an anti-authoritarian center – in which today there is an anarchist library, amongst others – and the existing of a trailer park, that was evicted in 2002, were leading to a continuity of visible, but partly also reformist and leftist-alternative protest.

Already before the summit of the OSZE in december 2016 anti-authoritarian and anarchist individuals proposed through flyers and posters to make a neighbourhood encounter in the libertarian center LIZ, in which the anarchist library Sturmflut (storm tide) is located, to deal with the coming situation of besiegement and to discuss about solidarity and self-organisation.

This initiative was encountered with surprisingly positive resonance. It became clear, that on the one hand there was and is a great urge in the quarter, to deal with the potential restrictions, that the so called security measurements will mean for the life in the quarter. At the same time there was also a great openness towards the proposal to resist self-organized, informally and not dependent on political organizations against the imposed state of exception, to oppose the feeling of powerlessness with an experience of solidarity and mutual support.

These encounters were less characterized by talking about the critique or antagonism concerning the summit conferences, but rather by the urge, to counter the latently established police besiegement of the quarter and its impacts on the social reality in the neighbourhood. Out of these now regularly encounters, that are taking place, different initiatives developed, which made solidarity and self organisation in the Karo-quarter visible.

Since then there have been neighbourhood picnicks several times, through which space in the quarter for a visible encounter against police presence and control was acquired without permission and in a self-organised way. Banners were hung up into the trees, in the evenings films were shown, flyers were spread and there was an info-table of the anarchist library. Neighbours brought food, the close-by bar provided electricity and tables. People discussed and got to know each other and talked about possibilities of intervention. After and after people got to know each other and tried together to act beyond the picnics, that appeared quite peaceful: recently there was a small, non-authorized walk through the quarter; in the end a banner against cops and control was hung up into the trees directly towards the fair halls. The “tame” and very social character of this organization is especially amongst involved comrades an essential part of discussions about these experiences.

It becomes apparent that a getting-to-know each other amongst individuals on the basis of self-organisation and solidarity also always means a getting-to-know the limits of the developing relationships and that the individual, offensive intervention in the contexts, in which they exist, should not be lost out of sight, if we don't

want to get stuck in the congeniality of the colourful parties and cosy barbecue evenings amongst neighbours. Good social relationships, a recognizing each other with people on the streets, in which one is moving and fighting is very important – but it becomes clearer, that it is also important to keep in sight the subversive potential of self-organization and solidarity and to question developing initiatives again and again concerning this.

Do we challenge the social peace, do we let it crumble, or do we create structures, in which the social misery and the attack of the authorities could be just tolerated better?

The developing solidarity amongst each other, the built relationships are only then combative, if they are the point of reference for a far reaching confrontation with the cause, from which they emerged.

The fact that after the first neighbourhood encounter the cops were visiting three persons at home, whose names are in the renting contract of the libertarian center LIZ, to question them about a possible connection with a recently happened fire attack against the fair halls, shows clearly that the cops dislike this initiative. In the aftermath of the attack the cops also questioned many neighbours at their front doors if they were taking part in the encounters. Civil cops are bowing and scraping around the picnics and the invitations that are hung up in front of the doors are removed regularly, but during the public initiatives the cops were holding themselves back until now.

To accept this alleged peace could be for sure no option, so we have to find out where we can attack and how, facing the permanent cop presence and surveillance. Experiences of the last weeks show that the security apparatus is having lacks, which they will not be able to close. The burning of a cop van, which was parked to protect the house of the mayor, directly near the cop station, the burning of a car of the police union in sight of the main cop station of the Police of Hamburg and the burning of four cop vans on the parking area of a cop station are showing for example, that attack is still possible – despite their armament.

In a situation, in which nearly everybody is concentrating on one event, it is extremely important to illustrate that the possibilities of attack against this world of exploitation and oppression are diverse – the trouble-free procedure of allday life in the robot city Hamburg, the unrestricted turnaround of goods in the harbour, the ongoing development of the city into a moloch, which they call “Smart City”; all these are fields of confrontation, that are despite of their military staging difficult to control.

The continuous, destructive intervention into the fluently working system of this city could for us be an experience, to choose the fields of our attacks self-determined

---

and unpredictably, not dependent on the situations during the summits, prepared by them. The disruption of the daily routine can illustrate that the heteronomy of our lives can be attacked, by easy means and with potentially big impact. This city is full of interfaces, that are necessary for the functioning of this programmed anthill. The local public transport system only functions if its set of signals are functioning, the local public trans-

port companies only make money, if their ticket machines are working, the work can only be done if the wage slaves could reach their work through empty streets and only if the electricity- and data networks are remaining unaffected. Often it is just a “cut” between deadly order and vivid chaos and to find out where these points are located could be essential for our ability to pour oil into the fire, in situations, when they are loosing control.



## G20 in Hamburg: These were days of revolt

---

*July 2017 - Hamburg*

During the days of the summit of the G20, thousands of people flooded the streets of Hamburg with their anger about the cops' violence and the world that they protect. Already in the week before, the cops made clear that they will confront every sign of protest or resistance with zero tolerance. On the demo of thursday evening, they emphasized their position once again, attacking the front of the demo from the first minute it started. The cops obviously and viciously embraced the possibility of potentially even lethal injuries, when they pushed and catted the front block of the demo in a very narrow, canyon-like part of the Hafenstraße, bordered to the sides by brick walls. They caused panic, hitting, kicking, pepperspraying, teargasing and water-canonning from the front and the sides. Many people seeked to flee over the walls on the sides, a lot of people got hurt – but you could also see impressive moments of solidarity, people helping each other up the wall, whilst others attacked the cops from above and brave and calm front rows defended the demo from the cops' attacks, taking a serious beating.

The baton in the face, the knee in your neck, the pepper in the eye are there to remind you of who is in charge of this world.

During these days, the representatives and leaders of the 20 richest countries of this world met for discussing the maintenance of this order of misery. Tenthousands of cops where supposed to protect this spectacle from those who seek to show their open rage, hatred and resistance to those arrogant authorities.

Thursday night a lot of people chose to regain a part of the dignity that is being stolen from us on a daily basis, attacking the cops on a lot of different places in the city. Barricades where built and with hammers, stones and fire people put numerous cracks to the fassades of a society in which only those find their place who function, consume and obey.

The barricades of the night weren't fully extinguished,

when the first cars were going up in flames in the early morning of friday. On different places of the city, groups were teaming up to make clear that these days are about much more than just the attack against a meeting of state leaders. Amongst other targets, real estate agencies, wealthy cars, the juvenile court, banks and the shiny fassades of the shopping-hells were attacked and also the first cops had to flee under pelting stones and bottles. In a lot of different areas of the city, groups blocked with sit-ins and demonstrations, without people chosing different means getting in each others way.

On friday, the anger erupted with disruptive force that is unfortunately very rare in this context.

To disturb the deadly tranquility of the civil life, to interrupt the normality and disrupt the functioning of the city of the rich and consumerism and to show clearly, that the police state won't prevent us from living is a really strengthening experience.

On friday, a part of the space, that the authorities have taken with brute force, in order to perform this spectacle of power, has been taken back for a few hours.

With burning barricades and steady attacks on the police, people created a space, in which they could finally decide, what they want to do for a few hours, without the states force having any control or influence. A few shops and supermarkets were lootet, individuals taking what they need or want, others deciding to destroy symbols of this deadly world of consume, that mortifies every sense for a life wild and free and burned them on the streets. The diversity of individuals sharing the streets this day, attacking the police, looting and building barricades was impressive – involving a large number of individuals that probably aren't part of some kind of protest milieu.

When some self-proclaimed spokesman of whomever says, that the riot became intoxicated by itself, irresponsible and unpolitical, one has to agree. Despite the



---

deep disgust about his fawning opportunism, one has to say, he is right:

To wrest a space that is not controlled by the cops is an inevitably violent act and a clear disruption of what is being imposed on us day after day. It indeed hasn't got anything to do with any political agenda or program of whatever movement or organization – but with the individual, total reappropriation of our lives.

If these moments of disruption create a certain discomfort and even fear of a situation, in which the order that we got used to is indeed out of joint, this is no wonder – these feelings are an inevitable and inherent part of breaking with this reality.

In addition to the recognition of this, we have to ask ourselves, whose fear of what or whom we are talking about.

If it is about such a sated and rich society like the one present in this city of consumerism and trade, scared about its property and that finds the looting of goods and the rampaging of shopping districts the most dreadful moments of these days, this society needs to be destroyed. Their fear is a clear sign, that we are hitting at the right spot.

Our domestication in this world of authority is very extensive.

The cop in our head is very persistent.

Only a few can imagine, what the absence of authorities actually means – that's why we have to create moments, in which we can experience their absence.

The fact, that individuals make decisions, that in the

aftermath might seem not right or irresponsible, is no surprise, not in these situations and not in any other situation in life. We will have to talk about these things, no doubt, if we want to come closer to an idea of freedom. But it has to be clear, that there is no objectivity – especially not in revolt. Individual responsibility and initiative of those who want to maintain it are inherent parts of the revolt.

It's really easy to fall for the imposed discourse of authorities and preservers of this order. Those, that were viciously risking peoples lives these days where the cops – no doubt about that.

Falling for this propaganda and rabble-rousing and letting it control the strengthening and liberating momentum of these days would be a big mistake.

On this weekend, resistance has left the field of politically orchestrated protest – and again it's becoming clear, that in revolt it is about choosing sides.

Either you are with those who seek to see this society, this order, this system in ruins – with the idea of a life in freedom and dignity, embracing all the mistakes and triumphs, that are inherent in the revolt.

Or you are with those who recognize, that they feel more comfortable with a tame and calculable protest milieu, that takes place in the safe frame of the totalitarian system – scared of taking steps that might actually lead towards the cold and vast fields of freedom.

***Anarchists for social revolt***



## At the beginning of the river

The struggle against the Google-Campus in Berlin

---

May 2017 - Berlin

*This text tries to be more than merely a short outline about the struggle against the planned Google-campus in Berlin. It tries to communicate, to stimulate discussions and to raise questions. Questions and discussions, that can help to deal with a specific struggle and also the projects of domination on a transregional and international level. Avalanche is offering itself for these questions and analyses. The following text is the attempt of a communication amongst anarchists, with the intention to widen an offensive scope of action, that is not staying merely in symbolic action and that can not be chained to one place through borders.*

\*\*\*

In the end of 2016 the plans of Google to open up a campus in Berlin were introduced at a press conference in Berlin. A Google-Campus, as already exists in London, Warsaw, Sao paulo, Seoul, Madrid and Tel Aviv. The Berlin Campus shall provide rooms for start up companies (of course everything in Google's interest – but not only), offer workshops for experts and amateurs, as well as host a „Google Cafe“. As location of all this shall serve the old electrical substation in Kreuzberg. Google submitted a permission for reconstruction, to start with the reconstruction measures in the old electrical substation and to be able to open the Campus in the end of 2017. Beside of the Factory in the Center of Berlin, a Start Up Campus of different companies, amongst others, also of Google, the new Google Campus would be another mainstay of the concern in Berlin. The plans of a Google Campus in Berlin are not only in the concern's interest, but also in the government's interest. It was not only, that the governing mayor of Berlin was present at the first press conference, and that he praised Google and explained what a chance a Google Campus in Berlin would mean for the economical development of the city, but also that out of the session of the senate it could be heard that the senate is entirely supporting Google's plans.

The reasons for an offensive anarchist project against the plans of Google and of domination are different

ones. On the one hand Kreuzberg and Neukölln (the quarter in which the old electrical substation is bordering on Kreuzberg) are since a long time places, in which an anarchist intervention is visible, for example there is the anarchist library Kalabalik in the same apartment block as the electrical substation. On the other hand Kreuzberg and parts of Neukölln are affected by a massive restructuring. Once those have been quarters where poorer people could afford to live in, but the quarter changed a lot in the last years (or decades) concerning this.

These changes and the displacement is coming along with a tension, out of which there are and have been again and again attacks against the state and its responsables. Nevertheless „Kreuz-Kölln“ (the quarter around the border of Kreuzberg and Neukölln) has long since become a hip scene place, in which amongst others the Start Up landscape of Berlin is growing. Here we see an interest of Google moving to Kreuzberg, because Kreuzberg still has the image of an alternative quarter, beyond Berlin and Germany. Google would like to stabilize its „casual“, „alternative“ and „hip“ image as well as collect „creative“ ideas. On the other hand the reasons for a struggle against Google is the attempt to attack the seemingly invulnerable technological power.

For us, it isn't about Google itself, but about the domination's projec of digitalisation and technologisation.

It is about to aim at the concrete construction project of a tech-concern, to prevent this and attack it, and as well develop a trenchant critique.

Since the release to the public that Google is going to open up a Campus in Berlin, there have been – amongst others – anarchist machinations in the quarter against the construction plans of Google. Whereas the protest of civil initiatives and of the left is aimed above all against the gentrification in the quarter, an anarchist struggle considers itself as offensive project against Google as tech-company and against the dreams of domination. Since the beginning of this year in the quarter and on

---

the walls of the old electrical substation slogans against Google and domination could be read: “It’s not possible to google freedom“, “power off“, “start up revolt“, ... An anarchist newspaper (called Shitstorm) was spreaded in an edition of 7000 pieces, that puts the prevention of the Google-Campus into a context of attack against the plans of domination (for example, plans of a Smart City).

The posters, that could be read on the walls and the flyers that were spread were aimed against Google, against technology, domination, as well as against the politics that try to pacify the resistance against the Google Campus. Once a month there is an “Anti-Google Café“ taking place in the anarchist library Kalabalik. This place serves as opportunity to exchange information, for coordination and discussion of an informal and self-organized struggle, aimed at the prevention of the Google Campus in Berlin. The anarchist proposal for an informal, self-organised offensive struggle, without appealing to politics and authority is visible in the quarter. For the state it seems threatening insofar as for example the old electrical substation was the only building that was explicitly protected by the cops on the 1st of may demonstration.

Although Google already has a renting contract and wants to open in the end of 2017, no reconstruction works – in general no construction works in the electrical substation – could be recognized until today. A month ago it was made public, that the reconstruction works of Google were refused in their first version. Until today when this text is written, it is not clear, if Google is able to move into the old electrical substation in Kreuzberg.

As it seems there are problems concerning the reconstruction plans. But these could be improved by Google and with this second application they could start with the reconstruction works. We are assuming that it is in Google’s interest to move into the old electrical substation and to Kreuzberg, so it is just a question of time when the reconstruction works will start.

It’s the Green Party who were the first ones to oppose themselves against the first reconstruction plans of Google, moving into the old electrical substation in Kreuzberg. Within this, the politicians are living up to their role as mediators for domination by trying to blunt the resistance in the quarter to a political dialogue on the one hand and on the other hand to pacify it. In the press appeared several articles about the resistance in the quarter against the planned Google Campus. The different fractions, politicians as well as leftists and citizens’ initiatives are arguing with the threatening replacement and the burden on that quarter, if Google is going to move into the electrical substation. We didn’t expect it from the accomplices and mediators of domination – but nowhere could be read, that Google is not any concern like other companies and which role Google

plays for the project of the restructuring of power. Nothing could be read about the visible anarchist critique of technology. Aware, that the anarchist critique of technologisation of power can not be adopted by state and capital, by politics and by leftists, because they would cut into their own flesh – they have to ignore it. This shows us once again that an anarchist struggle has to resist not only against the recuperation through (radical) politics, but also has to acknowledge politics as enemy.

For us as anarchists in the end it doesn’t matter if Google comes to Kreuzberg or to another quarter in Berlin. For us it is not about to react to a project of domination, but rather about to attack this project and by doing this to develop an own project. The intention of Google goes along with the plans of the state concerning technologization, for example, developing a smarter city or the plans of the government to create the conditions for a highly technological industry. This means that the infrastructure of the country and the city have to be expanded: faster internet, more w-lan access for free, more plug connectors in the public space, ... And all this needs in turn construction projects, as the installation of new cables. Without waiting for these obviously visible targets for attack to open up we’re trying to attack domination today. This also means to place the ideology, that all the tech-companies have dedicated themselves to, into the focus of an offensive anarchist struggle.

We can attend ourselves to a concrete project, as an adequate method, to not only speak about an “apocalypse through technology“ and to stay seated in our armchairs, but rather to attack here and now – to throw oneself into the river, trying to stay above the water with one’s head and to focus the enemy.

One could say that it’s too early to outline a struggle, which is not older than half a year. For sure this text was written out of a spontaneity, but nevertheless out of the deep interest to have discussions. A discussion, to rise the questions of how and if a specific struggle can be international, if there can be an international proposal, that is not moving on the terrain of symbolism and of spectacle. But also the questions concerning anarchist attacks against projects of domination, like technologisation, smartisation, digitalisation. The restructuring of power is an international project, so an anarchist struggle should not be restricted regionally, but should rather find ways to spread across areas. As already mentioned, this text is addressed to comrades in other parts of the world and tries to start communicating.

For sure other attacks, analyses and proposals could be developed, if one is not “limited“ due to the proximity to the struggle itself. This short and maybe too early outlining of the struggle in Berlin against a planned Google Campus is also the rejection to write an outlining only when everything is over, but rather to do it in the chaos of the struggle itself.



## Fighting under the state of emergency

Anarchist views on the conflictuality in France

---

June 2017 - France

*These last years, comrades from different geographical horizons put forward numerous questions concerning the French context during different exchanges. Discussions concerned for example the consequences of the jihadist attacks, in particular in repressive terms, as France certainly is one of the antiterrorist and security laboratories on European level. But discussions also and foremost turned to the climate of social upheaval, marked by opposition movements or revolts, of which some echoes crossed the national borders.*

*It is also to answer to this interest and curiosity that we will try to give an overview, obviously limited and partial, of the situation in which we are living and fighting. By making the choice to focus on some particular episodes of conflict, we do not intend to make unconditional praises of it or present it as the nec plus ultra of conflictuality, but rather to give some examples of anarchist activity in a context that surely is full of contradictions, but still not totally pacified – in spite of the efforts of Power and the continuous advancing of the devastating capitalist bulldozer. These situations have been occasions amongst others to continue to spread anarchist contents and practices, based on the refusal of all authority, individual initiative, free association and direct action. According to us, they also showed the need for our own interventions, also inside of the broader conflicts, as to deepen and extend the questioning of the existent and in the perspective of opening up real possibilities of profound disruption.*

### State of war and state of emergency

Since several years the French State has literally declared the territory in its power as being “at war”, not only externally with a multiplication of military interventions in different countries, but also against the so-called “internal enemies”. From 2014 on, the former socialist government launched a reform of the antiterrorist legislation, going obviously in the direction of a hardening of the legislation, allowing for example to extend the concept to the so-called “lone wolves” (individuals acting

on their own) or adding the crime of apology. More broadly, a wave of laws on internal security (6 new laws in three years, amongst which the law on the Intelligence Services) was going to extend the police and juridical arsenal even more, the presence of private militias in the public transport, the means of surveillance and all kinds of filing.

In January 2015, after the islamist attacks against the Charlie Hebdo newspaper and the supermarket Hypercasher in Paris, the State propaganda and the evermore oppressing surveillance by cops and soldiers, in particular in the Parisian region, gave the impression of a concrete layer poured out on bodies and minds. The huge demonstration organised by Power after these attacks to gather the citizenist herd under the holy Republican values, the national flag and the representatives of order, made the partisans of freedom sick and a lot to worry about. In that time, anarchist material was spread, calling to break the ranks in which the States, as well democratic as religious, and the soldiers, as well of God as of the Fatherland, want to enlist us, calling out against the military logical and the reign of fear, for the pursue of the fight for freedom.

In November 2015, after the jihadist attacks that caused massacres in several streets and in a concert venue in Paris, the State of Emergency was declared. This measure which in theory is “exceptional” (in reality, it was prolonged six times and will be prolonged until the recently elected government inscribes the principal measures of the state of emergency in common law), gave free rein to the dogs of the State to make house searches (24/24h and without warrants from a judge), systematic searches and controls,... Police operations sky-rocketed, leading to many arrests (mostly for other motives than the strictly anti-terrorist ones), convictions and administrative house arrests (based on suspicion and without a judge deciding on it).



---

## Social war

But all this didn't put an end to social conceptuality which takes on many different forms and intensities.

Police forces continued to be attacked in many different ways and for many reasons, in particular in the areas where they are omnipresent<sup>1</sup>; the diffuse hostilities against aspects of projects of domination were pursued in certain places. The so-called "war on terrorism" contributed to degrading survival conditions, already miserable from all points of view, even more for a large part of the population, and the being-fed-up continued to grow. A significant example of the determination to not bow to the injunctions of the State and its relays (like the media, the syndicates, the politicians of all sorts...) was the demonstration which took place a few days after the attacks of November 13th, although it was prohibited and cancelled by the official organisers.

Hundreds of people broke through the cop lines and marched on one of the biggest Parisian arteries, expressing in the act as well the rejection of the State of Emergency as the borders and the awful conditions imposed on migrants. This demonstration, like other attempts to "overstepping" during the mobilisations that followed like the one against the COP21 Summit in Paris, showed once more that the best reaction to any form of repression isn't citizenist indignation, but continuing to fight without mediation.

So, when the State tried to apply its new administrative arsenal by handing out house arrests and interdictions to demonstrate to persons which are considered dangerous for public order, many comrades, rather than ringing the democratic and media alarm bell of "freedom of expression", simply made the choice to defy these interdictions by using the margins at their disposal.

It is in this climate that in March 2016, the mobilisations against the so-called "Loi Travail" kicked off, a reform which is supposed to deeply modify the labour law in favour of the bosses with conditions of evermore flexible exploitation and sacking. As usual, the syndicates took the road of negotiations, some of them trying to play out a strong card by asking of the withdrawal of the law as to preserve their position of co-managers and an opposition façade in decline. Many political forces also jumped on the occasion to position themselves more towards the left on the pre-electoral chessboard. But rather than entering into details about this eternal manoeuvres of recuperation, we are more keen on speaking about the rage triggered by this straw that broke the camel's back, and about the revolt that expressed itself during four months, largely outflanking the framework of the "Loi Travail".

Yet we have to point out that in Paris – that's where we were – as in most of the cities, the clashes generally coincided with the syndical calendar of

---

1 Also the importance of sabotages, that in some places became systematic, of cameras installed by the authorities.

mobilisations<sup>2</sup>, a fact that didn't remain without consequences, in particular when the "action days" decided by the syndicates became less frequent (conform to their strategy of control and loss of impetus). When these days followed each other at a quite high rhythm, often different demonstrations took place at the same day in Paris. In the demonstrations called by the syndicates their security teams obviously were ordered to avoid all clashes and to work narrowly together with the cops. An industrial quantity of cops were deployed to supervise the demonstrations or surround ("nasser" or "kessel") the most combative parts of it. These enormous deploying of mass management, relatively new in Paris, aimed to neutralise all possibilities of mobile attacks, therefore, many energy has been put in launching offensive autonomous marches, assuring self-defence and fighting all the way of the demonstrations the lines of the super-equipped robocops. Those cops didn't hesitate to intensively use gas and weapons like flash balls and grenades, many demonstrators got injured because of this<sup>3</sup>. In spite of the conditioned reflex often consisting of focusing on the uniform, forgetting that it is first and foremost an obstacle on the way towards destruction; and in spite of the political strategy of some people, trying to turn the hatred for cops (rightly shared by many) into the common denominator to gather the masses, many people didn't settle for the sometimes spectacular and ritualised frontal clashes with the cops.

Small groups used the margins and the liberated spaces to attack from out of the autonomous marches what is participating in the routine of domination and exploitation. By effect of contagion, the groups multiplied; during the demonstrations, tens of banks, unemployment offices, interim agencies, real estate agencies, insurance companies, shops and city property where trashed; ever more imaginative slogans illustrated the need for and the joy of destroying what destroys us.

Outside of these massive demonstrations based on the concentration of a mass (with the attempts to seize control and the populist logics that they might engender) and of police, wild demonstrations were boosted, often during the night<sup>4</sup>. To our opinion, they have been much

---

2 But this didn't prevent them of being in several occasions the targets of attacks. For example, on the 23th of June, a part of the façade of the headquarters of the CFDT in Paris was destroyed, and in the night of the 24th of June followed an attack against the headquarters of the CGT in Montreuil.

3 In October 2014, an offensive grenade fired by a gendarme had already killed a demonstrator, Rémi Fraisse, during the struggle against the building of a dam in Sivens. After this killing, this particular type of grenades have been prohibited, but the mutilations caused by "non lethal" weapons can be counted in the hundreds.

4 We are not interested here in giving details about the movement "Nuit Debout", essentially citizenist and leftist, comparable to the "Indignados" in the sense that they



---

more interesting and rich in terms of possibilities as they allow much more to choose the trajectory (this or that area, these or those objectives) and the rhythm, to keep cops relatively out of the way giving air to individual initiatives and the appropriation and sharing of certain destructive practices. In the course of some of this wild strolls, shops have been plundered, police stations attacked and institutions ransacked<sup>5</sup>. On top of this comes the potential for disruption and disorganisation of order that such initiatives have and the chaos that their proliferation might provoke. In this sense, the forms revolt takes on are not only circumstantial, influenced by the material conditions against which it clashes, but are also linked to perspectives, in this case antiauthoritarian, with the choices that stem from them: for example the choice for a terrain that suits the propagation and the splitting up in more small, more mobile groups.

Another proposition was to call for the multiplication of sabotage against the fluxes of the economy as to disrupt the daily functioning of the exploitation machinery. But in spite of some blockade actions which showed that a bit of imagination, determination and rudimentary means can suffice to put sand in the clogs, the routine of domination has not been durably disrupted and in general, the quantitative illusion hasn't been surpassed.

The fact that that the majority of the activities were concentrated on an agenda and on terrains defined by others has been another important limit. With the State tightening even more the nose around the possibilities to demonstrate, with summertime and the unavoidable holidays coming and with finally the law passed, things cooled down fast.

On the other hand, one cannot deny that the whole of this

---

helped a new class of politicians to surf on the wave of discontent. Another point that both movements have in common was the occupation of squares. In Paris such an occupation took place during two months (more or less end of March until beginning of June). One can be sorry for the fact that this heterogeneous gathering became a point of fixation of energies to the detriment of autonomous spaces for deepening and coordination. In spite of this, the refusal of many people to get caught up in the impotence of mechanisms of delegation and representation in assemblies with parliamentary airs made this occupation also a starting place for wild demonstrations. This determination, as well as its localisation on a quite central square (place de la République), offering many different axes in all directions allowed in several occasions to break the encirclement of the police to spread hostilities.

5 Like on the 25th of February, when after a brutal intervention of the cops against protesting school kids in Paris, hundreds of angry people took to the streets during the day, attacking two police stations and expressing their rage in the surrounding areas, plundering two supermarkets on the way. Or like on the 14th of April, when a ravaging nocturnal stroll that kicked off from Place de la République, broke the windows of the Customs Office and the Commerce and Industry Chambers, plundered a supermarket and then ransacked a Jaguar dealership.

agitations of these four months around so many questions that are much more linked to the social war than to the "war on terrorism" has considerably modified the social climate. One of the commonly given examples to illustrate this changing of paradigm is the hatred for the cops which expresses itself in many ways, breaking the pseudo-consensus put on stage of the defensive role of the police forces after the attacks. Furthermore, the critique in words and in acts of the law, of labour and of the world that needs them, as well as the practical demonstration that oppression is not only embodied by the rulers (who are by the way not always so faraway as we might imagine), but also by a whole set of structures which can be attacked everywhere, certainly left its traces.

During the following months, evermore police killings<sup>6</sup> recalled, if this was still necessary, that the cops are also ready to employ terror, in particular in the poor areas. In some cases the killings were answered with riots, but they stayed often circumscribed in time and space, even when they were accompanied with shots against the uniforms.

On the other hand, beginning of February 2017, the news about the rape of a youngster with a baton during a police control, in full daylight and in a street full of people, burst out of the city in the Parisian periphery where it took place, spreading like wildfire. This time, rage spread, not only to a big number of periphery cities where the cops were sometimes attacked methodically and with fire, as well as their cars and their stations, but also to the capital and to other cities. Schools were blocked by barricades, riotous demonstrations attacked institutions, burned vehicles (in particular of the media, identified correctly as enemies), plundered supermarkets, ...<sup>7</sup>.

The revolt spread out during a month, claims of nocturnal attacks express solidarity, linking the revolt sometimes with other stories, like the one of a comrade in prison for breaking windows during the wild demonstration on the 14th of April 2016 or the recent incarceration (7th of February 2017) of another comrade, accused of

---

6 "Evermore" police killings, because the list keeps on growing. To give some more examples: at the end of March 2017, a guy of 56 years old of Chinese origin, was killed in his own flat in Paris when cops came after a call for "excessive noise"; on the 20th of May, gendarmes fired their guns, killing a rebellious farmer in Saône-et-Loire. And that's without quoting the deaths during car chases, or the coma's and the heavy injuries during routine controls.

7 On the 12th of February, during a gathering in front of the Bobigny Tribunal, the burning of a truck of the television chain RTL was the starting sign for a particularly destructive riot which lasted for hours. By the way, attacks against "journacops" – also the "alternative" ones – multiplied during demonstrations, anarchists texts criticising the harmful role of picture taking as such (and the plague of cellular phones), as a means of snitching and for the spectator relation it induces were spread.

---

having participated in the burning of a police car in May 2016<sup>8</sup>.

More generally, confronted with a widespread democratic and leftist discourse that makes a strange difference between Justice and Police, and confronted with claims that asks the one to punish the “abuses” of the other, it became essential to develop a radical critique of the judiciary apparatus as such, as well as the concept of “justice” itself. Through different channels – for example, many texts and more or less public activities – the necessity was pointed out to attack this pillar of authority as such (just like the prison with its various tentacles), always with the aim to definitively finish off the State. Vengeance and revolt have been reaffirmed against all dialogue with the institutions and against the illusion of ameliorating the existent.

All throughout this year, just as during other periods of presidential and legislative elections (in 2007 and 2012 for example), hostilities against parties, their representatives and their premises grew in intensity: candidates have been roughed up, meetings disturbed and tens of party permanences have been vandalised in different ways. The reasons for these attacks are certainly diverse, but it is significant that they touched the whole of the political spectrum, from the extreme right to the extreme left, with the Socialist Party (at that time still in power) taking on particularly many hits. Some offensive demonstrations in between the two electoral tours and after the results of the presidential elections, have affirmed as well a rejection of the electoral circus and blackmail (for example with the slogan “Ni Le Pen, ni Macron, ni Patrie ni Patron”, “Neither Le Pen nor Macron, neither Fatherland nor Boss”), as the will to continue to fight, whatever might be the power in place.

The electoral propaganda was also answered by a large spreading of posters, pamphlets, articles in anarchist agitation papers which, going far beyond the classical calls for abstention – of which it was clear it would be massive, as it turned out to be – extended the string of attack and put forward the

---

8 On the 18th of May 2016, the cops organised a gathering to protest “against the hatred for the police” on Place de la République in Paris. In response, a wild demonstration starts not far away from there. When the demonstrations crosses a patrol car, the car is neutralised and then burned, the two cops in the car already fled. After this, about ten people have been arrested on different moments. Some were put in prison, others got a judiciary control measure, all accused of having participated in the action, and in a first moment, of “attempted homicide”. This charge has been dropped now, but nine people will face trial from the 19th to the 22nd of September 2017 for “violence” and “destruction of a police car”, accusations for which they risk heavy sentences. One person is subject to an international search warrant, three are still in preventive jail (two are in prison since more than a year; the solidarity fund Kalimero which exists since 2007 sends money to them every month). Solidarity on anarchist and antiauthoritarian bases with the act of burning a police car has expressed itself during many public activities and nocturnal attacks against a variety of targets.

antiauthoritarian, insurrectional and revolutionary perspective as the only way to get rid of politics once and for all.

Obviously we have just glanced over the social upheaval in France. We could also have spoken about the clashes linked to the borders like in Calais, the revolts in different prisons and many more stuff. It is surely also not useless to recall once more that the social conflictuality doesn't limit itself to particular moments as the ones we discussed. Struggles against nuisances and specific projects didn't stop (the ones in Notre-Dame-des-Landes and in Bure are maybe the most known, but they are not the only ones). And a big many of diffuse attacks, not necessarily accompanied with communiques, against different targets are making clear that many do not totally put up with the imposed normality.

The reading of journals or of certain websites of counter-information in France gives a slight idea about the ongoing social war. But the sharpening of our perception and of our analyses of the conflictuality goes far beyond the necessarily deformed vision that the media give from it. They might above all give some supplementary indications, and it is up to each one to decide what to do with it as to think his or her own intervention and develop his or her acting, without ever renouncing his or her ideas, and surely not to follow some protagonists transformed into “revolutionary subjects”, but eventually to bring forward specific contributions. Then opens up a whole panorama of possible questions and experimentations concerning the autonomous struggles to wage, the thousand different ways to favour the extension of revolt, the deepening of subversive contents and the attacking angles that seem important, the spreading of practical proposals, the obstacles that have to be cleared out of the way, the complicities to be discovered, the possible articulations and echoes, far away from a wait-and-see-attitude, from all populism, from all force that pushed towards centralisation and a spectacular relation, and with the conviction that only radical ruptures with the normal course of domination can open up real possibilities of total liberation.

So many passionate experimentations that do not acknowledge borders and of which we hope that they will continue to extend in the four corners of the planet.

### ***Some internationalists***



## Putting into practice

---

May 2017 - Montreal

*“I would like for the police to be afraid of being attacked when they patrol Hochelag, for small yuppie businesses to hesitate before setting up shop here because their insurance premiums will be super expensive, for people to think about how if they park their luxury cars in the neighbourhood overnight, they’re risking waking up to them being trashed, that as soon as graffiti or posters are cleaned, they’re back up.” - sub.Media interview with an anarchist participant in anti-gentrification vandalism*

*Anarchist intervention in the struggle against gentrification in Montreal has gained force over the last several years. What started as just a few instances of vandalism a year has multiplied in frequency in the neighbourhoods of St-Henri and Hochelaga, to the extent that police now have a squad dedicated to repressing anti-gentrification vandalism (they’ve had no success). On the heels of attacks against yuppie restaurants earlier in the summer, in July several luxury cars outside of condos in St. Henri were put to the torch.*

*Putting into Practice was written half as a response to the critique Mise en Commun, and half as a reflection and proposal for an insurrectional perspective in this struggle against gentrification. We’ve shortened the text to include more of the later for this publication. If you’d like to read the full text, or communiques and counter-information related to this struggle, you can find them at [mtlcounter-info.org](http://mtlcounter-info.org).*

\*\*\*

We’d like to respond with our thoughts to a text Mise en Commun (Putting in Common) that has been circulated critiquing insurrectionary projects and perspectives in Montreal. [...] Mise en Commun makes reference to and responds to several dozen actions, attacks and small demos that were carried out in the neighborhoods of Hochelaga and St. Henri by anarchists over the last year (which have a continuity going back several years now). These actions which we’ll reference herein mostly involved destroying the facades or merchandise of busi-

nesses and apparatuses that contribute to gentrification: yuppie businesses, police, the offices of developers, luxury cars and surveillance cameras. Most of the actions we’re referencing were claimed with a communique that was published on the internet or printed and distributed in paper form (sometimes scattered in leaflet form at the site of the action) explaining the action, how it was carried out, and situating it within the particular context it occurred in. As far as claimed actions go, there was a spike in the frequency of these types of actions in 2016. We’re going to look at how these actions are placed in the context of neighbourhoods with tensions around gentrification, what this means for anarchists who want to intervene here, and what we think this has contributed to. Through this grounding, we’ll engage the questions of communication and intelligibility, mass movements, anarchist intervention, strategy, isolation and specialization, and repression. We’ll then make several proposals for a multiform and combative struggle against gentrification, along with other struggles that the Montreal anarchist space could pursue.

Intelligible to whom?

### Intelligible to whom?

*“To have resonance, our actions must be communicable, to make sense for others, they must be intelligible.”*  
– Mise en Commun

We certainly agree with elements of this. In acting, one of our primary considerations is how our actions will be understood, both by comrades and anyone else who encounters them. However, we want to be clear about to whom we are intelligible. We want to communicate with potential accomplices, people who, when they see or hear about the actions, resonate with the need to undermine that which grinds them down and makes their lives miserable, those who want to fight back. We want to be unintelligible to authority – we don’t speak their language and don’t want to, because we don’t want to fit in their paradigm so as to enter a dialogue. We want to destroy them.

---

Even when actions speak for themselves (and certainly some actions speak more clearly for themselves than others; this is ok) we can't rely on the leftist or corporate media to diffuse our ideas – the goal of those projects isn't to communicate ideas, but rather to reinforce their own worldview by incorporating our ideas or actions into their narratives. It's necessary that we develop and utilize our own channels of communication in order to be clear about what we're doing and what we want, and to avoid censorship.

Accompanying an action with a communique can help clarify the actors' intentions, to demystify the means by which it was carried out and to situate the action within a broader struggle or strategic line. Claims for many of the actions we're referencing were published online on Montreal Counter-information, a local infrastructure project of autonomous communication for our struggles in the Montreal anarchist space. Of course, this often comes up against the limit of only being engaged with by other anarchists. One way the project appears to address this limit is to make printable versions of the communiqués that can be posted up in the streets, and circulated through distro tables and among apartments. This attempts to open lines of communication with people who don't exist in the same limited channels of the internet that we do.

### **The language of war & the spectacle**

Mise en Commun criticizes the authors of an anonymous communique for "speaking of an act of war while claiming the vandalism of five businesses", accusing the actors of fetishization of terminology, pretension, and dramatization of their own power. Generally, when we speak of war (at least one that we ourselves might be engaged in), we tend to be referring to social war – the expansion of conflict to every aspect of life, just as domination and capitalism extend beyond the real subsumption of the workplace. This social conflict is necessarily open-ended, chaotic, and contains within it an exponential growth in possible complicities. This war is an underlying reality, one which we seek to make visible through our actions and propaganda, though we must note that our own engagement with this war constitutes but a small fraction of it. The actors also explained their 'act of war' in writing "We will not let these boutiques install themselves here peacefully. This facade of peace is nothing more than an attempt to make invisible the war in progress against poor and marginalized people." However, we should be conscious that 'war' is also the language the State uses to describe conflict, and wars often have truces and standardized logics, whereas the war we want to wage is permanent, and outside militaristic conceptions of struggle.  
[...]

We also want to complicate a reduction of confident language to "the staging of our power" [Transl. Mise en scène – to stage a play]. It might also be helpful to

point out that the current and local socio-cultural conditions, influenced by a puritan ethic, teach us to practice modesty when speaking from our hearts. In mainstream society, certain youth are allowed to think of themselves as the centre of the universe until they're beat into submission by hard economic realities and social roles. In this context, people prefer to allow celebrities and international struggles to have all the glory and to be fetishized as objects. With this in mind, we reject a practice of modesty when fighting against that which destroys us. When we speak in a heartfelt and proud manner, with respect to actions that we pour our passions into, we can only hope to normalize a love for oneself and our life's passions as a subversive act. Finding unmediated ways to interact with our own desires is in fact a great way to diminish the power of the spectacle, rather than reinforcing it. CrimethInc. is often critiqued or poked fun at for embracing these qualities in their writing, but they might have been on to something. If pride can be limiting, it's more so if it becomes an obstacle to self-critique and learning, or in our interpersonal relationships, and that's where we'd prefer to address this problem.

### **Mass-movement and popular anarchism in Montreal**

*"...We've had enough being on the heels of a context, waiting for a student strike or the construction of a pipeline... The context that favours us, the arena where we fight, the territory we inhabit, it's ours to create."*  
– Mise en Commun

We completely agree with the statement above, and it influences all of our projects. The time to act for freedom is now.

Mise en Commun goes on to state that "It's not in social movements that we look for [power], but rather in insurrectional moments". This is where we differ. We don't want to replace the Grand Soir with an anticipated insurrectional moment on the horizon, again deferring struggle into the future. Even for those who believe that collective power is only to be found in future insurrectional moments, it remains meaningful to act outside of such moments with the goal of preparing oneself for them, of laying the groundwork for them, of fomenting them. By honing our practices in the present, our capacity to intervene in future (often unexpected) occasions will be kept sharp.

Mise en Commun makes a full-circle contradiction by only mentioning the 2012 student strike as a concrete example for an insurrectional moment. April and May of 2012 is considered an insurrectional moment "not only in the sense that shit was popping off every night, but also in the sense that our relations were defined in function of, by and for the strike."

We differ in thinking that 2012 was an insurrectional moment. We'd define an insurrectional moment as a vio-



---

lent creation of time and space which breaks with social roles and normalcy. If the situation at times approached being uncontrollable, it's not because the student strike defined our relations, but in fact the opposite – because the struggle spilled out of the confines of the demand-oriented strike and the student identity after the repressive laws came into effect. Although our collective capacity for street-fighting was creatively expanded in many moments, this ultimately wasn't matched in uncontrollable ideas or in the subversion of social roles. All of those broken windows and injured cops were successfully re-framed as militant reformism, and all momentum was recuperated into electoral politics without so much as a hiccup. Our main reflection on our interventions in those months is that we didn't put enough energy into engaging on the level of our anarchist ideas and making them relevant to the situation.

It would be obtuse to claim that no liberatory power was felt in those moments. But it would be a great tragedy to not admit the ways in which we betrayed ourselves and potential accomplices by putting our radical perspectives aside in order to respond to a sense of urgency. Even in May of 2012, it was uncomfortably clear how largely white the faces of the so-called mass were in a very multi-cultural city, in a struggle that presented itself as class-based, while lefty liberals honked the horns of their Mercedes' in support of those disobeying repressive laws in the streets. Privilege politicians might look at such a reality and make the same mistake all over again – affirming that we need to put our individual desires aside for a demand that extends the liberal social contract (with its rights, privileges, and powerlessness) beyond the standard white-supremacist framework. But if we are to take ourselves seriously as anarchists and speak of “a culture of struggle” from our perspective and not that of a politician, let's hold positions that make fewer compromises.

In certain moments, actions taken and claimed by anarchists have alienated and made collaboration impossible with the Left; in a certain sense, this is desirable. We think that building a revolutionary culture of struggle necessitates, not alienating every single leftist, but rather sabotaging the Left's hold on struggles. The Left is one of the primary means by which previously uncontrolled struggles are recuperated, by diverting their energy into mediation with the authorities, and patching things up. Anarchists should engage with the Left as a barrier to liberatory perspectives and practices. A certain form of populist-leaning anarchism – inherited from the Left, and in the case of Montreal, militant student organizing – is in our view one of the greatest obstacles to anarchist projects in Montreal.  
[...]

Looking for normative legitimacy can only invisibilize conflict in the long-term. However, if we can socially spread narratives of the legitimacy of our practices in ways that break with normative values, we come into

a great, subversive power – when many other people think it's legit to fight cops and occupy buildings, and not legit for cops to shoot us or landlords to evict us. More is possible when there is social support for our actions and when more people are breaking out of their roles and participating in struggle or illegality. This will necessarily clash with normative legitimacy – we can see an obvious example of this irreconcilability in how ‘violence’ in normative paradigms is used to designate anything with a semblance of a revolutionary horizon. It's just as important that comrades are putting energy into arguing for the legitimacy of our practices as it is to be experimenting with practices – not with the media or politicians, but horizontally, in the streets, with neighbors, and undermining the legitimacy of the practices of the State.  
[...]

While it's worthwhile to find ways to interact directly with others outside of our youthful and subcultural milieus, people shouldn't focus on organizing others into some mass-movement in order to feed their sense of legitimacy, but should organize themselves, and be clear with those we interact with about who we are and what we want. Politics (and the ommissive and manipulative discourses it requires) should be avoided when building anti-authoritarian foundations. We think a critique of the left and of populism could bring interesting reflections to social anarchist initiatives, like that of Chlag.info, which organized an assembly against gentrification in Hochelaga.  
[...]

Elements of the failed framework of anarchists mobilizing the masses of students into a strike against austerity seem to have been transferred into mobilizing the masses of a neighbourhood against gentrification, so that some day in the future, direct actions can be embedded in this social-movement context. This framework functions through politics: a logic of recruitment, a deferral of struggle into the future, and the creation of a lowest-common-denominator point of unity publicity campaign. Whether ‘Fuck austerity’ or ‘Fuck gentrification’, ideas and differences are reduced to a political program designed to appeal to a ‘mass’. Where gentrification (or any specific struggle) offers an opportunity for us to link this struggle to anarchist perspectives that put everything into question, this political approach instead chooses to not make any of these connections or challenge the normative and respectable leftist discourse against gentrification.

Connecting this struggle to an analysis against all government, policing, colonization and social control, for instance, is thought to likely alienate many people in the projected social mass, and detract numbers from the base of supporters of a lowest-common-denominator cause. When these connections are drawn, they are limited to progressive arguments. [...]  
Although the mobilizers are likely correct that their



---

approach will bring more numbers to their 'cause', they're setting themselves up for recuperation by not broadening their arguments to anarchist critiques, and sacrificing quality to quantity.  
[...]

The question of to what degree actions such as a popular general assembly or even a rent-strike foster a revolutionary culture (rather than strengthening the Left) is a matter of whether we are honest about intentions from the get-go, or whether we play the game of social democratic values to get people who are more used to these kinds of legitimacy-games on our side. Contrary to the romanticization of "opacity" against structures of power (that then gets applied to anyone outside of the 'milieu') that we often hear being used to justify dishonesty about one's perspectives, we believe that wearing our hearts on our sleeves will go a lot further in the long run than hiding our intentions behind the facade of the responsible community organizer, or syndicalist militant, or whatever else.  
[...]

### **The Question of 'Strategy'**

[...] We propose an alternative framework for thinking about our goals and paths as perspectives and projectuality. We agree that we should make an effort to analyze our context and how it changes, to think about potential consequences of our actions on that context. We also agree that this can lead to perspectives and projects with long-term dimensions. This often gets called projectuality in insurrectionary jargon – though this isn't to say that we think the difference is only a matter of words, there are serious differences in the ideas that underlie them.

We disagree that we can always predict the consequences of our actions ahead of time, like moves on a chessboard. Our projects are experimental; we set certain intentions, words, and acts, and engage them in the social terrain, without much certainty (aside from educated guesses) about the results. We can only guarantee our own actions, and attempt to place things out there for others to grab ahold of. Such a search for certainty of prediction seems to come from being confronted with the overwhelming and perhaps hopeless obstacles to our projects of liberation, and needing to feel in control of something. It's an understandable but misplaced belief that our actions will have an easily predictable impact, if we just wait for the "right time" or find a formula for struggle.

We believe that visions of strategy that don't explicitly affirm divergent perspectives will lead to the centralization or the bureaucratization of the insurrection. Heterogenous projectualities better embody anarchic ethics by not sacrificing means to goals. Our goals are embedded within our means: to further projects that make the terrain fertile for the spreading of combativeness, nourish

any quality of struggle that is self-organized, put an end to dialogue with the class enemy, or normalize values and practices that undermine domination and exploitation.

Mise en Commun patronizingly argues that the actions in question haven't contributed to 'building a collective power', presumably because the actions fall outside of the author's strategy. It's self-evident to us (if only through simply reading the communiqués which have accompanied various actions that Mise en Commun appears to be in response to) that the actors behind some of these attacks are feeling and building some type of collective capacity. Even in a worst-case scenario where it seems that it's always the same people doing actions, and things aren't becoming contagious, at least people are building a combative network amongst each other, and subversive ideas are easier to engage with because they're felt in reality.

We want an expansive anarchist struggle, in which our actions widen the imaginary toolbox of how we can manifest our discontent or creative energies, outside of reformist channels. Although we don't think this will magically cause our actions to spread across the social terrain overnight, we do think it can have an impact when things do boil over.

The 2010 piece "Signals of Disorder: Sowing Anarchy in the Metropolis," outlines the titular proposal and touts the benefits of regular, visible attacks against obvious symbols of capitalist exploitation, carried out in times of relative social peace. These actions plant subversive seeds in peoples' consciousnesses which are later accessed and adopted during moments of broader social rupture. Even though most people won't agree with these attacks at the time, they can adopt these forms as their own tools when traditionally valid forms of political activity are inadequate. Effectively an inversion of the "broken windows" theory of policing, the text illustrates the concept through the example of the insurrection in Greece in 2008 (though certainly we've seen anarchist tactics adopted by wide swaths of people during various insurrections on this side of the Atlantic in the last few years). [...]

Recent anarchist attacks against far-right figures connected to Trump, or a few years earlier on a smaller scale, attacks in Seattle targeting what everyone knew to be elements of gentrification, had a huge effect in getting people to take anarchist critiques—and perhaps more importantly, the practices that stem from those critiques—seriously.  
[...]

### **On 'illegality', specialization, and isolation**

*"What gives us power is not the level of preparation of a clique of experts in destruction... Like it or not, we've got to admit to ourselves that if there's one*

---

*thing that power knows how to manage, as much in the discourse as in the effective repression, is a crew of friends who isolate themselves in illegality.”*  
– Mise en Commun

*“The point isn’t to develop an “expertise” in destruction. All that this action required was some hammers, crowbars, rocks, and paint. And before that, a bit of an idea of where to arrive from, where to exit, masks and maybe some clothes that can be gotten rid of. We’ll find each other in the night!”*  
– from communique flyers thrown at metro stations Préfontaine, Joliette and Pie-IX and at the Place Valois in February on the day after the action.

Our struggles are nothing without the power of negation. We equally think that a struggle that is limited in conception to the attack is condemned to being in perpetual conflict without ever having a chance of actually destroying the systems we hate. Even if our individual inclination is to focus more on projects of destruction, to sustain and replenish this we need our lives and struggles to carve out spaces of autonomy, material infrastructure, and webs of solidarity and support.

The combative elements of a struggle will always be isolated by the authorities, this is inevitable. Certainly, those engaged in these forms of struggle shouldn’t reinforce their isolation. We’ve seen this happen when anarchists believe that negation is the only valuable contribution to a struggle, reinforce specialization, or act without regard to context and only care about relating to other anarchists internationally. However, it’s just as much the responsibility of anarchists with more social focus to fight against this isolation that will be attempted. This can happen by publicly defending the illegal actions, refusing the false dichotomies between good and bad anarchists, and by not hiding their anarchist politics in their organizing to blend in with ‘the people’.  
[...]

Social support for attacks could also look like reading communiques aloud at popular assemblies or quoting them in their door-to-door mailbox publications, organizing the occupation of popular spaces or buildings while coordinating with anyone interested in defending them, and always pushing a discourse of the necessity of direct action and the refusal of reformist channels. The Montreal Counter-info communique poster series makes space for people to be actively complicit in whatever acts they find inspiring, without such complicity requiring doing similar actions themselves.

We think that we need to continue to break the narrative that anarchists are the only people who attack, and continue to make evident with our gestures, words and relationships how reproducible and accessible our actions are to anyone. However, as of yet, nobody has been doing actions that require intense technical expertise – smashing windows, and even setting fires, can be ext-

remely accessible, given that all the materials you need can be found easily in your neighbourhood.  
[...]

If merely acting outside the law is the only requirement for becoming specialists, we are truly doomed. But we know that many forms of crime are widespread. We also know that legitimate avenues, and the resources and reputations they require, are incredibly specialized. We would never say that all anarchist projects are illegal at their core, but that illegality is not something we can shy away from.

We don’t want to limit our critique of specialization to the tactical considerations of our participation in combative struggles, it applies to our whole lives. We reject the identity of the militant, the organizer, etc., that understands ourselves as specialists in struggle. The struggle is simply a part of our lives, because taking part in it feels like an integral part of living. We struggle to meet our needs, not as a sacrifice on the altar of politics.  
[...]

### Repression

*“It is necessary to always be one step ahead.. on repression”.*  
– Mise en Commun

*“You’re going to prison. You could go to prison for something you do, or something you did long ago. You could be framed and go in for something you had nothing to do with. Even if you’ve never broken a law, you could still go to prison—just reading these words makes you a suspect. The more people spend their lives in slavish obedience, the easier it is for the government to make an example of whomever they choose.”*

*“Look at the historical figures you respect—or maybe even your friends. If you follow the same path, chances are you’re going to prison too. Come to terms with this. Imagine your time in prison, what you will do, how you will handle it. You can go with dignity or you can go spinelessly, assisting your enemies and selling out your friends. You can go to prison for something you believe in, or you can go for no reason at all, never having stood up for yourself or anyone else.”*

*“You’re going to prison. Now that you realize this, you’re free. You can go to prison for whatever you want, you can do whatever you believe is right. Hell, if you’re careful, you may not go to prison for a long time.”*

*“If enough people figure this out, one day there will be no more prisons. As someone who is going to prison, you understand that day can’t come soon enough”*  
– Green Scared? Preliminary Lessons of the Green Scare

Mise en Commun implies that a measure we should use for ‘strategy’ is the negative implications of our actions, namely how they will bring repression. Many people

---

have used this discourse to justify inaction. Certainly people could have or might be arrested, houses may be raided; that's always a possibility. This possibility is a necessary wager for our struggles to have any force. Of course, it's okay to be afraid of repression. This is something we all carry with us, and we can support each other in moving through this. We nonetheless think that there's a very crucial shift that needs to happen in the way people are thinking and talking about repression, ideally before this fear makes itself felt in more significant ways, controlling and shaping our struggles beyond recognition.

We understand repression as an inevitable reality of anarchist struggle. Our goal is to destroy the State, the economy, and many other systems of power – if we mean what we say, of course the authorities will respond by locking us up, raiding our houses, and, in places where the State has a less-democratic veneer, assassinating and torturing those who side with the anarchists. People will face repression, and there is no shame in getting caught. We can't choose when repression strikes. We're up against an enormous enemy, with lots of power to fuck with our lives. But this fear should never be a reason to distance ourselves from those most likely to be targeted by repression, to reinforce the division that the State and media create of the good anarchist, who has opinions and community gardens and the criminal anarchist, who burns cars and breaks windows. [...]

The project of repression is one of separation and isolation. By rejecting this separation, by not playing into the court's guilty-or-innocent mentality, we can express true solidarity with one another while shining a light on the struggles of those facing repression.

### **Proposals for a projectuality in Montreal**

Projectuality is a word we use to describe our projects—our intentional activities—in their long-term and contextual dimensions. Projectuality is a consciousness and intentionality in how we project our desires and our force towards the world around us and towards the future, and in this way, how we make sure our projects take us to, and help us create, the places we want to go. Within a specific struggle, this intentionality is manifested through a multiplicity of interventions in that struggle, that are informing each other in their continuity and ever-changing in response to the context and the impacts of previous interventions. Although we focus here on the specific struggle against the gentrification of two neighbourhoods, this principal equally applies to any social tension or project of domination. The goals in combatting this are not just to destroy a specific manifestation of capitalist domination, but also to build capacity to autonomously self-organize, to create and maintain tension, and to spread combative practices and indomitable ideas.

Unfortunately, we cannot be everywhere at the same time, and we need to choose our fights. This being said, there are innumerable points of tension from where we could start. We think that the struggle against gentrification is an interesting point of departure for anarchists because it touches on relations of power in our everyday lives: police, bosses, landlords, and many others. It is an interesting opportunity to anchor our projects of subversion in a consistent space, which can foster a continuity of struggle, and can strengthen practices of self-organization for the long-term.

We think our interventions in these tensions are most effective when they are consistent. Rather than larger attacks which punctuate a great deal of empty space, we'd like to develop the capacity to contribute to consistent anarchic activity in a neighbourhood, to keep up the tension. Because this is decentralized, it is far less vulnerable to repression. Consistency, outside of the militant calendar of 'social movements', fights the passivity of cynicism that is the norm to times of social peace. After the crest of social movements, the lows can be less devastating by having a baseline of activity that we have agency in.

What projects do we think contribute to this projectuality against gentrification? How could our targets and methods be more creative? We'd like to put forward several proposals for how anarchists could contribute to a multiform and combative struggle against gentrification. We think these initiatives would complement each other, and give space for diverse skills, desires, and risk-levels:

- Attacking real estate developer offices, and fostering hostility towards developers, landowners and any 'revitalization' initiatives from the city.
- Building support for autonomous spaces and infrastructures like social centers, housing, and occupied gardens – for people to meet their needs in ways that move towards autonomy from the State and capital. Sabotaging the construction of condos and their promotion.
- Developing solidarity networks to defend against evictions, and act directly and collectively with people in the neighbourhood. Comrades in St. Henri experimented with the solidarity network model started in Seattle. They came up against the obstacle that almost everyone preferred to access the Regis du Logement – the official body for complaints, rent disputes and eviction battles. We would propose a narrower scope of an eviction-defense network for anyone who is failed by this 'justice' system, and is still slated for eviction.
- Making the neighbourhood undesirable for yuppies to live in by keeping their property unsafe.
- Finding others outside of our networks to fight alongside. This could look like temporarily occupying Place Valois or other popular squares to distribute literature and food, or permanent occupations in times of greater social tension. This could also mean organizing popular assemblies (more thoughts below).

---

- Undermining social control in the neighbourhood; defacing or destroying security cameras, breaking metro turnstiles to give everyone free rides, and having relationships with your neighbours and knowing that they won't talk to the police if they come knocking asking questions about you.

- Disrupting any events or inroads the police or city make to try to pacify the situation.

- Attacking the police whenever we have the capacity to – in our demos, and in their daily functions. Attacking the media to undermine their legitimacy.

We think that although it provides a useful backdrop to other actions, we shouldn't rely too heavily on vandalizing the facades of yuppie businesses. We appreciate the few times in the past years that paint has been sprayed over the merchandise and interiors, demonstrating a fundamental disrespect for commodities themselves, and shutting down the functioning of the business.

We should also be careful to not personify capitalism too strongly in specific gentrifiers, like Corey Shapiro (a St-Henri business owner). If these actions are the most frequent, they risk focusing too much on the blatant and obscene aspects of gentrification (the facade, if you will), without addressing the foundations. [...]

### **Breaking out of the limits of specific struggles**

We think it's crucial for anarchist intervention in partial struggles to always be expanding the fight against all systems of domination. Power appears to us as a totality, but we can only struggle against it in its specific projects and manifestations. Making the connections between our partial fights and their totalizing systems broadens relations of solidarity between struggles and preempts recuperation. A struggle against gentrification has to be connected to the centuries-long struggles against colonization undertaken by indigenous peoples fighting for sovereignty and self-determination. Struggles – even the ones with different explicitly stated aims, form or content – can support each other by sharing lessons and resources, drawing attention to one another, and simply continuing their fight against the same forces that perpetuate each of them; alienation from our means of living, racist and patriarchal oppression, and capitalist exploitation. These are the ingredients for a revolutionary solidarity.

One of the problems we see continuing to arise in the struggle against gentrification is how it's fractured from the struggle against capitalism and other systems of domination. Many get lost in the tunnel vision of what it means to 'win' against the single 'issue' of gentrification, and end up fighting it as if it exists in isolation. We also want to claim victories, but we want to broaden the criteria for victory to mean that anything we win must be embedded in simultaneously strengthening other struggles, and our capacity to struggle in the future. If

'winning' against gentrification means strengthening the municipality, the State, or the Left, it's not victory, but rather recuperation.

### **No Montreal, No Canada**

A recent text "150, 375: rebels come alive!" calls for actions to shut down Montreal and Canada against their colonial anniversary celebrations. We're inspired by the proposal and feel it offers similar opportunities for a concerted projectuality for anarchists in the territory dominated by the Canadian state. We appreciate that the starting point is a refusal of the nation-state – where attacking the specific manifestations of the genocidal project of Canada corresponds closely to disrupting the very foundations of domination in this territory.

In the second week of 2017, anarchists acted against these anniversaries by blocking the highway that runs through Hochelaga with a tire fire during morning rush hour. Actions such as this and others can utilize the organized energy in the neighborhood to draw lines of solidarity between those struggling against gentrification in a specific area of the city and those who have been fighting the project of the colonialist capitalist project of Canada since long before our time. We don't mention this to pay these struggles lip service or to position ourselves as allies – a position that necessarily relegates our own reasons for struggling against things that very much affect us: from daily life under capitalism, to borders and policing. When we practice active, revolutionary solidarity, when we struggle against these apparatuses of state power and control in the places where we live, the struggle as a whole gains traction.

### **Solidarity that destroys borders**

The recent election of Donald Trump signals a changing context south of the border. We've seen an emboldening of far-right and fascist activity, echoed in our context by the recent assassination of six muslim people in their Quebec city mosque by a Trump supporter, and a fascist demo in Montreal successfully taking the streets for the first time in decades. However, Trump's rhetoric and his governmental appointments of people with blatant ties to white supremacist groups distinguishes him from any other candidate only in his presentation strategy – the nightmare that Trump makes explicit was already there. But this explicit presentation has created a rupture, and there is an emerging widespread social conflict with the authorities – from airport shutdowns to riots in the nations capitol – with a horizon of becoming ungovernable.

Let's not ignore the threat that creeping fascism poses here in Canada, nor exceptionalize far-right activities from the fundamentally genocidal and xenophobic project of this country. How can we demonstrate that governance itself must be combated, no matter whether the Leviathan of State power uses extreme-right dis-



---

courses, liberal multiculturalism, or Leftist recuperation to continue the occupation of stolen land and the domination of whiteness and Western civilization. Once again, let's fight locally and communicate with those fighting in other places: they see us, they are inspired and strengthened to fight another day.

Let's also try to make an impact on the capacity to remain ungovernable within the US from where we stand. How can we disrupt and block the US economy from north of the border; where are the oil valves, train choke-points, and highways it depends on? How can we weaken the US-Canadian border, fight against deportation back into the US, become resourceful for those forced to flee?

### **Last words**

*“Gentrification is a process of capitalism and colonialism, among others. It makes itself seem inevitable, and maybe it is, but it's nonetheless worthwhile to struggle against it and to not let ourselves be passive. In a world as unlivable as the one we're in, I have the feeling that my life can only find meaning if I fight back... At best, the process of gentrification will move elsewhere, if a neighbourhood resists. And yet, struggling against capitalism and the State opens up possibilities that otherwise wouldn't have existed.”*

– Defend the Hood, interview with subMedia

We want our projects to communicate themselves well, but not with a particular, generalizable audience in mind like “the people” (nor for that matter, any other revolutionary subject), which sees a passive audience for consuming lowest-common-denominator ideas. We want to communicate our will to fight and desire to put everything into question with potential accomplices, with whom we can have reciprocal relations of struggle. An anarchist conception of insurrection looks toward anarchic elements that are spreading across a population and moment, rather than a numerical mass. These elements would have at their basis a rejection of recuperative elements, such as politics (grassroots or institutional).

Recognizing the inevitability (and desirability) of ‘strategic’ differences and disagreements across (and within) the milieu, we seek a ‘putting into practice’ of anarchist experimentation in Montreal that is heterogenous and decentralized. We hope that our reflections and criticisms can foster solidarity and respectful difference, and be received with openness and good faith. We'd be interested in hearing from others about what actions and projectualities they think are desirable, and how these can contribute to something larger than themselves. How do other comrades feel our projects could overlap? We've also had enough “of waiting for a student strike or the construction of a pipeline” and think it's interesting to “create a climate of insecurity in the neighbourhood by maintaining a constant level of vandalism”. [...]



- 4 - GERMANY - **Some thoughts on the summit of the G20 in Hamburg and the revolt**
- 8 - GERMANY - **G20 in Hamburg: These were days of revolt**
- 10 - GERMANY - **At the beginning of the river**  
The struggle against the Google-Campus in Berlin
- 12 - FRANCE - **Fighting under the state of emergency**  
Anarchist views on the conflictuality in France
- 16 - CANADA - **Putting into practice**

The next issue will be published in October 2017. The deadline for contributions is the 1st of October 2017 and the texts can be send to [correspondance@riseup.net](mailto:correspondance@riseup.net).

This correspondence entails reflections on struggle experiences, critical approach of old and new projects, correspondence on the general social situation, reflections on upcoming conflicts, proposals with an international scope,... Texts that already have been published in a different context, should be accompanied by an introduction (long or small) as to insert the text into the correspondence project.

Debate and comments:

Also in the next issue, a section of Avalanche will be reserved for debates and comments. For sending such texts in for publication, we invite the comrades to take as a starting point issues, problems, perspectives that were raised in texts already published in Avalanche.

The idea of this section is to offer a space for international exchange between anarchists in struggle, deepening of certain aspects, critiques on certain proposals,...