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This pursuit, in all of its endeavors, struggles, and passions is dedicated to those who have taken the path of resistance. To the innovators, dreamers, practitioners and debaters seeking a better tomorrow through confrontation with the present: Thank you.

Certainly I could abandon the venue of the library for that of the underground, swap the discourse analysis for rock throwing, but everything has its time and place. To the reactionaries who will most certainly call my efforts idle and harmful to a movement, let me suggest that battles are fought on many fronts simultaneously. The nature of networks means that those that pen histories may also sabotage the machinery of late capitalism.

To the anonymous authors of incendiary texts, the international networks of translators and distributors, and the never-ending parade of combatants, thank you. Thank you for acting. Thank you for imagining a future beyond the present. Thank you for standing up, fighting back, and staying strong despite it all.

Thank you for giving up your freedom so that others can live freer. For sacrificing life and limb to battle an enemy understood as ever-present. For not voting, not petitioning, and not asking. To those who resisted state coercion to inform and collaborate, we honor your name. To those that languished away in prisons and jails, who stayed true to their beliefs despite carrots and sticks, your names will always be with us. To those who were caught up in the struggle and found the temptation of cooperation and complicity too appealing to resist—to those who acted in support of the state and against your comrades—you are dead to us.

The movement for total liberation produces far too many martyrs to list. From those shot down in anonymity to the individual whose death is always recalled; this small labor of love honors your memory. While we may not agree on strategy, prefiguration, or the nature of identity, we all want greater control over our lives, more joy and less domination. More community and less state. More friends and less cops.

I have known many inspiring revolutionaries, some of which are no longer with us. To my fallen friends slain in occupied lands, though your bodies are beneath the Earth, your names are always on our breaths. To my lanky comrade who fell in battle, to his family, friends, and community, this humble effort is for you. As was said to me time and again—in the form of a modified Surah—‘Do not think of those who die in the service of victory as dead, they are living in a honored place in the future.’
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**Cluster Analysis:** “A multivariate statistical technique that allows the production of categories by purely automatic means…In corpus linguistics various identifiable features such as case, voice or choice of preposition within a text may be clustered in order to demonstrate how such features are used across different genres or by different authors.”¹

**Collocation:** “The phenomenon surrounding the fact that certain words are more likely to occur in combination with other words in certain contexts. A collocate is therefore a word which occurs within the neighborhood of another word…Collocates can be useful for demonstrating the existence of bias or connotation in words”² (e.g. the strongest collocate to the word *bystander* is the word *innocent*).
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---

² Ibid., 38–39.
³ Ibid., 42–43.
⁴ Ibid., 75–76.
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The insurrectionary project, which rapidly internationalized around the twenty-first century, has developed an insightful analysis of systemic violence and power despite receiving scant attention in academic discussions of philosophy and clandestine political violence. From its roots in anarchism, Marxism, Queer theory and poststructuralism, the epistemology, ideology and praxis of anti-state insurrectionary attack has yet to be discursively excavated for discussion. These post-millennial assemblages reimagine resistance beyond older modes of sectarianism, Soviet socialism, and vanguardist cadres.

Beginning with the decline of the anti-globalization movement, there was a corresponding rise in networked, clandestine movements adopting political violence—vandalism, sabotage, arson, explosives—for anti-capitalist and anti-state agendas. These networks rapidly deterritorialized through the exporting of moniker ‘brands.’ The decentralized networks carried out scores of attacks globally, claiming responsibility through anonymous communiqués signed with adoptable monikers. These communiqués can be understood to embody communicative, performative, and discursive ends,
functioning alongside the actions that co-constitute the texts. From this universe of social movement ephemera, a corpus of more than one thousand communiqués (i.e. claims of responsibility) was constructed and explored through both a quantitative—corpus linguistics—and qualitative investigation informed by Critical Discourse Analysis. These discursive frames are discussed through a genealogical reading of history, based around a constellation of events, texts, and figures, which coalesce to form an insurrectionary canon. While this canon is structurally different than philosophical traditions with strictly defined sets of books and treatises, this collectivity is developed through the form of the communiqué, and the function of the attack. Through this unique pairing of form and function, the rhetorical and analytical power of the communiqué is given prominence, and a new framework for its reading is offered. In sum, this approach seeks to develop an anti-securitization, critically informed method of analysis, which diverges from the orthodoxy of Terrorism Studies and Security Studies, and instead offered a method for understanding the communication of clandestine networks that is nuanced, contextually-embedded, and for the purpose of building emancipatory theory, not counterterrorism.
CHAPTER ONE

Ah hell. Prophecy’s a thankless business, and history has a way of showing us what, in retrospect, are very logical solutions to awful messes…Things are certainly set up for a class war based on conveniently established lines of demarcation, and I must say that the basic assumption of the present set up is a grade A incitement to violence.\(^5\)  
-- Kurt Vonnegut, *Player Piano* [1952]

An anarchist group has claimed responsibility for an arson attack on North Avon Magistrates’ Court…police are investigating the on-line claims but say they do not have the evidence to link it to other attacks carried out on buildings owned by ‘establishment’ bodies, including the police, the Army and various banks. In a post on the 325.nostate website, people naming themselves as the Informal Anarchist Federation, said: ‘10 camping gas canisters were enough to devastate the front lobby, with a homemade napalm mixture as the detonator. We chose the early hours to avoid any injuries.’\(^6\)  
--The Bristol Post, UK [2014]

When asked about anarchism’s association with violence, I often reply by inquiring whether one would ask the same thing of a retail clerk, a stockbroker, a lawyer, a priest, an engineer, a taxpayer, a consumer, a liberal, a conservative—or any other identity attribute associated with mainstream society. Most assuredly, the scale of violence perpetuated by the day-to-day operations of capital and the state is grossly disproportionate to anything in the anarchist lexicon, with upwards of 100 million deaths from wars alone during the twentieth century. I daresay that the sum total of people killed or physically injured by anarchists throughout all of recorded history amounts to little more than a good weekend in the empire. So when we talk about violence, let us keep the larger frame firmly in mind. Are anarchists violent? Sometimes, but more so when they are participating in the casual, invisible, structural violence of modern life than when they are smashing its symbols of oppression.\(^7\)  
--Randal Amster, anarchist academic and Peace Studies advocate

---


While each of the [armed revolutionary] organizations...is deserving of in-depth study and analysis, only a scant handful have thus far received it. The matter is by no means of mere academic interest. Only through excavation of their histories in substantial detail can lessons of their much-varied experiences be extracted, their errors corrected, and a better praxis of armed struggle in the metropoles achieved.8

--Ward Churchill, former professor of ethnic studies and all around rabble-rouser

---

Introduction

Throughout the past decade and a half, scholarship focused upon the study of political violence, specifically that which can clearly be labeled as terrorism, has rapidly increased\(^9\). With the obviously powerful aftereffects of the 9/11 attacks, interest in those pursuing political, social and religious objectives through violence found an obvious place in the academy. Largely this scholarship was dealt with through the fields of Terrorism Studies\(^{10}\), Social Movement Studies\(^{11}\) as well as interrelated disciplines such as Criminology, Security Studies and Sociology. While these fields have often overlapped through interdisciplinary pursuits, each has its own epistemological presumptions, methodological tendencies and canonical truths.

For the study of political violence, and especially clandestine political violence which is the subject herein, one is often positioned at the cross roads between interpreting the subject as a terrorist or a social movement, and as such, is led towards those


corresponding disciplines, literatures and presumptive groundings. Keeping in mind that
the poststructuralist assertion that the production of knowledge, especially that which is
involved in the formation of political policy, is never a neutral endeavor\(^\text{12}\), the collection
of evidence and the construction of arguments is inherently the culmination of decisions.

When faced with these choices, held up against the subject of post-millennial, anti-
authoritarian, insurrectionary networks, such concerns are paramount. Those who choose
to pursue study through the literature of Terrorism Studies, are likely to be burdened with
not only the state-centric bias of background literature, but also the field’s lack of
theorization and its focus on counterterrorism\(^\text{13}\) and other securitization implementations.
Those who choose to examine such networks as social movements\(^\text{14}\), a field that bases its
focus on manifestations of social protest, also face difficulties as this field has often


remained apart from radical politics within militant and violent protest\textsuperscript{15}, and has a corresponding theorization abyss regarding these borderlands.

Since the end of the twentieth century, an explosion of militant, anti-state networks of clandestine militancy have emerged throughout the world. Through thousands of attacks, revolutionaries have been constantly at war with the status quo, targeting localized manifestations of state and capital in an attempt to create a venue of conflict that can bring about system-level change. Though distributed globally and irregularly active, these networks attack with frequency and vigor, making them a top priority for law enforcement. In one locale, Bristol, England, a city of around one half million residents, insurrectionary anarchist networks have been responsible for “over a hundred offensives dating [from] 2010 [to December 2014]\textsuperscript{16}” according to the lead investigating officer. According to sympathetic activists, this number may be far higher as those compiling local communiqués were able to locate more than 60 attacks in a two-and-a-half year period.\textsuperscript{17} These attacks, many of which involve arson, are said to have caused approximately £20 million\textsuperscript{18} (~$31 million) in damage. The vast majority of these attacks have been claimed via online communiqués through anonymous monikers such as the Informal Anarchist Federation (FAI). The FAI moniker has been adopted so

\textsuperscript{15} Della Porta, \textit{Clandestine Political Violence}, 282.
\textsuperscript{18} Bevan, Who are Bristol’s anarchist arsonists?
frequently, that despite not having a centralized structure or ‘members’ the entity was declared to be a terrorist organization by the European Union (EU) in 2009.

In only a few years, in the city of Bristol alone, the clandestine political networks under examination were responsible for the £18 million arson of a police firearms training center, the burning of UK Border Agency vehicles\(^\text{19}\) and personal vehicles belonging to a Mayor and other local politicians\(^\text{20}\), sabotage targeting local commuter rail service\(^\text{21}\), and the arson of industrial infrastructure, which resulted in a loss of radio and TV service to more than 80,000 homes\(^\text{22}\). Other Bristol-area targets struck in the last few years include private security company G4S\(^\text{23}\) and the zoo. This brief look at Bristol is meant to provide insight as to the scale of the subject. The international, insurrectionary milieu—the subject of this study—is deserving of attention even of one only judges them on the basis of their destructive capabilities. Though modern attackers are not successfully assassinating heads of state as was somewhat commonplace in late nineteenth and early twentieth century, they are dispatching bombs to European Prime Ministers, burning down Mexican Walmarts and carrying out thousands of costly attacks targeting governmental, financial, commercial and other sites. Furthermore, since there have been very few arrests of this movement, we know relatively little about the


\(^{22}\) Channel 4 News, “Bristol Arson Attack Linked to Anarchist Terror Network.”

\(^{23}\) Malik, “Anarchist Group Claims It Started Blaze at Police Firearms Training Centre.”
participants. Because of this reality, in order to understand the insurrectionary arsonists, bomb makers and saboteurs, we must examine their frequent articulations of critique—the communiqué. Despite often failing to do this, the need for such forms of analysis have been expressed in mainstream press reporting, for example this article from The Bristol Post which states:

To understand why these attacks are happening, for what reason, and how these individuals identify politically, it's recommended to read their words and statements for clarity. Each attack is by a unique established group of individual/s, with a diversity of anonymous cloaks, presenting varying ideological viewpoints. The beauty of the insurrectionist movement you might say.  

While these attacks, and the communiqué/claims of responsibility that accompany them, have received nominal attention in the (counter) Terrorism Studies literature, very little focus has been paid to their political ideology and socio-political critique. Moreover, the interaction between “radical social movements” and their broader contexts (e.g. social, political, ideological) is under researched.

This is Not A Program, it is a Guide

The following introductory chapter will examine a number of key issues of central importance to the proceeding study. First it will discuss the object of analysis—the political communiqué—as a method for delivering critical analysis typically reserved for more formalized texts. This approach begs the question: ‘Can one read a claim of

---

26 Intentionally borrowed from the Tiqqun title.
responsibility (i.e. a communiqué) in the same formalized manner as one would read *The Communist Manifesto*\(^{27}\) or *The Federalist Papers*\(^{28}\)? This discussion will also survey the available literature that focuses on the study of communiqués and other texts penned by violent non-state actors and identify weaknesses and necessary corrections to this reading. Secondly, this study identifies some initial problems arising from the study of these objects, specifically problems relating to verifiability, triangulation\(^{29}\), determining authorship and credibility as well as the subjectivity of historical interpretation. Finally, this chapter discusses the limitations and scale of the study, establishing two hypotheses which are pursued throughout the remaining chapters. These hypotheses aim to guide the reader to evaluate two central claims: 1.) Modern insurrectionary networks of attack are informed by and act to constitute an ‘insurrectionary canon’—known as Hypothesis 1 (H1), and 2.) Due to the poststructural influence on the modern insurrectionary critique, the latter will resultantly carry forth an expanded understanding of structural violence and inequality—known as Hypothesis 2 (H2).

These four areas will serve to lay the groundwork for the subsequent chapters of the study. Following Chapter One, Chapter Two will historicize the insurrectionary method of attack, following such a trajectory back several hundreds years to the largely European experiment with ‘propaganda of the deed’ and other forms of anti-state,


revolutionary violence. Chapter Three will further interrogate this pre-millennial history, pivoting subtly to more specifically focus on the strategic and structural particularities of modern insurrectionary struggle. This discussion focuses around drawing connections and points of departure between the armed struggle and guerrilla movements of the twentieth century, and the twenty-first century’s history of insurrectionary networks. Chapter Four begins with an exploration of the so-called critical turn in the study of political violence before utilizing this framework to provide a quantitative analysis of communiqué text through the use of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Corpus Linguistics (CL). Chapter Five builds on the preceding quantitative analysis and offers a discourse-based qualitative analysis of the same set of texts, drawing out persistent points of agreement amongst the texts and in doing so, mapping points of congruence and dissent. Finally, Chapter Six serves to conclude the study through first evaluating the original dual hypothesis. This is accomplished through an elaboration on the insurrectionary critique of structural and systemic violence, and an explanation of its epistemological roots in poststructuralism. Furthermore, in the concluding analysis this study offers an explanatory model for interpreting this rejectionist, anti-state political violence as spectacle and the implications this has for future study of communiqués as objects of analysis.

A Feminist Method to Studying Violence

While a more complete discussion of critical modes of methodological inquiry is pursued at the beginning of Chapter Four, a brief discussion of ethics is warranted before proceeding. A methodological positioning informed by feminist ethics permeates all of
my scholarship. The feminist methodology adds a great deal including a reading of identity politics, standpoint theory, action-orientated research, sincere participatory involvement and so on. From amongst these tendencies, my work has sought to maintain a single goal, namely that research generates a reciprocally positive impact for the subject, and in this manner, the respondent community is not seen as a vessel containing knowledge to be taken, but rather as a partner in a collaborative endeavor to engage in knowledge building, not knowledge production.

Feminist methodology seeks to subvert traditional power relationships and ethical pitfalls and according to one scholar, offers challenges to four main concerns otherwise recurrent in field research:

1.) The increased salience of race/ethnicity, gender, and class in the research relationship; 2.) the objectification of research subjects; 3.) the influence of social power on who becomes a research subject; and 4.) problematic assumptions in the conventional analytic approaches.

---

33 Sprague, Feminist Methodologies for Critical Researchers, 121.
To provide a single example, the following analysis attempts to destabilize the ‘othering’ of the subject, which tends to portray the researchers’ position as in some way normative. In this manner, it becomes the task of a constructed taxonomy to position urban guerillas amongst a wider socio-political movement, and through placement within such a continuum, such “violent” actors can be understood as similarly rational actors choosing to pursue a less popular form of protest. This also means that as a researcher, one can position themselves within the research as not only an observer, but a participant in the subject community. Such an approach can allow one to “understand the kind of questions that needed answering,” as well as the process of knowledge construction for the respondent community. This approach is far from mainstream, as most often, political actors adopting counter-state and violent strategies are viewed within the exoticized lens akin to the primitive savage of the colonial, anthropological, village subject. This tendency is (as can be expected) further exaggerated in mainstream journalistic accounts of these movements, which often carry sensationalist headlines such as “Meet the Nihilist-Anarchist Network Bringing Chaos to a Town Near You.” By desensationalizing the violence, and instead focusing on the movement’s political discourse, one hopes to shift the readers’ attention away from the frequency of the bombs, and towards the validity of the critiques.

---

Furthermore, one of the methods of subverting the pitfalls of traditionally unethical scholarship is to be found in emphasizing the subject’s perspective, and allowing the knowledge holder to determine the research agenda and its analysis\textsuperscript{38}. This again is a contribution of post-1970s feminist methodological battles, and in terms of participant observation, interviewing, and other forms of ethnographic inquiry, a notable aspect of my methodological pursuit. Taken as a whole, a feminist methodological approach to qualitative investigation is adopted precisely because it addresses issues of power within the realm of research\textsuperscript{39}. It does so not in the analytical way likened to CDA, but in a practically applicable manner aimed at subversion and the development of new methods of investigation that exist as counter forces to traditionalism, knowledge banking, and the expropriation of stories from an othered subject. Therefore it is the aim of the proceeding discussion to not borrow the dynamism of insurrection to construct an engaging argument, but rather to move beyond the discussion of these networks as merely the producers of fires and explosions and instead begin to understand them as social critics, ‘organic intellectuals’\textsuperscript{40} and philosophical practitioners.

\textbf{Communiqués as Political Theory}

Communiqués are seen as an essential communicative component of insurrectionary attack. Following each incident of political violence—from a broken window to an assassinated nanotechnologist—the act is explained, ‘infused with meaning’\textsuperscript{41} via a text

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Sprague, *Feminist Methodologies for Critical Researchers*, 141.
\item Letherby, *Feminist Research in Theory and Practice*, 114.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
meant to expand the discourse on revolutionary struggle. This site, that of the communiqué, demonstrates the social construction of *both* the act (of ‘terrorism’) and the discourse (on ‘terrorism’). Both the event (i.e. the attack) and the object (i.e. the communiqué) are social constructed phenomena⁴², serving to apply meaning and context for a wider audience. These explanatory frames offered to discursively embed an act of anti-social violence have key functions within the construction of consequent discourses and the carrying out of subsequent attacks. To borrow an explanation from the bomb throwers themselves, “through the communiqués that accompany attacks we can begin an open debate on reflections and problems that, even if viewed through different lenses, are certainly focused on the same direction: revolution.”⁴³ Such “requisite revolutionary discourse…following[ing] bombings against targets that serve domination”⁴⁴ typically takes the form of a written communiqué posted and circulated through a networks of websites. These websites form a repository for the collection of communiqués and the establishment of a corpus.

Academic and popular press books dealing specifically with communiqués as subject—often reprinting entire document series—have been sparse, inter-disciplinary and seemingly on the rise. Notable examples include edited volumes such as *Voices of Terror: Manifestos, Writings and Manuals of Al Qaeda, Hamas…* ⁴⁵, *Speaking Stones:*

⁴⁴ Ibid., 11.

55 Anne Marie Oliver and Paul F. Steinberg, The Road to Martyrs’ Square: A Journey into the World of the Suicide Bomber (Oxford University Press, USA, 2006).
Communiqués of Individualists Tending Toward the Wild\textsuperscript{56}, which serves as a re-printing of the lengthy texts authored by this network of anti-technology, Mexican insurrectionary cells. In one of the more comprehensive approaches to the examination of communiqués, Yonah Alexander and Dennis Pluchinsky’s overview of nine European “fighting communist organizations,” the authors admit this structural decision noting:

This book was not designed to be an all-inclusive, detailed study of the European FCOs [Fighting Communist Organizations]. To the authors’ knowledge, no such study exists. The intent was to compile a brief collection of documents (attack communiqués, ideological tracts, interviews, policy statements, etc.)…so that the reader can obtain a general understanding of how these groups think and view the world about them.\textsuperscript{57}

While the aforementioned books contain very valuable exhibitions of primary source materials, with exceedingly few exceptions, the communiqués are not analyzed thoroughly and are often simply presented. The texts are far more descriptive in nature, not analytical. Typically the volumes are nearly entirely the words of the non-state actor with a brief introductory frame written by an editor. While some are careful to discuss the texts in relation to actual events\textsuperscript{58}, the texts themselves are rarely the focus. In none of the volumes surveyed is the political critique of the non-state actor held up as legitimate theory to be evaluated. Instead, it is often showcased in an exotic manner, or in the case of Laqueur’s edited volume, as the writings of various “terrorists.”

\textsuperscript{56} Individualists Tending Toward the Wild, The Collected Communiques of Individualists Tending Toward the Wild (Berkeley, CA: Little Black Cart Books, 2013).

\textsuperscript{57} Alexander and Pluchinsky, Europe’s Red Terrorists: The Fighting Communist Organizations, x.

\textsuperscript{58} See for example: Burton-Rose, Creating a Movement with Teeth a Documentary History of the George Jackson Brigade; Moncourt and Smith, The Red Army Faction A Documentary History, Volume 1: Projectiles for the People; Moncourt and Smith, The Red Army Faction.
Of course other books cataloging the political writings of individual practitioners of political violence are common, such as those containing the works of Islamist figureheads Osama Bin Laden\textsuperscript{59} of al-Qaeda and Sayyed Hassan Nasrallah\textsuperscript{60} of Hezbollah, Marxist guerrilla leader Ernesto ‘Che’ Guevara\textsuperscript{61}, the Red Army Faction’s Ulrike Meinhof\textsuperscript{62}, ‘New Afrikan’ militants Kuwasi Balagoon\textsuperscript{63}, Jalil Muntaqim\textsuperscript{64}, and Russell Maroon Shoatz\textsuperscript{65}, anarcho-primitivist “Unabomer” Theodore Kaczynski\textsuperscript{66} and Animal Liberation Front activists Walter Bond\textsuperscript{67} and Rod Coronado\textsuperscript{68}. In these person-specific compilations, the original (and translated) works are presented with very little commentary and often no analysis. There are also frequent personal narratives, memoirs and autobiographies from individual actors that often portray life events through powerful narratives, but exclude formal political statements. Examples from the revolutionary left include those by armed North American militants Ann Hansen\textsuperscript{69} and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{64} Jalil Muntaqim, \textit{We Are Our Own Liberators: Selected Prison Writings} (Toronto, ON: Abraham Guillen Press, 2002).
\item \textsuperscript{67} Walter Bond, \textit{Always Looking Forward} (Los Angeles, CA: NAALPO, 2011).
\item \textsuperscript{68} Rod Coronado, \textit{Flaming Arrows: Collected Writings of Animal Liberation Front Activist Rod Coronado} (Portland, OR: Warcry Communications, 2011).
\item \textsuperscript{69} Ann Hansen, \textit{Direct Action: Memoirs of an Urban Guerrilla} (Toronto, ON: AK Press, 2002).
\end{itemize}
David Gilbert\textsuperscript{70}, West German urban guerilla Bommi Baumann\textsuperscript{71}, 1960s student leaders and Weathermen Mark Rudd\textsuperscript{72} and Bill Ayers\textsuperscript{73}, American Indian Movement activist and prisoner Leonard Peltier\textsuperscript{74}, the autobiographies of Palestinian airplane hijacker Leila Khaled\textsuperscript{75}, Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) fighter María Eugenia Vásquez Perdomo\textsuperscript{76}, and Black Panther Assata Shakur\textsuperscript{77}, as well as a semi-autobiographical, first hand account from Basque ethno-nationalist militants offered in \textit{Operation Ogro: The Execution of Admiral Luis Carrero Blanco}\textsuperscript{78}.

Communiqués as political texts are an under theorized site for critical inquiry. Despite their prominence in the ephemera of clandestine networks of political violence, their compilation, interpretation and analysis has been lacking. Some scholars have focused on the development of methodologies for interpreting the ideological predilections of political manifestos.\textsuperscript{79} Though works like Harrison’s are instructive in a general sense, their focus on \textit{ideology} and \textit{parties} make them ill suited for discussing

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{70}David Gilbert, \textit{Love and Struggle: My Life in SDS, the Weather Underground, and Beyond} (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2011).
\item \textsuperscript{71}Bommi Baumann, \textit{How It All Began: The Personal Account of a West German Urban Guerrilla}, trans. Helen Ellenbogen (Vancouver, BC: Arsenal Pulp Press, 2002).
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anti-ideological, anti-political (i.e. those that reject politics as a method of social change) movements. Harrison’s methodology focused on the discourse of right wing political parties. Methodologically, the researchers identified the frequency of select words and these keywords were then coded for thematic analysis. Similar study has been coordinated by the Manifesto Research Group/Comparative Manifestos Project which has conducted “quantitative content analyses of parties’ election programmes from more than 50 countries covering all free, democratic elections since 1945.”

Not all acts of political violence—clandestine or otherwise—are claimed via a written communication. Some are claimed via video releases, audio transmissions, telephone calls and some are unclaimed. The issuing of communiqués following acts of violence is often dependent on the modus operandi of the movement. For example, Animal Liberation Front (ALF) and Earth Liberation Front (ELF) attacks are nearly universally claimed via a written communiqué—in approximately 93% of attacks—which are then compiled and circulated by aboveground support networks such as Bite Back Magazine, the North American Animal Liberation Press Office and the international, translation and counter-information network “of the new generation [of]
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80 Ibid., 55–56.
82 Michael Loadenthal, “Nor Hostages, Assassinations, or Hijackings, but Sabotage, Vandalism & Fire: ‘Eco-Terrorism’ as Political Violence Challenging the State and Capital.” (MLitt Dissertation, Centre for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence, University of St Andrews, 2010), 89 (chart 3.3).
incendiary anarchy and global anti-civilization attack” embodied in websites such as 325.nostate, War on Society and others.

In examining the post-millennial clandestine attack networks that drew inspiration, radicalization, and modeling from the anti-globalization, counter-summit protests, it is no surprise that the militant edges of this movement are communiqué rich sources. In a lengthy piece of strategic writing authored by anonymous individuals “somewhere in the [American] Mid-West” and affiliated with the militant direct action network Anti-Racist Action (ARA), the authors instruct:

It is important that all Black Bloc actions be followed with a comprehensive communiqué, which is whenever possible composed by a large representative volunteer committee from the various affinity groups. This communiqué should discuss the action in terms of why it occurred, why specific conflicts/tactics developed and how this immediate struggle is connected with the broader Anarchist movement towards a liberated and creative world…Such communiqués are important in regards to reaching out to the broader populace, as well as in debunking the demonization of our activities as can be expected to emanate out of the corporate press (and also often from the Liberal Left and orthodox/conservative Communist press).

This commentary speaks to the reliance on communiqués as a speech act, and specifically as a means to self-report, spread propaganda and challenge divergent accounts from

---

84 This website (325.nostate.net) will be referred to throughout as simply “325.”
85 This history is discussed in detail throughout Chapter Two and Chapter Three.
86 “Black bloc” is a militant street formation and tactical approach used commonly by anarchists. It was first deployed in its current form by German activists in the 1980s, and imported into the anti-globalization movement in the late 1990s. Typically it involved participants dressing entirely in black, covering their faces with masks, and assembling in small affinity groups, prepared to engage in property destruction and confrontations with security forces. This tactical and strategic formulation is discussed in Chapter Two.
media and liberal/sectarian sources. What explains the underground attackers’ preference for reporting via communiqués? The nature of the communiqué; the structure of the particular speech device, facilitates direct communication between a previously silenced entity (i.e. the attacker) and an often curious recipient (i.e. the public).

The Challenges of Collecting Communiqués

On a practical level, the collection of communiqués allowed for the construction of an approximated incident-based dataset: a historical recounting of the politics of direct attack as told through the broken windows, slashed tires and burnt storefronts so eloquently rationalized through the texts. The construction of such an incident-based dataset begins with the development of strict in-group/out-group rules for inclusion and exclusion. The construction of this rule set requires a more generalized familiarity with the content hosted on the website network surveyed. In discussing the analysis and mapping of “radical violence in social media,” researchers from the Swedish Defense Research Agency make the same observation, writing, “in order to develop relevant keywords that actually indicate radicalism, an in-depth knowledge of the milieu in question is required.”88 After familiarizing myself with its content over the course of years of reading,89 broad parameters are established, tested and then refined and recorded.

89 This speaks to my own positionality vis-à-vis the subject. Prior to deciding to pursue a study of these materials, I regularly read insurrectionary and sympathetic communiqués for years through many of the websites featured here. Also, while writing my Master’s dissertation, I systematically read thousands of communiqués written by the ALF/ELF and affiliated activists and used these sources to develop a multi-variables incident database comprised of more than 27,000 attacks occurring 1972-2010.
in a decision tree\textsuperscript{90}. Only incidents that were claimed via a communiqué and posted to the surveyed hubs were included. Similarly, communiqués that did not \textit{claim responsibility} but offered more general critique, theory or debate were excluded.

This was by no means an easy task. The nature of clandestine, decentralized and internationally-dispersed cells of attack offer methodological challenges beyond simply the frequent inability to triangulate data and reach respondents for follow up and judging validity. In their discussion of the Revolutionary Cells (RZ)—a German, moniker-based, direct action network operating 1970s-1990s—Moncourt and Smith discuss similar problems stating:

The Revolutionary Cell [RZ] seemed unstoppable in 1982, but tabulating their activity poses a methodological problem, as anybody could carry out an attack—from breaking some windows to planting a bomb—and claim it as an RZ action. Limiting the account to major actions is both arbitrary and unavoidable in a study not itself devoted to the Cells; nonetheless, readers should keep in mind that these major attacks [e.g. bombings, shootings] were accompanied by a much greater number of low-level actions [e.g. vandalism, sabotage], even if most of these are now largely forgotten.\textsuperscript{91}

It is precisely because of such cautionary methodological tales of woe that this study was constructed around the communiqué object. Within these means, the presence of the primary source document equates to inclusion, not the subjectively judged ‘severity’ of the attack. Thus, while the dataset will contain discussions of bombs, bullets and Molotovs, to a larger degree it is the story of painted walls and broken windows. In this sense, the history of the modern insurrectionary attacker mirrors that of the RZ, in that

\textsuperscript{90} This process is discussed in Chapter Four.
\textsuperscript{91} Moncourt and Smith, \textit{The Red Army Faction}, 2:221.
the frequency of revolutionary vandalism is overshadowed by the spectacle of tactics more easily understood as *terrorism*, namely those involving fire, explosives and guns.

Furthermore, by including the entirety of attacks claimed by communiqué, and not sorting for those which are high profile, one allows the incident-based history of the movement to ‘speak more for itself,’ rather than reflect the careful manipulation of inclusion and coding methods to serve political, securitization or rhetorical ends. For example, in an analysis of 27,000 incidents of so-called “eco-terrorism” completed in 201092, I discovered that the tactical coding of these incidents by state-funded and allied scholars allowed incendiary devices to be regarded as explosives, animal releases to be recoded as theft, and the frequent gluing of locks, slashing of tires, breaking of windows and sabotaging of machinery to be nearly uniformly disregarded93.

**Opaque Truths and Verifiability**

In the deciphering of authenticity that is necessary in interpreting opaque online reports, one must acknowledge that misrepresentation, exaggeration, and outright fictitious incidents will most certainly occur. First, establishing authorship is difficult if not impossible in a variety of cases. Communiqués, letters and other forms of rhetorical text are written, published, and distributed, and those behind them are unknown. If ten texts are posted, it is difficult to determine if these are the work of a single author, ten individual authors, or possibly scores more writing collaboratively. While there are
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92 Loadenthal, “Nor Hostages, Assassinations, or Hijackings, but Sabotage, Vandalism & Fire: ‘Eco-Terrorism’ as Political Violence Challenging the State and Capital.”
investigative linguistic techniques that can be used to identify and compare lexical features, word classes and syntax—such as the frequency of words, parts-of-speech and sentence constructions respectively—these methods are “not mature enough” and outside the intent of this study.94

Determining authorship remains a challenge for the analysis of online and anonymously authored texts, but does not present a particular challenge for this study as establishing such points of identification are not necessary. The intent here is not to determine the identity or size of a given milieu but rather its collectively constituted universe of ideas. The linking of individual texts to individual or group authors would require extensive social network research, mapping, and triangulation, and because such an effort could easily be used by law enforcement for intelligence gathering and repression, it is avoided. Furthermore, identifying authors of anonymous communiqués disrupts the intended function of the text. The decision by an attacker to communicate via a moniker, pseudonym or remain anonymous, is a conscious decision and the result of many calculations. In this sense we can consider each new articulation of identity—from the formal “FAI” or “ALF” to the playful “some insurrectionary anarchists”—as a new author, even if the new persona is embodied in a prior writer. It can be assumed that individual authors have written under a variety of pseudonyms, and that documents seemingly representing a multitude of voices are written by a single individual.

These sorts of challenges with reliability are not confined to the postings of anti-state revolutionaries, as both traditional non-state actors (e.g. the Taliban) and state

security forces (e.g. Department of Defense) have intentionally falsified reports. Often, official accounts of counterterrorism operations are falsified to demonstrate strength to one’s opponents, weakness of the enemy, or to reframe skirmishes and otherwise muddy the waters of accurate narration. Such acts of narrative reframing can be used to retell a stone throwing demonstration against the military into a ‘terrorist attack’, or to reframe as ‘armed clashes’ the invasion of a village.\textsuperscript{95} To cite one example, National Public Radio’s Cairo correspondent Leila Fadel states that when investigating Egyptian counterterrorist operations targeting jihadi insurgents, the state was found to have misrepresented itself and engaged in outright false reporting. According to Fadel, "We found that a lot of that huge military operation was actually quite fictional. We couldn't really find evidence of these major attacks. A lot of the reports of militants being killed were really exaggerated."\textsuperscript{96}

This problem of reliability is not reserved to armies and arsonists. Consider the frequent revisions the nation was treated to in President Obama's retelling of the killing of Osama bin Laden.\textsuperscript{97} Since the SEAL team responsible for his assassination, and the soldiers charged with dumping his body into the sea are few in numbers and discouraged from public comment, the citizenry is largely unable to access information regarding the historical event. Instead, one is forced to accept the state narrative or enter into the ill-


fated world of the ‘conspiracy theorist’. Similar problems exist in establishing fact regarding US drone strikes in Pakistan, Afghanistan, Yemen and Somalia; such accounts offer a single state-produced narrative which one is forced to accept as additional data sources are often not available. This is particularly relevant when the question is the nature of fatalities, especially their status as combatants or civilians. When civilian eyewitness and NGO data is available, their reporting often shows disagreement between state accounts and those from local media, eyewitnesses and foreign governments. For example one could examine the wildly differing accounts of an airstrike in Sudan in January 2009, targeting a truck convoy allegedly transporting weaponry to the Gaza Strip. According to media accounts, between 39-41 people were killed in the airstrike.\(^98\) According to the Sudanese Defense Minister, Abdel Rahim Mohamed, in a speech delivered to Parliament, 119 were killed including “56 smugglers and 63 smuggled persons from Ethiopian, Somali and other nationalities”\(^99\) Here we see once again the consumers of information, even those that attempt to triangulate and verify their sources are left with stark choices: accept one of two narratives, both of which are inaccessibly unverifiable.

This problem with data validity is additionally burdened by analysis that often accompanies reporting of acts of political violence, especially if those reports are found


within security literature such as annual Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) reports, INTERPOL papers, or government-funded attack databases, such as the Global Terrorism Database maintained by the National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism, a university-affiliated research project of the Department of Homeland Security. The complexity of political violence, its various strategic and tactical tendencies, and intersecting but separate histories are far beyond the scope of what most desire in seeking to contextualize an attack. Most data consumers simply want to know if the attacker is ‘right wing’, or ‘left wing’, ‘Communist’ or ‘jihadi’, ‘anti-government’, ‘pro-militia’, etc. Surely these are truncated categories to the point of being cartoonish, but despite these limitations, contextual data surrounding political attacks against the state are often not available. When such narratives are located, they routinely are penned by either the direct producer of violence (e.g. the one sending the mail bomb) or the recipient entity (e.g. the Office of the Prime Minister). From both perspectives, inflated, bombastic and misleading description can be employed to craft simple narratives from complex events. One of the explanations for fantastical explanations for significant events—like the US’s assassination of Osama bin Laden—can be found in the study on conspiracy theories and narrative. In a 2014 study published in the *American Journal of Political Science*, Eric Oliver and Thomas J. Wood explain that Americans have:

> [a] natural attraction towards melodramatic narratives as explanations for prominent events—particularly those that interpret history [in terms of] universal struggles between good and evil…For many Americans, complicated or nuanced
explanations for political events are both cognitively taxing and have limited appeal.\textsuperscript{100}

This sort of logic can not only explain the difficulty in distinguishing falsehoods from truths in an age of unprecedented information availability, but also the challenge of pushing discussion of political violence towards an arena of nuanced and well-informed and engaged analysis. It is much easier—and more dramatic, hence appealing—to present clandestine revolutionaries as caricatures of themselves; to reinforce old tropes of the bomb-throwing anarchist hiding around the corner.

\textbf{The Masked Arsonist As Theorist}

In developing political theory as derived from communiqués and other claims of responsibility, it is important to note the revolutionaries’ tendency toward ‘organic intellectualism.’\textsuperscript{101} Antonio Gramsci, the Italian Marxist, offers this concept, writing, “all men are intellectuals…but not all men have in society the function of intellectuals…Everyone at some time fries a couple of eggs or sews up a tear in a jacket, we do not necessarily say that everyone is a cook or a tailor.”\textsuperscript{102} In this manner, the production of high theory through non-academic, non-traditional settings is commonplace in the activist-academic community, as well as from activists ‘in the streets.’ Sandra Jeppesen, an anarchist academic, speaks to this tendency writing:

Among anarchists there are many ‘organic intellectuals’ who produce theory and action in written and dialogical texts that are not primarily academics, including


\textsuperscript{101} Gramsci, \textit{Selections from the Prison Notebooks}, 9.

\textsuperscript{102} Ibid., 9 & Footnote.
zines, blogs, workshops, teach-ins, counter-summits, Indymedia web sites, and other anarchist spaces. I would argue that this work is also informed by and important to the formation of post-structuralism. Thus, in considering post-anarchist theory, we need to extend that space that we investigate as post-anarchist or we risk seeing only a partial picture that looks neither beyond the male European classical anarchists to contemporary anarchist thinkers…and current social movements in which anarchists are playing agenda-setting roles.103

This “theory and action in written and dialogical texts” is part of a larger anarchist pedagogy based in developing ephemera, theory and inter-movement histories for a variety of purposes. Another way to think of these extra-academic knowledge products is that of “guerillas texts”104 described by one anarcho-theorist as “irregular non-uniform anti-authoritarian texts combating a much larger normalized authoritarian system of textual production that tends to be capitalist, patriarchal, heteronormative, racist and/or ableist.”105 These “guerilla texts” are thus meant to “develop a sense of individual and collective autonomy and self-determination, and to produce cultural producers who experience liberation, joy overflowing, love without end, and other sustained outbursts towards transformative social relationships.”106

Therefore the anonymously authored texts that make up the object of analysis throughout this study can be understood as not only the products of anarcho-organic intellectuals, but structurally represent texts which are in themselves “subterranean at times, like manifestos, zines or direct action communiqués, breaking out as ‘surface

105 Ibid.
106 Ibid.
extensions’ in many directions, like books by independent publishers or pamphlets
distributed at protests.”\textsuperscript{107} To foreground a concept introduced in Chapter Two, this
manner of representation is “rhizomatic”, borrowing from critical theory’s model of
networked movements as rhizomes\textsuperscript{108}.

\textbf{‘Primitive Rebels’ & Other Such Nonsense}

While discussing the histories, action and ideas of a social movement, one inherently
adapts an often unspoken framework that influences the construction of arguments and
the ordering of events within a politicized logic. In other words, it is important to attempt
to act transparently when discussing subjective histories and it is equally important to
point out when others are not meeting this standard. There is an inherent subjectivity
hidden within historical interpretation, and when one’s history prejudices them against an
even-handed analysis of a subject, this bias should be acknowledged. To cite but one
example of a foundational, social movement text which is at odds with the present
discussion, we can examine historian Eric Hobsbawm’s 1959 book, \textit{Primitive Rebels:}
\textit{Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movement in the 19th and 20th Centuries}. In this book,
Hobsbawm develops the archetype of the “primitive rebel”, which he describes as a “pre-
political…blind and groping”\textsuperscript{109} mass of individuals struggling from poor and/or rural
areas in a battle against domination. Hobsbawm speaks deploringly of these masses and
their agitation, thus earning them the apolitical term \textit{primitive} and the slightly less

\textsuperscript{107} Ibid., 474.
\textsuperscript{108} See Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, \textit{A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia}, trans. Brian
\textsuperscript{109} Eric Hobsbawm, \textit{Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movement in the 19th and 20th
despairing term, *rebels*. Hobsbawm speaks of “social bandits,” best understood though the Robin Hood\footnote{Ibid., 4, 13–27.} character, who emerge from the masses to carry out illegal acts against those in power in an attempt to redistribute wealth and control to the poor and marginalized. While one may find such character portrayals admirable, Hobsbawm deplores them as having “next to no organization or ideology…totally inadaptable to modern social movements.”\footnote{Ibid., 5.}

Hobsbawm’s criticism reaches beyond his rejection of Robin Hood-style banditry, and the *primitiveness* of unorganized mobs and appears overly despairing of a political and social framework the author found counter to his own. Hobsbawm’s portrayal of spontaneous, collective violence such as riots, has been called “anti-class struggle”\footnote{James D. Young, “Eric J Hobsbawm: ‘Communist’ Historian, Companion of Honour and Socialism’s Ghosts,” *New Interventions* 10/11, no. 3/4 (Spring - Autumn 2001 2001): para. 30, http://www.marxists.org/history/etol/writers/young/hobsbawm/index.htm.}, as critics accuse this bias as existing “at the heart of all his written work as a labor historian.” This is largely due to Hobsbawm’s expressed preference for social change through organized labor (i.e. union activism) and his dismissal of “the spontaneous militancy of primitive rebels, bandits and…working-class militants.”\footnote{Ibid., para. 23.}

These later methods of contestation are seen as un-political, inherently unsuccessful and thus largely irrelevant in the historical record outside of demonstrating their unsuccessfulness.

Hobsbawm explicitly addresses anarchist militants, spending a fair bit of time on those found in Spain around the Civil War of the 1930s. Despite the establishment of

\footnotesize
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collectivized, anarchist-styled lands, trade unions, factories, social services, organizational bodies and militias which occurred in conjunction with a highly asymmetric war against the fascists of Francisco Franco, Hobsbawm laments the militants’ efforts, writing “anarchism was and is helpless…Nothing is easier than illegal organization in a unanimous village…but when the millenarian frenzy of the anarchist village subsided, nothing remained but the small group of the…true believers.”¹¹⁴ This portrayal stands in contrast to the findings of other scholars¹¹⁵ specifically examining the anarchist experiment in wartime/Revolutionary Catalonia. In typical accounts, scholars have concluded that the failure of Revolutionary Catalonia was not the fault of anarchism but rather of reformist efforts on the left, and direct repression from the right. Hobsbawm later writes, in reference to Revolutionary Catalonia, “anarchism is thus a form of peasant movement almost incapable of effective adaptation to modern conditions…thus the history of anarchism, almost alone among modern social movements, is one of unrelieved failure.”¹¹⁶

Hobsbawm’s prediction for mass-based organized labor and his rejection of anarchism’s “spontaneous and unstable rebelliousness”¹¹⁷ is obviously influenced by his efforts in conjunction with the German Communist Party which he joined in 1931, the Communist Party of Great Britain which he joined in 1939 as a student at the University

¹¹⁴ Hobsbawm, Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movement in the 19th and 20th Centuries, 91.
¹¹⁶ Hobsbawm, Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movement in the 19th and 20th Centuries, 92.
¹¹⁷ Ibid.
of Cambridge, and his consistently vocal support for Joseph Stalin’s Popular Front.\textsuperscript{118} Hobsbawm assumes in his method of argumentation that socialist-inspired forms of organized labor consistently led the charge for reform, and that forms of resistance from the “inarticulate”\textsuperscript{119} are meaningless. This stands in obvious contrast to the insurrectionary position that favors the spontaneity, anti-reformist and unorganized nature of mass revolt and struggle and rejects the glorification of ‘workerism’ and ‘workerists.’\textsuperscript{120} Additionally, Hobsbawm’s criticism of loosely assembled, spontaneous outburst of anti-state anger (i.e. riots) as lacking merit represents one side of a debate, with insurrectionary-sympathetic writers on the other side\textsuperscript{121}, often speaking of the potential strengths of these types of outburst.

This discussion of Hobsbawm is meant to partially unearth the political subjectivities that inform our collection of historical data and its interpretation. Certainly one can not escape their own subjectivity, especially in matters of historical interpretation as read through one’s politics. Therefore I would be remiss to not note that my own

\textsuperscript{119} Hobsbawm, \textit{Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movement in the 19th and 20th Centuries}, 2.
\textsuperscript{121} For such an example from a scholarly text see: Doug Gilbert, \textit{I Saw Fire: Reflections on Riots, Revolt & the Black Bloc}, 1st ed. (Institute For Experimental Freedom, 2014); Other more centrally located insurrectionary theorists speak of the utility of riots such as discussions contained in: Bonanno, \textit{From Riot to Insurrection: Analysis for an anarchist perspective against post-industrial capitalism}; The Invisible Committee, \textit{The Coming Insurrection} (intervention series 1: Semiotext(e), 2007).
reading of history, the reading of history contained herein, is understood through my embracing of the anarchist tradition. As Hobsbawm was in favor of large, mass-based forms of protest from organized labor, this was likely the result of his positive experience with such movements for socialism. However normal this appears, it becomes problematic when Hobsbawm uses this position to not only speak of the possibilities contained in Stalinist socialism, but the child-like sensibilities of those who operate with more fluidity and less predictability. For Hobsbawm, these rioters, peasant insurgents, social bandits and illegalists are the short-sighted, illogical, non-strategic masses, and it is only through the centralism of Communism that one can effectively wage such battles. As a result, Hobsbawm’s notions of social change do not align with that of his subject and as a result, he tosses them aside. Noting the failures of Hobsbawm, the current examination of insurrectionary anarchism is not meant to inscribe this author’s anarchism atop the subject; to judge its successes or failures with strategy or message and offer a complementary or critical alternative. Rather the intent here is to explore insurrectionary theory through its own framework, which while informed by anarchism at its roots, embodies a new articulation of its own ilk.

**Hypothesis, Intent & Limitations**

The study contained herein is designed to examine the contemporary illegalist, revolutionary milieu, and specifically, this collective’s discourse of resistance and its analysis of structural and systemic violence. The study will specifically focus on post-millennial, clandestine actors, organized into networked federations, who share a politic that is anti-state and that advocates direct attack. From this point on, those inhabiting
such a milieu will be identified as “insurrectionists” and would include the FAI, International Revolutionary Front (IRF), Conspiracy of Fire Cells (CCF) and smaller cells ideologically affiliated with so-called insurrectionary tendencies. In sum, this study seeks to answer a central question: What precisely is the contemporary insurrectionary tendency, how can it be historicized, and what application does this framework offer for understanding structural conflict? In brief, I seek to argue that the insurrectionary tendency can be identified by textual signposts which develop the borders of the discourse, and that such a discourse is based around a politics of affinity towards a shared set of ethics, expanded upon at length in Chapter Five.

These two questions will be pursued through a bifurcated hypothesis (H1 and H2). The first hypothesis (H1)—the “canon hypothesis”—contends that modern insurrectionary networks of attack are informed by and act to constitute an ‘insurrectionary canon’: an indispensible body of written work that the milieu consumes, interprets and reacts to in voice and action. The second hypothesis (H2)—the “poststructuralism hypothesis”—states that because of the poststructural influence influencing the modern insurrectionary critique, the latter will resultantly carry forth an expanded understanding of structural violence and inequality. These two hypotheses will be discussed briefly at present, and evaluated for validation or refutation in Chapter Six.

The theoretical components of this inquiry center around how these “ultra leftists” develop conceptions of power, hierarchy, violence and community. Their political framework will be discussed vis-à-vis poststructural theory, as I hypothesize that the insurrectionary and poststructural theories share important components such as a
deterritorialized subject, boundless arenas of expansion, and a focus on power and domination, not simply their local manifestations. In seeking to draw out the theoretical traditions of this community, I hypothesize that one can construct a political framework that is no less rigorous than competing orthodoxies (e.g. Marxism, Leninism, Trotskyism, ‘classical’ anarchism, anarcho-syndicalism, primitivism, etc.) despite the community’s lack of consistent, canonical texts.

While the bounds of Marxism are easy to trace through the works of its namesake and those of Frederick Engels, V.I. Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg, Antonio Gramsci and others, the contemporary insurrectionist tendency is not often viewed in such a manner. The format of the insurrectionists’ communications has inherently limited their academic consumption. In other words, as the movement has been slow to produce book-length treatises and academic journal articles, its communiqués, zines, pamphlets, posters and websites have been relegated to the trash heap of revolutionary ephemera, when in reality, they collectively form a precise theoretical cannon—that while remaining unbounded and open—has established ideological fence posts to create a well-defined in-group/out-group community of ideas. This insurrectionary community deserves our academic attention if for no other reason than its destructive capabilities. In its current form, it is most certainly the most destructively active segment of the revolutionary left witnessed in some time. The activity of these groups has led many governments to designate entire portions of the left as ‘terrorists’ and throughout their short, half-century history they have caused tens of millions of dollars in damage to property. It is precisely

this rhetorical reality that should motivate critical investigators, because if those who share some manner of affinity do not conduct such an inquiry, it will eventually become the sole purview of the state and its counterterrorism framework.

These two hypotheses were chosen for their specific applicability to developing theories concerning ideological construction, discursive formation, and structural violence. The integration of critical theory for the understanding of political violence is central. Since the violence is meant as commentary, or reaction to problems at the level of the entire society (e.g. poverty, pollution, police violence), the nature of the explanation is often based in notions of a social order. Critical theory, is meant to “isolate and critique those rationalizations of society which are advanced as self-evident truths, but which may be ideological mystifications.” Such “evident truths”—such as the validity of the state, the wage-labor exchange system or the commodification of animals for food—can be called into question if such a critical theory is applied to insurrectionary action. Through an interrogation of the textual basis for this revolutionary tendency, one can more freely interact with the ideas presented, understood as distinct from the vehicles that delivered them. In other words, through a deep reading of insurrectionary communiqués, we can interact with the milieu’s analysis and reasoning without the burdensome rhetoric of terrorism and anti-social violence muddying the waters. Despite the fact that theory is delivered in the form of a document claiming responsibility for a criminal act, in attempting to develop a canon from these texts, we are acknowledging their legitimacy as objects of analysis, something typically denied when politics is

---

delivered via violence. By suggesting that insurrectionary theory has conceptual lessons akin to those of Marxism, poststructuralism or Queer theory, the attention of the reader shifts to *what* the actors say, not through which criminal act (e.g. broken window, graffitied storefront) they chose to speak through. This dual hypothesis approach is thus designed to ‘test’ both the applicability of insurrectionary theory to central questions of conflict analysis (i.e. structural violence), as well as its discursive construction from amongst the critical tradition of poststructuralism. This hypothesis testing approach can be understood as akin to a philosopher’s test of a logical proof in more ways than it resembles a scientific hypothesis. However, the use of a hypothesis-driven framework has been adopted to retain the dual forms of inquiry: one focused upon the canon and the other, the theoretical application.

The importance and implications of this research rests in a number of key areas. First, it is essential that the theoretical and political ideas of this movement enter into the public arena of intellectual debate, and not be simply excluded on the basis of the group’s choice to adopt ‘violence’ as a means. The community’s choice to utilize non-traditional, non-state sanctioned methods is well informed by their politic and intrinsically linked to its understanding of structural reality. These theoretical contributions—which up until now have been overlooked—can serve to advance Peace and Conflict Studies through an expanded analysis of structural and systemic conflict, further helping one understand how discourse is constructed through an exchange of texts. I argue that the theoretical contributions of the insurrectionary tendency—derived from anonymously penned communiqués—can serve to advance the development of transformative strategies aimed
at confronting persistent, system-level conflicts such as those dealing with growing wealth gaps, racial inequality, patriarchy, ecological degradation and other associated ills\textsuperscript{124}.

This discussion will be limited to a difficult to define, yet demonstrably separate segment of the wider anti-state, anarchist milieu. This internationally decentralized community of autonomous cells and networked groups has been called:

\begin{quote}
The Black International...the affinity groups of anarcho-individualists and nihilists...promot[ing] informal organization, affinity between cells and the uniqueness of each individual....[an] invisible community where the desires of attack against our era, meet....[known as] New Anarchy and the Black International.\textsuperscript{125}
\end{quote}

This neo-insurrectionary community, the “anarcho-individualists of praxis,”\textsuperscript{126} borrow and reinterpret a variety of previous manifestations of resistance including those advancing “propaganda of the deed” in the late 1800s, illegalist anarchists from the first half of the 1900s, the armed urban and rural guerilla warriors of the latter half of the 1900s, and the populist anti-capitalist and anti-globalization movement of the late 1990s and early 2000s. These intersectional histories will be explored in depth in Chapter Two and Chapter Three, but prior to proceeding, it is important to develop some broad groupings. The groups being discussed, while emerging from the wider anarchist milieu, are keen to differentiate themselves. Many cells have firmly declared themselves to be outside of the anarchist community, as this tendency, according to the anonymous

\textsuperscript{124} This will de discussed as Hypothesis 2 (H2).
communiqué authors, has been co-opted by sectarian leftists, populist movements, and so-called “civil anarchists”\(^\text{127}\) who seek to resist within the confines of the state’s laws. These distinctions are made consistently throughout the literature, as a collective of imprisoned members of one insurrectionary network state:

Especially today, we believe that by simply stating that we are ‘anarchists’, in order to speak through a communique or an action, is inadequate and problematic. We choose to separate our positions from the ‘anarchists’ who cooperate with the leftist grassroots labor unions, use Marxist analyzes, unionize their misery, slander direct actions, fantasize workers’ communes, participate in residents’ local committees and transform anarchy into a social therapy.\(^\text{128}\)

Therefore while it is important to understand the development of these networks from within the broader anti-capitalist and anti-statist left, the insurrectionary tendency must be understood as distinct yet intersectional, complementary yet oppositional. Therefore, at its most basic level, it is essential to ask: When the term ‘insurrectionist’ or ‘insurrectionary anarchism’ is used in the subsequent discussion, what does it mean? For the purpose of discussion, one can think of insurrectionary anarchism in the following terms, provided by the influential anarchist collective known as CrimethInc.. In their radio show discussing the insurrectionary tendency within contemporary anarchism, the presenters state:

By definition, an insurrection is an act of revolting against a civil authority or government. So, an insurrectionary anarchist would be an anarchist who is in favor of revolts against civil authority or government, or more specifically, one


\(^{128}\) Conspiracy of Cells of Fire FAI/IRF Imprisoned Members Cell, “Let’s become dangerous...for the diffusion of the Black International.”
who believes that smaller revolts against authority will lead to larger revolutions.\textsuperscript{129} This definition is adequate to begin our exploration of the pre-modern history, while keeping in mind these broad tendencies that are recurrent throughout the milieu, namely those of un-civil rebellion against capitalism and the state.

CHAPTER TWO

This is what we have done by creating an anarchist conspiracy of friendship, comradeship, attack...This is how the new anarchist urban guerrilla was born, this is how the Conspiracy of Cells of Fire continues to exist. Our attacks deliver blows to the system’s officials and symbols, destroy temples of money, torch political party offices, attack private security guards and security companies, place bombs at jails, courts, detention centers, fascists, at the Parliament, police stations, churches, houses of ministers, we send explosives to embassies and heads of states, blow up military vehicles and militaristic targets, burn newspaper offices and journalists’ cars, we choose to live in the lawless side of life, away from the aesthetics of money and the morality of authority, against the technological shackles of the digital world and the herd of slaves, against the culture of compromise and the civilization of animal and natural exploitation.

From the moment we chose the path of anarchist urban guerrilla, we knew in advance that there was a chance of dying in a fight or receiving a long-term prison sentence spent in captivity. But at least, even if we are prisoners of authority at the moment, we know that we didn’t lead the life of a slave.

Because when the prisoner finds a way to escape, he/she would do so, while the slave will stay in his cell, even if he finds the door open.  

-- Conspiracy of Cells of Fire, Imprisoned Members’ Cell [2014]

---
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Introducing A Past History of Insurrectionary Attack

*Insurrectionary anarchism is primarily a practice, and focuses on the organization of attack.*

-- *Do or Die* magazine [2003]

The forces that define the insurrectionary networks under examination are based around the creation of “broad umbrella spaces”; critical frameworks which are the subject of this study. While more traditional, modern anarchism—embodied in anti-globalization activists opposing multilateral trade talks—is based around a politic of collective action, civil disobedience, direct action, and voluntary association, the illegalist-infused insurrectionary approach is based around a complementary but tangential set of features. These tendencies, appear more negative and less utopian then those strands of anarchist resistance seen in the past; borrowing from the centuries of nihilism, individualism, and freedom-centric egoism. These tendencies position themselves within a generalized spirit of aggression and revolt; the fostering of social war on all fronts.

While these individuals envision an egalitarian, communist-like future, they aim more towards tearing down than building up. The critique is boundless and aimed at any and all manifestations of domination and power including any spokes linked to religion, governance, economy and ecocide, as well as the more central hubs of capitalism and the state. Individuals’ motivations to immerse within this clandestine milieu often point to social and economic inequality and a “widely shared sense of injustice,” a common motivational feature for the production of political violence. The emphasis of the

131 Anonymous, “Insurrectionary Anarchy: Organising for Attack!”
133 Della Porta, *Clandestine Political Violence*, 238.
insurrectionary, nihilist-infused anarchism is on creating war-like conditions for opposing capitalism, the state and that which perpetuates structural violence (e.g. racism, poverty, speciesism, ecocide, gender roles, etc.). The ‘insurrectionary turn’ in contemporary, revolutionary politics is largely due to a poststructuralist influence, and as such, is well suited for analyzing power and domination. The poststructural influence has allowed insurrectionary anarchism to become unlinked to the structural Marxist which birthed it, and instead, the decentralized networks of attack being seen today are boundless, ribosomal occurrences defined only by a shared banner of total liberation and a rejection of traditional populist social movements, mediation through representation and reformism.

A Genealogical Account of Discourse

The approach to history adopted in this study is informed by Michel Foucault’s notion of “genealogy”134 which, according to poststructural anarchist philosopher Todd May, “seeks to trace the emergence of its object, be it a discourse, a practice, or a concept,”135 in this case, insurrectionary anarchism. This genealogical history of insurrection is an assemblage of events, ideas and individuals from a broad historical record, united in a shared ethos and praxis of illegality, aggression, spontaneity, informality and clandestinity. To develop such a history is to foster a taxonomy, a set of rules for


inclusion and exclusion, and to again borrow from Foucault, establish knowledge (i.e. “power/knowledge”) through acknowledgment and inclusion. In Foucault’s own words, when historicizing sexuality, he writes, “I have sketched a genealogical history of the origins of a theory and a knowledge of…the various techniques that relate to it.”\(^{136}\) In the establishment of a chronological record one establishes the discursive borders of the insurrectionary tendency through retroactively labeling diverse forms of resistance through a modern framework. This historical record is thus dependent on one’s understanding of the discursive tradition, its origins and its strands of contributive thought. The resulting genealogy of insurrection “recognizes that its knowledge is value-laden and contextually situated”\(^{137}\) within one’s understanding of this milieu. This is especially important as Foucault notes, “historical knowledge of struggles…[are often]…buried [and] subjugated” as illegitimate knowledge precisely because they are seen to be “hostile” to systems of power.\(^ {138}\) The excavation of this genealogical account is key prior to any nuanced discussion of tactics, strategy or ideology. It is essential to understand the history that formed a set of ideas before exploring the ideas themselves. This historical and evolutionary lens allows the reader to consider the political developments in context and within a broadly temporal ordering. Therefore, the structuring of this study is intentional: first comes history (Chapter Two), then strategy (Chapter Three), then theory (Chapter 4 & 5) and finally interpretation (Chapter 6).

The study seeks to trace the borders of this neo-insurrectionary tendency, to see

\(^{136}\) Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings 1972-1977* by Michel Foucault, 78.
\(^{137}\) May, *The Political Philosophy of Poststructuralist Anarchism*, 94.
\(^{138}\) Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings 1972-1977* by Michel Foucault, 83.
where its adherents converge and dissent. Though this task is descriptively difficulty based on the fluid and amorphous nature of such moniker-based networks, one can begin by mapping the history of these illegalist and militant tendencies prior to examining the texts generated by individual, cell-level actors claiming ideological affinity. The following historical account will trace the trajectory of illegalist anarchism and

*propaganda of the deed* before arriving at the modern history of clandestine, insurrectionary guerrillaism. This history is key as it demonstrates not only the genealogy of anti-state, individualist, direct attack, but it also establishes a linage of martyrs whose names are often invoked in the present era of Internet communiqués. From the shooting of monarchs to the placement of bombs to kill the bourgeoisie, the history of illegalist, nihilist and insurrectionary anarchism prior to the twenty-first century paves the way for the post-9/11, networks of the “Black International…anarchists of praxis.”

The following chapter develops a multi-century historical trajectory that arrives at the development and expansion of modern, global, insurrectionary networks. Though the vignettes may appear fractured, they collectively constitute a history of anti-statism based in the deployment of political violence. The individuals profiled are those that are most often invoked in the insurrectionary narrative. From the French bank robbers to the Italian assassins, these events form the history of direct attack against the state. Because this backgrounding temporarily suspends the study’s central goal of understanding insurrectionary violence through the object of the communiqué, it can be read as an

addendum, a necessary precursor to the development of ideological borderlands. In other words, in choosing to include and exclude specific individuals and events, those that were selected for inclusion reflect the tendencies carried forth from the annuals of the past into the present. Following the historical account presented in this chapter, the chapter that follows traces these histories through a discussion of strategy and structure, profiling some of the same actors in order to probe the methods of insurrectionary violence through an understanding of its historical predecessors.

The Armed Propagandists: Spread Revolution Through Example

On October 26, 1605, a letter arrived to the Baron of Monteagle informing him that in ten days, Robert Catesby, Guy Fawkes and nine co-conspirators would attempt to blow up the House of Lords during the annual State Opening of Parliament ceremony marking the first session of congress. The bombing was to target King James and provoke a Midlands revolt against the regent. Fawkes was captured the day before the planned explosion—set to occur on the 5th of November—in the presence of 36 barrels of gunpowder to be used in the House’s bombing. Catesby was shot and killed violently resisting arrest by the Sheriff of Worcester, and eight captured conspirators, including Fawkes, were sentenced to be hanged, drawn and quartered. One man was hanged, castrated, disemboweled and then quartered. Fawkes avoided public torture by leaping from the gallows once his rope was tied, killing himself. Catesby and a second man who avoided trial were later
exhumed and decapitated, their heads displayed on spikes at the House of Lords. The
attempted bombing, known as the Gunpowder (Treason) Plot, is eulogized in the late
seventeenth century folk rhyme:

Remember, remember! The fifth of November,
The Gunpowder treason and plot;
I know of no reason, Why the Gunpowder treason,
Should ever be forgot!
Guy Fawkes and his companions, Did the scheme contrive,
To blow the King and Parliament
All up alive. Threescore barrels, laid below,
To prove old England’s overthrow.  

This short vignette is provided to position Fawkes and his co-conspirators as one of the
oldest, yet contemporarily relevant actors striking unilaterally against the state. The
Gunpowder Plot served as the basis for the 1980s graphic novel, *V For Vendetta*  
which features an insurrectionary-styled protagonist—named V—who wages an armed
campaign against the state through the use of guerilla warfare. This text became a film  
in 2006, and though Fawkes (and V) was far from a self-declared insurrectionary
anarchist, his example of attack without mediation, and a rejection of traditional politics,
earned him a place in the insurrectionary hall of heroes.

More than two and a half centuries later, the historical precedent for the modern
insurrectionary campaign of arson and explosives can be found around the eighteenth
century, when anarchists carried out demonstrative acts of violence and termed it
“propaganda of the deed.” This concept of demonstrative violence organized by
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140 This is only a portion of the rhyme written around 1870.
individuals or small groups as a form of performative *propaganda* is key in understanding modern insurrectionary violence. This strategy is explained in relations to one European nation:

The anarchist belief in violent direct action, formulated in the policy of ‘propaganda by the deed’ (rather than by the word), reflected the particular bitterness of these struggles. Propaganda by deed was translated into action in three forms: insurrection, assassination, and bombing. The insurrectionary method…was not tried out in France. Instead, assassination became the principal weapon of revenge against the bourgeoisie and the figureheads of the State.  

Propaganda of the deed carries with it the presumption that “the population bearing witness to these acts would both see the fallibility of power AND would rise up to fill this void.” This belief is rooted in anarchism’s inherent positive view of human nature (i.e. people yearn for greater freedom and oppose domination ‘naturally’) and its understanding of a progressive route from the domination of present to the liberated territory of the future. Propaganda of the deed, as a strategy, does not presume to in itself bring about radical social change. The early anarchist thinker Peter Kropotkin stated that “a few kilos of dynamite could not demolish the historical structures [of oppression] created over thousands of years,” and thus understood these attacks as forms of propagandistic communication, not substantive methods of radical change.

---


This global period, from approximately 1878-1901, saw knife wielding and bomb throwing anarchists assassinate a host of world leaders and local enemies\(^{146}\). Some scholars have linked this era to contemporary discussions of political violence and terrorism, terming this period the “classic age of [anarchist] ‘lone wolf’ or leaderless terrorism.”\(^{147}\) The most well known group of this era is often the Russian Narodnaya Volya [*The People’s Will*] (~1878-1887) who successfully assassinated Tsar Alexander II. The group, which offered a nihilist-infused anarchism, maintained cells in more than 45 cities with membership around 500 people. Between 1879-1883 more than 2,000 members of Narodnaya Volya were brought to court in a series of more than 70 trials.

Notably, the concept of *propaganda of the deed* has remained salient into the contemporary, and in 2011, one group of Mexican attackers decided to label their cell the “Revolutionary Action Brigade for Propaganda by the Deed and Armed Action.”\(^{148}\) Both the attackers of the nineteenth and twenty-first centuries acted from a nihilist position, rejecting the moral authority that opposes attacking people as part of a social contract.\(^{149}\)

In other words, a common strand throughout these nihilist attackers which separates them from more traditional, aboveground, social movement-minded anarchists is that while the former advocates the killing of its targets free from a moralizing logic, the latter tend to

---


\(^{148}\) FAI Artisans Cooperative of Fire and Similar (occasionally spectacular), International Revolutionary Front and FAI 20th July Brigade, International Revolutionary Front, “Do Not Say That We Are Few - Statement from the Italian FAI” (325.nostate.net, September 2011), http://325.nostate.net/?p=3015.

prioritize prefigurative politics which match the methods of struggle to one’s desire for a future society including its associated morals.

During the late nineteenth century, there existed a common assertion linking anarchism to terrorism. While prior eras of propaganda of the deed and struggle helped to establish this understanding, the actions of two Russian anarchists, Sergey Nechayev (1847-1882) and Mikhail Bakunin (1815-1876) cemented these beliefs. Nechayev, often associated with anarchism’s nihilist tradition, helped to inaugurate the “prototype of modern terrorism”, drawing inspiration from fellow Russian Dmitry Karakozov (1840-1866) who infamously is the first Russian revolutionary to try and kill a tsar. On 4 April 1866, Karakozov fired at Tsar Alexander II in a St Petersburg park but failed to kill him. Karakozov was arrested and executed several months later. Nechayev would later write *Catechism of a Revolutionary* (possibly in conjunction with Bakunin), which advocated the formation of clandestine networks modeled after secret societies. *Catechism* has been regarded as the text that “inspire[d] the [nihilist] movement-in-waiting into a movement-with-teeth with dozens of [armed] actions against the Russian state.” The release of this influential text also served as a historical marker separating nihilism’s foundational period (1860-1869) from its “revolutionary period” (1870-1881), directing nihilist thought away from pure philosophy and towards revolutionary action. This urging for revolutionaries to head underground would lead to Bakunin being expelled from the First International (also known as the International Workingmen’s Association) by the
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Marxists who accused him of fomenting a conspiratorial “secret society” within the association. The echoes of *Catechism* would be felt a century later when the Black Panther Party, and leader Eldridge Cleaver in particular, studied and circulated the text, even reprinting it for sale as a pamphlet advertised in the Party’s newsletter. Though they were not the first, the secretive means through which Nechayev and Bakunin were seen to operate cast them infamously as anarchist terrorists aimed at fomenting revolution through individualistic acts of anti-state violence.

Several years before the outbreak of anarchist-led attacks against the state, Louis Auguste Blanqui, a leader of the 1871 Paris Commune, furthered a strategic framework of elite vanguardism that would be instrumental in inspiring the French illegalists such as the Bonnot Gang and other former communards-turned-illegalists. After the destruction of the Paris Commune, Marxism and anarchism began down divergent paths, leaving Blanquism to rot on the vine. Its influence however reverberated throughout the leftist discourse, though often unacknowledged. It is Blanqui’s theories that help formulate the Bolshevik-Leninist notion of an “elite Party leadership” and subsequent

---

156 Though numerous illegalist anarchists are (in)famous due to their linkages to specific acts of political violence, the tradition includes many lesser known individuals. These include French illegalists Clément Duval (1850-1935), François Claudius Koenigstein (aka Ravachol) (1859-1892), and Alexandre Jacon (aka Marius Jacon)(1879-1954). Other noted illegalists include Italians Vittorio Pini (“1860-1903), Gaetano Bresci (1869-1901) and Gino Lucetti (1900-1943), Spaniards including Buenaventura Durruti (1896-1936) and Francisco Sabaté Llopart (aka El Quico) (1915-1960) and Indian socialist-anarchist Bhagat Singh (1907-1931) who played a major role in India’s anti-colonial struggle.
notions of an armed, military-styled vanguard devoid of support from the industrial proletariat. Blanquism can be summarized as the fomenting of a libertarian socialist\textsuperscript{158} “coup d’État”\textsuperscript{159} by small groups or highly organized, professionalized, and clandestine cooperating conspirators. In the temporary, revolutionary period, the socialists would establish a form of dictatorship, allowing for its forces to seize power and use its position to implement socialism. Once socialism was established, the dictatorship of the minority would be dissolved and power handed back to the people. In this sense, the Blanquist framework is preoccupied with the methods of revolutionary change and not post-revolutionary reconstruction. The socialist revolution and toppling of the bourgeoisie can be understood as an end in itself even prior to the formation of socialism. Blanqui, diverging from Marx, did not believe that the proletariat had a large role in the socialist revolution, nor would they naturally form a revolutionary consciousness. Moreover, Marx and Engels rejected the premise that individualistic acts of violence (e.g. terrorism as strategy) could be the fire that ignited the historically inevitable revolution.\textsuperscript{160}

\textsuperscript{158} “Libertarian socialist” in this sense is meant to indicate a broad philosophical tendency towards socialist communitarianism without state control. Libertarian socialists in this manner are more akin to traditional anarchists than Marxists as the former critiques the state and the latter seeks to recreate it form the powerbase of the proletariat. Libertarian socialism advocates self-management, decentralization, horizontalism and federated forms of organization including assemblies, trade unions and workers’ councils. This definition includes, but is not limited to, philosophical traditions described as: anarchist, anarcho-communist, collectivist, syndicalist/anarcho-syndicalist, mutualist, autonomist, communizationist, council communist and libertarian Marxist. Libertarian socialist is not tied to the contemporary use of the label Libertarian—by individuals such as Republican Congressman Ron Paul and New Mexico Governor Gary Johnson—as someone favoring social liberties (e.g. freedom of choice) with market deregulation (i.r. laissez-faire capitalism).


\textsuperscript{160} Ibid., 30.
Nearing the beginning of the twentieth century, anti-capitalist and otherwise revolutionary insurrections were occurring in a variety of locales. While the subsequent history will focus on the European continent, a great deal of activity was simultaneously erupting in lesser-chronicled battles. In a rarely cited example, Francisco Zalacosta—the student of Greek anarchist Plotino Constantino Rhodakanaty—organized armed peasant revolts in central Mexico. Some of these orchestrated insurrections involved up to 1,500 armed fighters simultaneously, and occurred throughout several states, focusing on lands seized by railway speculators. According to historical accounts, this period involved “a few hundred men, sack[ing] and burn[ing] haciendas across several states for more than a year and a half.” Other, more sympathetic historians describe the effort as a “running battle with government troops.” Zalacosta’s fighters spread and took over several towns in southern Mexico. By 1871, the movement was reinvigorated when former participants of the Paris Commune arrived to assist. In 1878 Zalacosta formed those in revolt under the Gran Central Comunero, spreading the peasant revolts until around 1883 when the movements were successfully repressed under the direction of President Porfirio Diaz. Zalacosta’s network would spawn 62 national sections, a journal,
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166 The Communero (sometimes written as Gran Comité Comunero) would issue the Ley del Pueblo [law of the people] in 1879, which much like the EZLN declarations around 1994, called for the distribution of nationally-owned and privately-owned lands to landless Mexicans.
and an 1879 reunion attended by 5,000. Zalacosta himself would be executed by the state in 1880. The Mexican uprisings spread the logic of insurrectionary struggle through example throughout the countryside, drawing support from the widespread anger at displacement and land confiscation.

While Zalacosta was forming the *Comunero* to spread rural revolt, propaganda by example was picking up steam in Europe. In 1878, Sergei Kravchinski—later known as “Stepniak”—stabbed and killed the chief of the Russian secret police in St. Petersburg. Stepniak later wrote a manual of guerilla warfare, and joined with Errico Malatesta and approximately 25-30 others who took to the mountains to try and organize armed revolt in the supporting Italian villages. The revolutionaries seized two southern villages, destroying symbolic capital, and called for an end to the monarchy. Similar efforts were carried out throughout the world. Two years prior, in 1876, the Berne Congress of Bakuninists “enthusiastically adopted” Malatesta’s proposal for the carrying out of “insurrection deeds as the most effective means of promoting ‘the principals of socialism.’” Two weeks after the Congress, French socialist Paul Brousse would coin the phrase “propaganda by deed.”

Returning to 1878, Giovanni Passannante (1849-1910), a 29-year-old cook, stabbed the new Italian king, Umberto I in Naples. King Umberto survived. Passanante stabbed the King with a knife that bore the inscription “long live the international
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Also injured in the attack was the Italian Prime Minister. Supporters of the King organized a parade to celebrate the monarch’s survival, but a bomb thrown into the procession killed four and injured ten. 22 years later, a second anarchist, Gaetano Bresci would finish the job and successfully assassinate King Umberto. Following the King’s death, American anarchist James Ferdinand Morton, Jr. wrote:

All through the [American] South, men are hung, shot, tortured, and burned at the stake on the flimsiest pretexts; and the dastardly murderers invariably escape unpunished. These are only negroes. In Pennsylvania, and elsewhere in this free land, unarmed men, marching in peaceful procession on the public highway, are shot down like dogs by the hirelings of capital; and their death remains unavenged. These are only workingmen. But when the bullet or dagger strikes down one solitary man who sits on a throne, a parasite whose hands are red with the blood of his fellow-men, whose coffers are filled with the wealth wrung from the exploited and starving wage-workers, all the world cries out in horror. For he is a king.

Two days after the King’s parade was attacked, another bombing occurred, this time a hand thrown device in Pisa targeting a celebration of the Queen’s birthday. The attempts on King Umberto’s life came only months after similar attacks targeting the German emperor (by August Reinsdorf, the “father” of German anarchism) and the King of Spain (by Otero), all linked to illegalist anarchists of an insurrectionary tendency. In 1892, Paulino Pallás, a Spanish anarchist, attempted to kill General Martinez Campos of Catalonia by throwing a bomb into the Alcantara Theater, shouting “Long live Joll, The Anarchists, 123.

James F. Morton, Jr., “Another Blow to Royalty” (Free Society Library, no. 6 (republished by Kate Sharpley Library), September 1900), http://www.katesharpleylibrary.net/fn3063.


“Execution of a Would-Be Regicide.,” The Maitland Mercury and Hunter River General Advertiser, June 8, 1880.
anarchy!”, during annual May Day celebrations. Historical accounts state that the crowd of demonstrators cheered and applauded the action, seen as an attempt to “register protest” for the death of four comrades, not kill the General.\textsuperscript{177} Later, a friend of Campos’s assailant, Santiago Salvador, furthered the plan for vengeance by allegedly throwing a bomb into a Madrid theater killing 20-22 people. This bombing, and a subsequent explosion targeting a religious procession\textsuperscript{178}—which injured 60 and killed 12—were condemned by contemporary anarchists and believed by some to be the work of police provocateurs.\textsuperscript{179} Others have argued that Jean Girault, a French anarchist who left Spain for Argentina following the attack, carried out the religious procession bombing.\textsuperscript{180} One year after the attack on General Campos, in 1893, Auguste Vaillant attacked the Chamber of Deputies in Paris with a hand-thrown, shrapnel-laced, powerful explosive device. When he was captured, convicted and executed, his last words were “My death will be avenged!”\textsuperscript{181} Six months later (24 June 1894) French President Sadi Carnot—who had denied Vaillant leniency—was stabbed to death in Lyon by 21-year-old anarchist, Santo Geronimo Caserio (1873-1894). Within a few years, other anarchist-led assassinations targeted President William McKinley of the US\textsuperscript{182}, and the Empress Elisabeth of Austria who was stabbed by Luigi Luccheni (1873-1910), an Italian.

Between 1892-1894, Paris alone witnessed 11 major explosions, as well as the

\textsuperscript{178} This attack is detailed in: Jensen, “The Pre-1914 Anarchist ‘Lone Wolf’ Terrorist and Governmental Responses.”
\textsuperscript{179} Joll, \textit{The Anarchists}, 130.
\textsuperscript{180} Jensen, “The Pre-1914 Anarchist ‘Lone Wolf’ Terrorist and Governmental Responses,” 88.
\textsuperscript{181} Joll, \textit{The Anarchists}, 132.
\textsuperscript{182} This attack is explored in: Jensen, “The Pre-1914 Anarchist ‘Lone Wolf’ Terrorist and Governmental Responses,” 89–91.
assignation of President Carnot; all linked to anarchists.\textsuperscript{183} In 1897, Italian anarchist Michele Angiolillo Lombardi (1871-1897), shot and killed the Spanish Prime Minister, Antonio Cánovas, and was executed\textsuperscript{184}.

Around the same time, in 1882, German anarchist Johann Most (1846-1906) arrived in the US by way of Austria and England. Most was heavily influenced by the writings of Bakunin and Blanqui and while in the US, began a German-language anarchist paper \textit{Freiheit}. In 1885, Most published a pamphlet which would be influential within the illegalist, “propaganda of the deed”-brand of anarchists entitled “\textit{Science of Revolutionary Warfare: A Little Handbook of Instruction in the Use and Preparation of Nitroglycerine, Dynamite, Gun-Cotton, Fulminating Mercury, Bombs, Fuses, Poisons, etc.}.” As the title suggests, the pamphlet provided instruction for the manufacturing of nitroglycerine, dynamite, fuses, poisons and other weaponry. On 5 March 1886, after finding himself unable to acquire a bomb, 27-year-old anarchist Charles Gallo took prussic acid to the Bourse de Paris (Parisian stock exchange) after reaching its gallery, he threw the bottle of acid and fired three rounds from a borrowed revolver. Gallo is preserved in the annals of revolutionary history through his closing words to the court upon sentencing:

\begin{verbatim}
Long live revolution!
Long live anarchism!
Death to the bourgeois judiciary!
Long live dynamite!
Bunch of idiots!\textsuperscript{185}
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{183} Joll, \textit{The Anarchists}, 136.
1886 also offered the Haymarket bombings, one of the most commonly referenced moments of anarchism’s past. On 4 May 1886, anarchists organized a rally in Chicago’s Haymarket Square. After a series of fiery speeches, police arrived in a large contingent and ordered the speakers to halt. As the police lines advanced on the podium, a dynamite-filled bomb was thrown, killing a police officer and wounding six others (all of which later died from their injuries). The explosion triggered an exchange of gunfire between police and demonstrators, though it is widely debated who fired first. Four demonstrators were killed in the fighting and 60 police officers were injured. The incident would usher in a stern repression of leftist and pro-labor activists (i.e. the Red Scare). This included the arrest and conviction of eight individuals said to have been involved in the attack, all who were condemned to die. One of the defendants was sentenced to 15 years, two defendants were able to have their sentence commuted, one committed suicide, and four were hanged. The arrest, trail, and conviction of the Haymarket anarchists is an often invoked rallying cry extolling the honor bestowed amongst revolutionary martyrs. Contemporary anarchists often adopt the name, and the image of the martyrs is frequently reproduced as part of propaganda and outreach efforts.

186 Oscar Neebe (1850-1916)
187 Samuel Fielden (1847-1922) and Michael Schwab (1853-1898)
188 Louis Lingg (1864-1887) committee suicide (10 November 1887) the day prior to his scheduled execution, while in police custody. He did this by igniting a blasting cap in his mouth which had been smuggled into the prison. Four days prior, four explosive devices were discovered in his cell.
189 Those executed were George Engel (1836-1887), Adolph Fischer (1858-1887), Albert Parsons (1848-1887) and August Spies (1855-1887).
Between 1892-1894, French illegalist Émile Henry (1872-1894) carried out a series of deadly attacks including the bombing of a Parisian police station, a cafe and mining company, as well as the shooting of three police officers. The café bombing is noted as a turning point in the modern history of political violence, “the day that ordinary people became the target of terrorists.” In 1892, Auguste Vaillant (1861-1894) threw a bomb into the Chamber of Deputies in Paris and famed anarchist Alexander Berkman attempted to assassinate Henry Clay Frick in the US for his role in anti-union activity leading to the death of nine unionists. After failing to construct a working bomb, Berkman acquired a handgun and traveled to Pittsburgh to confront Frick. After bursting into Frick’s office, Berkman fired twice before being tackled, and subsequently stabbed Frick three times with a dagger contained in his pocket. Frick survived, and Berkman’s actions were condemned by a host of radical thinkers, including Most who wrote an essay entitled Reflections on Attentats arguing that the “propaganda of the deed” strategy—wherein anarchists carryout demonstrative violence in the hopes of inspiring additional acts—was predestined for misunderstanding in the American context. Criticism was also levied inward—showing an evolution of thought—as Berkman would comment 37 years after the shooting of Frick:

…many Anarchists who at one time believed in violence as a means of propaganda have changed their opinion about it and do not favor such methods any more. There was a time, for instance, when Anarchists advocated individual acts of violence, known as ‘propaganda by deed.’ They did not expect to change

government and capitalism into Anarchism by such acts, nor did they think that
the taking off of a despot would abolish despotism. No, terrorism was considered
a means of avenging a popular wrong, inspiring fear in the enemy, and also
calling attention to the evil against which the act of terror was directed. But most
Anarchists today do not believe any more in ‘propaganda by deed’ and do not
favor acts of that nature. 192

A few years after Frick’s shooting, in 1901, propaganda of the deed once again received
international attention when Leon Czolgosz (1873-1901), a man who had attended a
lecture of famed anarchist Emma Goldman’s, assassinated US President William
McKinley. After McKinley’s shooting, several anarchists were arrested in connection,
including Goldman and Most. The killing of McKinley, in conjunction with the public’s
reaction to the Wall Street bombing of 1920 which killed 30 and injured more than 140,
effectively ended twenty years of illegalist, insurrectionary attacks by anarchists, and in
the US, ushered a series of anti-anarchist/leftist/immigrant legislations that were rapidly
passed by Congress.

The Bonnot Gang & Armed Expropriation

Across the Atlantic Ocean, the turn of the century saw similar activity throughout Europe
and elsewhere. This history of illegalism is embraced by contemporary insurrectionary
networks both in terms of its spirit of disregarding the state, and its focus on directly
meeting the needs of revolutionary communities. Between 1911-1912, a collectivity of
around 20 anarchists, known popularly as the “La Bande à Bonnot” [The Bonnot Gang]
carried out a series of attacks in France and Belgium within the illegalist (i.e. criminal)
tradition. Their criminal activities, despite pejorative portrayals, were distinctly

revolutionary as they understood their efforts as “attacking the economy through the
direct individual reappropriation of wealth.”¹⁹³ Most members of the Gang were French,
a few Belgian, and all frequently unemployed. The members were born during a period
when France experienced an exasperation of class tensions and many were further
radicalized by the suppression of the 1871 Paris Commune—led in part by Louis
Blanqui—which involved the death of between 17,000-30,000 communards.¹⁹⁴

Following the offer of amnesty issued in 1880 to past communards, thousands of
anarchists and other leftists returned to France from exile.

This period saw the wide expansion of anarchist groups in the country with an
estimated 2,500 “active” members.¹⁹⁵ Anarchist groups adopted violence-laden and
militant names including “Dynamite”, “The Sword” and “The Terror of La Cioat”¹⁹⁶
signaling what was to come in the following years of revolutionary, illegalist activity.

This upsurge of offensive attacks by anarchists was seen throughout Europe. The addition
of dynamite to the revolutionary arsenal saw a peak a few years prior in 1892 when more
than 1,000 bombings were reported to have occurred throughout Europe.¹⁹⁷ With the
Bonnot gang, explosions gave way to guns and getaway cars.

Scholars have been careful to describe the Bonnot Gang “not [as] a close-knit
criminal band in the classical style, but rather a union of egoists associated for a common

¹⁹⁵ Ibid.
¹⁹⁶ Ibid., 10.
¹⁹⁷ Ibid.
purpose." Other historians have argued “those who grew-up with the Bonnot Gang [considered them] as some sort of modern Robin Hood and his Merrie Men.” The individualist anarchists that formed The Gang had various connections to the anarchist periodical *L’Anarchie*. The core of the Gang centered around Jules Bonnot, Raymond Callemin, Octave Garnier, Élie Monier, André Soudy and René Valet who utilized automobiles and semi-automatic firearms in their attacks. The group carried out their first attack in December 1911, a robbery targeting a Parisian bank. The robbery was the first in history to use an automobile as a getaway mechanism, and the robbers successfully got away with over 5,000 francs. The same month, the group robbed a gun store in Paris, and days later entered the home of a prominent businessman and killed him and his maid, stealing approximately 30,000 francs. Several other robberies occurred in this time period resulting in the deaths of two police officers.

In March 1912, the Gang stole an automobile in Paris, killing the driver, and used the car to rob a bank, shooting three bank workers in the process. By May 1912, French police had arrested 28 members and associates of the gang while at least three of the founding members remained free. After shooting two officers and escaping an attempted arrest in on 24 April 1912, Jules Bonnot was killed on 28 April, in a police raid that
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involved nearly 500 officers and the eventual dynamiting of the building. On 14 May 1912, two other members—Garnier and Valet—were killed in a similar raid, this time involving 300 police and 800 soldiers and a similar use of explosives. In February 1913, 14 Bonnot Gang members were tried. Ten were convicted. Following the trial some members were imprisoned, Édouard Carouy committed suicide, and Raymond Caillemin, Antoine Monnier and André Soudy were executed. Four individuals were found not guilty. Following the disassembling of the Bonnot Gang, French police led a series of anti-leftist raids similar to those organized by the FBI (i.e. The Palmer Raids) less than a decade later.

Of course the Bonnot Gang did not comprise the entirety of the illegalist tendency of the time, and even limited to the French state, other illegalists were quite active. Around 1900, Marius Jacob organized anarchists in Paris explicitly for criminal activity, calling his group the “workers of the night.” The illegalists operated in France, Italy and Belgium and carried out highly successful burglaries and subsequent sale of stolen goods. As Jacob had a radical, anarchist politic that predated his criminality, the group focused its theft on bourgeoisie and government-affiliated individuals, and some members, on Jacob’s urging, donated ten percent of their criminal earnings. The group avoided the violence typically associated with armed robberies and instead functioned quietly through prowess not force. According to contemporary illegalist anarchist Gustavo Rodriguez, in a talk given in a Mexican squat, the ‘workers of the night’ had a code:
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…only use the weapons to protect our life and our freedom from the police, only steal from those considered social parasites; entrepreneurs, bankers, judges, soldiers, nobles and clergy, but never to those who do noble and useful professions; teachers, doctors, artists, artisans, workers and so on. And set aside a percentage of the money recuperated for propaganda of the anarchist cause.  

Jacob may have been involved in up to 150 burglaries, though by his own account, he was only a part of 106, earning 5 million francs. 29 members of this network were arrested in 1903, and after a trial, 16 were convicted including Jacob. Ten of the accused, including Jacob’s mother, were acquitted. The Bonnot Gang accordingly occupy a special place of heroic martyrdom in the pre-modern insurrectionary history as their example serves to inspire those seeking direct confrontation with the forces of state and capital.

The Galleanists

Italian apostles of Anarchism have been in this country [of the United States]: F. S. Merlino, the pioneer; Pietro Gori, the poet, Errico Malatesta, Giuseppe Ciancabilla, impressing characters all of them, clear minds and pure consciences. But their activity here, however intense, was more or less of a short duration. Galleani’s on the contrary, spread over most of twenty years and was marked by the continuous progress of his mind and of the revolutionary movement as well.

Italian anarchist Luigi Galleani (1861-1931) was trained as a lawyer but never practiced, instead choosing to organize amongst anarchists, including involving himself in campaigns to resist Italian colonization in Ethiopia. He was imprisoned in Italy in the 1890s but later escaped. While traveling through France, Switzerland, Egypt and England he was imprisoned several times, deported twice, and though unsuccessful, was the
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subject of an attempted extradition by Egypt to face criminal changes in Italy. Galleani arrived in the US in 1901 and lived in Patterson, New Jersey and Barre, Vermont, both areas with large Italian immigration, and active militant anarchist scenes. Galleani was active in the US and eventually deported back to Italy in 1919. Galleani argued that individual acts of violence—including expropriation\(^\text{209}\)—against the state and capital constituted “‘a necessity and inevitable medium’ by which a just society might be achieved”,\(^\text{210}\) and from approximately 1914-1931 Galleanist anarchists\(^\text{211}\) carried out a series of assassinations and bombing attacks targeting government, business and religious sites. In his work as editor and propagandist, Galleani used his platform to defend and explain the actions of illegalist anarchists such as Czolgocz (McKinley’s assassin) and Bresci, the second assassin to target Italian King Umberto. Galleani saw Umberto’s assassination at the hands of Bresci as a global event awakening a revolutionary moment.\(^\text{212}\)

Four years after arriving in the US, in 1905, Galleani published a pamphlet—\textit{La Salute è in Voi} [The Health is Within You]—that instructed anarchists in the manufacturing of explosives. Such methods of spreading information were used by Johann Most, who in 1885 published \textit{Science of Revolutionary Warfare}, also a pamphlet-

\(^{211}\) Galleanist anarchists of the time include Frank Abarno, Pietro Angelo, Gabriella Segata Antolini, Luigi Bacchetti, Mario Buda, Carmine Carbone, Andrea Ciofalo, Ferruccio Coacci, Emilio Coda, Alfredo Conti, Nestor Dondoglio (aka Jean Crones), Roberto Elia, Alfonso Fagotti, Luigi Falzini, Frank Mandese, Riccardo Orciani, Nicola Recchi, Nicola Sacco, Andrea Salsedo, Giuseppe Sberna, Raffaele Schiavina, Carlo Valdinoci and Bartolomeo Vanzetti.
\(^{212}\) Shone, \textit{American Anarchism}, 201–202.
length anarchist how to manual dealing with explosives and poisons. Similar tactical manuals were uncovered in police raids in 1911 targeting future members of the Bonnot Gang. In one such police search, two manuals were discovered—*How to Use the Blowtorch*, used to break into safes, and *Revolutionary Manual for the Manufacture of Bombs*—along with counterfeit money, binoculars, maps, nitroglycerine, and various surveying, chemistry, drafting and mechanical tools.213 Galleani’s pamphlet was utilized by those who bombed the home of John D. Rockefeller on 4 July 1914 in retaliation for the industrialist’s role in the repression of miners in Colorado.214 Galleani’s manual was also found in the home of anarchists attempting to bomb St. Patrick’s Cathedral in New York who were arrested when undercover police agents embedded in their group emerged.215

In 1916, Galleanist Nestor Dondoglio, in his role as a chef, added arsenic to the soup of 100 guests attending a banquet in honor of an Archbishop. The attendees, who were leading figures in business, industry and government, all survived with the help of a doctor who was on site attending the event. The same year, Galleanist Alfonso Fagotti stabbed a police officer during a demonstration-tuned riot in Boston, and the day after, Fagotti or an associate detonated a bomb in a city police station. Though it could never be conclusively linked to Galleani or his network, on 22 July 1916, as the city of San Francisco held a parade for Preparedness Day, a bomb concealed in a suitcase detonated, killing ten and wounding 40. The bomb’s construction, particularly its use of metal
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shrapnel additives, resembled previous and future devices used by Galleanists and is thought to have been built by Mario Buda. Buda is also thought to have built the explosive device that detonated on 24 November 1917 at a police station in Milwaukee, Wisconsin killing nine officers and one civilian. The bomb had originally been placed in a church, presumably to target Reverend August Giuliana who was involved in activities seen as anti-anarchist. On 30 December 1918, a series of at least three bombs detonated in Philadelphia targeting the homes of a judge, the Acting Police Superintendent, and the President of the Chamber of Commerce. Each bombing was accompanied by anarchist flyers left on site. Two months later, in February 1919, four Galleanists were killed while attempting to place a bomb at the American Woolen Company whose workers were on strike.

Galleani’s 1919 deportation back to Italy occurred at a time when the US was witness to frequent bombings by leftists. In April of 1919 alone, thirty-six dynamite bombs in the US were mailed to government officials, servants of the court and prominent businessmen, and on 2 June 1919, nine shrapnel-packed pipe bombs exploded nearly simultaneously across seven US cities—New York, Boston, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Patterson, D.C. and Philadelphia.216 Like previous Galleanist bombings, flyers were left at the scene speaking of class war, violence and retaliatory justice. The June 1919 bombings targeted, amongst other sites, the home of US Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer, a man who would later lead the anti-anarchist “Palmer Raids”, and aid the

creation of the FBI’s counterintelligence program targeting leftists. Palmer’s bomber, who was killed in the attack, was identified as Carlo Valdinoci, an associate of Galleani. When Galleani was deported several weeks later, the newly formed FBI/Department of Justice’s General Intelligence Unit—ran by future FBI innovator J. Edger Hoover—linked Galleani as central to the attacks.

Following Galleani’s deportation, possibly the most (in)famous case of anarchist history unfolded in the US state of Massachusetts. On 15 April 1920, a factory worker was robbed and murdered. The crime was blamed on two Italian anarchists, Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti. While it is likely that Sacco and Vanzetti were followers of Galleani\(^{217}\) and committed anarchist militants, it is unlikely that either was involved in the robbery-murder. Sacco and Vanzetti were arrested, tried and executed and their death became a rallying cry for anarchists further enraged by a miscarriage of justice linked to the state’s fear of revolutionary change and its discrimination of Italian immigrants. Numerous attacks were carried out in the two martyrs’ names. For instance, days after their arrest, an unknown assailant, thought possibly to be Mario Buda, a colleague of the two arrestees and known Galleanist, placed a bomb outside of the J.P. Morgan building on Wall Street. The bomb killed at least 33 people.

Other prominent illegalist anarchists of the time include Giuseppe Ciancabilla (1872–1904) who immigrated to the US in 1898 with Galleani and settled in Patterson with other Italian anarchists. He worked as an editor of numerous anarchist publications

including those affiliated with poet Pietro Gori and Malatesta, also working to translate the works of prominent anarchists including Peter Kropotkin. Ciancabilla is routed squarely in the modern insurrectionary tradition and paves the way for such tendencies in his essay “Against Organization” writing:

…we don’t want tactical programs, and consequently we don’t want organization. Having established the aim, the goal to which we hold, we leave every anarchist free to choose from the means that his sense, his education, his temperament, his fighting spirit suggest to him as best. We don’t form fixed programs and we don’t form small or great parties. But we come together spontaneously, and not with permanent criteria, according to momentary affinities for a specific purpose, and we constantly change these groups as soon as the purpose for which we had associated ceases to be, and other aims and needs arise and develop in us and push us to seek new collaborators, people who think as we do in the specific circumstance.  

This rejection of programs and emphasis on free, temporary, and informal association would eventually mark the insurrectionary networks that proliferated in the twenty-first century.

This manner of practice embraced individualism, while coordinating collective, militant action. Individualists of this ilk included Abele Rizieri Ferrari, who wrote under the nom de plume Renzo Novatore. Novatore was a famed Italian poet and philosopher of the illegalist school, inspired by individualist Max Stirner. Both Novatore and Stirner continue until the present to inspire insurrectionary, nihilist and individualist tendencies found in anarchism, and sympathetic leftist presses frequently publish their works.  

---

1920, Novatore wrote his famed essay “My Iconoclastic Individualism”, wherein he writes:

…Individualism is neither a school nor a party, it cannot be ‘unique’, but it is truer still that Unique ones are individualists. And I leap as a unique one onto the battlefield, draw my sword and defend my personal ideas as an extreme individualist, as an indisputable Unique one, since we can be as skeptical and indifferent, ironic and sardonic as we desire and are able to be. But when we are condemned to hear socialists more or less theorizing in order to impudently and ignorantly state that there is no incompatibility between Individualist and collectivist ideas…when we hear someone try to make an invincible and unsurpassable iconoclast like Max Stirner out to be some tool for the use of frantic proponents of communism, then we may certainly have an ironic smirk on our lips. But then it is necessary to resolutely rise up to defend ourselves and to attack, since anyone who feels that he is truly individualist in principle, means and ends cannot tolerate being at all confused with the unconscious mobs of a morbid, bleating flock…Individualism, as I feel, understand and mean it, has neither socialism, nor communism, nor humanity for an end. Individualism is its own end.

Other prominent illegalist, insurrectionary forbearers of the time include Bruno Filippi (1900-1919), an Italian individualist anarchist inspired by Stirner, and publisher of Iconoclasta together with Novatore. Filippi was involved in the Italian Red Biennium, a two-year post-war period (1919-1920) of social protest involving mass strikes, workers demonstrations, factory occupations, the creation of workers’ councils, and guerrilla warfare in cities and the countryside. Bruno died during this revolutionary period while attempting to detonate a bomb targeting the city’s elite during a reunion. Comrade Renzo

---


Novatore eulogized him in an article speaking of the slain anarchist in a “fruitful embrace with death because he madly loved life.”

Also from Italy was Severino Di Giovanni (1901-1931), who resided in Argentina after Mussolini’s rise to power caused him to leave Europe. In Argentina, Giovanni organized against fascism and in support of Sacco and Vanzetti. In 1925 he founded *Culmine*, an anarchist periodical advocating propaganda of the deed through direct action. Giovanni carried out a series of bombings including targeting the US embassy in Buenos Aires hours after Sacco and Vanzetti were sentenced. Other bomb attacks targeted a statue of George Washington, the Ford Motor Company, a tobacco company who had proposed selling a Sacco and Vanzetti cigarette, the headquarters of Citibank and the Bank of Boston, and the Italian consulate. The consulate bombing killed nine Italian fascists and injured 34, making it the deadliest bombing ever to occur in Argentina. Giovanni was also involved in several assassinations and attempted assassinations targeting a member of Mussolini’s secret police, a federal police officer in charge of investigating bomb attacks, the president of the Fascist Committee of La Boca, and US President Herbert Hoover. After the bomber targeting Hoover was arrested, Giovanni entered a period of inactivity, returning his attention to *Culmine*. While evading arrest at a printing shop, Giovanni shot and killed a cop and injured a second. In a
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222 In the modern internet age of internationally-distributed insurrectionary communiqués, one of the main Italian language hubs for such material is similarly named *Culmine* and is available at https://culmine.noblogs.org/.
subsequent gun battle in which two anarchists were killed, Giovanni was arrested. He was tried by a military tribunal and executed by firing squad. He shouted, “Long live Anarchy!” before being shot eight times by high-powered rifles. Giovanni embodied the insurrectionary illegalist tradition of direct attack, propaganda of the deed and direct action. He believed in retaliatory violence, symbolic violence and violence as a form of warfare.

One of the most famed period of militant anarchism also occurred in this time between the end of World War I and the start of its predecessor. Towards the end of the 1930s, the Civil War in Spain was ending. Throughout the conflict between the Spanish Republicans and the fascist forces of General Francisco Franco, anarchist activity was in large part managed via the Confederación Nacional del Trabajo [National Confederation of Labour] (CNT), an anarcho-syndicalist union active since 1910. The CNT would eventually form an alliance with the Frente Popular [Popular Front]—a collation of Marxist-Stalinist factions—which would foster dissention amongst the anarchists. Within the CNT was a second organization, the Federación Anarquista Ibérica [Iberian Anarchist Federation], which similar to the modern network, adopted the moniker F.A.I.223 The F.A.I. is the clearest pre-model for the affinity group, wherein small groupings of comrades freely assemble for a temporary basis when their interests align. The F.A.I. began in secret in 1927 in response to the CNT’s push towards trade unionism and libertarian communism and away from militant agitation and anarchism. Though it was still young, by the early 1930s the F.A.I. was exerting significant influence over the

223 For the purposes of differentiating the Informal Anarchist Federation from the Iberian Anarchist Federation, the former will be written as “FAI” and the latter as “F.A.I.”
larger CNT. This caused some rifts within the CNT with more moderate factions breaking away eventually forming the Catalan Partit Sindicalista\(^{224}\) [Syndicalist Party] or joining other factions within the Popular Front such as the Partido Obrero de Unificación Marxista [Workers’ Party of Marxist Unification] (POUM).

The militant revolutionary spirit of the F.A.I. adopted familiar methods including armed expropriations, organizing general strikes and direct attacks against the fascist forces. The disagreement between the CNT and the F.A.I. can thus be understood to embody several forms: one in terms of structure (e.g. mass-based, formalized syndicalist trade unionism v. clandestine anarchist militant affinity groups), and the other in terms of spirit (e.g. labor-centric unionism v. anti-state illegalism). This disagreement between those in favor of large, horizontal organizations and those advocating underground networks of aggressive militants foreshadowed the rifts that would be highlighted later between so called ‘classical’ anarchists and those advocating insurrection. Importantly, when the fascists defeated the Spanish Republicans in 1940, the Franco regime went on to execute up to 200,000 dissidents, and many CNT-F.A.I. members fled internationally. Some, such as Francisco Sabaté Llopart (aka El Quico or simply Sabaté) (1915-1960), fled to France and aided the French Resistance to Nazi occupation. After Sabaté and others finished fighting in France, many would return to Spain under Franco and carry out anti-state attacks including assassinations, prisoner releases, and armed expropriations to fund revolutionary activities. These methods were drawn from past experiences with militant guerrillaism and would prefigure decades of inspired anarchist

\(^{224}\) *Partido Sindicalista* in Spanish.
attack. In other countries, such as Italy and Chile, similar fights against authoritarian regime would help to form networks of anarchist militants, some of which would later constitute the insurrectionary milieus.

Following the close of the post-war period, and prior to the start of World War II, global anarchist violence seemed to decline, ending the so-called “first wave of terrorism” (~1880-1920), often termed the “anarchist wave.” While this broadly defined post-World War I, pre-millennial century saw anarchists take up arms against Franco in Spain, anti-statism ceased to be the predominant source of global non-state, political violence. While anarchist influence was widely seen in terrorism’s third wave—the “New Left” wave embodied in the Weather Underground and other opponents of the Vietnam War—it would cease for a time to be explicitly affiliated with militant attacks against the centers of power. Anarchism remained a potent social force throughout the twentieth century, entering its ‘classical period’ of thought marked by collectivist thinkers such as Emma Goldman (1869-1940), however its armed tendencies, especially those prioritizing networks of armed attackers, would lay largely dormant until the eve of the twenty-first century.

The 21st Century: From Chiapas to 9/11

_The postindustrial shifts in the economy, the globalization of markets, the decline of a large industrial working class in core capitalist nations, and the questioning of modern forms of culture all set the stage for new types of social movements…[these movements] that emerged there in the 1970s and 1980s were prototypes of such movements…[These movements] did not have a clear-cut class base, as had large working-class socialist movements. They organized in the_
name of the public...or the marginalized, as well as women and youth...activists included educated middle-class young people as well as more marginal people...Together they provided a support base for some of the new social movements and the increasingly decentralized forms of critical resistance...The new social movements did not seek to capture the state or use it to carry out reforms; rather, they harassed it, sniped at it with local actions, worked around it, and showed their contempt for it...the new movements were self-consciously local, decentralized, antibureaucratic, and antihierarchical.227

Indians and Elves

On 1 January 1994, the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN), made up of only 3,000 revolutionary, indigenous fighters, led an uprising against the Mexican state, while freeing prisoners and destroying military and police property. Following their surge, the Mexican army counterattacked EZLN forces, and fighting lasted for ten days. The EZLN’s armed insurrection was timed to coincide with activation of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), and through subsequent, lengthy texts, the movement expressed an anarchistic rejection of neoliberalism, “free trade” and capitalism at large.228 This action brought an anti-globalization, anti-capitalist sentiment to an international audience in a violent outburst not seen from anti-statists in decades. With lightning speed, a relatively unknown non-state actor successfully took control over Mexican territory—the state of Chiapas—establishing counter-institutional infrastructure and preventing Mexican incursion. The Zapatistas set up 38 autonomous municipalities—local forms of decentralized, horizontal, participatory democracy with distinct anarchist, Marxist and libertarian-socialist influences. They established hospitals, and schools, factories and

227 Garner, Contemporary Movements and Ideologies, 99–100.
militias. The EZLN spoke for the rights of the marginalized; the indigenous, the poor and the citizens of the ‘global south’ resisting neoliberalism and transnational capital accumulation.

The final years of the twentieth century saw the explosion of new networks of attack directly confronting state and capital. Zapatismo, the ‘ideology’ of the EZLN, served to inform anti-capitalists internationally who in turn informed the EZLN through exchanges of ideas and shared experiences. This cross-pollination and the physical proximity provided by foreign activists’ forays into Chiapas served to incorporate the Zapatistas into a global discourse of justice and anti-capitalism. Two years after the EZLN uprising, on Columbus Day, the first act of the ELF is claimed in the United States. Though the network had briefly emerged in the UK in 1992 as a splinter faction from the Earth First! network, on the night of 14 October 1996, clandestine ELF activists carried out three simultaneous acts of sabotage targeting a Chevron gas station, a public relations office and a McDonald’s restaurant. The targets had their locks glued shut and their walls defaced with political messages including the three-letter calling card moniker: “E.L.F.” The ELF emerged during a roughly ten-year period (1994-2004) of global anti-capitalist and anti-globalization demonstrations and direct actions and would invigorate and heavily influence the organizational tendencies of many to follow. The ELF, like its parent ‘movement’ the ALF, utilize decentralized activists (in cells and as

individuals) carrying out thousands of acts of property destruction to economically sabotage targets and industries. These attacks on property have at least two broad purposes as explained by Peace Studies advocate and anarchist Randall Amster, who explains: “The basic premise [of the ELF] is that economic sabotage can educate the public by highlighting unjust enterpriseism while at the same time conveying a spirit of empowered resistance through direct action.”

Both the ELF/ALF and Zapatistas are modeled around antiauthoritarian principals and are prominently anti-state and anti-capitalist. They represent a new wave of movements, which while *philosophically* rooted in the Marxism of the 1970s, have since abandoned the red concept of historical materialism, and its tendencies towards vanguardism, centralism and hierarchical command structures. These movements did not agree with Marx who contended that although capitalism must be confronted—precisely why Marx along with Bakunin founded the First International—the system naturally contained within itself the contradictions that would lead to its demise. Rather these post-Marxists understood that capitalism must to be confronted and destabilized, establishing alternative forms of organization as demonstrated through radical praxis. It was partially due to their confrontational, anti-reformist, anti-politics approach that led to the ELF/ALF networks being labeled “the most active criminal extremist element in the United States” and the “number one domestic terrorist threat.” In developing this

---
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history of contemporary, clandestine networks, it is important to understand the evolution and internationalization of the ELF/ALF, as their tactics, strategies and Internet-aided, moniker-based communication style would mark the new era of insurrectionary struggle.

The “Anti-Globalization” Movement & the Black Bloc

The rising tide of anti-capitalist anti-authoritarianism reached another global crest when in late November, 1999, between 50,000-75,000 demonstrators marched in downtown Seattle, Washington against the third ministerial of the World Trade Organization (WTO). Following the first day of marches, direct actions, and rioting, more than 600 demonstrators were arrested. The protestors were so disruptive, and the police response so violently-disorientating to the city’s operation, that the opening trade talks were postponed. When the talks resumed as activists continued to demonstrate outside, they quickly collapsed on their own, and the three-day ministerial was concluded two days early. In response, the demonstrators declared victory. The so called “Battle of Seattle” gave international attention to black masked anarchists defacing and damaging corporate property, and a multitude of diverse global justice activists engaged in pitched street battles with heavily armed, quasi-militarized police.

While movement historians are careful to point out that the majority of demonstrators assembled did not identify as anarchists per se\(^{234}\), “anarchist values and methods in fact played an integral part in the highly drilled non-violent demonstrations

\(^{234}\) For example the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO) assembled between 25,000-50,000 street demonstrators against the WTO, probably few of whom identified as anti-authoritarian or anarchist.
that shut down the WTO Seattle meeting.”

The demonstrations, which came to be known in the activist vernacular as “N30,” ushered in a multi-year global movement of mass convergences coinciding with meetings of multilateral organizations. In the US alone, large-scale demonstrations were held opposing and disrupting meetings of the WTO, World Bank (WB), International Monetary Fund (IMF), Group of Eight (G8), Organization of American States (OAS), World Economic Forum (WEF) and others. These convergences were unique not only in their mass, but also their focus on prefiguration, and organizational practices derived from a larger anti-authoritarian praxis (i.e. horizontality) with a focus on participatory decision-making and direct action.

For years following N30, nearly every such global meeting was met with thousands of demonstrators, including large section of ‘militants’, anarchists and others willing to engage in direct action including property destruction. This era saw the importation and rapid adoption of the black bloc tactic wherein large groups of demonstrators dress all in black covering their faces with masks, and protect their bodies in order to remain a homogenous, opaque mass. This cohesive and mobile grouping
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238 For further exploration the history of black bloc, and its use as tactic and strategy see: Claudio Albertani, “Paint It Black: Black Bloco, Tute Bianche and Zapatistas in the Anti-Globalization Movement,” New Political Science 24, no. 4 (December 2002): 579–95, doi:10.1080/0739314022000025408; Amster, Anarchism Today; Edward Avery-Natale, “We’re Here, We’re Queer, We’re Anarchists’: The Nature of
provides cover and escape allowing individuals from within the crowd to attack property and police, and then return to the relative safety of a sea of similarly-dressed individuals. Interestingly, the black bloc finds its historic roots in the *Autonomen* movement of West Germany that stood in defense of political squatters, in opposition to neo-Nazis, and in support of urban guerrillaism such as that of the Red Army Faction (RAF) and RZ. This Autonomen movement rose in visibility in conjunction with similar movements contesting space in other European (and non-European) locales such as Denmark which also witnessed a post-Soviet Union rise in movements to occupy and hold vacant spaces (i.e. squats). Autonomen ‘ideology’ embraced an intersecting patchwork of influences


including anarchism, Marxism, radical feminism and an environmental, workers’ rights framework.\textsuperscript{241} At pro-RAF assemblies, marchers would wear black leather jackets, motorcycle helmets and black facemasks.\textsuperscript{242} They would arm themselves with clubs and protect their lines with wide banners. Correspondingly, there has been a consistent association between militant black bloc anarchists and the insurrectionary tendencies of thinkers such as Alfredo Bonanno, The Invisible Committee (TIC) and Tiqqun.\textsuperscript{243}

From 1999 until late 2001 the global wave of mass demonstrations continued. What began in the US as opposition to multinational trade talks saw the diffusion of these social networks and political projects into other areas. The 2000 Republican and Democratic National Conventions, and the inauguration of President George W. Bush saw similar mass convergences, similar uses of direct action street confrontations, and similar black blocs. In April 2001, demonstrations against the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) in Quebec City, saw 75,000-100,000 demonstrators assemble. In the fist two days of actions, up to 20,000 militants, largely anarchists, attacked the security perimeter of the conference, tearing down hundreds of feet of fencing and barriers. Affinity groups of black bloc anarchists were able to smash bank windows and confront riot police lines with projectiles and charges. In their recounting of the demonstrations in Quebec City, know as “A20,” veteran black bloc activists and authors of The Black Bloc Papers write:

\textsuperscript{241} Dupuis-Déri, Who’s Afraid of the Black Blocs?, 24.
\textsuperscript{243} Dupuis-Déri, Who’s Afraid of the Black Blocs?, 60.
All and all Quebec marked a turning point. Although it did not have the immediate psychological impact on the general North American population as did Seattle, it did result in the further militant radicalization of the actively involved social protest population…In the days of protests more than 450 were arrested. A good percentage of them taking place on the night of the 21st. All told, there were 75-100,000 social protesters pitted against approximately 10,000 Provincial and Federal police, primarily stationed behind a protective barrier. In the clashes at least one cop was seriously injured with another 71 treated in hospitals. On our side at least 100 required medical attention. In all the State fired 5,000 tear gas canisters in order to repress the voice of the people.

A20 truly did mark a turning point for this global wave of anti-capitalist, anarchist movement. Five months after the demonstrations, a non-state actor of a different nature changed the trajectory of global politics in ways still reverberating more than a decade later.

From the EZLN in Chiapas, through the clandestine saboteurs of the ELF, up through the “summit hopping” black blocs, all of the warriors wore masks. All opposed the state and capitalism as core principals of their philosophical, organization and political frameworks. Thus both the EZLN, ELF, and the more generalized anti-globalization movement are reacting to similar tendencies under neoliberalism, namely “the command and control character of everyday life under globalization: its standardization, routinization, constant surveillance, performativity, and military style discipline.” These shared rejectionist positions allowed a multitude of influences to co-constitute the post-millennial insurrectionary tendency, which drew a great deal from these autonomous networks of anti-capitalist collectivities.

244 Van Deusen and Massot, The Black Bloc Papers, 131.
The Al-Qaeda Effect & The Diffusion of the Rioters

On 11 September 2001, three airplanes were hijacked and flown in suicide missions into targets inside the United States. The 9/11 attacks would rapidly lead to the US initiating two foreign wars and a similarly rapid decline in the global counter-summit protests. The post-9/11 discontinuation of the anti-globalization movement can be encapsulated in the events of 29 September 2001. Following the 9/11 attacks, the fall IMF/WB meetings, which were to be held in Washington, DC, were canceled. In response to the canceled meetings and out of ‘respect’ for the victims of the attacks, most liberal and progressive social movement bodies canceled their planned protests of the economic summit. While this cancelation severely restricted the number of attendees, unpermitted, anarchist-organized marches and direct actions organized by the Anti-Capitalist Convergence (ACC) carried on while other groups hosted a permitted rally. This march was in response to the ACC’s revised “Call to Action”, distributed only nine days after the 9/11 attacks. This document called for a “march against the growing capitalist war” and invited “all those interested in creating a world free from terror, hate, racism, poverty and war to demonstrate our unity and vision for a better world.” The day of the march, the front banner read, “No War But The Class War”, and through careful messaging, the group reframed their protest to oppose not only the policies of neoliberalism embodied in the IMF/WB, but also nationalism, militarism and war. This forced reframing and the

poorly attended street demonstrations functioned as a clear indication that the era of anarchist-led, militant summit hopping was over.

Beyond the impact on oppositional social movements, the September attacks also had wide reaching effects on US foreign and domestic policy. Following the attacks, policing and intelligences forces such as the FBI shifted their domestic policy aims from one of ‘policing’ to ‘national security’²⁴⁷, accompanying a newly invigorated rhetoric of (counter) terrorism-dominated media and political discourses. Militant activists fighting police in masks suddenly and irrevocably were reframed from engaging in revolutionary struggle to plotting dangerous, extremist, terrorism. Of course a global movement did not simply stop on a dime. Demonstrations, including those with large militant components, continued on irregularly for several years eventually finding a new central focus with the university occupations and Occupy Wall Street movements of the next decade.

What is undeniable is that tens of thousands of people who for months prior had been involved in campaigns of semi-regular protest gatherings had now ceased to assemble for mass marches, convergences and ‘summit hopping’. There existed a certain surplus of labor from all segments of the diverse resistance movements. This included street medics, Indymedia journalists, communications and tech specialists, action organizers and trainers, previous and future participants in black blocs, and collectives penning theory. If 75,000 marched in Seattle, and 100,000 in Quebec City, did this mass movement’s committed and interlinked participants simply abandon radical politics? It is likely that the wave of clandestine networks of anti-capitalist attack that occurred

throughout Europe, Asia and the Americas following 9/11 were populated by individuals and networks developed during these prior waves of summit protests and mass convergences.

Maybe a large portion of ELF activists and insurrectionary attack cells are made up of seasoned activists who were disheartened with the experiment seen in the anti-globalization, global justice movement? Certainly this theory has been proposed, by amongst others, the anonymous authors of *The Coming Insurrection*, who spoke of the post-summit period writing: “In all the affinity groups they spawned and left in their wake, we glimpsed the conditions that allow social movements to become a locus for the emergence of new communes.”\(^{248}\) This possibility has been supported, by at least some anecdotal accounts given by members of ‘the family’, the largest ELF cell ever exposed. Through interviews and police accounts, it is reported that four of the ten group members\(^{249}\) participated in the Seattle WTO black bloc\(^{250}\) and planned acts of property destruction to coincide\(^{251}\) with the trade summit. Some of the 200,000 activists who were witness to violent confrontations surrounding the 2001 anti-G8 demonstrations in Genoa likely had connections to past and future ‘members’ of the FAI which rapidly expanded a few years later. Years later in 2008, when Greece underwent widespread social upheaval

\(^{248}\) The Invisible Committee, *The Coming Insurrection*, 121.
\(^{249}\) According to a government sentencing memorandum, Nathan Block, Joyanna Zacher, Suzanne Savoie and Daniel McGowan participated in the N30 black bloc.
\(^{250}\) This is discussed by one former ELF cell member in the film: Marshall Curry, *If A Tree Falls: A Story of the Earth Liberation Front*, DVD (Oscilloscope Laboratories, 2011).
with mass anarchist involvement, international activists frustrated with the failures of the previous decade traveled to Athens and other cities to network, organize and act. After the police’s killing of a teenage boy, riots erupted in several Greek cities which included direct attacks on police and frequent destruction of property. The throwing of stones and Molotovs was broadcast from Greece to sympathizers globally, and (often-militant) solidarity demonstrations occurred in more than 70 cities around the world. This series of events once again captured the attention of North American anarchists as “activists [who] once drew inspiration from the Zapatistas of Chiapas…now drew it from the student rebels of Athens…the common link, to be sure, is a pervasive spiriting of taking charge, of acting as if one were already free, of rebellion and insurrection.”252 This pre-9/11 period was also a key time for cross-fertilization amongst a variety of struggles around the world253, including within the North American continent. While the targets of the various movements varied, they remained (to varying degrees) critical of state power and sought to “transform the social experience.”254

9/11 had the effect of derailing the cascading crowds of increasingly well-practiced networks mobilized to resist global capitalism. When the mass convergences ceased, a vacuum was created for former summit-hoppers, local organizers and newly inspired and radicalized leftists to fight the state. Just as the tactics of the black bloc had migrated from German Autonomen and deterritorialized throughout the broad left, so too

254 Ibid.
would the methods of the ELF/ALF intersect and cross-pollinate with new, previously unheard of clandestine networks. Groups such as the Greek CCF would emerge in one country to attack, and, soon after, strike in other locations. In this way, the new social movements of decentralized saboteurs, arsonists and vandals would for some resemble the images of al-Qaeda, the Islamist non-state actor which claimed responsibility for 9/11. In a poignant enacting of postmodernism, while nations were made to fear hidden cells of Islamist suicide bombers plotting to kill civilians, similarly hidden cells of insurrectionary anarchists were conspiring to bring down capitalism and the state through an old form of war. While al-Qaeda chose the path of terrorism for the recreation of an Islamic empire, the insurrectionists chose urban guerilla warfare as a path to freedom, autonomy and liberation.

The EZLN, ELF, FAI, CCF and anti-capitalist networks that spontaneously sprang up around the world to block streets shared a great deal in term of politics and form. All emerged during the period marked as ‘postmodern’ and in this sense, were interpreted by some through such a lens. Borrowing from Deleuze and Guattari and their opus *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*:

The EZLN, suddenly emerging to occupy town, their infiltrators just as suddenly disappearing and dissolving Mexican army units, and then fading into their jungle redoubts are rhizomes…the anonymous and autonomous cells of the ELF erupting in sudden arson attacks across the United States and as rapidly disappearing are rhizomes…Rhizomes threaten an established order; they often operate unseen; they are irrepresible and cannot be eradicated as their root stem allows for proliferation at each of its nodes.²⁵⁵

The rhizome, as described by Deleuze and Guattari\textsuperscript{256} represent “a spreading, underground, decentered network of roots that appear aboveground as sprouts and thickets like blackberry bushes or bamboo.”\textsuperscript{257} According to the rhizomatic interpretation\textsuperscript{258}, these new emergent networks of resistance are easily multiplied, difficult to isolate, and decapitate, and their “irreducibility…to any ultimate organizing principle.”\textsuperscript{259} In this manner, even if a spokesperson, cell, collectivity of cells or other segment of a network is compromised, captured, killed or otherwise neutralized, the remaining portion “shoots off in other directions continuing to proliferate.”\textsuperscript{260} Therefore, while the post-NAFTA movements against neoliberalism and state power have shared a great deal which is observable and pronounced, it is likely that what they most intimately share is their reproductive logic; the organically-evolved, situational methods by which they emerge, exist, expand, die and repopulate. For the EZLN, while a specific physical site such as a mountaintop autonomous municipality may fail, another site expands as the mass of Indians simply reallocate their presence. In the rare instances when ELF cells have been penetrated, disrupted and captured, network energies shift in new directions, a portion of which rallies to support the captured comrades. In this sense one of the most distinguishable features of these networks is their fluidity, their leaderlessness, and their rapid adaptability.

\textsuperscript{256} See Deleuze and Guattari, \textit{A Thousand Plateaus}, chap. 1, pp. 3–25.
\textsuperscript{258} This approach is used to describe, amongst others, the EZLN. For example, see: Alex Khasnabish, \textit{Zapatismo Beyond Borders: New Imaginations of Political Possibility} (Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, Scholarly Publishing Division, 2008), 19–20.
\textsuperscript{259} Becker, “Rhizomatic Resistance: The Zapatistas and the Earth Liberation Front,” 8.
\textsuperscript{260} Ibid.
A Modern History of Insurrectionary Attack: From the Greece to Mexico

Revolt needs everything: paper and books, arms and explosives, reflection and swearing, poison, daggers and arson. The only interesting question is how to combine them.\(^{261}\)

-- Anonymous, *At Daggers Drawn...*\(^{262}\) [2001]

The following historical accounts will attempt to develop the record of a social movement that is still in a formative stage. Because this author is denied the luxury of historical hindsight, this account will inherently be incomplete. Combatants written about in the present tense may be captured or killed before these words reach the reader. Buildings will burn, laws will be passed, and fighters will be jailed. All of these events collectively constitute the history of modern insurrectionary warfare, and while one aims to present the most complete historical account possible, as networks are in constant flux and the conflict is ongoing, one must proceed with an acknowledgement that despite best efforts, much of this history is yet to be written. In order to connect the various configurations of post-millennial, insurrectionary violence, we will explore three of its most identifiable components, the FAI, the CCF, and the emergent networks of Mexico. Following these network-specific histories this chapter will explore a case study of an internationalized call to action. In exploring this single campaign, one can begin to understand the process through which monikers deterritorialize, expand and diffuse.

**The Informal Anarchist Federation**

---


\(^{262}\) Because the name of this title is so long, and because it is discussed frequently, the remaining words of the title (...)with the existent, its defenders and its false critics) is excluded throughout.
One becomes part of FAI-IRF only at the very moment he/she acts and strikes claiming as FAI, then everyone returns to their own projects, their own individual perspective, within a black international that includes a variety of practices, all aggressive and violent.  
-- Alfredo Cospito, “Olga Cell” of the FAI-IRF [2014]

Though a variety of direct attack networks, monikers, and individual cells have emerged since the post-millennial reinvigoration of the urban guerilla, the strategy and momentum of direct, anti-state attack was carried forth most notably by the Informal Anarchist Federation [Federazione Anarchica Informale] (FAI). The FAI has been linked to attacks as early as 1999, but its current, internationalized, adoptable-moniker form, emerged around 2004 in the Italian city of Bologna. In 1999, the network sent mail bombs to the Greek embassy in Italy, a tourism office in Madrid, Spain and a branch of Citibank in Barcelona, Spain. Subsequently, pre-2003 FAI bombs targeted newspapers, churches, courts, police, prisons and other targets located in Western Europe, largely in Spain and Italy.

In the final days of 2003 (29 December 2003), two letter bombs were mailed to Europol—a Europe-wide police data center—headquarters in The Hague, and the head of the European Central Bank, Jean-Claude Trichet as part of the FAI’s “Operation Santa Claus.” Technicians defused the Europol bomb, and German police discovered the improvised explosive device (IED) sent to Trichet in the bank’s mailroom. Both bombs were postmarked in Bologna. One day prior (28 December 2003), a third mail bomb exploded at the Bologna home of Romano Prodi, the heard of the European Commission,

---

264 Hanrahan, “Meet the Nihilist-Anarchist Network Bringing Chaos to a Town Near You.”
and former Prime Minister (1996-1998, 2006-2008). According to communiqués from the FAI, this was the third bomb to target Prodi that week.\textsuperscript{265} Two previous explosions occurred in trash receptacles, and the third IED, the one delivered with the mail, was assembled inside of a book and addressed to Prodi’s wife.\textsuperscript{266} The book bomb, according to Prodi, “[produced] a big flame but without an explosion.”\textsuperscript{267}

The day following the two letter bombs, a fourth letter bomb was mailed, this time to the headquarters of Eurojust, a European policing agency. The IED did not explode and according to officials, was the work of the same network who had dispatched the previous three.\textsuperscript{268} Additional IEDs, also originating in Bologna, were sent to the president and vice-president of the European People’s Party, as well as Gary Titley, leader of UK Labour and British member of European Parliament. Titley called the bombings an unjustified “attack on democracy…[likely] from an Italian anarchist group.”\textsuperscript{269} In response to the six mailed devices, the Italian city of Bologna halted the delivery of parcels from the region to European institutions such as EU administrative bodies.\textsuperscript{270}

\textsuperscript{266} Ibid.  
The FAI explained their motivation in a communiqué entitled “Open Letter to the Anarchist and Anti-Authoritarian Movement.”271 This document serves to announce the FAI to the world, to begin to develop its methodology for attack, and to communicate with sympathetic allies in the producing of future attacks. According to some historical accounts272, the letter is a sign post marking the real emergence of the FAI global network. In the text, the network claims responsibility for the attacks, calling their targets the “repressive apparatus that plays the democratic farce and that will bring the main characters and institutions to the new European order.”273 The attackers quantify their enemy as “the various police departments…a prison system…bureaucrats and politicians”, proclaiming:

Attack and destroy the responsible for repression and exploitation!
Attack and destroy prisons, banks, courts and police stations!
Revolt is contagious and can be reproduced!
Social war against capital and the State!274

The FAI describe their network as “a federation formed either by groups of action or by single individuals, in order to go beyond the limits implied in single projects and to experiment the real potentialities of informal organization.”275 The communiqué goes on to describe the network’s interpretation of “informal”, “anarchist” and “federation” and discusses strategy, organization and other questions of practicality.

272 Cospito, Interview by CCF – Imprisoned Members Cell with Alfredo Cospito (Greece, Italy).
274 Ibid.
275 Ibid., 3.
Following the Bologna-based bombing campaign, the FAI expanded, forming components such as the “Armed Cells for International Solidarity Brigade” which continued to mail explosives (2 April 2004, 10-11 December 2004), the “Metropolitan Cells” which detonated IEDs in Milan (29 October 2004), and numerous joint formations, such as the FAI/“July 20 Brigade”, and the FAI/”Crafts and Fire Cooperative”, which detonated IEDs targeting police and prisons (3 March 2005). These cells operated in the Italian cities of Bologna, Genoa, Rome and Milan, and were responsible for at least 16 explosive attacks, with security sources estimating the network’s composition to be 50-250 individuals.\(^{276}\) According to pro-FAI movement historians, between December 2003-December 2006, the network carried out “7 revolutionary campaigns…[and] 30 incendiary and explosive attacks on things and people.”\(^{277}\) These bombs targeted courts, police buildings and individual officials such as Mayors and corporate directors.

Years later, the FAI would prove to be long-lasting, sending additional parcel bombs including:

- 15 December 2009: Director of Center for Identification and Expulsion (CIE), a immigration detention center, in Gradisca d’Isonzo, Italy.
- 16 December 2009: Bocconi University in Milan, Italy.
- ~28 March 2010: Headquarters of the Northern League (Lega Nord), a right-wing political party in Milan. The device injured a postal worker.
- 23 December 2010: Embassies of Chile and Switzerland in Rome, Italy. These devices injured two.


• 30 March 2011: Nuclear company Swissnuclear in Olten, Switzerland. This device injured two.
• 31 March 2011: Barracks of Italian paratroopers deploying to Afghanistan located in Livorno, Italy. This attack injured one soldier severely.
• 7 December 2011: The Chief Executive of Deutsche Bank. The device was intercepted in Frankfurt, Germany.
• ~9 December 2011: Josef Ackermann, director of Equitalia state tax collection agency in Rome. This attack serious injured Ackerman.
• 9 April 2013: La Stampa newspaper in Turin, Italy.
• 10 April 2013: Europol offices in Brescia, Italy.

Of its scores of attacks, the most infamous is likely that which occurred on 7 May 2012.

On this date, a cell of the FAI was responsible for the non-fatal shooting (i.e. “kneecapping”\(^{278}\)) of Roberto Adinolfi, the 56-year-old chief executive of Ansaldo Nucleare, an Italian nuclear company affiliated with defense/aerospace firm Finmeccanica. The masked attackers fired three times, shooting Adinolfi in the knees from atop a motorcycle, as the target left his Genoa home. The shooting of Adinolfi was claimed via a four-page communiqué\(^{279}\)—as the “Olga\(^{280}\) Nucleus” cell of the FAI—received 11 May 2012 by an Italian newspaper. A year after the shooting, the FAI named the attack as part of “Operation Hunt the Spy”\(^{281}\) linking it to the bombing of La Stampa (9 April 2013), and that of Europol (10 April 2013). The three attacks were rhetorically linked in the communiqué, noting:

\(^{278}\) The use of “kneecapping”, (gambizzazioni in Italian), was common amongst the Red Brigades active in 1970-1980s Italy.
\(^{280}\) The “Olga” namesake is a tribute to Olga Ikonomidou, an imprisoned member of the CCF network in Greece.
[Europol] provides the forces of order with equipment such as microchips, microcameras and other technological wickedness...[and] 'La Stampa’ [is] always ready to corroborate the frame-ups of the carabinieri [Italian military police] and police, especially when they strike those who are at war against the state. In September 2012, two male individuals, 35-year-old Nicola Gai and 46-year-old Alfredo Cospito were arrested in Turin and linked to the crime via surveillance footage, wiretaps and textual analysis of the communiqué. The two individuals were convicted and imprisoned for a combined sentence of twenty years. Their sentence was assigned a “finalità di terrorismo” [purpose of terrorism] condition due to the anti-state politics of the shooting.

With similar regularity to its explosive devices, FAI cells have used timed incendiaries such as the ones that ignited under the cars of Lord Mayor of Bristol, Geoff Gollop, and Tory Councillor, Kevin Quartley (7 November 2011), claimed by the FAI’s “Class Terror” cell. Despite being conservative functionaries within the British state, the two men expressed shock that they were targeted. Lord Gollop stated, “I am at a total loss why anyone would want to do this. I have got absolutely no idea what the motive could possibly be.” Councillor Quartley expressed similar sentiments stating, “I’ve got no idea why this has happened.”

---

282 FAI/IRF Damiano Bolano Cell, “‘Damiano Bolano’ FAI/FRI cell claim the parcel bombs sent to the daily La Stampa of Turin and the private investigation agency Europol of Brescia,” trans. 325.nostate.net (325.nostate.net, April 20, 2013), http://325.nostate.net/?p=7697.
283 Class Terror/FAI, ”Attacks against Vehicles of Lord Mayor & Tory Councillor in Bristol” (UK Indymedia (republished by 325.nostate.net), November 7, 2011), http://325.nostate.net/?p=3517.
285 Ibid.
While the FAI was established in Italy, like other moniker-based networks, it quickly was exported as a model internationally. In June 2012, police arrested eight individuals in Italy, one in Switzerland and one in Germany, all accused of affiliation with the FAI/IRF. In at least one case, an Italian judge issuing warrants, charged the accused with “subversion, terrorist conspiracy and international terrorism.”\textsuperscript{286} State officials noted presumed links between the arrested FAI members and the Greek CCF. As the imprisoned members of the Greek network stated in their letter to the Italian FAI, “The Informal Anarchist Federation travels over borders and cities, carrying with it the momentum of a lasting anarchist insurrection.”\textsuperscript{287} By 2014, cells of the FAI had claimed attacks in a variety of countries beyond Italy including Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Greece, Indonesia, Mexico, the Netherlands, Peru, Russia, Spain, the UK and the US. Also, while the FAI name would be combined in endless combinations with the CCF, IRF and others, it also was regularly used in conjunction with the ALF/ELF monikers, such as an attack in Moscow, Russia (~21 February 2012) where a group ignited two improvised incendiary devices (IIDs) to burn cellular phone towers in an area popular with hunters.

Around September 2011 two Italian FAI nodes operating since 2004—the “Artisans Cooperative of Fire and Similar (occasionally spectacular)” cell and the ”20th July Brigade”—released a lengthy statement entitled, “Do Not Say That We Are


\textsuperscript{287} Olga Ekonomidou et al., “CCF-Bullets of words for the bullets of the FAI/FRI,” trans. contra-info (Athens Indymedia (republished by contra-info), May 14, 2012), http://en.contrainfo.espiv.net/2012/05/14/greece-ccf-bullets-of-words-for-the-bullets-of-faifri/.
In this document—termed a “contribution to discussing communication, organization and armed struggle at the dawn of a new era”—the authors claim responsibility for several mail bombs, express solidarity with the CCF, and discuss an international campaign of insurrectionary direct action. The anonymous authors speak of the deterritorialization of their network writing:

Many things have happened since we launched the proposal for an ‘Informal Anarchist Federation’. Today, thanks to the sisters and brothers of the ‘Conspiracy of Cells of Fire’, who have re-launched it, the ‘FAI/International Revolutionary Front’, the ‘FAI/Global Network’, the ‘International Network of Action and Solidarity’, the ‘Informal Anarchist Federation–Global Network’ has become reality with their one thousand names. A reality that needs to grow up especially now through the instrument of informal organization on a worldly level and thanks to a federation of action groups. Dozens and dozens of cells, nuclei, movements, individual comrades, united by a clear and strong horizontal and widespread pact of mutual aid, wage war on the existent in a chaotic and destructive way.

Following this, the statement details the names and national locations of 36 cells spread across nine countries.

Following the shooting of Adinolfi, and in response to repeated attacks targeting Equitalia—the Italian tax collection agency—the Italian Ministry of the Interior reassigned 18,000 officers to “security detail” and carried out a series of police raids, arresting eight, and serving warrants to already imprisoned (and infamous) anarchist

288 FAI Artisans Cooperative of Fire and Similar (occasionally spectacular), International Revolutionary Front and FAI 20th July Brigade, International Revolutionary Front, “Do Not Say That We Are Few - Statement from the Italian FAI.”
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291 Italy (12 cells), Mexico (9 cells), Greece (8 cells), Chile (2 cells) and 1 cell each in Indonesia, Russia, Peru, the Netherlands and England.
militants Gabriel Pombo Da Silva and Marco Camenisch. Since its emergence, there have been several individuals arrested in connection to FAI attacks, though in general, the network has been resistant to disruption. Because the FAI’s attacks have tended to avoid injury, the network’s actions have been consistently “underestimated” by both police and academics. In a report to the Italian parliament by the Ministry of the Interior, the FAI is described as the “most dangerous form of domestic non-jihadist terrorism in the country”, yet Muslim non-state actors still receive far more “focused intensity” from police. Nonetheless, according to Europol, “attacks by far-left and anarchist militant groups jumped 43 percent in 2009 [compared to 2008]”, and have doubled since 2007.

The Conspiracy of Cells of Fire

In 2008, there were very few people in the United States who read the communiques from the Conspiracy of Cells of Fire. At the time, communiqués for low level vandalism, sabotage and a few arsons had just started being issued from

---

293 Gabriel Pombo Da Silva is an anarchist militant who was involved in revolutionary bank expropriations since age 15. After being imprisoned in Spain, he escaped from Spanish prison in 2004. While trying to flee to Germany, he was discovered at a border crossing and exchanged fire with German security forces. No one was injured in the shooting but Da Silva was arrested and convicted of attempted murder and kidnapping. He is currently serving 13 years.

294 Marco Camenisch is an anarchist militant currently imprisoned for murder. Camenisch was involved in radical environmental movement prior to his arrest and had served time for industrial sabotage and other direct actions targeting power stations. After being arrested in 1980 for sabotaging a Northeast Swiss Power Station, he was sentenced to 10 years in prison. He escaped prison in 1981 along with five other prisoners. During the escape, a prison guard was shot and killed and a second guard was injured. From 1981-1991, Camenisch went underground and on 5 November 1991, Italian security forces arrested him. Upon capture, Camenisch opened fire wounding one soldier, and was shot and injured in the process. In 1992, he was sentenced to 12 years for the shooting and the sabotage, serving 9 years in solitary confinement. In 2002 he was extradited to Switzerland, and in 2004, sentenced to 17 years in prison for the alleged killing of a Swiss border guard (Kurt Moser) in 1989.

295 A brief chronology of arrested related to the FAI is included in the appendix.

296 Marone, “A Profile of the Informal Anarchist Federation in Italy.”
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various parts of North America and these were only disseminated through a few sources on the internet. But while the gringos were busy burning some trucks against the Olympics or paint bombing some condos, something else was transpiring across the Atlantic, at the end of the Mediterranean. A group of people, large in number, chaotic in nature and diffuse in scope, began to increase their attacks against capitalism, its police and its military. They had a proclivity for using fire and explosives in their actions. They loved fire so much that they referred to themselves as the singular group called the Conspiracy of Cells of Fire.

-- Conspiracy of Cells of Fire [2008]

Rivaling the prominence of the FAI, the Greek network known as the Conspiracy of Cells of Fire [Συνωμοσία των Πυρήνων της Φωτιάς] (CCF), has paved the way for an era of insurrectionary attack. Though the FAI has older roots, the near celebrity status of the CCF have allowed the insurrectionary-nihilist network to rapidly internationalize. Besides obvious ideological, organizational, tactical, and strategic similarities, the FAI and CCF have also been linked via police investigations. For example, in June 2012, Italian police investigating FAI bombings included at least six Greek members of the CCF, calling the CCF-FAI link a “proven connection.”

The CCF emerged 21 January 2008, when cell members carried out near simultaneous arson attacks targeting “4 cars at a Porsche dealership, 3 Eurobanks, 16 cars and a motorcycle at a car exhibition, a Piraeus bank, a Citibank, a PV Motors dealership,

---

301 The network’s name is occasional recorded as Conspiracy of Fire Cells or Conspiracy of Fire Nuclei.
303 Marone, “A Profile of the Informal Anarchist Federation in Italy.”
304 This is the same day of the year that the FAI began their campaign and an obvious show of solidarity between the two networks.
and a public power company crane vehicle.”\(^{305}\) The IIDs were built from gas canisters, a method that CCF cells would repeat throughout the years. The origins of the CCF align with the more generalized rise in leftist militancy seen in Greece following the shooting death of Alexandros Grigoropoulos (6 December 2008) by police which led to a wave of “rioting, street violence and small-scale terrorism.”\(^{306}\) The police’s killing of 15-year-old Grigoropoulos sparked weeks of rioting, occurring in conjunction with increased police repression focused on Athens’s Exarchia neighborhood\(^ {307}\). Nationally, the state also experienced a steep economic downturn that led to a more popularized opposition to the state which was seen as “[serving] the interests only of the rich.”\(^ {308}\)

Moreover, with the rise of explicitly right-wing, fascistic parties such as Golden Dawn, renewed violence between such groups and leftist movements has become commonplace. For example two members of Golden Dawn were shot (1 November 2013) and killed, and a third man injured, while standing outside of a party office in Athens\(^ {309}\). They were shot by two assailants who arrived on a motorcycle, dismounted, left their helmets on and then opened fire, releasing at least twelve rounds from a semi-automatic

\(^{307}\) Exarchia is a semi-autonomous neighborhood in Athens managed within the ethics of revolutionary anarchism. The area is made up of a variety of squats, social centers, and political projects and is known to be extremely hostile to police presence. It is the site of widespread graffiti/murals, wheat pastes and other forms of political street art/speech, a great deal of which is in support of anarchist guerrillism.
pistol and hitting the three men in the chest and head. The attack was assumed to have been carried out by leftist urban guerillas including Revolutionary Struggle, the Sect of Revolutionaries and the CCF. It is important to note that in 2002, the Greek revolutionary network known as the 17 November group (17N), was declared dead and its members imprisoned, after 27 years of attacks on the state.

On month after the initial attacks (20 February 2008), an IED detonated at the law firm of former Minister of Justice Anastasios Papaligouras injuring one employee. That evening (21 February 2008), cell members carried out a series of separate attacks throughout the Attica region. These attacks targeted eight banks, four luxury vehicles and an insurance company. A few weeks later, cell members in Thessaloniki set fire to a government building and three security vehicles (19 March 2008). In April (9 April 2008), in solidarity with prisoners of the Italian FAI, CCF cells in two cities attacked an Italian educational institution and an Italian car exposition, destroying 35 cars. In July 2008, CCF carried out a series of attacks targeting police motorcycles (9 July 2008), diplomatic vehicles of the Moroccan embassy (10 July), three banks (10 July) and an office of New Democracy (15 July).

In mid-September (13 September 2008), at least fifteen members of the CCF in a rare semi-public action, attacked a Thessaloniki police station. The guerillas threw IEDs (Molotov cocktails) from their motorcycles, igniting two police cars, 20 police motorcycles and portions of the station’s exterior. No CCF members were arrested in the attack. Later that month (25 September 2008), CCF cells used gas canister IIDs to set fire to diplomatic vehicles of belonging to the Czech Republic and Italy as well as luxury
cars, private business and three banks. Between 2008-2010 regular attacks would continue to utilize IIDs and IEDs to target government buildings and other property, banks, the homes of current and former officials, press offices, car dealerships and vehicles, and a variety of private businesses. While many attacks struck functional property of the state (e.g. police vehicles, embassies) and capital (e.g. bank ATMs, car dealerships) other attacks focused on more symbolic targets.

In November 2010, CCF deployed a series of 14 mail bombs targeting state officials. Packages were sent to the Mexican Embassy in Athens and Eurojust—and EU-wide cooperative policing agency—in the Netherlands. The embassy package reached its target and injured an employee while the Eurojust package was located and destroyed by police. Two men—Panagiotis Argyros, 22-years-old and Gerasimos Tsakalos, 24-years-old—were arrested in connection with the packages. When detained, the men were found to be in possession of two additional mail bombs addressed to French President Sarkozy and the Belgian Embassy. The suspects were wearing wigs and 9mm pistols. One of the men was also wearing a bulletproof vest.

The day after their arrest, another wave of mail bombs was discovered. Two bombs exploded outside of the Swiss Embassy and the Russian Embassy. A third IED was located and destroyed en route to an office of Europol. Three additional IEDs were also destroyed after being dispatched to the embassies of Chile, Germany and Bulgaria. Two more IEDs were located and destroyed. One device reached the offices of Italian Prime Minister Berlusconi and another reached the offices of German Chancellor Merkel.
The devices caused no injuries. The Greek response to the wave of attacks was to suspend all international airmail for 48 hours (3-4 November 2010).

In late December 2010, a month after the international mail bomb campaign, CCF cells in Athens returned to action and detonated an IED attached to a motorcycle, damaging a courthouse. The device caused no injuries after the bomber made a warning call to police who evacuated the area. Less than five months after the motorcycle attack, in May 2011, Athenian police attempted to arrest suspected members of the CCF. Upon confrontation, the two suspects opened fire and injured two officers.

In mid-2010, the CCF saw its methods and name exported from Greece to the Netherlands in a series of attacks targeting Rabobank, a Dutch, multinational banking and financial service company. According to a communiqué claiming responsibility for three arsons, the authors state that Rabobank was chosen due to its connections to the weapons industry. The authors align themselves with an international campaign of clandestine direct action targeting arms military-linked companies such as Royal Dutch Shell, ING Group, ABN AMRO Bank N.V. and Randstad Holding NV. In the communiqué for the Dutch arsons, the authors dedicate the fires to “our brothers of the prisoner’s cell of the members of Conspiracy of Cells of Fire and the oppressed people of the world.” In the text, the authors claim responsibility for three arsons (June 2010-February 2011) of Rabobank high-rise offices in the Netherlands and the hacking of a corporate website. The communiqué is signed, “Conspiracy of Cells of Fire, Dutch Cell.” 310 In the self-

assessment zine authored by imprisoned members of the CCF, the collective notes this adopted name stating:

…any comrade who agrees…with the [aforementioned] three key points…can…use the name Fire Cells Conspiracy in connection with the autonomous cell she is a part of. Just like the Dutch comrades who, without us knowing one another personally but within the framework of consistency between discourse and practice, attacked the infrastructure of domination (arson and cyber attacks against Rabobank) and claimed responsibility as the Fire Cells Conspiracy (Dutch Cell).311

Back in Greece, on 7 June 2013, a one kilogram, dynamite-based IED exploded from underneath the BMW of Maria Stefi, director of an Athenian prison where CCF comrades were detained. The CCF claimed the bombing the following day. Earlier in 2013, the various Grecian cells of the CCF claimed responsibility for the bombing of a shopping mall, additional bombings targeting homes and offices of government and media officials, as well as the drive-by shooting of an office of Prime Minister Antonis Samaras. According to one police study, there were 527 bombings in 2012, and 254 during the first six months of 2013. The source attributes the majority of these attacks to “anarchist or leftist ‘anti-establishment’ groups.”312 Though not all of these bombings are explicitly linked to the CCF network of cells, according to police, the network has carried out about 150 “criminal acts” 2009-2013313, typified by small IEDs built inside of pressure cookers. During this time, at least 30 individuals have been arrested in connection to CCF activity. According to one deploring account of the perpetrators, the activists are described as

312 Maltezou and Babington, “Special Report.”
313 Ibid.
breaking from the traditional utopianism of Marxism, and instead are “educated, disaffected…‘nihilist[s]’…[who] care little about ideology.”

During a brief period (2012-2014), the various formations of the CCF have been involved in at least four trials, linking them to particular crimes. The first case, known as the Halandri Case, was instrumental in altering the method of attack employed by clandestine guerillas as explained by imprisoned members of the CCF who write:

The ‘Halandri Case’ as it’s been dubbed by the mass media, represents a decisive point in the trajectory of the new urban guerrilla war…About two years had passed since the appearance of the Conspiracy of Cells of Fire and—more generally—the new anarchist urban guerrilla warfare…anarchist groups engaged in propaganda by the deed were collaborating with one another in some cases, coordinating arson rampages on a national level. In many of the texts/communiqués accompanying those attacks, a new perception was being documented, settling the crosshairs of its critique on social inertia, people’s passivity, and the complicit silence that allowed power to define our lives.

In parallel, and for the first time in Greece, words and concepts like anarcho-individualism, nihilism, and antisocial anarchy were escaping the immobility of theoretical texts and seeking their place within the communiqués of practice…Meanwhile, the Conspiracy of Cells of Fire shifted from arsons to the strategy of placing explosive devices in churches, politicians’ homes, and ministries.

Following the Halandri case, three CCF ‘members’ were tried for sending explosive packages. Later, other conspirators were connected to “250 attacks” and tried. Lastly, in July 2013, Andreas Tsavdaridis was tried for a mail bomb attack targeting Dimitris

---
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Horianopoulos\textsuperscript{318}, former commander anti-terrorist division commander in Greece, as part of the “Phoenix Project” campaign.

From prison, many CCF members have continued to remain active, frequently issuing theoretical, strategic and organizational texts, often as a so-called ‘imprisoned members cell.’\textsuperscript{319} In once such communication issued May 2012 and entitled “Bullets of words for the bullets of the FAI/IRF”, ten imprisoned guerillas\textsuperscript{320} used the text to praise the shooting of Adinolfi, whom they call “a high priest of the new totalitarianism of science and technology imperatives.”\textsuperscript{321} The authors speak of expanding the practice of armed struggle and state, “The practice of armed attacks was, is and will be an integral part of the new anarchist urban guerrilla warfare.”\textsuperscript{322}


\textsuperscript{320} CCF members Olga Ekonomidou, Giorgos Polidoros, Gerasimos Tsakalos, Panagiotis Argirou, Christos Tsakalos, Damiano Bolano, Michalis Nikolopoulos, Giorgos Nikolopoulos, Haris Hadjimihelakis and associated non-CCF anarchist Theofilos Mavropoulos.

\textsuperscript{321} Ekonomidou et al., “CCF-Bullets of words for the bullets of the FAI/FRI.”

\textsuperscript{322} Ibid.
The CCF has been integral in furthering the conversational, call-and-response nature of the global insurrectionary network. For example, in a CCF communiqué the authors write:

We do not share our choices only by speaking and writing texts against the state and its society but also when we offer each other possible practical ways, to make our theory practice. This is why we propose to the comrades of the FAI-IRF that we proceed to the publication of manuals which describe i.e. the way to construct an explosive mechanism, the wiring of a time bomb, the assembling of a parcel bomb, the use of a home-made system of time-delaying in incendiary attacks, the strengthening of the destructive power of a molotov, the synthesis and mixtures of ingredients for the creation of explosive materials... also our “work” in the chaotic arts of sabotage can open its thematology from the destruction of cameras, the blocking of ATMs and the construction of home-made smoke bombs up to burgling and stealing cars and motorbikes and the conservation and use of weapons. 323

In response to this call, a group calling itself “Conspiracy of Cells of Fire - FAI/IRF International sector for spreading heretical arts (occasionally spectacular) of sabotage” published a seven page manual detailing the construction of parcel bombs from easily available materials, addressing the manual to “all anarchists of praxis, nihilists, anarchists individualists, anticivilization.”324 Prior to this, another collective, described as “siblings unknown to us who share the mutiny of FAI/IRF comrades”325 had published another guide to IIDs/IEDs in response to the CCF call.

The example of the CCF and its internationalization is meant to highlight the network’s success in expanding the scope if its struggle. Its ability to successfully produce attacks, avoid mass arrest, and maintain an international discourse of resistance

323 Conspiracy of Cells of Fire FAI/IRF Imprisoned Members Cell, “Lone Wolves Are Not Alone...,” 43.
325 Ibid., 1.
has a wide impact on all of the cells and networks that followed. Not only are the arrested members of CCF held up high as martyrs, but their continued involvement with the international insurrectionary network (largely through letters penned in prison) has furthered the development of an insurrectionary strategy and method that is still ongoing. The announcement of CCF cells in Mexico, the Netherlands and other locales carried forth the FAI’s encouragement for local groupings to join the battle, and through the CCF’s sustained propaganda, adherents are able to include even imprisoned members in the development and spreading of the so-called Black International.

**The Mexican networks: Uncle Ted meets CCF**

Beginning around 2010, a sudden surge of insurrectionary-styled, clandestine guerilla networks emerged in Mexico and launched a series of attacks on the state and capital. While a complete chronology and historical accounting of this movement is beyond the scope of this study, a brief review is warranted. Within Mexico, attacks have been claimed under a variety of the commonly occurring monikers including CCF, ELF, FAI and so on. To trace a single example of internationalizing monikers, we turn towards the emergence of a Mexican tendency linking CCF and the FAI. According to an inter-movement, self-narrative account authored by the “Mexican Fire Cells Conspiracy/Informal Anarchist Federation (CCF/FAI)”, “[On] September 15 [2011] The Fire Cells Conspiracy (CCF) faction of the Mexican Informal Anarchist Federation (FAI-M) is formed by affinity groups and like-minded people in several Mexican states.”

---
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The following day (16 September 2011), the CCF/FAI-M “carries out three simultaneous arsons…Liberatory fire destroys merchandise, as flames consume Textiles Suburbia, CV Directo, and TF Victor.”³²⁷ From there the network engaged in frequent arson attacks and in less than two months set fire to sites including a warehouse, an airport staff training school, two Walmarts, a shopping mall, a lumber warehouse and at least four other businesses. From the CCF’s Greek roots and those of the FAI found in Italy, it is notable that such a formation occurred so far away, and in such a culturally different venue as Mexico. The development of this new network is reflective of national tendencies, wherein Mexico becomes a site for a renewal of militant actions and the fostering of newly lethal tendencies.

Beyond the rapid expansion of CCF/FAI-M, Mexico also saw the development of nationally-restricted networks, two of which will be examined below. This is not to discount the actions of a variety of other clandestine attackers, but rather to discuss in greater detail, two such networks that display interesting rhetoric, strategies and methods. The following accounting of history will focus on two district networks, that of the Práxedis G. Guerrero Autonomous Cells for Immediate Revolution (CARI-PGG), and Individualists Tending Towards the Wild (ITS). While ideologically, the former mirrors the more traditional approach of Western European anarcho-guerillas such as CCF and FAI, the ITS network resembles a newly emergent praxis borrowing from anarchism’s primitivist and anti-technology tendencies, exacted through an atypically violent pattern

³²⁷ Ibid.
of attack. ITS and CARI-PGG’s predominant deployment of explosives make them an apt network to study as their tactical and strategic patterns fall well outside of those seen in other insurrectionary networks. In short, these networks’ goals are to kill and maim individuals associated with targeted institutions, while typical insurrectionary attack aims to destroy symbolic property while avoiding individual targeting of persons for injury and death.

CARI-PGG are quick to state their willingness and desire to carry out lethal violence, not simply the destruction of property or the intimidation of individuals. The network makes this aim quite explicit in November 2011, writing:

The Sole-Baleno insurgent cell of the CARI-PGG declare that…a package bomb was mailed addressed to the general offices of the PGR [Federal Attorney General], to be explicit the package was addressed to the attorney general Miguel Mancera. Although our objective was to wound the heads or apparent heads of the police system, being that the package apparently ‘originated’ from the general
offices of Telmex, specifically from the person in Telmex responsible for the Secure City project...the package would have been returned to him if it did not reach its destination. The package bomb was composed of a galvanized metal pipe, dynamite, a 2.5 volt source, matches, cable, a 9 volt battery, and shrapnel.

Here one can observe the network’s lethal aims, to “wound” either an individual associated with the PGR or another associated with Telmex. CARI-PGG emerged in late 2010. In the early months of that year, a series of communiqués were circulated on the traditional, English-language network hubs claiming responsibility for the machine gunning of police vehicles, the erection of flaming street barricades, Molotov cocktails thrown at banks and the bombing of a McDonalds. By October 2010, the first stable, repeated moniker appears, CARI-PGG, though the group was active for years prior.

According to one of their communiqués:

CARI-PGG are coordinated cells who began acting in 2008 without transmitting any claim of responsibility for our actions, and it wasn’t until 2009 that a claim appeared for an action against a Renault auto company…We do not have vanguardist ideas, nor much less militarist ones, we are groups of anarchist action and we base ourselves on informality; we have often questioned ourselves on the use of signatures, but we reached the conclusion that they are only necessary as part of a strategy and nothing more. We do not pretend to bring anybody to insurrection—insurrections are spontaneous and collective, we take up the conflict in the first person. 328

CARI-PGG follows the generalized insurrectionary rejection of systems of control and governance targeting “the police as an institution, their computers, their surveillance systems, their patrols, their criminologists, their experts” who work for “the interests of those who have power, for the protection of the ‘social order.’” 329 Furthermore, CARI-
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329 Autonomous Cells for Immediate Revolution – Praxedis G. Guerrero, FAI, “The Sole-Baleno insurgent cell of the CARI-PGG claims the package bomb sent to the attorney general,” trans. War on Society
PGG has at times claimed attacks as part of the FAI\(^{330}\) and in discussing the shooting of an Italian nuclear executive they write, “we are totally in accordance with the action of the Olga Cell of the FAI in having shot in the legs that bastard of nuclear energy in Italy.”\(^{331}\) Similar to other networks, CARI-PGG regularly expresses solidarity with CCF and prominent political prisoners involved in the insurrectionary model of attack. The network’s targeting selection is not surprising and includes IEDs targeting police vehicles, banks, Starbucks, the homes of politicians’ and prison directors, the Chilean and Italian embassies, the Mexican ambassador to Greece, the Attorney General, the Federal Electricity Commission, the Mexican head of Monsanto, and the Mexican Archbishop. Between January 2010-December 2013, the moniker was used to claim responsibility for 22 bombings and at least one arson\(^{332}\).

---


\(^{332}\) A complete chronology of these attacks is included in the appendix.
Following the example of CARI-PGG, around April 2011, the next movement to emerge and utilize the international counter-information and translation service of the so-called ‘black international’ (i.e. nihilist anarchists\textsuperscript{334} of praxis), was Individualists Tending Toward the Wild \textit{[Individualidades Tendiendo a lo Salvaje]} (ITS). According to a rare interview the group describes its purpose:

\begin{quote}
[ITS] deemed it necessary to carry out the direct attack against the Technoindustrial System. We think that the struggle against this is not only a
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{334} Though ITS shares a great deal with other anarchist-identified networks, it often contests this labeling, such as in section IV of their 7\textsuperscript{th} communiqué.
stance of wanting to abandon Civilization, regressing to Nature, or in refuting the system’s values, without also, attacking it. ITS has received international attention after repeatedly targeting scientists and researchers with lethal force. ITS has stood out from other bombers due to their lengthy, academic communiqués and direct attacks on individuals from outside the typical target set: heads of state and corporations, officials in law enforcement, jailing, etc. As previously stated, ITS is unique in its repeated, stated objective which aims to kill as well as their specific, tech-related target set. In the 2014 interview, cell members explain:

Our immediate objectives are very clear: injure or kill scientists and researchers (by the means of whatever violent act) who ensure the Technoindustrial System continues its course. As we have declared on various occasions, our concrete objective is not the destruction of the Technoindustrial system, it is the attack with all the necessary resources, lashing out at this system which threatens to close off all paths to the reaching of our Individual Freedom, putting into practice our defensive instinct…ITS has from the beginning proposed the attack against the system as the objective, striving to make these kinds of ideas spread around the globe through extreme acts, in defense of Wild Nature, as we have done.

According to their own historical account offered in a 2014, communiqué, the group began in 2011, experimenting with “known and attempted arson attacks on cars and construction machinery, companies and institutions…until we decided to focus on terrorism and not sabotage.” From 2011-2014, ITS has deployed at least 13 mail bombs, issued two written threats packaged with bullets, and assassinated Méndez Salinas, a biotechnologist with the Institute of Bio-Technology hosted at the National

336 Ibid.
337 Individualists Tending Toward the Wild, “Eighth Communique of Individualists Tending Toward the Wild” (Dark Nights #40 (republished by War on Society), April 9, 2014), http://waronsociety.noblogs.org/?p=8913.
Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM). Salinas shot in the head, and according to ITS, was killed by “the most violent cell of ITS in Morelos, being already familiar with the purchase and use of firearms, decided to implement the act.”

Through their various communiqués and interviews ITS has claimed responsibility for a series of attacks, many of which were claimed under other monikers and later linked to the ITS network. For example, in September 2014, ITS declared the formation of Wild Reaction (RS):

After a little more than three years of criminal-terrorist activity, the group ‘Individualists Tending toward the Wild’ (ITS), begins a new phase in this open war against the Technoindustrial System…we want to explain that during all of 2012 and 2013, various groups of a terrorist and sabotage stripe were uniting themselves with the group ITS, so that now, after a long silence and for purely strategic reasons, we publicly claim [10 attacks from newly affiliated networks]…

All of these have now fused with the ITS groups in Morelos, Mexico City, Guanajuato, Hidalgo, Coahuila and Veracruz…Due to this union, the extravagant and little-practical pseudonym of ‘Individualists Tending toward the Wild’ (ITS) ceases to exist, and from now on the attacks against technology and civilization will be signed with the new name of ‘Wild Reaction’ (RS).

Prior to this in April 2014, a group calling itself Obsidian Point Circle of Analysis (OPCan), after publishing three commentaries on ITS and becoming tired of simply writing, activated a new clandestine cell (which would later be absorbed into RS) called Obsidian Point Circle of Attack (OPCA). In it’s opening declaration OPCA writes:

It has been some time since we started writing about some situations that had arisen in Mexico concerning the terrorist group ITS; we published a total of three analyses, in which we have publicly demonstrated our support of the group ITS,
in their actions as much as their position. Until now we have decided to solely be those who comfortably spread and highlighted the group’s communiques and actions, but that is over. The violent advance of the techno-industrial system, the degradation that civilization leaves in its wake and the oblivion they are forcing us toward, ceasing to be natural humans to the point of turning into humanoids: there must be a convincing response.

We abandon words and analyses in order to begin with our war, the war against what kills us and consumes us, against the invincible megamachine which only wild nature or its very own technology can collapse. We do not seek victories, triumphs or results from what we do or have done, we are not revolutionaries, platformists or anarchists.

We only seek confrontation with the system, the sharpening of the conflict against it. From this day we publicly put aside the word ‘analysis,’ in order to become The Obsidian Point Circle of Attack.340

In other words, according to their own narrative, ITS inspired public commentary and critique by OPCAn, and in September 2014, when ITS became RS, it was announced that RS included OPCA as well. In the first declaration by RS, the authors explain, “during this year, 2014, two more terroristic groups have united with us who have put the development of the Technoindustrial System in their sights…The ‘Obsidian Point Circle of Attack’…[and]…The ‘Atlatl Group.’” Therefore, a complete history of ITS’s actions341, includes both attacks claimed under their name, those claimed under the OPCA and RS names, as well as smaller groupings merged under the network’s banner. According to a chronology assembled from the networks’ communications, one can identify at least 27 distinct actions including 22 IED attacks (mostly mail and

341 A complete chronology of these attacks is included in the appendix.
package/parcel bombs), the issuing of three written threats, several arsons of property, one animal release, and one fatal shooting.

ITS’s bombs have targeted civilian, seemingly ‘non-political’ scientists, professors, technical experts, researchers and technocrats and within a politic most closely described as Kaczynskian anarcho-primitivism. This method of argumentation, targeting and explosives was popularized in the 1980s by famed “Unabomber” Ted Kaczynski. Kaczynski’s 17-year (1978-1995) bombing campaign involved 16 bombs, which killed three people and injured 23. Following the publication of *Industrial Society and its Future*\(^{342}\)—popularly known as the “Unabomber manifesto” and released five months after his final attack\(^{343}\)— Kaczynski’s spirit has been carried forth by ITS and a few similar networks.

A comparison between the critique, tactics and rhetoric of ITS and Kaczynski has been made in an overwhelming majority of press accounts of ITS’s activity\(^{344}\). The tendency for scholars, reporters and commentators to make such comparisons may have

---


\(^{343}\) Kaczynski, *Technological Slavery,* 25.

led ITS to specifically address their relationship to Kaczynski in their fourth communiqué wherein they write:

Have ITS copied Ted Kaczynski? The million-dollar question.

Without a doubt, we see this person an individual who with his profound rational analysis contributed greatly to the advance of anti-technological ideas; his simple way of living in a manner strictly away from Civilization and the persecution of his Freedom in an optimal environment make him a worthy individual who due to a family betrayal is serving multiple life sentences in the United States.

Although there are notable discrepancies with his discourse, ITS do not consider it as very distant from what motivates us to keep attacking those intellectually responsible for the imposition of artificial life.

If we cite [Max] Stirner, [Ayn] Rand, [Theodore] Kaczynski, [Friedrich] Nietzsche, [George] Orwell, some scientists and other people in our communiques they are only for references, we do not have reason to be in agreement with all their lines and positions.

It has been said that we imitate the Unabomber; perhaps we have seen as strategic the action of [Kaczynski’s moniker] the Freedom Club [FC] against scientific personalities in the United States in the 70’s, 80’s and 90’s, and we have adopted this, but let it be clear that we have not imitated all his discourse in its totality, since as we said above, there are points that are plainly contrary to the positions of the FC. 345

In their sixth communiqué, ITS notes that their early writings (comprised of their first 346 and second 347 communiqués) did in fact borrow from Kaczynski, but that after reflecting on their “poor interpretations” the group has “discarded [Kaczynski’s ideas] and now for
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345 Individualists Tending Toward the Wild, “Fourth Communique from Individualists Tending toward the Wild” (War on Society, September 21, 2011), http://waronsociety.noblogs.org/?p=2913 [Emphasis included in original].


us they have no validity.”

Despite what many regard as similarities in critique, and despite ITS occasionally quoting Kaczynski directly, in its later communiqués, ITS explicitly denies ideological connections. In ITS’s first communiqué as the newly named “Wild Reaction, ‘Kill or Die’ Group” (RS) the group writes:

“We deny being followers of Ted Kaczynski…we have indeed learned many things from reading Industrial Society and Its Future, the texts after this and the letters before this text signed by ‘Freedom Club’ (FC), but that does not mean that we are his followers. In fact our position clashes with Kaczynski’s, FC’s, his disciple Último Reducto and others, since we do not consider ourselves revolutionaries, we do not want to form an ‘anti-technological movement’ that encourages the ‘total overthrow of the system,’ we do not see it as viable, we do no want victory, we do not pretend to win or lose, this is an individual fight against the mega-machine; we don’t care about getting something positive from this, since we are simply guided by our instincts of defense and survival.

Here one can witness RS’s declared revolutionary intent, to ‘bring it all crashing down’ while avoiding the trapping of movement building and conceiving of the conflict in terms of winners and losers. In this communiqué, after the group changed its name, RS goes on to further declare their ideological independence from the prominent critics of technology (e.g. primitivists) as well as the global anarcho-insurrectional milieu through which their communications are circulated and consumed. In their proclamation of non-affiliation, RS states:

Thus neither Kaczynski, Último Reducto, [John] Zerzan, Derrick Jensen, or any other with the (supposed) “primitivist” stamp represents RS. Nor do the Informal Anarchist Federation (FAI), the Conspiracy of Cells of Fire (CCF), Feral Faun, or any other with the ‘ecoanarchist’ or ‘anti-civilization cell of…’ stamp. RS and its groups only represent themselves.

349 Individualists Tending Toward the Wild, “8th Communique.”
Despite ITS/RS’s insistence to the contrary, prominent anarcho-primitivist thinker John Zerzen, often spoken of as the ‘father’ of the movement, notes that “ITS group is real slavish to Ted Kaczynski.” Zerzen goes on to say that he does not believe ITS’s methods will prove successful and that he is “turn[ed] off” by their usage of mailed explosives and their cavalier dismissal of human causalities.\(^{352}\)

**Case Study: Internationalizing Campaigns of Attack**

...we make a call for multiplication of direct attack actions. We do it without arrogance, but with the knowledge that anarchist proposal of autonomous attack by groups of related comrades horizontally organized, is possible, real, ever-present and necessary.

*We also claim this action as a part of*...[FAI/IRF]...*sharing the objectives it raises: ANARCHIST AUTONOMOUS ATTACK, always on offensive, without hierarchies and without specializations. INTERNATIONALISM, as the anti-authoritarian praxis knows no bounds, states or nations, connecting with other insurgent wills around the world. And SOLIDARITY, because we do not forget about our comrades inside the enemy’s prisons.*

*Also we claim this action as Phoenix Project, to give new impetus to the anti-authoritarian violent action in this area dominated by the Chilean State, as a way of facing repression and show that the anarchist attack is still alive and it will not surrender.*\(^{353}\)

*-- Arsonist Anarchist Attack, “Fire and Consciousness” Cell (FAI/IRF) [2015]*

The insurrectionary movement, as it is being defined throughout this study, is organized through a decentralized model drawn from the larger anarchist praxis. The roles played

---


\(^{352}\) Ibid.

by anti-authoritarian, horizontalist politics in the molding of leftist networks has been the subject of much scholarship. Anarchist theorist Uri Gordon described the generalized anarchist milieu as "network of informal interactions between a plurality of individuals, groups and/or organizations…on the basis of a shared collective identity."\(^{354}\) Gordon goes on to state that this 'movement's architecture' is "a decentralized global network of communication, coordination and mutual support among countless autonomous nodes of social struggle, overwhelmingly lacking formal membership or fixed boundaries."\(^{355}\)

Such a description is applicable to the insurrectionary milieu, which can be understood as a subset or a derivative of the larger anarchist movement or political tendency. For the insurrectionists, international campaigns of attack are coordinated through a diverse, virtual exchange of ideas played out via the texts of communiqués and claims of responsibility.

In attempting to accurately portray this organizational tendency through a modern insurrectionary example, we can examine the "Phoenix" campaign that occurred in 2013-2015\(^{356}\). The campaign began 7 June 2013, when a cell identifying with the CCF-FAI/IRF moniker clamed responsibility for a bomb attack in Athens.\(^{357}\) The targeted vehicle belonged to Maria Stefi, the director of the prison where members of the CCF
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\(^{354}\) Gordon, Anarchy Alive! Anti-Authoritarian Politics from Practice to Theory, 14.

\(^{355}\) Ibid.

\(^{356}\) At the time of writing, the last attack to be carried out as part of the Phoenix Project occurred 7 April 2015 in Chile. The history of these attacks is detailed in the appendix.

\(^{357}\) This first attack of the Phoenix campaign, as well as attacks #3 and #4 have been linked to Andreas Tsavdaridis and Spyros Mandylas as well as already imprisoned member of the Conspiracy of Cells of Fire (CCF). As of May 2014, the defendants were awaiting trial pending changes including the attempted murder of the target, Dimitris Chorianopoulos. This is detailed in the article "Update on the 'Phoenix' Project Trial (Greece)" written by Inter Arma and republished by 325.nostate.net, on May 8, 2014. This is available at: http://325.nostate.net/?p=10297.
were being held. The attackers were quick to claim the attack “as a display of genuine solidarity with our ten imprisoned brothers and sisters.” Interestingly, the bomb attack disrupted a period of inactivity for the CCF, as the authors write:

After almost two years of silence throughout the Greek territory, the CCF returns. Maintaining a common front with the...FAI cells (‘Antifascist Front’, ‘Unscathed Cell of Vengeance’, ‘Lone Wolf Cell’, etc.)... we support and strengthen the international conspiracy of the Informal Anarchist Federation/International Revolutionary Front.

The reemergence of the CCF moniker and the reinvigoration of this network, was portrayed as the rising of the phoenix. The attackers called the bombing part of the “Phoenix Project” implying that the incident was not a single occurrence.

Then, less than two weeks later, the second attack of the Phoenix Project occurred, the bombing of a car belonging to a “hated prison guard in Argos, Greece.” The attack was claimed by the “International Conspiracy for Revenge/FAI,” a newly coined moniker. A few days later, in what the attackers called “Phoenix Project – Act Two”, the third in a series of attacks in Greece occurred, similarly targeting the vehicle of a prison worker. Around 22 June 22 2013, the “FAI-International Conspiracy for Revenge” (the same moniker which claimed the second Phoenix attack), blew up the car of a prison guard whom they accuse of abuse, intimidation and bullying, writing that “the
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enemies of freedom have names and addresses." The communiqué addresses the issue of prison abuse and uses the text to further expand on the internationalist network writing:

The new anarchist urban guerrilla is not a means of struggle, it is our existence itself. All the rest which does not promote the continuous anarchist insurrection is ideological cowardice.

FAI (Informal Anarchist Federation) in cooperation with the Conspiracy of Cells of Fire aims to create a diffuse network of direct action cell in the Greek territory which will strike where the enemy does not expect it. Small autonomous flexible armed cells watch, collect info, sometimes cooperate sometimes not and choose the moment of sudden attack. Only in the attack is there life. We are anarchists of action, chaotic, nihilist, egoists, godless, we are the carriers of the black flags of anarcho-nihilism.

A few days after this communiqué was issued, expanding on and articulating the networked reality of the FAI, the Phoenix Project internationalized.

On 26 June 2013, insurrectionists in Jakarta, Indonesia carried out an arson attack targeting the Sheraton Hotel. The arsonists label their attack “Phoenix Project – Part 3” and note that their decision to act is “[their] decision to respond to the call from our Greek comrades.” In their closing remarks, authors encourage further continuation of the campaign writing “Let’s make the Phoenix project as an international project for revenge!” signing the communiqué the “Anger Unit of the International Conspiracy for Revenge/FAI-IRF,” once again utilizing that shared moniker and adding a new
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service unit. After the attack in Jakarta, at least ten more attacks would occur, totaling 14 “Phoenix Project” attacks as of Summer 2014. Following one such attack, the authors summarize the intent of the campaign writing:

[The] Project Phoenix is a punch in the gut. A punch in the gut because the new anarchist urban guerrilla is here and tears down the desires of all these worms to terminate our actions. Old groups are activated and new are created, with the promise to give life to the nightmares of authority and its subjects.

From the brief history of the Phoenix Project, one can see the deployment of adoptable network monikers used to claim cell-level responsibility for an attack while simultaneously demonstrating coordination and ideological affinity within a larger movement-level initiative. We see monikers deterritorialize, adapt, grow and change. From one initial challenge and call to action, cells around the world attack and in doing so, develop a decentralized campaign of sorts. Gordon, in his description of anarchist organization, likens such moniker networks to the concept of a "rhizome"—a terminology borrowed from the work of Deleuze and Guattari.

Borrowing from the work of anthropologist Jeff Juris, Gordon points out that anarchist networks display a uniqueness, seeking not traditional social movement "recruitment" but instead the reproduction of networks through a "horizontal expansion and enhanced 'connectivity.'" For example, in describing the structuring and strategy of
the global network of attack, an anonymous author(s)\textsuperscript{370} describes these horizontally-connected networks and states:

…with the bombing against the director of Koridallos prisons, we coordinate our attacks through the FAI/IRF international network…FAI/IRF is an international conspiracy of anarchists of praxis that sets fire on the defense positions of reformist societist (sic) anarchists. It gets rid of the smell of mold that has settled in anarchy seen at amphitheaters, and fills the air with the smell of gunpowder, black anarchy, nighttime, explosions, gunshots, sabotages. This explains why the International Revolutionary Front of FAI and Conspiracy is on top of the anarchist dangers list as cited in recent Europol reports.

Diffusion and informal organizing within the new anarchy into autonomous cells of direct action are what really scare the police of the whole world. Therefore, the State and the enemies of anarchy do not easily forget the anarchist militants who are held captive under their prisons’ authority.\textsuperscript{371}

This ‘coordinated attacks through the FAI/IRF international network’ has been the method originated in Italy, and rapidly spread to Greece, Mexico and scores of other countries. Nearly two years after the initiation of the Phoenix Project (in June 2013), combatant cells were still carrying the model forward. In a communiqué issued April 2015, the author(s) state that their IID attack targeting an office of Microsoft was carried out as a “contribution to the comrades of Czech FAI/IRF suggestion, who burned a police car and suggested the creation of an international action project with the name ‘, modeled on the ‘Phoenix’ Project.”\textsuperscript{372} A few days later, yet another Phoenix Project-linked attack was claimed, this time the arson of a meat company’s office in Chile. Clearly the notion

\textsuperscript{370} Throughout these pages, determining precisely how many authors wrote a particular work is nearly impossible. Often times, this difficulty is noted within the text by writing the sentence subject in the singular, and parenthetically noting the plural (e.g. author(s)). Monikers are typically referred to in the plural as well, such as, “The ALF broke a window. They did it with a rock.”


\textsuperscript{372} Combative Anarchy, FAI-IRF, “Incendiary attack against the central offices of Microsoft by ‘Combative Anarchy – FAI/IRF,’” trans. Inter Arma (Inter Arma (republished by 325.nostate.net), April 9, 2015), http://325.nostate.net/?p=15815.
of carrying forth campaigns of attack initiated by one cell and furthered by others will only continue. The example of the Phoenix Project was presented to show one such expansion, but a growing list would fill page after page. Since the emergence of the FAI, CCF and others in the dawn of the millennium, the expansion of clandestine insurrectionary attack has been swift. The preceding history has attempted to trace this history, not only from its nineteenth century ideological roots, but also from its more modern organizational genesis. In the following chapters, this history will be built upon in terms of a historicized strategy, and the contemporary discourse which allows the masked attackers to develop refine and disseminate a growing body of theory, analysis and critique.

**Conclusion**

This history of struggle is meant to develop a genealogy of insurrection based around the most often-invoked characters and periods. While there is not a chronologically-direct lineage from Fawkes to Bakunin and onwards to the CCF, these pre-modern actors, movements and events constitute the foundational precursors to the present period. Most, if not all of the individuals mentioned in this history are unearthed in the propaganda and theory offered through insurrectionary communiqués. Ideas are adopted and stolen without attribution and names of the fallen are summoned from centuries past to inspire and incite. To cite one example, in the April 2014 OPCA communiqué emanating from Mexico which was previous discussed, the author(s) state, “We abandon words and analyses in order to begin with our war”, a notion reminiscent of Nechayev’s recommendation that those conspiring for attack to “prove himself (sic) not by words but
by deeds."373 More famous, is the modern insurrectionary text, *How is it to be done?*374, which borrows its title from Lenin’s 1917 article *Just How Is it To Be Done?*375 without attribution. These are but two examples of the carrying forth of aged ideas without harkening back. In this manner, in the construction of an insurrectionary pre-history, one must examine the actions of attackers as well as their theories as the latter is often presented as ahistorical; operating independent of obvious precursors. In the chapter that follows this history of insurrection will be discussed in light of its shared and divergent characteristics with the modern movement. Therefore, while keeping this previously unearthed history in mind, the proceeding chapter will build upon this history, and apply it to the formation of post-millennial networks.

CHAPTER THREE

I believe that the action of these specific incendiary groups contributed to the unstoppable course of anarchist insurrection. Incendiary attacks are an inseparable part of the struggle because they are easy to carry out by new comrades, keep the fire of belligerent hostilities burning and contribute to the spreading of anarchist violence. They add their own pebbles to the continuation of the anarchist urban guerilla and cause trouble to the smooth running of the system. Of course arsons must occur in relation with all the expressions of anarchist violence (bomb attacks, political executions, violent mass clashes, raiding excursions), in order to create a common uncontrollable and dangerous front for action, which sets the total destruction of the existent as its only limit.  

-- Nikos Romanos, anarchist militant and member of “FAI-Fires on the Horizon,” “FAI-Unit Fire to the Galleys” & “Flaming Shadows and Militant Minority” [2014]

---

The Structuring of Social War

The preceding chapter sought to examine a genealogical mapping of the insurrectionary tendency, linking it to not only past fighters whose names are carried on into the present, but also those in struggle whose methods and aims coincided with that of the modern networks of attack. With this historical record in mind, the present chapter seeks to interrogate these past eras of struggle and to examine them in light of the modernist tendency. In other words, this chapter is not simply a continuation of the historical record offered in Chapter Two, but rather a distinct pursuit that seeks to frame the strategic and structural influences embraced by insurrectionary networks. In this pursuit, this chapter will seek to differentiate post-millennial armed struggle from armed movements for liberation located in the past. In doing so, these efforts serve to provide an interpretation of the historical account; specifically focusing on those issues that can best improve our understanding of insurrectionism. This approach is necessary to provide an analytical component to the aforementioned historical account. In this progression, Chapter Two’s history provides the background and framework for Chapter Three’s discussion. These chapters collectively aim to familiarize the reader with the movement, its history, and its methods, which are necessary to understand prior to the discussion of communiqués offered in the final three chapters.

The preceding history (Chapter Two) detailed the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries before skipping abruptly forward from the 1930s to the 2000s. In doing so, one misses a discussion of one of the most active periods of modern asymmetric conflict between the masses and the state: the era of the Vietnam War. The chapter that follows
corrects for this by directing detailed examination towards the era of armed struggle that arose after World War II and declined by the 1980s. The following discussion will first examine the modern insurrectionary strategy as an intentional (yet often unacknowledged) adaptation of guerilla warfare strategies embodied in leftist, ethno-nationalist and separatist movements of the 1970s. In reading insurrection as a form of warfare on par with that of Latin American paramilitaries, one is able to compare and contrast these methods of combat in terms of locale, scale, tactics and strategy.

Secondly, following the discussion of insurrection as warfare, one will examine the embracing of illegalist expropriation (i.e. robbery and theft) and the key ‘question of terrorism,’ in other words, do insurrectionary methods constitute a form of terrorism. One will ask the question: How does this milieu interact with the post-9/11 rhetoric of terrorism, both in a rejection of its trappings and an embracing of its rhetorical power.

Thirdly, the chapter will explore the intellectual and experiential history of rural guerrilla warfare of the Marxists—embodied in Latin American focalism—and explore its adaptation into a form of urbanized warfare by the modern insurrectionaries. Forth, one will focus on the revolutionary’s identity as either a ‘full time’ or ‘part time’ fighter, before further exploring structure through an analysis of the genealogical connections between the affinity group model popularized in the 1990s and those of the modern insurrectionary network. This history relies upon the historical narrative developed in the previous chapter, especially the ‘anti-globalization’ period occurring between the passage of NAFTA in 1994, and the dawn of the millennium six years later.
Finally, the chapter will explore the question of claiming authorship for attacks. It will compare and contrast the ways through which clandestine, networks negotiate ‘guidelines’ for group inclusion/exclusion, and explore ongoing debates concerning the utility of claiming attacks via monikers versus leaving strikes unattributed. These questions must be understood as key to the development of an insurrectionary method, a way of understanding combat and practicing resistance. How one structures a network, how one linguistically positions itself vis-à-vis the notion of terrorism, how one determines group identity, and how a group claims ownership over attacks—these decisions collectively determine group identity in key ways and are therefore necessary to explore prior to a further interrogation of modern insurrectionary combat.

**Insurrection: Strategy, Structure and Form**

Insurrectionary struggle must be understood as more than the sum of its communiqués. To understand it only in these regards is reductionist and misses important occurrences such as frequent street-level confrontations, marches, building occupations, riots, blockades, and clandestine attacks. A defender of insurrectionary strategy commented in an anarchist message board, trying to succinctly explain this strategy and framework, writing:

> The insurrection purposed by many contemporary anarchists is an informal non-military non-non-violent communization or egoist campaign. An insurrection is the actualization of our desires that go against the ruling order. An insurrection spread cracks in the spectacle of social peace. The anarchist insurrection is the
riot, the social war, the blockade, the strike, the gang, the commune, and so much more.377

The insurrectionary strategy, or rather the strategy proposed by insurrectionists is a multifaceted initiative based around building autonomous spaces378 (e.g. squats, communes, police-free neighborhoods, zones of opacity379, temporary autonomous zones380), fostering conflict to expose inequality (i.e. making social war), and directly attacking forms of domination through informal, individualist, illegal action including property destruction, sabotage, propaganda, expropriation and strikes at individuals.

Unlike Marxism and other revolutionary frameworks, insurrectionary anarchism is not rooted in a specific theory of change (e.g. historical materialism) but is rather a theory of critique and action, not prefiguration. In his discussion of guerrilla warfare and terrorism, conflict theorist Richard Rubenstein points to a two stage understanding advocated by Vietnamese leader and military strategist General Vo Nguyen Giap who divided the conflict into two stages, beginning with guerrilla war before moving into more conventional forms of warfare381. General Giap understood the role played by guerrilla violence, stating:

At the price of their hard-won experiences, our compatriots in the South realized that the fundamental trend of imperialism and its lackeys is violence and war; that is why the most correct path to be followed by the peoples to liberate themselves

---

381 Rubenstein, Alchemists of Revolution, 29–30.
is revolutionary violence and revolutionary war. This path conforms strictly to the ethics and the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism on class struggle, on the state and the revolution. Only by revolutionary violence can the masses defeat aggressive imperialism and its lackeys and overthrow the reactionary administration to take power. 382

While the guerrilla warfare resembles the strategies and tactics of the insurrectionists, it is in this second stage, where one move into a phase of more regular combat, that the comparison breaks down. While the Marxist and nationalist struggles of this era were defined by the desire to foster a “mass-based guerrilla army” in order to “move from large-scale rebellion to revolution,” the insurrectionary perspective lacks this prescriptive chronology and sees only the moment of the attack, the resulting rupture, and the attacks that follow. These do not necessarily culminate—in terms of scale and mass—in a revolution in the traditional Marxist sense, but there is a presumption that attacks lead to more attacks, which in some way lead to structural change.

The insurrectionary milieu has a tactical and strategic understanding, and while many individuals quite obviously possess a clearly demarcated theory of change, the movement on the whole is not based in this predictive reality. While not advocating a shared theory of social change, the insurrectionary milieu shares a “violence framing” which speaks to a “set of culturally salient violent practices through which to understand it contextualize a political situation…or a proposed course of action.” 384 This shared “violence framing” is prevalent despite the lack of a clearly established, and often

383 Rubenstein, Alchemists of Revolution, 30.
repeated, long-term, prescriptive vision. It could be argued that this represents a “global framing” wherein the milieu “[utilizes] international symbols to frame domestic issues for the purpose of mobilizing support,” but as these networks actively ignore nation-state boundaries, such transnational distinctions become less relevant and meaningful.

For example, insurrectionary attackers are extremely unlikely to call for the revolutionary overthrow of specific nation-states but instead advocate a totalized war wherein all beings are emancipated from all forms of domination.

Instead of predicting the forms of change, the movement is focused on the production of attacks—what social movement theorist Donnatella della Porta calls “the logic of [material] damage”—making these attacks larger and more frequent. While these attacks have a variety of aims, one central goal is to ‘interrupt the flow of commodities.’ This is achieved when a bank is unable to open after having its windows smashed, a fleet of police cars needs to be replaced and is unable to patrol for a period, or a multinational office is forced to lockdown after receiving an explosive package or threat. These strikes against state and capital which seek to ‘interrupt the flow’ are not centrally directed, yet follow a basic guiding logic, as explained by the anonymous authors of The Coming Insurrection who instruct, “As for methods, let’s adopt the following principle from sabotage: a minimum of risk in taking the action, a minimum of time, and maximum damage.” The strategy is thus simultaneously aimed at tearing down (the

386 Della Porta and Diani, Social Movements, sec. 7.3.2.
387 The Invisible Committee, The Coming Insurrection, 119.
388 Ibid., 111.
state) and building up (the commune). As one anonymous writer states, “The commune is the basic unit of partisan reality. An insurrectional surge may be nothing more than a multiplication of communes, their coming into contact and forming of ties.”\textsuperscript{389} This strategy offered by TIC seeks to replace “the institutions of society: family, school, union, sport club” with counter formations, based in an anti-authoritarian structure that meet the “material and moral” needs\textsuperscript{390}. To ‘build the commune’ one seeks to create counter-bodies which sap power from the institutions of the society one seeks to destroy. It is the expansion, and multiplication of ungovernable zones, and communities of resistance based around mutual aid, solidarity, self-sufficiency and resistance to domination.

TIC slyly lays out their macro strategy in the chapter headings of \textit{The Coming Insurrection}. While the beginning of the book describes and critiques the society at large (modeled after Dante Alighieri’s ‘nine circles of Hell’), the final four chapters lay out a method which brings one from the moment of the present, constrained by domination, to a future which is more free. The authors describe these stages as:

- Get Going!
- Find Each Other
- Get Organized
- Insurrection\textsuperscript{391}

This is the broadly defined insurrectionary proscription for action. The insurrectionary action advocated in \textit{The Coming Insurrection} is one of building up communities of

\textsuperscript{389} Ibid., 117.
\textsuperscript{390} Ibid., 102.
\textsuperscript{391} Ibid., 7.
resistance, and fostering conflict and direct confrontation with the state through organized networks.

These forms of insurrectionary action and resistance are integrated into daily existence and reject some aspects of the 1960s-era guerrillaism. While the ethics of armed struggle are maintained from these predecessors, forms of daily resistance become makers alongside isolated armed attacks as “the urban guerilla figure of the previous decades collapses into the average city dweller who doesn’t pay for the subway.” The goal of an insurrectionary strategy is to “widen the breach between politics and the political”, to bring about radical social change through initiating conflict. Arson, explosives, graffiti, animal release and various forms of vandalism comprise a wide tactical array that is often patterned nationally or within networks. For example, while Mexico, Greece and Chile, Italy and Spain have frequent bombings, the US, Canada and Germany rarely see this tactic. Greece has had frequent armed expropriations from banks, while Chile has seen frequent armed clashes with police at universities and in city streets. In Mexico and Italy, mail bombs have been used to target officials, political leaders, technocrats and scientists. These differing realities are likely the results of cultural and historical conditions outside the scope of the current discussion. For example, is it merely a coincidence that the nations experiencing active bombings campaign such as Chile, Greece, Italy and Spain all have recent national experiences with fascism?

---

392 The Institute for Experimental Freedom, Between Predicates, War: Theses On Contemporary Struggle, 46.
393 The Invisible Committee, The Coming Insurrection, 25.
This study focuses its attention on attacks recorded in the public registry through the issuing of a communiqué through online channels. It is limited in this regard. Though these websites’ communiqué repositories are extensive, and utilized frequently to communicate attacks, it is certainly not the entirety of insurrectionary activity. Street actions such as confrontational marches and riots, building and university occupations, demonstrations outside and within prisons, provoked clashes with security forces, spontaneous road blockades and other insurrectionary-aligned occurrences, while essential, fall outside of the scope of this discussion. The following discussion will explore the macro strategy of insurrectionary action as a strategy and form of warfare. It will explore the means, strategy and organization of political violence, which are necessary to historically encapsulate modern conflict.

**Reinterpreting Urban Guerilla Warfare**

*I stand here as your declared and unrepentant enemy, I do not beg for your lenience, I do not seek to engage in dialogue with you and your peers. My values are at war with yours, so that every phrase I come out with against you is a razor scoring the masks of your hypocrisy and making clear the position and the role of each of us...The simple laws of physics dictate, that reaction is the consequence of action. Outside this courtroom on free lands, there are rebellious people, comrades for me, terrorists for you, who don’t intend to tolerate our extermination, without making you and your political supervisors bleed first. You can take this as a threat if you like. I believe, that this is the cynical reality. Each option has its own cost. I guess, that, as judges and servants of the law, you would agree with me on this.*

-- Nikos Romanos [2014]

The new assemblage of clandestine attackers has borrowed from many previous incarnations of anti-state and counter-hegemonic resistance movements. While the tactics

---

394 Nikos Romanos, “Statement by Nikos Romanos at the trial which started on 03/02/2014” (Inter Arma, March 2, 2014), https://interarma.info/2014/02/05/dilwsi-rwmanou-sto-dikastirio/?lang=en.
have ranged from the vandalism of property (private, corporate and state) to the outright targeting of individuals with explosives and firearms, this tactical continuum has been deployed within a framework of asymmetric, protracted, urban guerilla warfare, with practitioners frequently refereeing to themselves as “urban guerillas”\textsuperscript{395}, “armed guerillas”\textsuperscript{396} or “anarchist urban guerillas”\textsuperscript{397}. Though there is no insurrectionary consensus on strategy or organization, there are fluid, constantly reinterpreted guiding principals. In a 2014 interview, a Canadian, self-described insurrectionary anarchist outlines three points of broad-based affinity in an interview, stating:

The part of the anarchist movement I come out of is very influenced by the insurrectionary anarchist practices that was theorized in Italy in the [19]70’s, the principal points that are applicable to our struggle are:

A) a break from the traditional worker’s movements in favour of more fluid organizing, less tied to our roles in the economy.

B) an emphasis on attacking the enemy in small easily reproducible ways, that allow more possibilities for these tactics to spread across the social terrain, and avoid some of the traps that the urban guerillas of previous generations fell into.

C) Most important of all, is informal organizing, this means that we do not want to create organizations that waste energy on keeping themselves alive, just for the sake of it, and instead to work on projects on a basis of affinity, whether that means a lived affinity with others who do not share our anarchist identity, or an

\textsuperscript{395} CCF-FAI/IRF, “Parcel bomb sent to the police precinct of Itea,” trans. Inter Arma (Inter Arma (republished by 325.nostate.net), April 29, 2014), http://325.nostate.net/?p=10250.
\textsuperscript{396} CCF-FAI/IRF and Ryo Cell, “Phoenix Project #6: Parcel Bomb Arrives for Dimitris Mokkas, Chief Prosecutor in the CCF Case,” trans. Conspiracy of Cells of Fire FAI/IRF Imprisoned Members Cell (325.nostate.net, October 8, 2013), http://325.nostate.net/?p=9066; Conspiracy of Cells of Fire FAI/IRF Imprisoned Members Cell, “‘Fear first nests in our souls and then raises the walls of its prisons’ – A communiqué by CCF about prisons.”
affinity with others such as indigenous rebels who also desire the destruction of the Canadian state.\textsuperscript{398}

Here we see basic insurrectionary ethics such as the avoidance of populist movements, fluid, temporary and informal organizations based on networks of affinity, and an emphasis on direct confrontation and attack through simple, “easily reproducible” means. While the target set is vague, this reflects the totalized conflict position of those at war with society at large, and the state-capital nexus more centrally. This modeling is at contrast with the forms of urban guerrillaism, which peaked in the 1970s. The differences and similarities between these two articulations of armed struggle are key and will be explored throughout this chapter.

The fluidly-defined yet ever-present nature of the systems of domination create a veritable smorgasbord of available targets for attackers; targets they can consider and weigh based on symbolism, feasibility, opportunity, etc. It is in this manner that the asymmetric nature of the state v. non-state relationship benefits the latter. For the attacker, they can strike when the means and opportunity avail themselves, but for the state, they must defend all capital at all times. The insurrectionary vandal can set out to burn a police car, find it well guarded and set fire to an adjacent bank; all within the same logic and rhetoric. This is especially true in urban environments.\textsuperscript{399} Furthermore, with the technologization, automation and dispersal of capital, the targets multiply. As one


anonymous, insurrectionary theorist writes, “the spreading of production and control that
the new technologies allow makes sabotage easier.”\(^{400}\) In so-called “city terrorism…the
government must, since it is the government, protect everywhere the interests of property
owners; the \textit{guerrilleros} don’t have to protect anything anywhere.”\(^{401}\) This is part of the
revisioning of the \textit{urban} guerilla embedded within a locale with endless targets all
interwoven through a single revolutionary narrative; from a slaughterhouse to a police
 crusher, all manifestations of domination, politics and power are fair game.

Though this revisioning is unique in some regards, in others, it preforms with
patterned regularity when compared to other matters of political violence. For example,
when examining what sorts of \textit{targets} attackers chose to strike, a great deal of similarity
exists between the insurrectionary milieu and other non-state attackers. To draw this
comparison, one can examine a single national locale, in this case the US. In a 2014 study
of ‘domestic terrorism’ occurring in the US (1940-2012), the authors conclude that while
84 attacks caused 134 fatalities, none were the product of attacks by “left-wing
extremists.”\(^{402}\) Scholarship specifically focused on “white leftist groups” of the late
1960s-early 1970s notes that during this period, while European leftists and anti-colonial
movements directed a large portion of their attacks at people, in the US this was not the
case\(^{403}\). According to the study, this was an adaptive process through which leftist groups

\(^{400}\) Anonymous, \textit{At Daggers Drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critics}, 21.
\(^{401}\) Régis Debray, \textit{Revolution in the Revolution? Armed Struggle and Political Struggle in Latin America},
\(^{402}\) Michael Becker, “Explaining Lone Wolf Target Selection in the United States,” \textit{Studies in Conflict &
\(^{403}\) Luca Falciola, “A Bloodless Guerrilla Warfare: Why U.S. White Leftists Renounced Violence Against
People During the 1970s,” \textit{Terrorism and Political Violence} 27, no. 2 (2015): 1–2,
reigned one another in through inter-movement critique and criticism, and breaking ties with those that transgressed the questions of violence against people. Despite its infrequency in the US, a great deal of modern publications seemingly fixate on preparing for armed struggle in Western metropolitan through strategic discussions as well as practical guides in military matters (e.g. weapons assembly/maintenance, maneuvers, training) adapted for revolutionary movements.

The context through which anti-state violence is created is context-specific and may require the examination of difficult questions dealing with notions of legitimacy, labeling, power and structural violence. Why a particular site was attacked and what social critique this was meant to highlight draws attention to the underbelly of the social order. For example, an attack targeting a slaughterhouse will likely speak to issues of speciesism and capitalist commodification, while the arson of a police station speaks to a

---

404 Ibid., 17.
discourse surround the legitimacy of law enforcement at large. In her work examining the poststructuralist approach to the study of terrorism, Harmonie Toros speaks of the need to “resituate terrorist violence within its context” and to ask these questions:

A bomb exploding in a square does not make sense unless one can situate it. For this, there are more direct questions that all scholars ask: Where is the square? Who did the bomb aim to kill? Who did it aim to impact? Who claimed responsibility and/or to which group was it attributed?...What are the power structures and balances at play—locally, regionally, nationally and internationally? What preceded the explosion and what succeeded it? What are the aims of those who claim responsibility...What are the struggles—political, social, economic—that surround the violence?407

I would add to list was the bomb intended to kill. Since most insurrectionary bombings target property (similar to the ALF, ELF and other contemporaries), and that those aimed directly at human targets (e.g. ITS, Kaczynski) have often been small in size, it is essential to question the notion of intent in terms of lethality. Nonetheless, Toros encourages us to focus critical attention towards matters of context, specially that which can help to explain why a particular target and method was chosen. Therefore when an insurrectionary cell sets fire to a cellular tower (as has been done frequently), this must be understood not as an isolated, anti-social act of meaningless rebellion, but a contextually-situated attack emanating from a socio-political critique of alienation, anti-capitalism and an anger finding a target in the infrastructure of corporate interests. A similar, if not more meaningful self-reflection would follow the intentional targeting of a person with, for example, an IED sent through the mail. In this case, why that person was chosen from amongst a much larger community of contemporaries must be understood in both micro,

community-level terms as well as global discourses critical of, for example, nanotechnology, nuclear science or certain corporate interests.

This tendency to target property and not people mirrors the insurrectionary history where property damage is substantial and human/animal casualties are nonexistent. Furthermore, “terrorists” tended to target “easily accessible, familiar, unhardened targets…with easily attainable weapons [e.g. IIDs, rocks, glue].”\textsuperscript{408} The study posits that attackers often target “nodes, paths and edges”\textsuperscript{409}: sites that are already integrated into their daily reality such as those which occur near their residence or places of frequent activity. Though there is no evidence to assert for the insurrectionary milieu, it may account for the seemingly mundane nature of the networks’ targets such as bank branches (not headquarters or corporate offices), ATMs, phone booths, automobiles and other civilian (i.e. non-government, non-military) manifestations of their criticism peppered throughout daily life. In general, through both the traditional studies of violent non-state actors and the observation of insurrectionary attack, both groupings seem to choose “targets that were congruent with their stated political ideology, but they mainly confined their target selection to areas with which they, verifiably, had familiarity based on their daily routines.”\textsuperscript{410} Though it may seem like a presumption, it bears mentioning that research supports the assumption that attacks by non-state actors correspond to ideological posturings thus selecting deserving, “enemy” targets from a functionally

\textsuperscript{408} Becker, “Explaining Lone Wolf Target Selection in the United States,” 967.
\textsuperscript{410} Becker, “Explaining Lone Wolf Target Selection in the United States,” 968.
unlimited pool of potentials.\(^{411}\) This strategy of attack increases the cost of doing business for the movement’s opponents, and while isolated attack alone is not sufficient to cause mass social upheaval, it is the wedge driven deeper by insurrectionists that seeks to damage the enemy, inspire the ally and put into practice forms of resistance that are ends in themselves.

Throughout the insurrectionary literature, there is a consistent warning regarding the dependence or fetishism of the underground, armed guerilla, the vanguardist armed struggle, and the “mythology of clandestinity and combat organisations.”\(^{412}\) From anonymously penned texts, potential fighters argue that as a strategy, the use of guerilla warfare is devoid of politics and can be adopted by any radical actor from reformist to sectarian communists.

‘Armed struggle’ is a strategy that could be put at the service of any project. The guerilla is still used today by organizations whose programmes are substantially social democratic; they simply support their demands with military practice. Politics can also be done with arms.\(^{413}\)

While such cautionary warnings exist, modern insurrectionary warfare can certainly be classified as a branch rooted in the tree of asymmetric, guerilla strategy. To historicize this evolution of thought, one can examine earlier proponents of guerilla warfare strategy, including Ernesto “Che” Guevara, Mao Tse-tung and Vo Nguyen Giap\(^{414}\) —the senior
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\(^{414}\) It should be noted that such a listing is quite cursory. Other famed proponents of guerilla warfare and insurrectionary methods include: Sun Tzu (544-496 BCE), Maha Thiha Thura (~1720-1782), Teingya Minkhaung (~1750s), Michael Dwyer (1772-1825), Carl von Clausewitz (1780-1831), Omar Mukhtar (1858-1931), Izz ad-Din al-Qassam (1882-1935), Muhammad Ibn ‘Abd al-Karim al-Khattabi (1882-1963), Yousef Borahil al-Msmare (1886-1931), Nestor Makhno (1888-1934), Thomas Edward Lawrence (1888-1935), Michael Collins (1890-1922), Ho Chi Minh (1890-1969), Alberto Bayo y Giroud (1892-1967), Albert Levy
military commander of the Vietnamese National Liberation Front. These past warfare theorists contended that such wars of asymmetry must be fought in the countryside\textsuperscript{415} by militarily-trained units, not dispersed networks of part-time activist-turned-guerillas, based in cities.

The insurrectionary anarchist strategy is descendent from an urbanized form of guerilla warfare. It is an asymmetric war of attrition wherein the dispersed network temporarily assembles to strike the ever-present, near enemy—the state and capital—and then retreats into safety. This approach acknowledges the power imbalance between the clandestine networks and the state’s armories, and seeks to avoid protracted, military-styled engagement, as the authors of \textit{The Coming Insurrection} explain in the conclusion to their treatise:

> From a strategic point of view, indirect, asymmetrical action seems the most effective kind, the one best suited to our time: you don’t attack an occupying army frontally. That said, the prospect of Iraq-style urban guerilla warfare, dragging on with no possibility of taking the offensive, is more feared than to be desired. The \textit{militarization} of civil war is the defeat of insurrection.\textsuperscript{416}

Traditional guerilla warfare campaigns, whether urban or rural, have relied on fighters immersing themselves into full time underground living\textsuperscript{417}. This follows the advice of

\begin{itemize}
\item The Invisible Committee, \textit{The Coming Insurrection}, 129.
\item This requirement for total commitment to struggle (i.e. ‘full time revolutionaries’) is repeated in Nechaev’s \textit{Catechism of a Revolutionist} where adherents are told that they must be completely
\end{itemize}
theorists who argued that “the armed unit...is organically separate from the civilian population.”\footnote{Debray, \textit{Revolution in the Revolution? Armed Struggle and Political Struggle in Latin America}, 29.} This dependence on full time forces is standard amongst a variety of armed non-state actors including the FARC, the Basque Fatherland and Liberty Party (ETA), the Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA) and ongoing anti-occupation insurgencies in locales such as Iraq, Afghanistan and Palestine.

When speaking of the more famed armed conflicts—such as those occurring in Ireland, Palestine, Colombia and the Basque region—one must account for the existence of armed cadres in conjunction with broader-based, mass uprisings. Rubenstein argues that a key strategic distinction exists between situations where guerrilla warfare acts to support ongoing mass uprisings, and others where guerrillaism acts as a driving force to \textit{encourage} such uprisings. In relation to these methods, termed “terrorism” in Rubenstein’s discussion, the author states, “Guerilla fighters may be terrorists, but terrorism, properly defined, is exemplary small-group violence. Its function is to \textit{create} the mass movement.”\footnote{Rubenstein, \textit{Alchemists of Revolution}, 196.} Certainly there are cases where this occurs, such as Ho Chi Minh’s experience in Vietnam where the North Vietnamese leader was able to “convert...a small guerrilla band into a mass-based people’s army.”\footnote{Ibid., 197.} Rubenstein also points to the resistance to French colonialism in 1950s Algeria\footnote{Ibid., 201.}. In this case, as Rubenstein explains, acts of violence by the Algerian paramilitaries did not succeed in expelling the French, but the resistance’s use of small-group violence forced the hand of

\footnote{Commitment to creating revolution and that this aim must dictate every manner of life including desires and friendships, the latter of which was meant to be judge by potential allies’ commitments to revolution.}
the French occupation authorizes, and they were forced to repress the population in the name of counterinsurgency. This forcing of the state’s hand towards retaliatory violence aids in the construction of ‘us v. them’ narratives offered by the broader segments of the anti-colonial struggle. This strategy of striking the enemy, forcing the enemy to respond and then using that response to further recruit and mobilize supporters is common in asymmetric conflicts, and can certainly be seen in the insurrectionary method as well. In Rubenstein’s understanding of history, acts of small scale violence have never “mobilized the masses” but they have been successful in “disrupt[ing] normal life, incit[ing] the authorities to excesses of indiscriminate violence, and generat[ing] states of political emergency.”\(^{422}\) Such discussion of “small-group” versus mass-based violence are typically reserved for conflicts in rural areas, especially those with large agricultural and other laboring constituencies. In these rural venues, individuals typically termed “militants,” “guerillas,” “combatants” or simply “terrorists” engage in a lifestyle of 24-hour activity. When an individual is not engaged in active preparation or commission of an act of violence, they are living a subterranean existence as their activities are known the security forces and thus normal, day-to-day living is altered in the cat and mouse game of attacker versus defender.

This is of course not to claim that guerilla warfare as a strategy began with Algeria or Vietnam—nor with Guevara or Mao—rather the strategy dates back to at least the Maccabean Revolt (167-160 BCE) where the Judean people fought the state through guerilla warfare after Antiochus IV Epiphanes forbid them to practice their religion.

\(^{422}\) Ibid.
Other early examples include the Numidians’ war against Rome (100 BCE) and the Spartacan Slave Revolt against the Roman Republic (70 BCE). The term guerrilla warfare also appears during the Spanish fight against Napoleonic occupation occurring around 1810 CE. Other historical usages of note include the French Revolution of the 1790s, which saw peasants attack regimented armies with some degree of success, the Second Sino-Japanese War of the 1940s which involved a guerilla campaign led by Chinese military commander Chaing Kai-shek against Emperor Hirohito’s Japan, or the Dutch resistance to Nazi occupation during World War II. Although these examples span centuries, continents and a range of political ideologies they share a tactical and strategic framework of guerrillaism that involves asymmetry, mobility, and the exploitation of the enemy’s weaknesses.

In a well-known and ‘classical’ revolutionary guerilla movements such as Republican Northern Ireland, PIRA fighters struck at British interests wherever present and available for attack. Strikes were targets of opportunity carried out with lengthy planning. In this way, contemporary insurrectionary attacks operate within a similar strategy; striking at the representatives of the near enemy when able, and then retreating

426 Teitler, “The Urban Guerilla, as a Revolutionary Phenomenon and as a Recruiting Problem,” 111.
into the masses. The aim is to make system maintenance more costly, to provoke the violent actions of the security apparatus, and to promote ‘propaganda of the deed’ and the dissemination of radical, critical theory through propaganda. For those operating in an urban setting, the goal is likely not to seize power through controlling large areas of physical territory. Instead as urban movements tend to be numerically smaller, their war is one of attrition rather than outright victory. In discussing the strategic differences between urban and rural armed movements, John Wolf writes:

Urban-based terrorists at best can only hope to raise the cost of governing for the incumbent so that he abdicates…the destruction of an enemy involves breaking either his ability or his will to resist…force is employed to demoralize the enemy more than defeat him…Consequently, the use of terror entails more than the impairment of the enemy’s will to fight. It seeks to build the morale both of the insurgent forces and of the wider masses, by demonstrating through daring acts that the incumbent is not unassailable.\(^\text{427}\)

The goal throughout guerilla struggle—urban or rural—remains the same: to tire and frustrate the enemy, creates zones of ungovernability, and compete for popular support in the public sphere. Insurrectionary attack seeks to create rupture—temporary ‘breaks’ or spaces within otherwise occupied zones of control—which can demonstrate alternative modes of existence, temporary sites of counter-systemic living. Through the use of revolutionary, anti-statist and anti-capitalist violence, attackers hope to demonstrate that not only is actualized, visible opposition possible, but that the creation of such tension with one’s opponent is a victory in itself. For the insurrectionists, when a bank is set ablaze and painted with revolutionary messages, that bank’s function within the socio-political arena of structural control is disrupted and its function temporarily changes from

\(^{427}\) \text{Wolf, Fear of Fear, 22–23.}
that of structural maintainer to symbol of resistance. Such a transformation of property from a manifestation of capital to one of utility and resistance is a continuation of the anarchist social movements that spiked in prominence just before the emergence of the post-millennial insurrectionists.

**Tactical Vignette: Illegalist Expropriation**

When examining the methods and strategies of the modern networks, it is instructive to trace tactical traditions throughout the ages to determine how these methods have been continued and modified as new configurations adopt old means. To this end, a brief examination of the politics of expropriation is warranted, to provide a single example of how a tactic and strategy that is less commonly understood can persist within the modern active imagination of the insurrectionary milieu. Before the Greek insurrectionary networks were carrying out revolutionary, anti-capitalist bank robberies, or Mexican cells were attacking and burning armored cars, illegalists were stealing from the coffers of capitalism to fund the system’s destruction.

The actions of the Bonnot Gang (and other French illegalists) most closely prefigured future campaigns by armed anarchist networks in Argentina, Spain and other parts of Western Europe. Between 1920-1935 in these locales, anarchist affinity

---


429 Individuals within this Argentinian tradition include Miguel Arcángel Roscigna (1891-1936) and Severino Di Giovanni (1901-1931).

430 Individuals within this Spanish tradition, many of which fought with the CNT-FAI in the Civil War, include Buenaventura Durruti (1896-1936), Francisco Ascaso (1901-1936), and Lucio Urtubia Jiménez (b. 1931)

groups engaged in campaigns involving theft, robbery and counterfeiting to finance revolutionary actions. These ‘expropriative anarchists’ differed from the Bonnot Gang as the former’s criminality was largely pragmatic politics and the latter’s more tied into an illegalist lifestyle. The past actions of illegalist anarchist have not escaped the consciousness of contemporary anarcho-guerillas and clandestine attackers. Their names are often invoked and their memories summoned to pay homage. In one collectively penned communiqué, authored by the Imprisoned Members’ Cell of the CCF, the authors write:

Our refusal to apologize to the judges [in our ongoing trial] is not, certainly, an isolated moment, but a part of the insurrectionary history of the anarcho-individualists of praxis. The experience of the previous eras brings us today close to comrades from the past, Emile Henry, Ravachol, Clement Duval, Marius Jacob, Vaillant, Severino di Giovanni and tens more eternally insurgent souls.

Back then those comrades were using the court’s stand to make the voice if insurrection heard and to break the fear for the authority. Their ‘apologies’ inverted the terms of the defeat of captivity and transformed into an “indictment” against the judges, the priests and the authority or that time. At the same time their scornful smile in front of the guillotine carved an indelible scar of negation and disobedience in the world of submission.432

In the 1920s, anarchist illegalist collectivities were organized in Asia, an often disregarded region in the insurrectionary history. In 1922, Giroshin Sha [Guillotine Society] was established in Japan and utilized revolutionary expropriation from banks to fund social protest.433 The group carried out two attempted assassinations of General Masatara Fukuda, a member of the security forces linked to the killing of a prominent

432 Polidoros et al., “Arming Negation.”
433 Conspiracy of Cells of Fire FAI/IRF Imprisoned Members Cell, “‘Giroshin Sha’ – An Anarchist-Ilegalist Cell, Formed in Japan in the Early 20th Century.”
anarchist writer, Osugi Sakae. Other attacks occurred 1922-1925 when two Giroshin Sha members were arrested and executed; accused of anti-governmental activities including bank robberies and conspiring to assassinate Hirohito. Like so many captured anarcho-attackers, once sentenced to life in prison Giroshin Sha fighter Kyuaro Wada took his own life while in custody.

Revolutionary expropriations (i.e. robberies and thefts) like those undertaken by Giroshin Sha and the Bonnot Gang have a lengthy history within the libertarian tradition including the 1907 Yerevan Square bank robbery in modern day Tbilisi, Georgia. In this action, Bolshevik militants, organized by Lenin, Stalin and others used firearms and hand thrown explosives to rob a stagecoach transporting funds from the post office to the State Bank of the Russian Empire (predecessor to the Central Bank of the Russian Federation). The robbery led to the deaths of 40 individuals, with at least 50 others injured. The Bolsheviks escaped with approximately $3.4 million. The expropriation of capital for explicitly political ends has been an oft cited reason for bank robberies and has been advocated by, amongst other, Carlos Marighella in his Mini Manual of the Urban Guerilla, and has been actualized by the George Jackson Brigade (GJB), the Black
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435 Carlos Marighella, Minimanual of the Urban Guerilla (Brazil: (republished by Marxist Internet Archive), 1969), chap. 3.
436 This would include the Brigade’s attempted armed robbery of $43,000 from the Pacific National Bank of Washington (23 January 1976), the armed robbery of $1,300 from Newport Hills state liquor store (21 May 1977), the armed robbery of $4,200 from the Rainier National Bank (20 June 1977), the armed robbery of $1,100 from the Old National Bank (8 September 1977) and the armed robbery of $8,200 from the People’s National Bank (19 September 1977). An explanation of the use of such "armed expropriations" as an element of revolutionary guerrilla struggle is included in the Brigade’s Fall 1977 communiqué entitled "Summer Solstice", as well as their pamphlet-length statement "The Power of the People is the Force of Life: Political Statement of the George Jackson Brigade" issued November 1977.
Liberation Army (BLA), the Symbionese Liberation Army (SLA) and the RAF.

Within the insurrectionary milieu, similar rhetoric has been adopted for unarmed expropriations. For example, on 11 April 2014, Greek anarchists issued a communiqué signed “poor but dishonest”, claiming responsibility for stealing items from a “big supermarket”. The anonymous authors noted that after the theft, they: “left some of the items we took from the supermarket at the local unemployment office as a gesture of class solidarity towards other workers and unemployed.” Other supermarket expropriations—where masked groups of individuals fill their carts before leaving en masse without paying to distribute the foodstuffs to the community—have been seen in Spain as a response to austerity measures (e.g. around what is known as the Spanish financial crisis, or the Great Recession of Spain), and in France in support of the ongoing resistance.
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437 The BLA has a long history of its members engaging in armed expropriations to finance revolutionary activity. In 1971 the BLA attempted to rob the Triple O nightclub (June 5), and successfully robbed one bank in New York City, NY (June 18), another in Queens, NY (August 23) and one in Atlanta, GA (October 7). In 1973, BLA members are involved in a robbery of a Brooklyn, NY club (January 2), a Bronx, NY bank (February 9), a Brooklyn, NY supermarket (March 27), a Queens, NY bank (April 10), a Bronx, NY bank (July 18). In 1974 the BLA carried out at least two additional bank robberies. Both occurred in the Spring, one in Berkeley, CA and the other in New Haven, CT. In the Connecticut robbery, a police officer was critically wounded. On 20 October 1981, 6 members of the BLA in conjunction with 4 additional comrades (from the WUO and May 19 Communist Organization) carried out the armed robbery of a Brink’s armored car at the Nanuet Mall in Nanuet, NY. The attackers managed to steal $1.6 million and also killed two police officers and a private security guard employed by Brink’s.

438 The SLA gained international attention when on 15 April 1974 they robbed the Hibernia Bank in San Francisco with the help of newly recruited heiress-turned-guerilla Patty Hearst. In the robbery, the SLA stole $10,000 and shot two civilians. One year later, on 28 April 1975 members of the SLA robbed the Crocker National Bank in Carmichael, CA. This robbery resulted in the death of a bank customer. Patty Hearst claims to have acted as a getaway driver in this robbery.

439 On 29 September 1970, West German guerillas carryout three simultaneous bank robberies. The robbers are carried out by members of the RAF and the 2nd of June Movement (2JM). Nine years later, on 19 November 1979, four RAF members rob a Zurich bank, stealing approximately 548,000 Swiss francs. The robbery results in the shooting of two police and one civilian. A ricocheting bullet kills a second civilian. Finally, on 26 March 1984, the RAF robs a bank in Würzburg, Germany, stealing 171,000 DM.
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land occupation (2009-present) known as the Zone À Défendre (ZAD) [Zone to be Defended], where thousands of activists have bravely fought police to resist the Aéroport du Grand Ouest Project which aims to replace the Nantes Atlantique Airport with a newly constructed facility. Similar expropriative approaches have been seen in the anarchist-led, community level response⁴⁴² to Hurricane Sandy, a storm that devastated US east coast cities in October 2012. In one such communiqué, the anonymous authors write:

Over the past two weeks, a group of concerned New Yorkers has been expropriating thousands of dollars worth of tools and materials from luxury residential developments across Manhattan and delivering them to neighborhoods devastated by Superstorm Sandy…Liberated from their role in building multimillion-dollar pieds-à-terre for wealthy CEOs and Hollywood celebrities, these tools are now in the collective hands of some of the hardest-hit communities in the city where they are now being allocated and shared among the people who need them most. These expropriations will continue as long as the demand for them exists.⁴⁴³

While the logic of the 1970s guerillas was to expropriate money and other resources to fund revolutionary activities, in the two modern examples located, the thefts are distributed altruistically to communities seen to be in need; the poor and those affected by a flood respectively. This shift in discourse and strategy is reflective of a larger shift in the methods of social protest seen since the disbanding of the urban guerillas of the 1970s.

⁴⁴² These networks represented, anarchist-organized, prefigurative solidarity networks wherein activist social networks and labor was coordinated to provide emergency relief to victims of the storm. This follows similar efforts by anarchists to provide ‘solidarity not charity’ to those affected by Hurricane Katrina; the most famous of these projects being Common Ground Relief which began in 2005.
In the modernist insurrectionary milieu, the expropriation of money from banks—often through armed robberies—has once again resurfaced as a legitimate form of struggle. A central theorist in the insurrectionary tendency, Alfredo Bonanno of Italy, was arrested in 2003 and 2009 for involvement in robberies of jewelry stores and banks in Italy and Greece. Further, insurrectionary Greek anarchist militant Giannis Dimitrakis who was shot by police while leaving an Athens bank robbery in 2006, explained his motivation, writing (from prison):

…taking me into consideration who wanting to resist on a personal level…my future yoke, to determine [for] myself the conditions and quality of my life, to put into practice my refusal to ‘work’ and also to play the role of yet another productive unit, of yet another wheel in the wagon, wanting to attack the monstrosity that is called a bank (however at the same time having no illusions that I’ll inflict any major blows to this economic institution), choosing to mark a course of dignity in my life I decided to rob a bank. An act which I consider, amongst many others, as revolutionary and which claims deservingly its own place as such.444

Dimitrakis’s argument is an articulation of a purist praxis; the desire to actualize his rejection of capitalist wage labor, and to steal from the system instead. As Dimitrakis explains, he believes it to be a revolutionary act to steal from capitalism in order to avoid selling one’s labor to the same system in exchange for sustenance. This logic is similar to the justifications offered by armed guerilla units of decades past such as the GJB who stated:

[There is a] need to expropriate banks as a means of furthering specific political goals…There can be no revolution without money—for weapons, explosives, survival, organizing, printing, etc. The people are poor. We will make the ruling

class pay for its own destruction by expropriating our funds from them and their banks.\textsuperscript{445}

The insurrectionary rejection of state authority, and its corresponding laws is linked to the milieu’s abhorrence of capitalism to formulate a circular justification for armed expropriation: if one must steal to survive, why is this more ethical to steal one’s own life through waged labor than to directly steal funds from the state? This argument embraces the confrontation of state authority seen in illegalism, furthering these ends through the actualization of armed, anti-capitalist resistance.

The Question of ‘Terrorism’ & ‘Violence’

Perhaps the dominant mainstream perception of anarchism is its equation with violence, disorder ‘bomb throwing,’ and—even more odiously, in today’s parlance—terrorism... The negotiation of the ‘violence versus non-violence’ terrain is one of the many dichotomies presented by anarchist praxis, and it further represents something of a political litmus test of movement culture.\textsuperscript{446}

-- Randall Amster, anarchist and Peace Studies advocate

Terrorists are simply the members of their societies who are the most optimistic about the usefulness of violence for achieving goals that many, and often most, support.\textsuperscript{447}

-- Robert Pape, author of Dying To Win: The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism

How various armed formations have responded to the post-9/11 rhetoric of terrorism is telling when seeking to understand their internal logic. Before examining the specific networks’ interaction with this term, one can examine the insurrectionary milieu through foundational readings of social movement taxonomies, such as the work of theorist Roberta Garner. The structuring of a movement will have great ramifications for its

\textsuperscript{446} Amster, Anarchism Today, 43.
\textsuperscript{447} Robert Anthony Pape, Dying to Win: The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism (New York: Random House, 2005), 8.
strategic functioning. In her widely cited social movement theory book, Garner examines these structural realities, applying them to past movements. For the insurrectionary movement, several of Garner’s typologies\(^{448}\) apply. The broad insurrectionary milieu utilizes “clandestine organizations”, “armed insurgencies” and employs strategies akin to “destabilization” and “terrorism.” Garner explains that the development of clandestine organization is the product of a political system that fails to allow for an open space for movement participation thus forcing activists underground into cell structures.\(^{449}\) While the result (e.g. underground cells) can be seen in the insurrectionary networks, the cause identified—lack of political opportunity—fails to adequately describe the contemporary actors. Similarly, Garner’s “armed insurgency” typology is the result of a state that is too repressive.\(^{450}\) While insurrectionary networks certainly do attempt to foment insurgency against the state through the use of armed action, this is not the result of political repression as insurrectionary networks thrive in liberal democracies of Western nations. Once again, while the organizational tendency is present, the cause is not.

More applicable then her organizational models are the strategies outlined. Garner explains the strategy of destabilization in a manner far closer to the insurrectionary model. “The movement takes action that polarizes the society, weakens support for the incumbent government, and suggest to the public that the state is no longer in control.”\(^{451}\) While Garner links this to paramilitaries who then attempt to fill the power vacuum (something completely counter to an anti-authoritarian objective), the strategy of

\(^{449}\) Ibid., 28–29.
\(^{450}\) Ibid., 29–30.
\(^{451}\) Ibid., 30.
polarizing, weakening and creating zones of ungovernability is certainly present. It would be difficult to argue that modern insurrectionary methods have accomplished this (e.g. polarizing society, weaken state support and image of control) though the movement maintains these markers as a goal.

Terrorism, according to traditional understandings, is essentially an act that aids in the “creation of ideological politics”\textsuperscript{452}, something key to the insurrectional project and its deployment of violence. The insurrectionary strategy is firmly committed to widening and exasperating the polarization of class antagonisms—damaging the population’s image of the state—though their efforts thus far have only made slight inroads in this regard. In another, more abstracted sense, insurrectionary attack has succeeded in damaging the population’s image of the market, showing its vulnerability to crisis and attack and the state’swedded nature through corporate bailouts and other acts of protectionism. Perhaps the best example was the decentralized Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty (SHAC) campaign (1999-2014) against Huntingdon Life Sciences (HLS)\textsuperscript{453}, an animal testing and breeding company. This campaign which included the use of insurrectionary-styled tactics, successfully isolated HLS, forcing the British state to

\hspace{1in}

\textsuperscript{452} Gillespie, “The Urban Guerrilla in Latin America,” 5.

support the besieged company economically when other potential financial backers broke ranks in light of protests. Garner states that “terrorism” is used as a means towards destabilization, adding that it serves the cause of polarization and demonstrating weak state control. Building upon this understanding, scholars have argued that terrorism can be separated from other forms of anti-social violence by its political orientation focused on influencing the public, state or the social structures at large.\footnote{Anthony Quinton, “Reflections on Terrorism and Violence,” in \textit{Terrorism, Protest and Power}, ed. Martin Warner and Roger Crisp, 1st ed. (Brookfield, VT: Edward Elgar Publishing Company, 1990), 35–36.} Though typically, practitioners of political violence do not self-identify with the terrorist label—instead posturing as “highly symbolic and moral”\footnote{Robert L. Heath and H. Dan O’Hair, “Terrorism From the Eyes of the Beholder,” in \textit{Terrorism: Communication and Rhetorical Perspectives}, ed. H. Dan O’Hair et al. (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2008), 18.}—some insurrectionary networks have embraced it. Modern insurrectionary groups self-identifying with “terror” include the “Terrorist Cells for Direct Action- Anti-Civilization Faction”\footnote{Terrorist Cells for the Direct Attack – Anticivilization Faction, “Claim of responsibility for two bombing attacks and contributions to the development of praxis against the industrial-technological system and civilization,” trans. War on Society (Liberación Total (republished by War on Society), November 12, 2011), http://waronsociety.noblogs.org/?p=1869.} a Mexican, anti-civilization, primitivist network responsible for several bombings. The word terror is also seen in the monikers of several contemporary cell-level formations identifying as elements of the FAI-IRF and CCF such as:

- **IRF:** “Terrorist Complicity Warriors of the Abyss Severino Di Giovanni Commando”\footnote{FAI Artisans Cooperative of Fire and Similar (occasionally spectacular), International Revolutionary Front and FAI 20th July Brigade, International Revolutionary Front, “Do Not Say That We Are Few - Statement from the Italian FAI.”} the “Deviant Behaviors for the Spreading of Revolutionary Terrorism, Cell of Anarchist Action”\footnote{Ibid.} and the “Anarchist Revolutionary Front:
Deviant Behaviors for the Spreading of Revolutionary Terrorism, Cell of Reflective Attack” 459

- **CCF:** “Breath of Terror Commando” 460, and the “Terrorist Guerilla Unit” 461
- **IRF/CCF:** “Revolutionary Groups for the Spreading of Terror – Nucleus of vandals” 462 and the “Revolutionary Groups for the Spreading of Terror, Cell Abnormal – Heretics” 463
- **FAI-IRF/CCF:** “Revolutionary Groups of Terror Dispersion” 464

Beyond the FAI/IRF/CCF networks, there are separate yet ideologically aligned groups which have self-identified as “terrorist” such as clandestine animal liberation cells who have chosen to not identify with the ALF moniker but have at times taken similar, terrorist-affiliated names such as “Columna Terrorista de lxs 465 Revolucionarios de Negro” 466 [Terrorist Column of the Black Revolutionaries] operating in Mexico. This trend is far from new as early proponents of property destruction in favor of the environment self-labeled as “Evan Mecham Eco-Terrorist International Conspiracy”
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(EMETIC)\textsuperscript{467}, naming themselves after the then-Governor of Arizona where the attacks were carried out. EMETIC can be seen as a precursor to the ELF as both utilized spectacularly dynamic forms of property destruction to economically damage targets seen to be damaging the Earth, afterwards announcing their acts and intent via a communiqué. According to government sources\textsuperscript{468}, the EMETIC group carried out five attacks in Arizona (1987-1989), using acetylene torches to down several ski lifts, as well as energy infrastructure powering a uranium mine and an electrical substation.

While numerous groups have incorporated the value-laden term into their names, others have consciously utilized such means, even commenting on such tactical considerations. For example, the Mexican eco-insurrectionary network ITS which has focused its attacks on nanotechnologists and other researchers, wrote in 2014:

\[\text{\ldots in 2011 the (newly formed) ITS was testing various modus operandi (from known and attempted arson attacks on cars and construction machinery, companies and institutions in Coahuila, Guanajuato, and Veracruz State of Mexico, until we decided to focus on terrorism and not sabotage), some were successful and some not, the most violent cell of ITS in Morelos, being already familiar with the purchase and use of firearms, decided to implement the act by then.}\textsuperscript{469}

ITS acknowledged several times in a single communiqué that they are consciously employing \textit{terrorism} as a strategic model. In their eighth communiqué which claims responsibility for several parcel bombs sent to scientific researchers, the anonymous cell

\textsuperscript{467} EMETIC is an understudied piece of radical history. Few historical accounts of the group's activity exist. For one example see: Leslie James Pickering, \textit{The Evan Mecham Eco Terrorist International Conspiracy}, 1st ed. (Buffalo, NY: Burning Books, 2013).

\textsuperscript{468} National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism, \textit{Evan Mecham Eco-Terrorist International Conspiracy (EMETIC), Incidents over time} (University of Maryland, College Park, MD: Global Terrorism Database, 2015), http://www.start.umd.edu/gtd/search/Results.aspx?perpetrator=10060.
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states: “With this statement we do not intend, in the least, that technologists give us their academic acceptance…because obviously that will never happen, as they will never accept terrorism against them.”

Less than one month after ITS issued their communiqué, self-identifying their strategy to include terrorism, a newly emerged group calling itself Obsidian Point Circle of Attack (OPCA), claimed a parcel bomb. In OPCA’s communiqué, they speak in support of ITS, yet identify them as “the terrorist group ITS.” The new faction/cell writes, “we published a total of three analyses…in which we have publicly demonstrated our support of the group ITS, in their actions as much as their position,” providing footnoted references to the documents.

Member of the CCF’s Imprisoned Members Cell have reflected in a similar fashion, embracing the identification with terrorism. In a 2014 communiqué written from within Greece’s Korydallos Prison, the imprisoned authors write:

> The authority says ‘those that I cannot befool, at least I will intimidate…’ So fear rules. The Conspiracy of Cells of Fire have made our intentions clear. **To terror you respond with terror.** The only way to dissipate fear and its tyranny is to transfer it in the enemy’s yard. The anarchist armed guerilla through autonomous affinity cells that sometimes meet inside the FAI informal network and sometimes they don’t is our response to the authority.

Of course this is not a completely new phenomenon. Possibly one of the first groups to embrace the term, to proudly self-label, was also a group formed around a nihilist-infused form of anarchism. In the mid 1800s, Nechayev, the Russian anarcho-nihilist, labeled his
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actions, and that of his group, People’s Retribution, as terrorism. One hundred years later, counterculture Yippie hero Jerry Rubin—described as “the fighting man’s version of Abbie Hoffman”—stated to a House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC) committee “Here we were, terrorists, anarchists and freaks.” In other self-referential pearls from Rubin, he terms himself a “hippie guerilla” and a “one-man international revolution, a walking conspiracy.”

A great deal of political violence is labeled terrorism; typically dependent on who is deploying the violence and who is the recipient. If the perpetrator is a non-state actor, and the recipient the state, this act will be declared terrorism with near universal regularity. Activists are aware of this discursive and rhetorical shift, and some have explicitly addressed in when discussing their tactical decision-making. In one example, ALF militant Walter Bond, convicted of three arsons, notes that since the state is in control of this rhetorical process, he may as well aim for tactical effectiveness since any action will likely be labeled as ‘terrorism.’ Bond writes:

The first thing I knew was that I would work alone…The next thing I knew was that I wanted to go big. With the current government crackdown on any kind of effective…campaign, I might as well go for it. If they’re gonna try to catch me and call me a terrorist for breaking a McDonald’s window, I might as well think much bigger.
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In a sense, Bond embraces the state’s rhetoric and uses it to justify his own tactical choices, since to meter one’s actions, according to Bond, would not avoid such a labeling anyway. This embracing of the rhetoric of terrorism is also not restricted to the actions of revolutionary anti-statists and has been employed by members of the right, such as anti-abortion militant Clayton Wager. In a series of communications posted online on 2001, Wager directly threatens clinic workers with assassination, and reflects on his terrorism labeling. In once such letter circulated by the clandestine, anti-abortion network known as The Army of God (AOG), Wager writes:

The government of the most powerful country in the world considers me a terrorist. That label set me aback at first. Then it struck me: They’re right. I am a terrorist. To be sure, I’m a terrorist to a very narrow group of people, but a terrorist just the same...I’ll drop you [targeted clinic workers] a note and we’ll get this terrorism thing started in earnest.\(^\text{480}\)

Despite Wager’s embracing of the label, many social movement activists—including those who reject and embrace militant means—have sought to challenge this framing.

Certainly such an asymmetric labeling of political violence is deserving of challenge.\(^\text{481}\) Anarchist and revolutionary leftist scholarship on theories of violence—both that directed against property as well as direct/physical and structural forms—has

---


been a mainstay of theory since scholars put pen to paper. Furthermore, as Randall Amster points out, a great deal of anarchist scholarship dealing with an explicit endorsement of pacifism is present including works by Henry David Thoreau (1817-1862), Leo Tolstoy (1828-1910), Ammon Hennacy (1893-1970), Dorothy Day (1897-
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1980), Paul Goodman (1911-1972) and Alex Comfort (1920-2000). To that list I would add contemporary peace educator and anarchist Colman McCarthy (b. 1938).

Contemporary anarchist theory has tended to problematize the state’s labeling of acts as ‘violent’ or ‘nonviolent’, arguing that nonviolence can insulate the state from effective modes of resistance. For example, Peter Gelderloos argues that democratic forms of statecraft are predicated upon the government encouraging its citizenry to express dissent through legalistic means, such as voting, dialogue, and lobbying elected representatives. While some have argued that the violence/non-violence binary is a limiting frame for the analysis of social movements, others such as Gelderloos have based their work precisely at this point of distinction. Gelderloos argues that the state’s position—that all social conflict can be resolved through legalistic means—is an essential aspect of maintaining social order in democratic societies, serving to insulate the state from revolutionary violence. On the other hand, the insurrectionary critique argues that the fostering of social tensions acts to demonstrate the state’s oppositional relationship to the citizenry, showing that the former is in constant conflict with the latter. Therefore, for the insurrectionists, an atmosphere of sustained social warfare is counter to more traditionally leftist calls to maintain nonviolence.

Both Gelderloos and the insurrectionists represent a rejection of pacifism, arguing that its deployment to dissuade revolutionary violence is a strategic usage by the state as
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a means for control. Other anarchist scholars have similarly argued that not only is violent resistance permissible, but that it has been a mainstay in all social struggles. This argument is made by modern (i.e. twenty-first century) authors as well as ‘classical’ (i.e. twentieth century) anarchists such as Alexander Berkman. For Berkman, he argues in his foundational work *The ABC of Anarchism* that not only do anarchists not dominate the deployment of political violence, but that such methods are an inherent part of social movements. To this end he writes:

> You see, then, that anarchist have no monopoly on political violence. The number of such acts by anarchists is infinitesimal as compared with those committed by persons of other political persuasions. The truth is that in every country, in every social movement violence has been a part of the struggle from time immemorial.\(^{487}\)

In the modern era, many activists focusing on political violence agree with such an assertion. One such scholar, Craig Rosebraugh, who has served as a spokesmen for the ALF/ELF, argues that to isolate so-called nonviolence from more militant forms of resistance is a historical impossibility, and that the portrayal of social movements as nonviolent (e.g. the US Civil Rights movement) is a form of historical erasure of more militant strands of protest\(^{488}\). Rosebraugh argues that a great many social struggles historically understood as nonviolent were in actuality a symbiosis between those avoiding violence on ethical and moral grounds and those embracing it for tactical and strategic ends. Now while some who choose to adopt more militant methods do so while embracing a discourse that separates themselves from ‘terrorists,’ other evolutionary actors have worn this disparaging title as a mark of distinction.

\(^{487}\) Berkman, *The ABC of Anarchism*, 5.

\(^{488}\) Rosebraugh, *The Logic of Political Violence: Lessons in Reform and Revolution*. 167
While some insurrectionary actors have toyed with self-identifying as *terrorists*, typically awareness of such trappings have led to post-9/11 movements to markedly dis-identify with those that hijack planes and bomb buses. Though often militant, violent and clandestine, the nature of insurrectionary warfare is that it is not directed outwards at the masses, to terrorize and coerce; it is directed upwards at power. Not only does this allow for a more sincere, non-delegated articulation of strife, but it does not create a combatant/civilian, revolutionary/non-revolutionary duality. To de-fetishize the insurrectionary cell is to blend it seamlessly into a more distributed dissent. As one anonymous author(s) states:

For its part, the State has every interest in reducing the revolutionary threat to a few combat organizations in order to transform subversion into a clash between two armies: the institutions on the one hand, the armed party on the other. What power fears most in anonymous, generalized rebellion. The media image of the ‘terrorist’ works hand in hand with the police in defense of social peace.489

Part of this awareness of powerful state labeling is a product of the post-9/11 state reliance on a newly invigorated boogey man to follow that of fascism and Soviet communism. Following the attacks of 2001, *terrorism* could be mobilized to rally patriotism, nationalism and jingoism.

The early Marxist Leon Trotsky (1879-1940) cautioned against the dependency on terrorist-styled methods of attack. In his aptly named essay, “Why Marxists Oppose Individual Terrorism,” he argues that such a strategy “belittles the role of the masses in their own consciousness” falsely offering a “great avenger” to lead a revolutionary
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path. Trotsky argues that while these individualist methods of insurrectionary attack are thought to raise a revolutionary consciousness, their effectiveness disincentives the masses and those targeted are easily replaced. He writes:

The anarchist prophets of the ‘propaganda of the deed’ can argue all they want about the elevating and stimulating influence of terrorist acts on the masses. Theoretical considerations and political experience prove otherwise. The more effective the terrorist acts, the greater their impact, the more they reduce the interest of the masses in self-organization and self-education. But the smoke from the confusion clears away, the panic disappears, the successor of the murdered minister makes his appearance, life again settles into the old rut, the wheel of capitalist exploitation turns as before; only the police repression grows more savage and brazen. And as a result, in place of the kindled hopes and artificially aroused excitement comes disillusionment and apathy.

For Trotsky, it is not a moral objection to political violence but a strategic argument about its effect on the revolutionary program. Trotsky asserts that terrorist acts do not aid in organizing the masses for collective revolt but rather resigns them to “spectators” of the act, and that their outsider observation will eventually lead to a desire for enforcement of order.

Others on the anti-capitalist left have made similar arguments against individualistic modes of direct attack (e.g. terrorism) such as the 1979 essay, “You Can’t Blow Up A Social Relationship,” written in response to the Sydney Hilton Bombing (13 February 1978), which killed two garbage collectors and a police officer. In a similarly reactionary manner, following the assassination of Italian King Umberto I in
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1900, James F. Morton, Jr., an American, individualist anarchist, once again engaged the question of direct attack, writing:

Do I therefore applaud the act of the assassin? By no means. The shedding of human blood, though at times to be justified or excused, is never a fit cause for exultation. Nor is the spirit of revenge an element of the Anarchist philosophy. Our mission is not to incite to violent acts, but to wage an eternal warfare against the crime-producing and misery-breeding conditions of the day. When the downtrodden proletarian, filled with a deep sense of the myriad wrongs inflicted on himself, his dear ones and his kind, strikes a blow of vengeance against the representatives of the system which has transformed men into beasts, we do not rejoice — nor condemn. We simply explain. Would you put an end to the assassination of rulers? Then end the conditions which make men miserable; end the wrongs which provoke men to resistance; cease to outrage flesh and blood as human and as sensitive as that of kings.\(^{494}\)

The author proposes a solution of sorts to stemming the tide of anarcho-political violence: If one hopes to quell resistance, one must seek to change the material conditions that oppress the masses and create the conditions for such a critique to develop.

The novel and relevant question is not whether placing an explosive device in the lobby of a bank or police garage is strategic, or amounts to an act of terrorism, but rather, ‘What does one’s hatred of police tell us about how law enforcement is critically understood in the society?’ Is terrorism a “response to a certain kind of social crisis”\(^{495}\) as Rubenstein suggests, or perhaps sometime more akin to a strategy adoptable by anyone? Can terrorism be a tactic utilized within other strategies? Can a tactic be intimidating, effective and targeted yet not be terrorism? Does labeling something terrorism have any

\(^{494}\) Morton, Jr., “Another Blow to Royalty.”
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effect other than to pejoratively describe and defame.\textsuperscript{496} Rubenstein suggests that “to call an act of political violence terrorist is not merely to describe it but to judge it….imply[ing] illegitimacy.”\textsuperscript{497} This declarative statement clearly identifies the strict discursive reality of the rhetoric of terrorism. If a state-backed paramilitary can kill union leaders to un-incentivize union activity and be labeled ‘paramilitary guerillas,’ why should an anarchist burning banks to strike at capitalism be inextricably likened to terrorism; often regarded as the intentional targeting of civilians and other secondary target audience for political, social or religious purposes? Furthermore, the ability to extricate oneself from such a rhetorical gaze is not often possible. For example, after being imprisoned for an alleged conspiracy to disrupt a North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) meeting held in Chicago during May 2012, Mark “Migs” Neiweem was classified within the prison system as having “Gang or Unauthorized Organization Activity.” This disciplinary violation alleges that Migs’s tattoos—which include the anarchist ‘circle A’ and the pro-equality ‘circle E’—constitute gang affiliation\textsuperscript{498}, and that such markings, in conjunction with the inmate’s friends and


\textsuperscript{497} Rubenstein, \textit{Alchemists of Revolution}, 17.

possession of related reading materials, mark him as a security threat. This example shows the powerlessness often bemoaned by activists unable to control their rhetorical portrayal within a discourse of securitization by state forces. Furthermore, such association between labeling (e.g. a tattoo) and affiliation (e.g. with a moniker-based network) provides a disincentive for clandestine activists to claim attacks via monikers, as to associate with the FAI, CCF, ALF, etc. could constitute similar ‘gang’ affiliations and be used to further criminalize dissent through the anti-gang discourse.

While one can (and should) challenge the rhetoric of terrorism to describe a strategic deployment of illegal violence, it is certainly true that insurrectionary methods such as bombings leave a state with two options, both of which benefit radical politics: 1.) fail to stop “terrorism” and appear weak and ineffectual, or 2.) stop “terrorism” through repression and force and fulfill your typecast role as a violent apparatus and further polarization.\(^499\) Certainly there are examples from the revolutionary past where option two was chosen by the state yet the polarization produced served counterrevolutionary purposes. In response to a campaign of violence waged by Italy’s *Brigate Rosse* [Red Brigades] (RB), the polarization of the left led to the Communist Party moving towards the political right, crating an unfilled vacuum (for a time) for mass-based, leftist mobilization\(^500\). While aged social movement typologies and strategic models are inadequate for describing the contemporary milieu, they are instructive in developing broad categorical reference points for positing new tendencies within existing pattern of sociological behavior.


A New ‘New Left’

The modern insurrectionary tendency has reimagined the model of the leftist *urban* guerilla popularized in the 1960s-1970s. This era, and on into the 1980s, saw the rise of such armed anti-imperialist\(^{501}\) internationals\(^{502}\) such as the RAF, RZ and Movement 2 June in Germany (2JM), Action Directe in France, First of October Anti-Fascist Resistance Groups (GRAPO) in Spain, Fighting Communist Cells (CCC) in Belgium, the RB in Italy, 17N in Greece, Dev Sol (Revolutionary Left) in Turkey, the Popular Forces of 25 April (FP-25) in Portugal, the Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional (FALN) in Puerto Rico, or The Weather Underground Organization (WUO), SLA, New World Liberation Front (NWLF), May 19\(^{th}\) Communist Movement (M19CO), and United Freedom Front (UFF) in the United States. Such armed formations are distinct from their ideological compatriots operating in largely rural, “Third World” environments such as 19\(^{th}\) of April Movement (M-19) in Colombia, the Tupamaros National Liberation Movement (MLN-T) in Uruguay, the Túpac Amaru Revolutionary Movement (MRTA) in Peru and various armed insurgencies throughout South/Central America, the Middle East, Asia and Africa.

While these groups are obviously quite different in terms of tactics, strategies, message, ideology and every other such measure, they shared characteristics of being anti-capitalist and often anti-state, urban-based, pro-armed struggle, and active in the late


twentieth century. Their inclusion within a historical discussion is meant to speak to their contemporariness, that fact that they all emerged and fought in a similar era. While we can continue to discuss such unique collectives within a single lens, we must avoid considering them the same, or risk misunderstanding their particular formations as informed by ideology, strategy and approach. In an early work critical of orthodox approaches to terrorism, Joseba Zulaika and William Douglas warned of “homogenization and trivialization of vastly different social realities under the buzzword of ‘terrorism’”\textsuperscript{503}, and I would expand that to encourage a detailed examination of particular groups open lumped together in categorically cumbersome manners. Groups form, act and decline for a variety of reasons, and while active, carryout violence through vastly divergent realities.

These divergent realities led some groups towards attempting to “import” the Latin American urban guerilla model to the cities of Berlin or New York, something some have called a failure\textsuperscript{504} of the 1960s and 1970s. This era also saw activity from clandestine actors operating outside of the traditional Leninist brigade model, such as the group spearheaded by Sam Melville (1934-1971)\textsuperscript{505}, often portrayed as a ‘lone wolf’—to borrow from the modern counterterrorism parlance. Though Melville acted with at least three other individuals in a string of eight bombings in 1969\textsuperscript{506}, the group was unnamed.
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and the majority of attention focused on a single individual. Melville was later jailed and helped to lead the Attica Prison riots in 1971. He was shot and killed during the police’s retaking of the prison. Melville’s co-conspirators would go on to work amongst the ranks of the WUO and other armed formations.

These “First World”, urban, leftist movements (e.g. RAF, WUO, RB), while maintaining different political frameworks and methods of operation, shared a key understanding of the strategy of guerilla warfare against the forces of state. They were largely hierarchical, borrowing some organizational aspects from traditional military models. Often times they were inspired by, modeled after, and sympathetic to foreign insurgencies and anti-occupation movements such as the WUO’s focus on the guerilla war of the Vietnamese. Most of these urban guerillas were strategically formed around a Marxist-Leninist and/or Maoist—often termed “New Left”, “Ultra Left” or “extreme left”—politic embedded in a politics of anti-imperialism, or in the case of the BLA, specific aspects of an identity-based politic. This holds true for movements like the WUO that had explicitly female grouping, often termed “militias” and “brigades”, and
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regularly issued collective statements speaking to ‘women’s issues’ or gendered readings of strategy, social policy and politics.\textsuperscript{512}

Despite participation by women, people of color, ex-convicts and other marginalized groups, the movement ranks were typically regarded as products of privilege\textsuperscript{513}; white, male, college educated, and middle class\textsuperscript{514}, a notable observation when compared to the perception of their Latin American comrades, thought to be drawn largely from undereducated and poor backgrounds. This however was not the case. Many Latin American Marxist movements such as the Uruguayan MLN-T, Argentina’s People’s Revolutionary Army (ERP), and the Peruvian Shining Path (\textit{Sendero Luminoso}) drew leadership and members from highly educated and/or middle-class constituents, resembling more closely the perceived demographics of “terrorists” as “single males between twenty-one and twenty-four, with university experiences (especially in the humanities)…from middle or upper classes.”\textsuperscript{515} In fact, scholars have frequently pointed out that left-wing terrorist movements are more likely to attract educated, middle-class
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members, while right-wing movement are more likely to draw support from the “less privileged socio-economic classes.” In a 2015 quantitative study of 1,500 US-based “extremists”, the authors conclude, “far Left extremists were…more likely [than “far Right” or “Islamic” extremists] to be students.” Concerning other demographic categories, groups like the SLA, WUO and RAF were largely white and often contained highly visible but small numbers of people of color such as the SLA’s Donald DeFreeze—an African American ex-convict known as Cinque Mtume—and Wendy Masako Yoshimura—a Japanese-American woman born in a World War II Japanese internment camp.

Other armed formations maintained an anti-authoritarian political posturing, organizing themselves closer to traditional anarchist affinity groups than Communist cadres. Groups of this type are far more rare and include the Angry Brigade in the UK, Direct Action 5 (DA5) in Canada, the GJB in the US and several intersecting collectives active in Greece such as the Sect of Revolutionaries, Anti-State Justice, Revolutionary Struggle, Black Star and Revolutionary Nuclei. Here the GJB stands as a
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518 The Direct Action 5, also known as the Squamish 5, the Vancouver 5, or simply Direct Action, was an urban guerrilla group active in Canada in the early 1980s. The group included Ann Hansen, Brent Taylor, Juliet Caroline Belmas, Doug Stewart and Gerry Hannah. The guerrillas initially carried out acts of sabotage and theft, and in 1982, bombed a hydroelectric substation ($5 million in damages) and a weapons manufacturer—Litton Industries. Later that year, the group set fire to several pornography stores as the Wimmin’s Fire Brigade. The five individuals were arrested in 1983 and later convicted.
rare example of a *diverse* movement\(^{519}\) as its members included people of color, ex-convicts, and queer folk, not simply the archetypal, white, Marxist graduate student often satirized as constituting the WUO and RAF. For example, prominent GJB member Mark Cook was an African American former prisoner from a poor Seattle family, but the only African American in the brigade. He also served as a co-founder of a chapter of the Black Panther Party based in Walla Walla State Penitentiary showing cross over between an identity-based movement and one with a more broad-based, anti-authoritarian framework.

Despite this seemingly intersecting and acronym-heavy list of armed revolutionaries, it is important to distinguish the insurrectionary actors under analysis from those that came before. The aforementioned groups, with the exception of the anti-authoritarians mentioned above, advocated a Marxist-Leninist (and often Maoist) style of guerilla warfare based in the model of the distinct armed cadre, a military-styled formation of small cells that are used to lead the masses in revolution. Leninism’s influence taught that the proletariat was unable to develop and carryout its own plans for revolutionary change\(^{520}\), and as such, it is the role of a small, radicalized elite to demonstrate for the masses the possibility for change, and the means to get there. Leninist conceptions of revolution involve the vanguard\(^{521}\)—as articulated in pre and post
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\(^{521}\) This is not to claim that classical anarchism is completely devoid of such minoritarian, vanguardist tendencies. Foundational thinkers such as Mikhail Bakunin (1814-1876) spoke of ‘an invisible force directing the people’s revolution’ in correspondence with Russian revolutionary nihilist Sergay Nechayev.
revolutionary texts—a concept later rejected by anti-authoritarian and insurrectionary movements. In explaining anarchism’s rejection of vanguardism, political philosopher and anarchist theorist Benjamin Franks writes:

The vanguard is a particular group with claims to either superior knowledge or more fortunate location in the political terrain, and which can take strategic priority and win battles for others (and often speaks on behalf of the client group). Such a view is associated with orthodox Marxism…referred to as Leninism.

In the classical, twentieth century theory of revolutionary organizing, the armed vanguard, taking the form of military-styled cadres, conduct guerrilla attacks against the state and provide a focal point (later described as focalism) for sympathetic individuals to align with. The vision is that through the vanguardist actions of the cadre, with enough focused attraction and support of the proletariat, the masses of society, feeling discontented, will stand with the armed cadres and foment a generalized revolt. Sometimes these armed, vanguardist cadres are further organized to resemble military formations such as the ‘Tupamaro model’, which segmented their guerilla fighters into a professionalized army of cells, columns, and action groups.

Such a style of warring combat was famously advocated by, amongst others, Guevara in his foundational work, *Guerilla Warfare* amongst other writings. While
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Guevara advocated for a mass-based guerilla “People’s War” (e.g. the Viet Cong), he also encouraged a vanguardist formation wherein a small grouping of revolutionaries would attack the state, inspire the masses and lay the groundwork for a proletarian-led People’s War to follow. Guevarian war theory states that no preparation on the part of the vanguard is necessary, and furthermore, that the underdog fighting in the heart of the enemy will garner support precisely because of the asymmetry. For Guevarians, Che’s experience with the 1959 Cuban Revolution proved for him the utility of the model. Here, less than 100 fighters arrived in Cuba in December 1956 and were able to take control of the city of Santa Clara in two years. After the fall of Santa Clara by Guevara’s 26th of July Movement (M-26-7) fighters, Cuban General Fulgencio Batista fled the country, and the island nation was controlled by the forces of Fidel Castro’s Cuban Revolution. On New Year’s Eve 1959, Guevara and Castro’s M-26-7 fighters entered the capital city of Havana and declared victory.

While the followers of this model were indeed Marxist vanguards within a Leninist tradition, Lenin himself would have likely stood firmly at odds with the writings Guevara (as well as Jules Debray discussed latter). In his time, Lenin was a harsh critic of
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the vanguardism embodied in Russia’s Left Socialist Revolutionaries (LSR), a faction of the Russian Socialist-Revolutionary Party (SR) who split in favor of the Bolsheviks. LSR engaged in vanguardist attacks against the state such as the assassination of the German Ambassador to Russia Wilhelm von Mirbach, and the Military Governor of Ukraine, General Field Marshall Hermann von Eichhorn. Rubenstein describes the strategic understanding of SR, writing, “The SR’s believed that when the state apparatus had been sufficiently weakened by terrorist attacks, workers and peasants would complete the job, convene a constituent assembly, and establish socialism.” Lenin argued that disparate acts of small-group violence would not only fail to bring about radical social change, but that the state could draw strength from these measures. Instead, Lenin advocated that the armed stage of the revolution should wait until the social conditions permitted the masses to revolt along with the vanguard. Therefore, while and Guevara and his progenies were Leninist in a limited sense of embracing vanguardism, Lenin would have likely disagreed a great deal on the strategic pacing of revolutionary struggle.

Following Guevara’s death in Bolivia in 1967, some strategists concluded that such a defeat demonstrated the marked failure of the rural-based guerilla warfare strategy thus implicitly advocating for such revolutionaries to move towards urban combat. Certainly the design of modern cities provides a great deal of utility and advantage for the asymmetric attacker. When considering the strategies of the insurrectionary networks, one notices that the vast majority of attacks occur in urban
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settings—Athens, Berlin, Jakarta, La Paz—and very few in the countryside. This is because, by their very nature, they are minoritarian, non-broad based movements that cannot survive through Guevarian methods of living amongst the people whom provide for you. For insurrectionary networks, the city provides cover, opportunity, resources and a variety of targets. As one Professor of criminology explains,

The urban landscape is as geographically complex as that of any rural setting; physical cover is multidimensional, owing to the walls, roofs, basements, and utility passages. These topographical characteristics give the urban environment a vertical acreage and horizontal mileage...[needed for] protection.

Furthermore the nature of modern cities provide not only a treasure trove of available targets for attack (e.g. banks, offices, vehicles, etc.), their infrastructure also “produces the means of its own destruction” by providing “mobile phones and internet access points [which give] the guerillas newfound ways to self-organize...allow[ing] them to become such elusive targets.” Therefore for attackers who are numerically weak, the city becomes a focal point for the spreading of a more generalized insurrection.

Jules Régis Debray, a French philosopher who fought with Guevara in Bolivia, further elaborated what would be termed the ‘foco theory’ of revolution, calling the foco “a pole of attraction for the whole country” in other words, a site for the revolution to focus. This is how the city can be thought of in the modern context of attack. Debray’s 1967 book, Revolution in the Revolution?, extended Guevara’s ideas, applying them to contemporary and past Latin American revolutionary movements. Building from both Guevara and Debray, one finds Carlos Marighella’s Mini-Manual of the Urban
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Guerilla\textsuperscript{535} published in 1969, which furthers the foco model’s urban application, encouraging fighters to carryout attacks to transform a political crisis into an armed conflict with the state.\textsuperscript{536} Marighella believed that if the vanguard could force the state to begin a military campaign against the revolutionaries, it would alienate the population and encourage them to revolt. Other South American militant theorists agreed with Marighella concerning the utility of the city as a site for guerilla warfare including Spanish-born Abraham Gullén who developed strategy and theory in conjunction with fighters from Uruguay’s MLN-T\textsuperscript{537}. Other Latin American movements advocated a Guevaran-Debrayan-Marighellaian foco theory of revolution including the ERP in Argentina, the Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional (FSLN) in Nicaragua, the New Jewel Movement in Grenada, and the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front (FMLN) coalition in El Salvador. Obviously numerous other highly active guerilla warfare conflicts existed as contemporaries (1950s-1970s) including those in Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, the Philippines, Bangladesh, Guatemala, Bolivia, Colombia, Peru, Angola, Kenya, Algeria, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Namibia, South Africa, Cameroon, Guinea-Bissau and the Congo. These movements exhibited a great deal of diversity to the degree that their inclusion borders on oversimplification. While some conflicts were waged with

\textsuperscript{535}Marighella, Minimanual of the Urban Guerilla.
liberationist agendas, others fought for secession or separatism, reformism\textsuperscript{538} or simply to place themselves in power after the fall of an opposing regime (what Clapham terms \textit{warlord insurgencies}).

\textbf{Full Time, Professional (Revolutionaries) Versus Part Timers}

The strategic vision advocated by Guevara, Debray, as well as Mao Tse-Tung in \textit{On Guerilla Warfare}, contends that from the proletarian masses, a vanguard cadre emerges, and it is this cadre that organizes the masses and leads it in combat with the state. To borrow language from the WUO’s strategic discussions, this would involve a “cadre organization”\textsuperscript{539} facilitating an “active mass base”\textsuperscript{540} movement as a “division of the International Liberation Army.”\textsuperscript{541} In this model, the participant leaves their civilian life behind, and through paramilitary preparations, becomes a soldier in a Marxist army. For Leninists, “The vanguard elite are…not just a theoretical category to explain the development of political strategies, but a specific grouping of special individuals who must be identified and trained distinctly from the broad mass of the population.”\textsuperscript{542} The vanguard-cadre model with a unified, central organization was furthered by urban guerilla movements such as the WUO—described as a self-styled revolutionary
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vanguard\textsuperscript{543}—who spoke of the ‘revolutionary youth movement’ “requiring a cadre organization...toward the creation of a unified revolutionary party”\textsuperscript{544}. This form of centralization and professionalization aimed at a militants’ full immersion separated the activist from the militant, and the revolutionary from the guerilla.

This facilitated organizing of the masses via an intentionally constructed minority is an essential difference between the Leninist-styled fighting organizations of the 1960s-1970s and the insurrectionary-styled networks of today. Lenin assumed in his analysis that the proletariat, already burdened with a high level of socio-political suffering, possessed a readiness to revolt and that the role of the vanguard was not to incite, but to organize these masses for revolution. Therefore, under Lenin’s logic all of the proletariat were potential ‘full-timers’ but only the vanguardist forces had reached the required level of outrage to become mobilized. This is different from the insurrectionary understanding, which posits that the masses do not possess a preeminent analysis of alienation and domination and that it is the role of the underground to display the possibility for revolution through political violence. While Lenin presumed that those under the yoke of capitalism would be radicalized by their position, the insurrectionaries argue that the systems of control and coercion obscure this oppression and disincentive the oppressed to organize and strike.
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The urban-rural divide further exaggerates this binary—fully immersed militant versus part time activists—as difficulties arise when urban-based movements attempt to build, maintain and conceal large memberships; a task more suited to rural organizations. One member of the Italian RB described this 24-hour guerilla emersion as “a hidden life at all times”...[an] “all-absorbing and highly demanding.”545 Within this strategic organization, some movements stratified their combatants546 into “regulars”—full time militants who lived underground—and “irregulars”,547 who appeared to live normal lives in the world of legality. Furthermore, for professionalized units like the RB, militants existed apart from the larger community, their family and other unaffiliated individuals. The brigadists were to live separate from their immediate family, children, and those not in the fight in an ultimate act of isolationist self-denial that even restricted sexual contact548 to the coordination by the Brigade’s technocrats. In a study on radicalization authored by the Asymmetric Warfare Group of the US Army, the authors report that “anarchy ideologues” (i.e. anarchist-identifying revolutionary activists) are specifically prone to severe breaks with preexisting social networks after dedicating themselves to a lifestyle of revolt, noting that this shift “represents a complete break with society, requiring an underground existence.”549

For the vanguardist, highly organized networks of armed cadres, one’s desires were subordinated to the struggle, their joy traded for duty and sacrifice. For those
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embedded in professionalized vanguardist models, this self-denial is all encompassing, intentionally segregating and non-negotiable. One Italian fascist militant, the “political and military mind of the Movimento Politico Ordine Nuovo (MPON)”550 spoke of this experience as a professional, underground utilizer of revolutionary violence:

You have to break contact with all those you had left behind: friends, family, boyfriend or girlfriend. . . .[emotional ties] had to be eliminated or removed. Because when you’re being hunted, when you live underground, you can’t allow them. You can’t allow yourself anything. 551

This modus operandi of self-denial, martyrdom and a sense of obligatory duty is abandoned in the neo-insurrectionary model. Additionally, at the level of organization, contemporary attackers abandon the two-tiered taxonomy—separating ‘full time militants’, also known as ‘professional revolutionaries’, from those who lived ‘normal lives’. As imprisoned members of the CCF explained in their self-reflective publication, “The Sun Still Rises:"

The CCF, instead, proposes informal organization of tightly-knit groups of friends in which specialization is leveled by generalization of skills and knowledge, and in which daily life and intimate relationships are not separated from the practice of revolt. This is the revolutionary as diffuse guerrilla and the guerrilla as insurrectionist. 552

This logic is repeated by the authors of The Coming Insurrection who speak of “what is political in friendship”, rejecting the “neutral idea of friendship understood as a pure affection with no consequences.” 553 Here the social ties of friendship are powerful
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unifiers; more powerful then the membership lists and donor records of the NGO or grassroots movement.

The modern insurrectionary movement can be thought of as engaging in a reinterpreted, anti-authoritarian foco theory-inspired form of warfare. The goal of these neo-guerillas is not to lead the masses or direct the anti-state war through a vanguard, but those burning banks and slashing tires function with the hopes that their ‘propaganda of the deed’ will demonstrate not only an anarcho-praxis, but also the feasibility of attacking an enemy as stoic and rigid as the modern neoliberal state. This strategy exposes an often-critiqued aspect of insurrectionary theory typically represented as ‘steps towards the revolution’, and mockingly expressed in a variety of forms such as:

1. Break a window, light a fire, detonate a bomb….
2. Write a communiqué
3. Circulate your communiqué
4. ??????? [insert unknown series of steps here]
5. Live the insurrection!\textsuperscript{554}

This recurring critique, delivered in the form of a snarky message board comment or outright joke, is formulaic: it contains an element of insurrectionary tactics (e.g. break a window, light a fire, glue a lock), the production of a communiqué, and ends in insurrection. Quite obviously, this approach skips over the quite necessary period where isolated attack leads to a system-level response and the victory against the state. This is an often-maligned breakdown in the insurrectionary strategy which stands in stark contrast to Marxist (e.g. Guevarian, Debrayian) programs which are predictive in their

\textsuperscript{554} A nod to this style of prescriptive strategy can be seen in the Invisible Committee’s recommendations for strategy as outlined in their four stages: “Get going!,” “Find each other,” “Get organized” and “Insurrection” corresponding to chapters 10-13 respectively.
understandings of the steps from attack to revolution. Instead of offering such a *strategy* insurrectionary theory coalesces more closely around a shared set of *tactics*. In their discussion of militant social movements, the anonymous authors of CrimethInc. write, “different formats for confrontation [i.e. tactics] encode different power relations and forms of social change within them.”\(^{555}\) This is precisely why insurrectionists base their tactical array around their shared organizational ethics, most notably informality, spontaneity, and direct (non-mediated) interactions with power. Therefore, one can understand the insurrectionary approach as a collection of tactics more than a central strategy, yet all is informed by a jointly-constituted and globally-shared set of ethics.

Thus while insurrectionary action can be seen as the production of a *focal point* for anti-social, anti-state and anti-capitalist resistance, it rejects the centrism, hierarchy and leadership-reliance embedded in Guevarian methods. This hybridized adaptation of a foco theory can also be seen in numerous urban guerilla movements of the 1960/1970s such as the WUO, who drawing from Debray’s foco theory, tried to exemplify militant resistance to the Vietnam War as a recruiting method for expanding the struggle amongst working class, white youths.\(^{556}\) Some contemporary analysts sympathetic to WUO politics have drawn similarities between foco strategies and the 1969 Kent State riots in Ohio, that led to the US National Guard firing on student demonstrators, killing four and injuring nine. According to journalist Andrew Kopkind, through the actions of a small band of militant student at Kent State, the rioters were able to “galvanize” 5,000

moderates who assembled the following day to support the militant factions engaged in battles with police and National Guard forces\textsuperscript{557}.

An essential part of the revisioning of the urban guerilla of the 1960s by the modern era of attackers is an abandonment of the artificial separation between an underground and aboveground life; one in which the later is exchanged for the utility of the former. In the insurrectionary model, this self-sacrificial, military-styled method is abandoned. The ideas of duty and ‘giving one’s self’ to the revolution are rejected in favor of a struggle grounded not in the rejection of bourgeois comforts, but in the embracing of an anti-social, confrontational attacker. In the introduction to a communiqué penned by imprisoned member of the CCF, the explains this shift away from the RAF/SLA/WUO model and writes:

The urban guerrilla of another time was one of hierarchy, martyrdom, and leninism. It claimed to be the vanguard of the coming revolution, while always maintaining a patronizing view toward others which inevitably led toward fantasies of centralized power. The new guerrilla avoids these pitfalls...[for] the Conspiracy of Cells of Fire, self sacrifice is rejected, along with orthodoxy and hierarchy in all its forms...What we see is the implementation of insurrectionary anarchist methodology within the context of guerrilla warfare. While criticisms of armed struggle, militarism, and guerrilla warfare are central aspects of insurrectionary anarchist critique, these have thus far been a response to the Marxist-Leninist guerrilla warfare of the 60’s and 70’s, with its authoritarian communist rhetoric and joyless, sacrificial practices. What shows its masked face now is something more horrible: an insurrectionist guerrilla with contempt for all leaders and vanguards, whose revolt is as inextricably linked with the joy of life as it is with the urgency of our situation.\textsuperscript{558}

Here we see that members identifying with the CCF moniker align themselves squarely with this new insurrectionary tendency, one that rejects the “authoritarian communist

\textsuperscript{557} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{558} Tsakalos et al., “The Sun Still Rises,” 2.
[and] joyless sacrificial practices” of bygone urban guerillas. Therefore, while the
insurrectionary model is opposed to “sacrificial practices” it does presume that those
acting against the state carry with them the risk of capture, imprisonment and death.
While this cannot be denied when clandestine actors are building explosive devices and
confronting police, the aim is to avoid sacrificial acts that may lead to capture and instead
focus on damaging the target while avoiding the repression of the state. For the
insurrectionists, there is no utility in martyrdom, as it removes an individual from the
arena of struggle.

**Affinity Groups, the Moniker & the “Guideline” Model**

*FAI, the Black International, the CCF, the affinity groups of anarcho-
individualists and nihilists is the community we want to live in. This has nothing
to do with the cumulative perception of power. FAI is not the model of a
centralized organization. On the contrary, it promotes informal organization,
affinity between cells and the uniqueness of each individual. We are against the
dictatorship of numbers and central committees. Neither do we follow the logic of
two fighting armies but instead we promote the diffusion of hundreds of points of
rapture and action, which sometimes cooperate in an international coordination
and sometimes express themselves as unique cells or individuals. FAI is simply
the invisible community where the desires of attack against our era, meet. In this
way, we promote New Anarchy and the Black International.*

-- Conspiracy of Cells of Fire: Imprisoned Members Cell, FAI-IRF [2013]

The new guerillas of insurrectionary attack should be understood as an international
network of disconnected and sometimes loosely federated affinity groups, ad hoc
collectives, and individuals. The *affinity group model* has its roots in a variety of social
movements often linked to the so-called anti-globalization, global justice movements that
crescendoed around the millennium, embodied in mass demonstrations opposing the

---

*559 Conspiracy of Cells of Fire FAI/IRF Imprisoned Members Cell, “Let’s become dangerous...for the
diffusion of the Black International.”*
WTO, IMF, WB, G8 and other multinational bodies. However, their roots in anti-state, anarchist resistance are a bit older. The use of the affinity group model dates back to at least the anarchist resistance to Francoist Spain and fascism in the 1930s. As the CrimethInc. Ex-Workers’ Collective recounts in their discussion of the history of insurrectionary anarchism, the speakers describes these structures as “small, nimble groups that wages attacks, assassinated political figureheads and police, and freed prisoners, while robbing banks to support themselves and living illegally and clandestinely.”\(^{560}\) The affinity groups would be constituted or disbanded depending on the changing nature of the conflict and preferred direct combat with the state rather than mediated representations through politics. According to one social movement scholar, “affinity groups” can be defined as “small, semi-independent units, pledged to coalition goals, tactics, and principals…but [are] free to make their own plans.”\(^{561}\) They are “small units of activists, effectively mirroring, in organizational terms, a group of friends…based on organic horizontality.”\(^{562}\) This analogy to networks of friends is shared in the aforementioned comments from the CCF activists. Typically affinity groups are between three and ten people and are organized for the specific needs of the action\(^{563}\) on hand and may possess varied skillsets based on the individuals involved. This tendency to organize towards the small is interwoven into the leftist tradition or organizational
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\(^{560}\) CrimethInc. Ex-Workers’ Collective, “The Ex-Worker.”


\(^{562}\) Feigenbaum, Frenzel, and McCurdy, Protest Camps, 168.

struggle. In a “Warning to the Insurgents” of Moscow delivered 11 December 1905, it is written:

Main rule: do not act en masse. Carry out actions in three of four at the most. There should be as many small groups as possible and each of them must learn to attack and disappear quickly...It is easier to defeat a hundred men than one alone, especially if they strike suddenly and disappear mysteriously.  

While the aforementioned descriptions are meant to describe alternative formations (e.g. affinity groups participating in mass demonstrations, or Russian “insurgents”) the framework can be utilized to trace the borders of the insurrectionary tendency as well. For networks such as CCF/FAI/ALF, (described as clusters when applied to affinity groups) small groupings of activists ally toward the broadly defined goals of the coalition as identified by their moniker. For traditional affinity groups the same rules apply. “Rather than agreeing an overall strategy for political action, the plurality of affinity groups, at times combined with a broad ‘action consensus’ (e.g. non-violence), leaves the decision over which action to take and how far to go with the individual groups.” While an affinity group may agree to an “action consensus” such as a Points of Unity, a cell network will agree to a set of guidelines. Within this guided frame, individual cells can decide how best to pursue the ‘broad consensus’ tactically within a shared strategy.

The friendship/affinity group model, whether used to coordinate civil disobedience through snarling traffic or mailing explosive devices to political officials,

---

564 As quoted in Anonymous, At Daggers Drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critics, 19.
566 Feigenbaum, Frenzel, and McCurdy, Protest Camps, 23.
both rely on a basic, self-contained\textsuperscript{567}, small scale, temporarily assembled tactical model. Groupings may merge, split and transition from organizing public disturbances to clandestine guerilla warfare. This is the case with the Students for a Democratic Society’s (SDS) factionalization around the 1969 Days of Rage. Around this time, the SDS wing known as the Revolutionary Youth Movement (RYM I)\textsuperscript{568}—including Bernardine Dohrn, David Gilbert and Mark Rudd who would later constitute the first generation of the WUO—split from the larger SDS during the movement’s National Council meetings in Texas.\textsuperscript{569} The tendency for social movements to factionalize is largely avoided in the insurrectionary model as the movement’s “leaderless resistance”\textsuperscript{570} structure and focus on temporality allows factions to form, act and then disband only to be reconstituted at a later date. In the model of affinity groups and clandestine, networked cells—“the horizontal linking of affinity groups”\textsuperscript{571}—only remain assembled for the length of time required to complete their specific actions. Individuals do not hold onto group membership in perpetuity or as long as dues are paid, but only as long as the co-conspirators find it a necessity. Before and after the action, the collective does not exist. This affinity group-styled mode of resistance functions in tandem with the deployment of


\textsuperscript{568} Around 1969 the RYM split into RYM I and RYM II, the former going on to become the WUO and the latter a more Maoist-leaning faction which rejected the initiation of immediate armed revolution in favor of the building of a vanguardist, revolutionary party. RYM II would later become the New Communist Movement.


\textsuperscript{571} Anonymous, At Daggers Drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critics, 32.
communiqués to determine attack authorship, and further demarcate group membership and inter-community inclusion and exclusion. This phenomenon can be seen in an examination of the communiqués and network guideline as markers of identity within a fluid social movement.

Following the 1999 WTO demonstrations, where window-smashing anarchists caused approximately $20 million in property damage and lost revenues, many correspondents were searching for a ‘group’ to associate with the violence. Though the vandalism and property destruction was carried out by a variety of individuals, both ‘affiliated’ and independent, one of the affinity groups responsible issued a communiqué, wherein they stated:

When we smash a window, we aim to destroy the thin veneer of legitimacy that surrounds private property rights. At the same time, we exorcize that set of violent and destructive social relationships which has been imbued in almost everything around us. By ‘destroying’ private property, we convert its limited exchange value into an expanded use value.

A storefront window becomes a vent to let some fresh air into the oppressive atmosphere of a retail outlet (at least until the police decide to tear-gas a nearby road blockade). A newspaper box becomes a tool for creating such vents or a small blockade for the reclamation of public space or an object to improve one's vantage point by standing on it. A dumpster becomes an obstruction to a phalanx of rioting cops and a source of heat and light. A building facade becomes a message board to record brainstorm ideas for a better world.

Following such an attack, whether by the 1999 black bloc or the 2014 arsonist, the goal is to generate another strike in a long series of attacks. In this sense, the strategy of protracted combat is open-ended as the attackers do not imagine that any single incident

---

573 ACME Collective, “N30 Black Bloc Communiqué.”
will lead to the collapse of capital or the state. The attackers do not expect the branch to fail or the parent company to capitulate to some reformist demands, rather the strike against the enemy is in itself the end goal. It exists within a chronological ordering of similar attacks that occurred before and will occur after. These attacks collectively represent a social force that seeks to create structural change.

In this manner, insurrectionary strategy is simultaneously pessimistic and optimistic. It is pessimistic because it does not believe that a campaign of attack will lead to the sudden yielding of power by the state, but maintain an optimism that such a series of attacks does serve a revolutionary goal of radicalizing the population, exposing the violence of state and capital, and temporarily focusing the attention of the population on issues of structural violence through forcing people to ask the question: ‘Why did those people blow up that bank?’ The goal is thus to localize the struggle, to allow one’s anti-state actions to serve as a negation of the systems domination and a transcendence of mediation of capitalist relations. Since the nature of the insurrectionary understanding of control is one where the forces of domination are transnational, ever-present and boundless, the goal is not to defeat this amorphous body but rather to create ruptures—however temporary—which allow one to imagine another world of greater freedom and autonomy.

Most importantly, the carrying out of attacks can be seen as an end in itself as they serve to confront the enemy, in the “urgent immediacy”, though an unmediated

575 Ibid., 39.
method of struggle. To produce an attack is to rhetorically link it to thousands of attacks from the past, and to provide yet another example of praxis for those acting in the future. This is the precise functional use of the adoptable moniker. By uniting disparate incidents through a shared and named label, these seemingly disconnected acts of resistance are linked together into a collective history. This collectivity then shares a narrative, it shares intellectual resources and creates a ‘digital community’\textsuperscript{576} which serves to “produce and provide ideological frameworks, knowledge concerning tactics, equipment and targets, but of greatest importance, inspiration and the idea that one is part of a vivid, supporting community and not alone.”\textsuperscript{577} In this manner, between 1972-2010, the ALF and ELF monikers have been used to claim responsibility for over 7,200 attacks\textsuperscript{578} in at least 36 countries\textsuperscript{579}, most frequently in the US and UK. The power of such a unifying marker should not be understated. Using the ALF/ELF as a model, the shared identity creates a social movement from seemingly unconnected broken windows, slashed tires and burned out slaughterhouses. In other words, the moniker functions as a rallying point, a centrally-located means of movement identification, wherein a window breaker in Berlin and an arsonist in Tel Aviv can feel as though they are part of the same movement, united in a


\textsuperscript{578} See chart 3.1 in appendix

\textsuperscript{579} Loadenthal, “Nor Hostages, Assassinations, or Hijackings, but Sabotage, Vandalism & Fire: ‘Eco-Terrorism’ as Political Violence Challenging the State and Capital.,” 81–89, 94–95.
shared guideline for action, and moving towards the same goal (e.g. ending speciesism, opposing capitalism, etc.).

These groups that share a name in order to claim responsibility for attacks often adopt a “guideline” approach to drawing in-group/out-group distinctions. In 1973, the German group RZ began encouraging cells and individuals to act, stating that “anybody could carry out and action within the context of the RZ’s politics…and claim it as an RZ action.” While RZ did not appear to maintain a static, numbered list of rules, it created thematic borders for its actors, defining their areas of operation into three categories:

1.) anti-imperialist actions, 2.) actions against the branches, establishments, and accomplices of Zionism in the FRG [Federal Republic of Germany], and 3.) actions supporting the struggles of workers, wimmin and youth, and attacking and punishing their enemies.

RZ urged its adherents to carryout cell-level attacks against targeting fitting the above criteria and *encouraged* the destruction of property, not the targeting of individuals, similar to the strategy of the ALF/ELF.

According to media accounts, RZ carried out 186 actions in approximately 20 years. Around the same time RZ was forming in Germany, the ALF was emerging as a
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581 This spelling of “women” is intentional and common amongst radical feminist writers and other anti-patriarchal leftists. It is intended to remove the root “men” from the female person. Other examples of this phenomenon can be seen in the ‘misspelling’ of the Spanish word “compañerxs”, replacing gender-specific indicator letters with “x” to de-gender the word. This Spanish language example is borrowed from a communiqué written by Adrián Díaz, entitled “Communiqué from Adrián Díaz on solidarity and against the rumors” published 13 July 2013 by War on Society.
582 RZ was linked to one death in Germany when an individual who had been ‘kneecapped’ bled to death. RZ later issued a communiqué stating that this was not intended. Two RZ adherents (Wilfried Böse and Brigitte Kuhlmann), in conjunction with the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine: External Operations (PFLP-EO), were involved in the 1976 hijacking of Air France Flight 139, diverting it to Entebbe, Uganda. The Israeli Defense Forces eventually freed nearly all of the 106 hostages while killing all 7 hijackers and over 40 Ugandan soldiers.
newly militant direct action tendency in England, separating itself from the Band of Mercy, which had used similar tactics of vandalism, sabotage and arson in defense of animals. The ALF in its formative years developed a set of five “guidelines” that an individual must adhere to in order to claim that action as that of the ALF. These guidelines state:

1. To inflict economic damage on those who profit from the misery and exploitation of animals.
2. To liberate animals from places of abuse, i.e. laboratories, factory farms, fur farms etc., and place them in good homes where they may live out their natural lives, free from suffering.
3. To reveal the horror and atrocities committed against animals behind locked doors, by performing nonviolent direct actions and liberations.
4. To take all necessary precautions against harming any animal, human and non-human.
5. Any group of people who are vegetarians or vegans and who carry out actions according to ALF guidelines have the right to regard themselves as part of the ALF.

The ELF, modeled after the ALF, developed a similar set of guidelines and through its aboveground press offices and publications, is careful to disseminate such texts widely. According to a 2011 FAQ circulated from the North American ELF Press Office, the guidelines are:

1. To cause as much economic damage as possible to a given entity that is profiting off the destruction of the natural environment and life for selfish greed and profit,
2. To educate the public on the atrocities committed against the environment and life,
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584 Molland, “A Spark That Ignited a Flame: The Evolution of the Earth Liberation Front.”
3. To take all necessary precautions against harming life.\textsuperscript{585}

The authors of the FAQ make it clear that based on these guidelines, “ELF” is simply a political framework that anyone can adopt.

The ELF does not have any sort of physical membership list or meetings you can attend to become involved. Remember, the ELF revolves around not a physical base or classically designed structure, but instead an ideology. If you believe in the ELF ideology and you follow a certain set of widely published guidelines, you can conduct actions and become part of the ELF.\textsuperscript{586}

Such a model has continued to expand as new formulations of resistance networks emerge.

In 2003, a series of bombings targeting affiliate companies involved in funding animal research were targeted. In August 2003 two pipe bombs packed with nails (used as anti-personnel shrapnel) exploded at the offices of Chiron Corporation in Emeryville, CA. One month later, in September 2003, a second bombing occurred, this time targeting the offices of Shaklee Inc., in Pleasanton, CA. Both Chiron and Shaklee were economically linked to HLS, the target of a multi-year, international protest campaign led by SHAC because of the company’s function as a breeder of animals for experimentation. The Revolutionary Cells—Animal Liberation Brigade (RC-ALB) claimed both bombings through emailed communiqués sent to media and Bite Back Magazine, a website and print periodical established to publicize ALF and ideologically aligned actions. In the second such text, which claimed responsibility for the September explosion, the author(s) outlined the guidelines for future RC-ALB actions.

\textsuperscript{586} Ibid., 14–15.
The revolutionary cells exists as a front group for militants across the liberationary movement spectrum. We are anarchists, communists, anti-racists, animal liberationists, earth liberationists, luddites, feminists, queer liberationists, and many more things across various other fronts...Anyone who takes part in the war against the oppressive hierarchies [sic] in this world can consider themselves a member of the Revolutionary Cells.

Revolutionary Cells Guidelines:
1. To take strategic direct action (be it non-violent or not) against the oppressive institutions that permeate the world.
2. Make every effort to minimize non-target casualties, be they human or non-human.
3. Respect a diversity of tactics, whether they be non-violent or not.
4. Any underground activist fighting for the liberation of the humyn\textsuperscript{587}, earth or animal nations may consider themselves a Revolutionary Cells volunteer.\textsuperscript{588}

Clearly one can see the influence of earlier incarnations on that of the RC-ALB. Not only did they directly borrow the namesake of RZ, a group inactive for nearly a decade, but also three of the four guidelines can be easily likened to those of the ALF/ELF. It is only guideline three—which allows for the RC-ALB to target people not property—that separates it from the ALF/ELF. In this understanding, the RC-ALB is similar to animal liberation networks such as the Justice Department (JD) and Animal Rights Militia (ARM) in that it largely resembles the ALF except for its tactic allowance or outright endorsement for attacks against human targets.

It is important to note that the first two RC-ALB bombings, both carried out in California, are said to be the work of Daniel Andreas San Diego, the first American

\textsuperscript{587} This is an intentional ‘misspelling’ of human to remove the “man” and create a gender-neutral, sexless term. Similar spellings occur with “woman”, often spelled as “womyn” or “women” spelled as “wimmin.”

animal rights activist added to the FBI’s Most Wanted Terrorist list. After noticing surveillance of his vehicle in 2003, San Diego disappeared and despite his addition to the Most Wanted list, has remained at large. While FBI and Department of Justice (DOJ) materials link San Diego to both the Chiron and Shaklee attacks, the RC-ALB moniker has been used to claim responsibility for six additional attacks, four in California, one in Maryland and one in Switzerland. The attacks have included the arson or attempted arson of six targets (three in Switzerland), two bomb threats (both in Maryland) and two mailed IEDs. While it is conceivable that San Diego created the RC-ALB and carried out all of the above mentioned attacks, it is more likely—according to Congressional testimony and court papers—that San Diego was successful in creating an appealing, adoptable moniker, and that others chose to act as self-appointed members of the RC-ALB and carry his message forward.

While taking a slightly different approach, the CCF proposed guidelines in their self-assessment zine, “The Sun Still Rises,” and suggested three points of affinity for cells seeking to expand the social war. The CCF writes:

We are…making a proposal for a new Conspiracy comprising a diffuse, invisible, network of cells that have no reason to meet in person, yet through their actions and discourse recognize one another as comrades in the same political crime: the subversion of Law and Order. This Conspiracy would consist of individuals and cells that take action, whether autonomous or coordinated (through call-outs and

590 United States District Court Northern District of California San Francisco Division and Special Agent Christine Loscalzo, “In the Matter of the Application of the United States of America for an Order Authorizing the Installation and Use of an Electronic Tracking Devices on or in Honda Civic, California License Plate 3EKTS0 [NO. CR 03-3133 MISC EMC]” (U.S. District Court Northern District of California, October 3, 2003).
communiqués), without needing to agree on every single position and specific reference point…instead they would connect on the basis of mutual aid focused on three key points…[1.] the choice of direct action using any means capable of damaging enemy infrastructure. Without hierarchization of methods of violence, comrades can choose from rocks to Kalashnikovs…accompanied by a corresponding communiqué…claiming responsibility and explaining the reason behind the attack, thus spreading revolutionary discourse…[2.] wage war against the state while simultaneously engaging in a pointed critique of society…[3.] international revolutionary solidarity…a solidarity that cries out through texts, armed actions, attacks, and sabotage to reach the ears of persecuted and imprisoned comrades, no matter how far away they may be…Any comrade who agrees (obviously without having to identify herself) with these three key points of the informal agreement we are proposing can—if she wants—use the name Fire Cells Conspiracy in connection with the autonomous cell she is a part of…. [and] be able to organize arson and bombing campaigns…communicating through their claims of responsibility.591

The CCF model is far more open then that of previous networks. It encourages points of generalized affinity, not specific rules, with the hopes that cell-level decision making remains autonomous while some form of international coordination can occur thorough the communiqués accompanying actions. The CCF even note how this idea has already been actualized by a cell of Dutch attackers who chose to attack Rabobank and claim the strikes as the CCF Dutch cell.

This history draws key distinctions in terms of clandestine networks’ methodologies of attack. One key difference which separates twentieth century groups such as the RAF from the modern insurrectionary attacks such as the CCF, is that while the former tended to attack symbolic targets, the latter have attempted to focus on tactical targets; those which can most effectively—in a strategic sense—serve to disrupt the flow of state and capital. This desire to cause material damage and disruption is recurrent in

social protest\textsuperscript{592}, but perhaps particularly important to the insurrectionary logic. The targeting logic of 1970s guerillas tended to focus on visible representations of larger social movement struggle—army bases, corporate offices, government offices—to strike against The Military, or The Corporation or The State\textsuperscript{593}. On the other hand, twenty-first century insurrectionary cells have tended to attack more localized manifestations of these systems such as individual bank branches, police vehicles and key technocratic individuals. While this pattern is by no ways a consistent description, it does differentiate those who target the symbolic representations of the state can capital from those who strategically strike its “functional logistics”\textsuperscript{594} aiming at financial damage and interruption. This desire to “hit [them] where it hurts”\textsuperscript{595} focuses on the operational abilities of the target rather than the symbolic capital it carries in a larger movement sense. Strategies that seek to diagram the weaknesses, bottlenecks and soft underbellies of grandiose targets are common in the post-millennial clandestine networks and can be seen in the ALF’s mapping and serial attacks on fur farms (e.g. The Blueprint\textsuperscript{596}, The

\textsuperscript{592} Della Porta and Diani, \textit{Social Movements}, pt. 7.3.2.  
Final Nail\(^597\), or Ted Kaczynski’s calls to “strike at the most sensitive and vital organs of the system...[the] points at which it cannot afford to give ground.”\(^598\)

**To Claim or Not to Claim: That is the question**

I must say that the debate on using or not acronyms and claims is still very strong. Even in this case, I wouldn’t make an ‘ideological’ approach of the subject, I have nothing against actions not claimed, from my point of view they simply tend to disappear, they do not stimulate debate, they have a minimum potential of reproducibility...That’s why I made the FAI-IRF methodology my own...Whoever claims responsibility with an acronym is an enemy worthy of denigration.\(^599\)

-- Alfredo Cospito, FAI shooter of an Italian nuclear executive [2014]

Insurrectionary anarchism is often an identity of self-description, even in its more ‘civil’ (i.e. non insurrectionary) forms. For example, in the media reporting of anarchist activity (e.g. protests, arrests), it is exceedingly common for news outlets to describe activists as ‘self-proclaimed anarchists,’\(^600\) ‘self-described anarchists’\(^601\) and other such labels that


\(^{598}\) Kaczynski, “Hit Where It Hurts,” 251, 253.

\(^{599}\) Cospito, Interview by CCF – Imprisoned Members Cell with Alfredo Cospito (Greece, Italy).


imply the ambiguity of authoritatively assigning such a label. This sort of linguistic practice speaks to the self-adoptability of the anarchist ‘identity’ with or without a clandestine moniker. While the label is just as often undeservingly applied to those seen as acting ‘violently’ or ‘chaotically’, in a great deal of coverage of actual anarchists, their self-labeling becomes a constant reference. Does this self-labeling function differently when individuals and groups choose to self-label within a specific factional moniker, be it the FAI, CCF, ELF or others? Are there important considerations in determining how and if to claim responsibility for an attack?

Certainly discussions as to the pros and cons of claiming an attack, and the role played by stable monikers have occurred. Some have argued that by announcing an attack, issuing a communiqué, and labeling it with a group name, one is aiding state authorities in collecting evidence and eventually stopping the resistance activities. These activists argue that the action speaks for itself, and to further expose oneself with a written claim of responsibility—especially one that uses a moniker to link it to past and future attacks—is glamor-seeking, vain, self-indulgent and ultimately without purpose. Others, such as those who regularly pen, translate, post and circulate such claims obviously feel otherwise. In one of the most direct and plainly stated discussion of this question, the Indonesian anarchist guerilla known as Eat writes:

Some years ago when I spent my time behind bars because of political action, two European ‘anarchists’ whom I never met before visited me. They told me that they shared the same ideas for the action that I done. But one thing seemed to

bother them and for a while now since I was ‘freed’, I’ve realized from some of my correspondences with individuals from the so-called ‘general activist and anarchist milieu from local to international’, that the idea of naming one cell as FAI is a big issue.

One thing that these two Europeans asked me is why I ‘labeled’ the cell of attack. I answered them with a very simple logic: it was labeled as Informal Anarchist Federation because we shared the same ideas of sporadic attack and the critique of organization that came from anarchist-insurrectionalism.

It was a conscious choice to identify the revolt, whether by an individual or by groups, against the machinery of control. It was a gesture of solidarity to every anarchist prisoner around the world…FAI is also a manifestation of the idea of sporadic attack and the general critique on the specialization of attack – such as professional terrorist organization and the past Marxist-Leninist hierarchical and vanguardist form of armed struggle. It is also not necessarily an armed struggle, but more of a means of arming ourselves against the machine.

The question that was raised by these two Europeans originated from the critique of organization itself: the naming of the attack by a sort of invisible organization and in this case, it was the FAI/IRF. However, briefly I tried to explain to them then, that I think it is a very simple logic for every conscious individual who has a passion for waging war against the capitalist system. I have never met nor even corresponded with the FAI before I conducted the action, but I understood very well the ideas that lay behind it. And for me, our action was also a form of communication between individuals, anarchists especially, in the global sense. And it did, so I was very happy when I read and heard that so many solidarity actions were done for my case and it didn’t occur to me that it was just a FAI/IRF inclusive project, but it was a firestarter, a test for our theory and formula of action and organization. FAI/IRF for me was a global meeting point…FAI/IRF is maybe only just a name for some individuals who share some ideas, but it is also an experience in action and organization and not a form of fetishism. There are no individuals nor groups monopolizing the ideas, because the dialogue and debate is still ongoing. The action never stopped.602

Eat’s thoughts externalize this debate well. While he expresses an acknowledgment of the “Europeans” uncertainty, he chooses to claim attacks from within the FAI moniker precisely because of the power of an internationalized namesake. Eat explains the deterritorialized, disembodied insurrectionary milieu as an “experience”, a “form of

communication”, a “global meeting point.” Eat was able to consume the communiqés of the FAI produced in Italy, Greece and elsewhere, incorporate their ideas into his own framework, carry out a local attack, and immediately vault from onlooker to participant in an international network of anarchists guerillas.

In the times of urban guerilla warfare that preceded the FAI and its allies, similar debates occurred. During the 1960-1970s, when more frequent armed guerilla actions were occurring from the revolutionary left, the Angry Brigade which was active in the UK proposed the idea of a freely-adoptable moniker. The utility of such an approach was discussed in a 2012 publication chronicling the Angry Brigade. In their discussion of the usefulness of static labels, the author writes:

Action Directe [French Direct Action], the RAF [German Red Army Faction], the CCC [Belgian Communist Combatant Cells], RZ [German Revolutionary Cells] and other armed struggle groups in Europe were in fact the trees hiding the forest of autonomous groups of attack, far more numerous and diffused. On the one hand, one can find interesting the possibility mentioned in the communique that anyone can appropriate the signature Angry Brigade: ‘Where two or three revolutionaries use organized violence to attack the class system...there is the Angry Brigade. Revolutionaries all over England are already using the name to publicise their attacks on the system.’603 and “The AB is the man or woman sitting next to you. They have guns in their pockets and anger in their minds.”604 But on the other hand, one can doubt the usefulness of creating an entity and identity based on a fixed signature. And if ‘revolutionaries throughout England already use this name to publicize their attacks against the system’605, the opposite is also true, and this is all the better, because it decentralizes the attack and makes it less legible to the eyes of cops, preventing them from being able to attribute socially diffuse practices to a particular group.606

604 Ibid., sec. 9.
605 Ibid., sec. 6.
For this theorist, by advocating the diffuse usage of an adoptable moniker, this functions to obscure identifiable patterns of attack that may be useful to law enforcement, multiplying the ‘trees that hide the forest of attack.’ This sort of approach is also briefly mentioned in *The Coming Insurrection* wherein the author(s) speak of “not claiming your illegal actions, only attaching to them some fictional acronym.”  

Certainly the same can be said about the modern attacks claimed under the FAI, CCF and other monikers. One author argues that the modern groups “recognizing themselves under the logos FAI or IRF” function to “stifle” revolutionary fervor by claiming attacks under a stable, repeated moniker. Calling it the “spectacle of practices and logos” the author encourages the issuing of explanatory communiqués but cautions against acts of resistance becoming commodified spectacles as to apply a stable label to an attack is to make it “permanent…claim[ing] belonging to it as in any other formal and permanent organization.” This form of self-labeling serves to, “in view of police history…facilitates one’s own repression and loses some of the sense of the attack in question, putting the spotlight on the authors of the attacks rather than the attacks themselves.” At the level of the cells carrying out attacks, similar debates are ongoing. Besides the reflections of past attackers such as Eat, an Italian cell of the FAI, calling itself “Conspiracy of Black Fire” spoke of similar concerns while claiming responsibility

---

608 Ravage Editions, “Kick It Til It Breaks - An Introduction to Angry Brigade [introduction of Angry Brigade: Elements de La Critique Anarchiste Armée En Angleterre].”
609 Ibid.
610 Ibid.
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for an arson attack targeting a gasoline pump, and sabotaging ATMs. In their claim of responsibility, offered as the 13th attack in the “Phoenix Project” the attackers write:

We spent a great deal of time pondering on the question of informality [not claiming via a moniker] and the possibility of giving birth to a group of action [through creating a new moniker]. During our discussion, among laughter and seriousness, lively debates, desires and anxiety, projects and strategies, we decided to give birth to the Conspiracy of Black Fire and wage war to the megamachine of dominion.611

This choice to use the acronym was likely done for several reasons, one of which being to more completely integrate into the “Phoenix Project” international series of attacks.

Similarly, since the FAI name was coined, cells have popped up around the world quite rapidly. In May 2014, a new cell was announced in Hong Kong, the second such country in Asia following Indonesia. In their communiqué, the new cell states:

We, the Autonomous Cell for Revolutionary Class Struggle/Informal Anarchist Federation/International Revolutionary Front, would like to announce our formation...Through autonomous action and in conjunction with other revolutionary cells around the world and an FAI cyber cell here in Hong Kong we aim to strike a blow to the spectacle, to the enslaving system.612

The so-called “Imprisoned Members Cell” of the CCF-FAI also weighed in on this issue at length in their essay “Let’s become dangerous...for the diffusion of the Black International.”613 In this essay the authors speak to the utility and danger of adoptable monikers and stable acronyms, reacting to a critic of this approach who argues: “when an

613 Conspiracy of Cells of Fire FAI/IRF Imprisoned Members Cell, “Let’s become dangerous...for the diffusion of the Black International.”
action is followed by a communiqué, it is like a joke accompanied by an explanation. “The cell refutes that claim made by “exponents of political anonymity often say…’With communiqués and acronyms, the actions get owners.” The imprisoned authors rhetorically ask and answer this challenge writing, “‘but why are you obsessed with acronyms and naming cells?’ We answer, that we have no obsession, we just feel the strong desire to define ourselves.” The authors proceed to discuss the power of separating oneself from the larger leftist milieu stating:

We believe that by simply stating that we are ‘anarchists’, in order to speak through a communiqué or an action, is inadequate and problematic. We choose to separate our positions from the ‘anarchists’ who cooperate with the leftist grassroot labor unions, use Marxist analyzes, unionize their misery, slander direct actions, fantasize workers’ communes, participate in residents’ local committees and transform anarchy into a social therapy. Also, actions speak for themselves through communiqués, because they keep their distances from the ‘anarchist’ opposition, which may sometimes burn down a bank in the name of ‘poor people and against plutocracy’s capital’, in order to prove it does at least something. No, our burned banks is not a way of protest or a token of friendship and solidarity with the ‘poor people’ who does nothing and sits on his couch…So, we choose to identify ourselves and not to be lost in the anonymity of an imaginary anarchist movement.

The Imprisoned Members Cell represent only one contribution of a growing debate on this matter amongst proponents and detractors of clandestine attack claimed via communiqué, and a continued dialogue concerning utility, function and risk is warranted.

614 Ibid.
615 Ibid.
616 Ibid.
617 Ibid.
While in this manner, a moniker can be a useful disambiguation tool to mark certain political tendencies, the ease in adoptability for such labels can make the discussion and analysis of clandestine political violence tricky at best. Without the means to transparently verify attack claims, the potential for provocateurs producing false flag attacks is ever-present. For example, in June 1990, three attacks involving IEDs occurred in England targeting vehicles belonging to hunters. The attacks were blamed on animal rights activists (through a false claim of responsibility by the “British Animal Rights Society.”), a fictional group. Subsequent investigation proved these three attacks to be the work of Jim Alan Newbury-Street, the director of the British Hunting Exhibition. Newbury-Street was found to have manufactured the bombs and was...


This relates to the broader discussion of difficulties with verifiability and triangulation discussed in Chapter One under the heading “Opaque Truths and Verifiability.”


arrested with nails and other bomb components found in his possession.\textsuperscript{622} Within the insurrectionary tendency, similar accusations have been made. In December 2003, the Coordinating Committee of the \textit{Italian} Anarchist Federation, issued a statement, calling the Bologna-based mail bomb attacks by the \textit{Informal} Anarchist Federation to be “phantom-like.”\textsuperscript{623} The statement “denounces the serious and infamous nature of attributing the kind of facts to initials alluding to the monogram of FAI.”\textsuperscript{624} The Committee points out that the FAI acronym has been used by the aboveground anarcho-federation since its adoption in 1945, and therefore, its usage by a clandestine network of bombers is a violation. The union movement writes that it “asserts once more its condemnation of bombs, exploding parcels and such devices, that may strike without discrimination.”\textsuperscript{625}

While these insurrectionary, moniker-based, internationalist attack networks do not publicize specific guidelines like the ALF, ELF, RZ and RC-ALB, they still function through a praxis comprised of the strategies and tactics developed through action (e.g. attacks) and theory (e.g. communiqués and other texts). If these networks do have exclusionary guidelines to identify self and other, what does it mean to call one’s attack an act of the FAI? From their texts, we can deduce that in basic, those that carryout the attacks in effect make the theory. They make the theory through action as well as

\textsuperscript{624} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{625} Ibid.
interpretation. In their self-assessment pamphlet, imprisoned members of the CCF state their process for authoring communiqués, writing:

The writing of a communiqué on a specific topic was usually shared out among those who wanted the responsibility, and after it was written, we got together to read it and make corrections, additions, and final touches. If the communiqué was connected to a separate initiative, then the comrades involved in that separate initiative were responsible for writing it.\textsuperscript{526}

In other words, those that took initiative and those that showed up made the politics. This seems to be a common pattern amongst non-centralized clandestine groups of a variety of natures. Even at times when hierarchical coordination is commonplace, the politics of attack seem more driven by those who hold the Molotov than those that hold the pen. To quote an imprisoned member of the RAF interviewed in 1991, "we have always said that it is part of our basic politics that those who carry out the practice also determine the concrete policy."\textsuperscript{627}

Finally, the moniker has other important purposes. One such benefit is that it serves to reduce the impact of ideological disagreement amongst individual cells that could lead to disunity, inter-network bickering, and factionalization. One scholar, writing about the ELF specifically, notes that by its very structure, such actors can, “avoid ideological cleavages by eliminating all ideology extraneous to the very specific cause…thereby eliminating opportunities for ideological debate."\textsuperscript{628} He explains that for the ELF, its open structure “creates an overlapping consensus among those with vastly different ideological orientations, mobilizing a mass of adherents who would have never

\textsuperscript{526} Tsakalos et al., “The Sun Still Rises,” 5.
\textsuperscript{627} Moncourt and Smith, The Red Army Faction, 2:343.
\textsuperscript{628} Joosse, “Leaderless Resistance and Ideological Inclusion,” 364.
been able to work together in an organization. In other words if networked movements like the ALF, ELF, CCF, FAI were membership-based organizations or otherwise federated movements, disagreements between smaller collectivities could lead to the creation of factions from amongst the larger group. In the case of an adoptable moniker, if a faction chooses to reject certain aspects of the larger collectivity’s framework, they can simply not link their actions to that name, or as commonly occurs, create a new, group name. This can be seen, when for example, the JD and ARM emerged from amongst the ALF’s constituency; the former two groups rejecting the ALF’s demand for not harming humans in their protest actions.

For those acting in the name of modern insurrectionary anarchism, this surface level ideological harmony serves a mobilizing and unifying purpose. While the individuals responsible for burning a bank in Indonesia, and those redecorating a police facility in England may disagree passionately over the role of technology as a tool for creating social war, this disagreement is masked by both cells claiming their actions under the FAI banner. To the outside observer, the FAI appears decentralized yet united. In their self-assent pamphlet authored by imprisoned members of the CCF, the writers explain this trend within their own network, writing:

Even in cases when there wasn’t collective agreement on a particular action…the minority of comrades who insisted on carrying out the attack took the autonomous initiative to move forward with their choice. That happened in parallel with the rest of the collective, which supported them at specific times if necessary, naturally playing a part in our overall organization. That’s why a number of communiqués were signed by groups (Nihilist Faction, Breath of Terror Commando, Terrorist Guerilla Unit) that arose out of each separate initiative.630

629 Ibid.
Therefore, claims that such open, decentralized structures “avoid ideological cleavages”631 seem to hold true for a variety of clandestine actors. While some may disagree as to the function—positive or negative—of the communiqué and acronym, it seems undeniable that such measures allow for a diffuse collectivity of attacks to act with a singular momentum, creating theory as they go through a constantly reinvented discourse patterned by attack, communiqué, critique of attack/communiqué, counter critique and so on.

**Looking Ahead**

The preceding analysis and discussion is designed around not only understanding the evolution of the insurrectionary tendency, but also to differentiate it from bygone eras of armed struggle. The insurrectionary movement, devoid of strictly enforced movement boundaries can best be identified through the various debates explored above—rural v. urban warfare, the role of vanguards, ‘full time’ v. ‘part time,’ the structuring of cells, the usage of anonymity v. known monikers, the embracing or rejection of ‘terrorism’, etc. It is precisely where the actors stand vis-à-vis such debates that indicate their inclusion or rejection from the insurrectionary milieu. This speaks to the fluid and multifaceted nature of social movement (self)-identification. Since insurrectionists do not carry membership cards, fly a specific flag, don uniforms or participate in transparent political processes, one can only judge them on the basis of their actions and their ideas.

---

Moving forward one can begin to develop the philosophical and ideological component of modern insurrectionism. This “critical synthesis…[of] anarchist thought, Italian autonomist-Marxism form the 1970s, French ultra-gauche communism, the squatter’s movement in Europe in the 1980s, and the Situationist International”632 is built upon the foundational concepts of continental/poststructural philosophy. This philosophical discourse is woven through the proceeding chapters and will serve as the foundational basis for the evaluation of the study’s central hypothesis. The aim of Chapters Two and Three was to familiarize the reader with the history of these actions, and with these ongoing discussions in mind, the remaining chapters will depart this approach and refocus the discussion on ideas. The historical record and strategic decision making described in the preceding chapters can not be understood without a discussion of the ideas that inform. This is precisely why history must precede strategy, and strategy must precede ideology. Therefore it is essential that the readers remains conscious of the historical precursors, but allows themselves to nuance that understand as it is explored in light of the wider theory.

CHAPTER FOUR

I say to you: that we are in a battle, and that more than half of this battle is taking place on the battlefield of the media. And that we are in a media battle in a race for the hearts and minds....And that however far our capabilities reach, they will never be equal to one thousandth of the capabilities of...that [which] is waging war on us.633

-- al-Qaeda leader Ayman al-Zawahiri to Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, leader of al-Qaeda in Iraq [2005]

---

New Methodologies of Critical Inquiry

The exploration of radical political actors can serve a variety of functions. For example, one can analyze patterns of attack and target selection for the creation and refinement of methods designed to identify, disrupt and capture combatants. Conversely, one can examine the structural realities that radicalize combatants and seek to analytically apply these criticisms to subjects as grandiose as structural violence. This study is most certainly this second form of inquiry. In doing so, one begins their analysis from the fields of Peace Studies, not International Relations, and leans towards anarchism and poststructuralism than Realism and Neoliberalism. This is not to claim ideological blankness, but rather to assert one’s a priori framework. If one were to pursue the study of political violence through the preeminent field of Terrorism Studies, emboldened by the boom in scholarship post-9/11, then one would likely investigate how best to secure the homeland from attackers, and in doing such “agenda setting”\textsuperscript{634}, present the subject as one of securitization, not investigation.\textsuperscript{635} This manner of scholarship has been critiqued for its avoidance of empirical measures to study terrorism. When \textit{counter}terrorism is the focus, such a pattern is even more striking as according to one study\textsuperscript{636} “only 3 percent of articles from peer-reviewed sources appeared to be rooted in empirical analysis.”\textsuperscript{637}


\textsuperscript{635} Jackson et al., \textit{Terrorism}, 13.


In their discussion of “the terrorism industry” the authors of *Terrorism: A Critical Introduction* cite the failure in scholarship embodied in traditional/orthodox Terrorism Studies.

…the orthodox terrorism field has developed a long-term material interest in the maintenance of terrorism as a major public policy concern…[and] in order to protect its privileged position, the field has developed a number of subtle gatekeeping procedures which function to ensure that scholars or critics who do not share dominant views and beliefs are marginalized and denied access to policymakers and the main forums for discussion.638

Such a demarcation has been developed to separate research on political violence associated with securitization and counterterrorism, and that which seeks other aims. To borrow again from the book’s authors, in attempting to separate oneself from this trend, they define traditionalist scholarship as that which embodies “the failure to recognize that ‘terrorism’ is a label given to acts of political violence by outside observers, and that the designation of what constitutes terrorism has historically changed according to political context.”639

Scholarship examining social movements, including those movements that challenge through force, is essential, yet must be carried out apart from the discourse on securitization found prevalent in Criminology, (orthodox) Terrorism Studies and Security Studies. This securitization focus limits the types of scholarship that is produced. In the Preface to their multi-volume exploration of Germany’s RAF, the authors write:

We felt our work was unique, as English-language studies of the RAF were almost uniformly written from a counterinsurgency perspective, the goal being to

639 Ibid., 15.
discredit the guerilla and to deny it any recognition as a legitimate political force; in short, to deprive us of its history.\textsuperscript{640}

It is precisely this notion that has motivated the subsequent examination in insurrectionary texts. While very little scholarship addresses this trend at all, that which does has focused on securitization\textsuperscript{641} and sensationalism\textsuperscript{642}, presenting a broad and diverse social movement as a secretive conspiracy of inter-linked and orchestrated actors.

In order to interrogate this understanding of this portrayal, one must first establish what is meant by a \textit{movement}, and more specifically, a (radical) social movement. Political violence theorist Daniel Koehler offers a definition of “Radical Social Movement[s]”, building off of the concept of a “social movement” as defined by Sociologist Mario Diani.\textsuperscript{643} Koehler’s thus defines radical social movements as:

\begin{quote}
networks of informal interactions between a plurality of individuals, groups and/or organizations having the character of a counterculture with the primary goal to influence (positively or negatively), fundamentally alter, or destroy a specified target society on the basis of a religious or political ideology, using all available means, legal and illegal, including the strategic use of violence, to fulfill and realize the ideologically corrected or purified version of the target society.\textsuperscript{644}
\end{quote}

This description bodes well for the current study as in reality, the insurrectionary model of attack is a tactical and strategic sub-trend within a much larger social movement against the state and capital. Though some scholarship has sought to describe non-state actor networks as akin to “countercultures” where individuals “associate with each other

\textsuperscript{640} Moncourt and Smith, \textit{The Red Army Faction}, 2:XVI.

\textsuperscript{641} For example: Marone, “A Profile of the Informal Anarchist Federation in Italy.”

\textsuperscript{642} For example: Hanrahan, “Meet the Nihilist-Anarchist Network Bringing Chaos to a Town Near You”; Winfield and Gatopoulos, “European Anarchists Grow More Violent, Coordinated.”


through shared definitions of what is wrong with the status quo and where to look for a better alternative,” as insurrectionary action is the sum total of a variety of transnational counterculture networks, it is best understood as a movement which draws its constituency from a variety of cultures, both mainstream and counter. It is bound by shared politics as well as overlapping, associated social circles. This social aspect separates it from the authoritarian, militarized conflicts mobilized at the community level (e.g. ethno nationalist/diaspora communities, separatist movements) and enforced through regimented fighting forces, broad-based social service provision, and participation in the political sphere. In this manner, it is more RAF than FARC, more WUO than PIRA, despite frequent portrayal to the contrary. In other words, while these latter examples (i.e. FARC and PIRA) maintain networks of fighters that may drain supporters from larger social networks, the organizations are firmly integrated into the society through more dominant institutions such as formalized paramilitary brigades, direct service provision (e.g. education, healthcare) and interaction with state-level politics.

While scholarship (both academic and state) has been keen to analyze the Internet activities of violent non-state actors such as those affiliated with the global jihad, little

---

attention has been directed at similar online outreach and organizational efforts by those challenging the state at a more fundamental (and secular) level. This has created a noticeable gap in the literature. Though the precise cause for this exemption is unclear, it is likely influenced by the various venues of conflict. In the majority of cases, insurrectionary political violence occurs outside of the ‘traditional’ physicality of the exoticized and Orientalist\textsuperscript{647} “East” (e.g. Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, Syria, Palestine, Iran, Somalia...) but rather in largely “Western” nation-states (e.g. US, UK, Spain, Italy, Sweden, Greece, Argentina...). In other words, while traditionally, terrorism is something done to the West by a sub-state, subaltern\textsuperscript{648}, Oriental actor, insurrectionary violence is often located and produced by the so-called First World. In the present study, this seemingly unnatural turn away from the Arabian battlefields has likely contributed to the scant examination of insurrectionary violence in traditionalist Security and Terrorist Studies discourses. This may be due to unfamiliarity and discomfort with discussing violent outbursts outside of standard explanatory frames—lack of political opportunity, authoritarian political regimes, abject poverty, and religious fanaticism. This sort of (often avoided) approach functions to focus the readers’ attention toward structural criticisms such as rejections of the nation-state, capitalism, eco-cide, speciesism,


patriarchy, militarism and the like. There does of course exist exemplary scholarship examining the insurrectionary tendency, and although scant, these works must be recognized. Many are the product of insurrectionary proponents, anti-authoritarian theorists, politically-aligned public events, and traditional (critical) academics.

In order to build an analytical model to further explore these networks of non-state actors, I have adopted the frameworks developed within the so-called critical turn in social science analysis: a collective of evolving inter-disciplinary fields influenced arenas such as poststructuralism, Justice and Peace Studies, Feminist Theory and elsewhere. While the preceding discussion was meant to describe how one can descriptively establish what a movement consists of, and subsequently where and why that movement’s ideological boundaries exist, these intermediate goals are subservient to a larger methodological task of exploring new manners of critical inquiry adopted from feminist theory, Critical Security Studies, Critical Terrorism Studies and the mixing of

---


these disciplines through hybrid mechanisms such as feminist security studies\textsuperscript{656} and human security\textsuperscript{657}.

This study is seeking to incorporate aspects of two broadly inter-related fields, namely that of Critical Security Studies (CSS) and Critical Terrorism Studies (CTS). The often linked fields of Terrorism Studies and Security Studies have witnessed a boom following the more generalized rise in University study directed at Islam, political Islam, Islamic terrorism and Middle Eastern politics\textsuperscript{658} following the 9/11 attacks. Subsequently, new approaches have been devolved and taxonomized under a host of “critical” fields including \textit{Critical Terrorism Studies}\textsuperscript{659} and \textit{Critical Security Studies}\textsuperscript{660} which attempt to

\begin{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{655} Jackson et al., \textit{Terrorism}; Silke, “Contemporary Terrorism Studies Issues in Research”; Stump and Dixit, \textit{Critical Terrorism Studies}.


\textsuperscript{659} Bob Brecher, Mark Devenney, and Aaron Winter, eds., \textit{Discourses and Practices of Terrorism: Interrogating Terror} (New York: Routledge, 2010); Richard Jackson, Eamon Murphy, and Scott Poynting,
problematize and clarify a methodology of sorts for those seeking to investigate political violence and its responses through a non-orthodox, non-realist lens. Recurrent throughout both of these emergent fields is what is often referred to as the critical turn, characterized by (at least) four key components:

1.) Social and political life is messy: our analysis must reflect our belief that we cannot identify any single unifying principle in social and political life; methodological pluralism is a hallmark of this belief.
2.) Agency—the capacity to act—is everywhere: it can be found in individuals, groups, states, ideational structures, and non-human actants.
3.) Causality is emergent, rather than efficient: analyses set out the conditions of possibility for a set of politics, identities, or policies, rather than a single or complex source.
4.) Research, writing, and public engagement are inherently political: we understand politics in its broadest sense to mean questions concerning justice, power, and authority; critical scholarship means an active engagement with the world.

A great deal of this study’s approach speaks to the first critical component, that of methodological pluralism, as well as issues of agency. However important such components are, I have chosen to adopt a critical framework precisely because of component number four: the inherently political project of research, writing and public engagement.

---


engagement. To this end, CSS begins its pursuit by problematizing the concept of securitization itself, as “no neutral definition is possible”\textsuperscript{662}.

As other approaches do, CSS carries with it a set of proscriptive presumptions including the validity of ethnography and discursive investigations as form of security-themed investigation. CSS diverges from orthodox Security Studies in its validation of the “ethnographic turn”\textsuperscript{663} and the “discursive turn”\textsuperscript{664}, elaborating these tendencies within the field. Concerning ethnographic tendencies within CSS, the framework suggests that respondent ‘cultures’ must be experienced to be understood\textsuperscript{665} and that even in the realm of studies concerning policing, national security, and statecraft, issues such as reflexivity, critical engagement with “expertise,”\textsuperscript{666} and one’s relationship to the security state must be acknowledged and confronted. Questions such as ‘What constitutes security?’, ‘Can security have emancipatory functions?’\textsuperscript{667}, and ‘What is the implied narrative in traditionalist conceptions of security?’\textsuperscript{668} are indeed relevant at the onset of a research project. Such concerns separate a Critical Security Studies from a non-critical

\textsuperscript{665} Salter, “The Ethnographic Turn,” 56–57.
\textsuperscript{666} Within this post-9/11 era of terrorism scholarship, a new class of “terrorism experts” Glenn Greenwald, “The Sham ‘terrorism Expert’ Industry,” August 15, 2012, http://www.salon.com/2012/08/15/the_sham_terrorism_expert_industry/. has emerged with an aim at cornering the academic market, often on service of a wider statecraft of law enforcement. While this methodological concern requires a great deal of discussion, the largess of these complexities exists outside the realm of this methodological inquiry.
\textsuperscript{668} Wiben, \textit{Feminist Security Studies}, chap. 4.
method in radical ways of direct relevance to my work. For example, the relationship between knowledge construction and securitization, policing and intelligence gathering is a tricky collaboration at best.\textsuperscript{669}

Examining CSS’s \textit{discursive turn}, one returns to the Foucauldian emphasis on the socio-political power issues recurrent in language and story telling as in order to accomplish “serious discourse analysis…the researcher must hold a certain degree of linguistic and cultural fluency”\textsuperscript{670}. For example, in describing the political posturing of actors, it is obtrusively relevant to maintain a distinction between those acting with anarchist, communist, communizationist, insurrectionary, autonomist, primitivist and related political self-identifications. The flattening of the radical subject as one of “extremists,” “revolutionaries,” “militants,” or, worse yet, “terrorists” not only does a political disservice to the production of nuanced description, but it also fails to acknowledge the diversity of tactical, strategic and theoretical visioning of these networks.

Occurring directly alongside CSS is the field of CTS. Similar to the acknowledged contributions of CSS, CTS repositions the role of the researcher, respondent, and state in a newly theorized manner. Thus, CTS is adopted as a guiding framework precisely because it confronts and seeks to destabilize a state-centric analysis as well as the “objective features” of world politics\textsuperscript{671}. In yet another useful presumption of CTS, the contestability of the definition of “terrorism” is seen as banal, an intellectual

\textsuperscript{669} These concerns are explored in the next section under the subheading, “Returning to the Principal of ‘Do No Harm’”
\textsuperscript{670} Salter and Mutlu, “The Discursive Turn,” 116.
\textsuperscript{671} Stump and Dixit, \textit{Critical Terrorism Studies}, 3.
task quite controversial in fields such as International Relations, Security/Terrorism Studies and Government. Like CSS, CTS similarly maintains a focus on ethnography and discourse, and bases its analysis appropriately within critical theory and feminist/postcolonial approaches\textsuperscript{672}. Lastly, CTS has an explicit focus on confronting the ‘big T’ truth of Terrorism Studies\textsuperscript{673} as well as pursuing research of radical actors with a focus on ethics, non-linear causality, and to borrow from the feminist tradition, applied research. Such concerns have an obvious place in the designing of research in the manner previously laid out, and as such, the combined methodological proscriptions from feminism, CSS and CTS amount to a potentially emancipatory\textsuperscript{674} framework for critical inquiry beyond the search for absolutist truth.

**Returning to the Principal of ‘Do No Harm’**

In designing a method of inquiry for exploring the object of the communiqué and the subject of insurrectionary theory, careful attention was paid to the sorts of questions which were relevant for the extrapolation of critical theory but not useful for securitization through social network mapping, behavioral analysis and other forms of intelligence and information processing. Certainly a tactical analysis, broken down by target and country and cross-referenced for moniker could be enlightening, but the danger it may pose to those it represents may be far greater.

\textsuperscript{672} Stump and Dixit, *Critical Terrorism Studies*.

\textsuperscript{673} Ibid., 160.

Questions such as security for whom are central in such a critical inquiry. This decentering of the state as an object of analysis subverts traditional discourses and allows for the exploration of alternative political frames. As someone conducting research on clandestine, illegal and anti-state actors, the expropriation of my work for generating actionable intelligence is more than obvious. In this manner, it becomes the burden of the researcher to maintain the feminist methodological focus on generating reciprocal (not juridically detrimental) results for my respondent community. While this does not mean that my work will help to advance illegal activities of anti-statist revolutionaries, it may serve to elaborate the politics of their analysis, or at the very least serve to nuance one’s interpretation of their method of attack.

This manner of scholarship, one wherein someone seeks to elevate a subterranean discourse to the level of critical inquiry, is quick to be labeled as recuperation, where the politics of dissent are utilized to further refine the technologies of statecraft. In the analysis of recuperation offered by Situationist Guy Debord, critical notions (e.g. theories of revolutionary change) are defanged through their inclusion in social discourses, and after being sanitized of revolutionary potential, reintroduced back into mainstream society devoid of their destabilizing power. In this process, radical notions are co-opted and commodified before being allowed to carry forth, and in doing so, aids the process of statecraft through allowing the systems of domination to appear more malleable than they actually are. I have argued that the present study does not serve recuperative purposes precisely because the state is not concerned with incorporating the insurrectionary

critique into its framework in the same way that riotous protest culture is used to sell consumer products. Instead, this study seeks to apply a radical critique to the social order and to unearth these ideas for greater consumption.

While there is certainly law enforcement interest aimed at insurrectionary action, their focus is on stopping acts of illegal activity, not understanding the critique offered through communiqués that accompany these incidents. If one could suspend logic and presume that state authorities did in fact give concern to how insurrectionary theory understands notions of identity, power and structural violence, or the political and cultural histories that preceded it, then the same inquiry would conclude that anti-system violence can be prevented when structures no longer replicate the critiqued ills, namely inequality, alienation, domination, etc. Therefore, interactions with the previously subterranean material should be not seen as a manner of potential recuperation, but a site of potential conflict transformation, where “talking [with communiqués]” can be used as a “less harmful” method to prevent violence. Borrowing from the work of CTS scholar Harmonie Toros, the approach adopted herein seeks to support a form of ‘talking with terrorists (sic)’ through exercising texts from amongst the ephemera of the Internet and critically engaging with the ideas offered by a non-state actor. This form of talking is not to be confused with notions of negotiation or compromise—asking the aggrieved parties to put aside their anger in favor of a social peace—but rather a method to allow the texts to dialogue with the society at the level of discourse, and beyond its own in-
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group/out-group distinctions. While negotiation is focused on meeting the needs of opposing parties, dialogue in this manner is focused on understanding, not winning a negotiated peace. Of course, the insurrectionary attack itself is also a form of talking yet its method of speaking disqualifies it from the arena of state-centric conversation as the state proudly claims to ‘not negotiate with terrorists.’

In maintaining the aim of the research, it becomes dangerous to assume that potential respondent knowledge is of no use to intelligence and law enforcement, and thus there is an increased burden on the researcher for operationalizing issues of anonymity, informed consent and respondent engagement. This is the primary reason while exchanges with clandestine authors was not attempted. All documents examined were obtained on public forums in widely circulated hubs of radical information. Certainly because of my familiarity with the subject, its history, and its forms of communication I could have initiated an exchange between individuals claiming affiliation with such movements. If I had done so, these voices would be far from representative and highly circumstantial. Furthermore there is a history of such academic inquires ending in Federal Grand Juries where state authorities coerce individuals into providing information on respondents thought to be affiliated with clandestine networks or face prison. This can be seen in the cases of Rick Scarce, professor of sociology at Skidmore College, indicted in 1993 for his presumed knowledge of an ALF raid on a vivisection laboratory, as well as Scott DeMuth, a graduate student at the University of Minnesota, indicted in 2009. DeMuth refused to provide investigators the names of

680 Ibid., 53.
activists he interviewed for his graduate work and was sentenced to six months in prison for conspiring to violate the Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act (AETA). One is reminded of the Latin phrase ‘primum non nocere,’ ‘first, do no harm.’ In this spirit, and for the development of an anti-securitization analysis, this study aims to endanger no one except the target of insurrectionary attack, by bringing attention to their critique—the critique they are waging war to offer.

**Analyzing Discourse & Corpus for Ideology and Meaning**

In order to develop an observable, transparent and repeatable process for the exploration of text, a structured analysis is employed focusing on an externalization of the analyst’s thinking allowing such a process to be observed and critiqued in whole or in part⁶⁸¹. This analysis, is both qualitative and quantitative, with the latter focused around a lexical analysis (sometimes called a “linguistic content analysis”⁶⁸²).

Lexical analysis…[is] simply looking at what kinds of words there are in a text…what vocabulary an author uses…Word choice can signify different discourses or set up different ‘lexical fields’. These discourses or fields will signify certain kinds of identities, values and sequences of activity which are not necessarily made explicit⁶⁸³.

The vocabulary utilized by an author—be it of a novel or a claim of criminal responsibility—is indicative of the individual’s discursive universe and the deployment of this discourse can illuminate the tropes, epistemologies, borders and concepts their
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community employs.\textsuperscript{684} Language serves to communicate action (i.e. the content) as well as meaning and the ideology of the writer (i.e. the discourse).\textsuperscript{685} This approach separates purely linguistic analysis from discourse analysis as only the latter focuses on the use of language in the context of the writer/speaker, “the relationship between the speaker and the utterance…[more so than the] relationship of one sentence to another, regardless of their use.”\textsuperscript{686}

The manner of derivative lexical analysis carried forth in this study requires the construction of a text-based dataset (or corpora), which constitutes “expert-generated data”\textsuperscript{687}, which once assembled, can be studied to provide insight to a larger social phenomenon. In other words, while a stringent analytic technique facilitates the extraction of data—including the building of datasets, determining in-group/out-group distinctions, coding, computer-assisted processing, etc.—this material is then subject to a more subjective, less repeatable form of thematic discussion. The incorporation of quantitative, computer-assisted analysis helps to improve accuracy and reliability by limiting investigator bias and subjective intuition.\textsuperscript{688} It also serves to standardize difficult data for qualitative interpretation, allowing diverse formulations of language to be viewed through more regimented groupings. The mixed methods approach is thus a qualitative analysis of communiqué themes, and a quantitative analysis of communiqué language including word choice, concept refinement, and form. While some scholarship relies on

\textsuperscript{684} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{687} Heuer Jr. and Pherson, \textit{Structured Analytic Techniques for Intelligence Analysis}, 23.
either a qualitative or quantitative method, many\textsuperscript{689} have argued “the use of multiple methods during the course of a single analytic project should be the norm, not the exception.”\textsuperscript{690} This dual approach can allow results to be discussed and considered through multiple lenses. For example, in the proceeding discussion, the quantitative analysis of language as it relates to pronoun usage can inform the subsequent chapter’s discussion of identity as read through larger discursive tropes. In this manner, the microanalysis of the lexical can be complemented by the more mezzo analysis of the discourse. Similarly, the discussion of the word “attack” as understood through the quantitative world of Corpus Linguistics (CL), can be used to buttress the discussion of insurrectionary strategy as explored through both history (Chapter Three) and rhetorical discourse (Chapter Five). This methodological pairing was first developed conceptually, and is displayed in the figure below.

\textsuperscript{689} This dual approach argument for the analysis of propaganda and text is also made by: Morris, “Networking Vehement Frames: Neo-Nazi and Violent Jihadi Demagoguery,” 165.

\textsuperscript{690} Heuer Jr. and Pherson, \textit{Structured Analytic Techniques for Intelligence Analysis}, 24.
As the analytical basis for this study, anonymously penned texts distributed through decentralized Internet forums are interpreted. These texts are identified within a taxonomy that serves to determine inclusion and exclusion from the corpora. Initially, a cursory qualitative analysis is conducted of texts thought to be theoretically foundational for the ‘movement’. Throughout this process, the study of discourse must be
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691 These include: Bonanno, Armed Joy [La gioia armata]; Tiqqun, Tiqqun Revue n°2/2001 (La Fabrique, 2001); Introduction to Civil War (Semiotext(e), 2010); This Is Not a Program, trans. Joshua David Jordan (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2011); Theory of Bloom, trans. Robert Hurley (Berkeley, CA: LBC Books, 2012); The Institute for Experimental Freedom, Politics Is Not a Banana: What Are You Doing after the Orgy or the Insurrection or Whatever?, First edition. (The Institute for Experimental Freedom, 2009); The Institute
understood as taking two distinct forms—the micro analysis of lexical choice as understood through CL\textsuperscript{692}, and the discursive and conceptual macro analysis via Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)\textsuperscript{693}, based in the Foucauldian tradition, in order to analyze the power relations behind such word choices. In this secondary form of analysis, that of the discursive, this study focuses on the narratives constructed by non-state actors’ communicative ephemera—the deployment of narrative, seen as “the principal method through which social entities like terrorist groups disseminate information and attempt to influence others.”\textsuperscript{694} In the realm of communications authored by those employing clandestine political violence, this method of narrative construction\textsuperscript{695}—defined as the

\begin{footnotesize}


\end{footnotesize}
“fundamental genre that organizes the ways in which we think and interact”\textsuperscript{696}—serves a variety of purposes including the following:

...incite discontent among audience members, justify the necessity of the terrorist group’s existence to the community in which the group operates, reinforce pre-existing identities that are emendable to the terrorist group’s actions, and create new identities for group members.\textsuperscript{697}

This focus on narrative is especially well suited as insurrectionary communiqués typically speak from the first person (plural) perspective—‘last night we attacked the bank’, ‘we chose to bomb the police station because of...’—and are thus constitute not only a description of the act but also its justification. Therefore, while narrative can be deduced and read in a variety of means, the focus herein is its construction as a “discursive medium for reinforcing moral paradigms, probing the contours and meaning of events, and instantiating identities and positions...allow[ing] members of communities to reflect upon events, thoughts and emotions.”\textsuperscript{698} These analytical methods can be utilized not only to understand the narratives put forth by clandestine actors, but also to predict their communicative futures\textsuperscript{699}. These dual analytical approaches—that of CL and CDA—were selected from amongst the larger field of Discourse Analysis for their complementary features as well a their varied levels of application.


\textsuperscript{697} Braddock, “The Utility of Narratives for Promoting Radicalization,” 1.

\textsuperscript{698} Ochs, “Narrative in Everyday Life,” 80.

Critical Discourse Analysis Explained

To begin with, CDA scholars explain the positional boundaries of the method as one that sees “language as social practice,” and thus focuses on the context in which such language is deployed. The reason CDA has been selected over other schools of Discourse Analysis (e.g. Interactional sociolinguistics, dialogical analysis, narrative inquiry) is quite simply because of its focus on sources of power and the reproduction of authority. This is especially important for the analysis of insurrectionary texts as the rhetoric employed to report clandestine political violence frequently reflects on themes of “power and control” at a far higher rate of frequency then non-political texts. The task at hand is to deduce discursive meaning from a collectivity of texts, and from these scores of texts, discover how the evolving milieu understands the state, social change, mass mobilization, violence and authority. In all cases, these are questions of power and the reproduction of dominance; precisely the project of Foucault and CDA. CDA allows the researcher to select from a larger body of texts, choosing those examples in which one has “observed ideology in operation.”

This is precisely the task at hand: to understand the ideological contributions offered by neo-urban guerrilla networks to the larger field of political theory, social movements and asymmetric, revolutionary warfare. Therefore, CDA in conjunction with
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CL, will serve to establish descriptively what the milieu theorizes and how these theoretical positions are enacted via the text.

Reliance on emergent fields of analysis representative of the ‘critical turn’ have been selected due to their political and power-centric focus. This is precisely why Critical Terrorism Studies is prioritized over more orthodox methods. Similarly, the ‘critical turn’ in Discourse Analysis is key in positioning one manner of reading text over another. While authors are quick (and correct) to note, “the word ‘critical’ is a ubiquitous epithet attached to a variety of nouns,” its usage within the larger field of Discourse Analysis is indicative of a number of marked tendencies including:

That all thought is fundamentally mediated by power relations that are social and historically situated… That facts can never be isolated from the domain of values or removed from some form of ideological inscription… The relationship between concept and object and between signifier and signified is never stable or fixed and is often mediated by the social relations of capitalist production and consumption… That certain groups in any society are privileged over others… [and] that mainstream research practices are generally, although most often unwittingly, implicated in the reproduction of systems of class, race, and gender oppression.

Thus the critical posturing of CDA must be understood as maintaining a fluid yet outwardly political set of presumptions of not only a methodological nature, but also ones that are ethical and values-based. If one seeks to develop analysis around questions such as the subversion of systems of power, the role of ideology in language deployment, the role of state-capitalism productive capacities, and the hierarchical positioning of systems of privilege, a critical framework becomes essential.

---
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Corpus Linguistics Explained

While the CDA frame informs the analysis of language choice, ideology and power, at present the main technical method utilized in my approach is that of CL. CL is a product of Speech Act Theory, which developed in the 1960s largely through the work of John Austin and John Searle.\textsuperscript{706} Fifty years later, with the incorporation of postmodern and gender theory into the study of language, new conceptions allow for counter-hegemonic interpretations through focus on smaller scale texts and qualitative analysis\textsuperscript{707}. In this manner, CL maintains three defining benefits including:

[1.] Allow[ing] critical discourse analysis to work with much larger data volumes...[2.] to significantly broaden their empirical base...[to]...reduce researcher bias...[3.] And offer[ ] quantitative and qualitative perspectives on textual data...[to] assess individual occurrences of search words, qualitatively examine their collocational environments. Describe salient semantic patterns and identify discourse functions.\textsuperscript{708}

CL’s placement within a taxonomy of methods is difficult as it is seen divergently as a discipline, methodology, approach, “methodological bias”, set of procedures, etc.\textsuperscript{709} CL takes as its object of analysis “real-life language use”\textsuperscript{710} and examines it via both computer-based quantitative analysis and qualitative interpretation borrowed largely from content analysis.

The methodological aims of CL are to look beyond \textit{how} language works through relationships such as grammar and syntax, and instead examine \textit{why} a specific social

\begin{itemize}
\item Adolphs, \textit{Corpus and Context}, 25.
\item Baker, “‘Eligible’ Bachelors and ‘Frustrated’ Spinsters: Corpus Linguistics, Gender and Language,” 73.
\item Ibid., 264.
\end{itemize}
group deploys words in a temporal and context-specific manner. In this sense, CL’s focus is not the English language itself (or any other language for that manner) but the usage of that language by a social actor—“to unearth socially meaningful interpretations that can then be listed to do socially transformative work” 711—the focus being on the actor’s decisions not the language’s function.

Whereas quantitative-oriented forms of text analysis, for example, classic content analysis, can produce indices of manifest content, text analyses following the interpretive [corpus linguistics] tradition study both manifest and latent content, as the sociocultural framework in which the text has been produced is an integral part of the analysis, for example, as in grounded theory or discourse analysis. 712

This socio-anthropological focus begins to separate CL from other methods of content analysis and linguistic inquiry. In this generalized sense, content analysis at large can be defined as “a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts…to the content of their use” 713. If this broad-based definition is adopted, CL certainly fits beneath it as a method of content analysis marked for its distinctively interpretive and socio-anthropological focus.

CL relies on the usage of computer processing power to sort through large bodies of text, though the process can be used ‘manually’ with smaller corpuses. In their exploration of large sets of text data, Tausczik and Pennebaker use computational linguistic software to “apply a new array of computer-based text analysis to the study of

everyday language.” The authors argue for the use of computational, computer-assisted methods stating: “By drawing on massive amounts of text, researchers can begin to link everyday language use with behavioral and self-reported measures of personality, social behavior, and cognitive styles.” In the current study, this precise approach is adopted to make observations about a slightly different, yet highly related, area of inquiry, namely the contrition of a transnational, ideological discourse of resistance. The software used to conduct these analyses (known as corpus linguistics suites, concordancers and/or lexical analyzers) does not perform interpretation itself but rather “performs operations on text that make it easier for humans to analyze it.” These operations can help to produce both quantitative and qualitative results. The three-stage process of CL (concordance, collocation, annotation) is descriptive, analytical and interpretive. While concordance is used to diagram and describe, collocation aims to analyze and annotation to interpret.

The focus on the text, vis-à-vis the social structures that exist to create form and function, must produce a context-specific and relational explanation for language choice. In other words, CL asks how the collectivity uses the language, not how the language uses the words. CL thus looks at the ways in which speech acts and utterances, are used in context, and positioned within a specific time and place. Language theorist Paul Baker explains CL as the study of language based on real life usage, through bodies of coded
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text and interpreted through both quantitative and qualitative measures. CL relies on large samples of text to generate “representative samples of a particular type of naturally occurring language, so can therefore be used as a standard reference against which claims about language can be measured.” Since this study seeks to extract meaning and ideology from amongst a variety of texts, written by an even larger variety of anonymous authors, the generation of ‘representative samples’ is thus essential. In other words, since one cannot attribute target texts to individual writers, and can thus not know when single writers pen multiple texts, a movement-wide analysis requires generalizable data so that the individual authorship details are rendered nonessential.

Returning to CDA as a framing method, what one adapts from the work of Michel Foucault is precisely the sentiment that “discourses are not only mere expressions of social practice, but also serve particular ends, namely the exercise of power.” The Foucauldian addition to critical disciplines such as Marxism can be seen in the analytical shift from the functions of economic structures to the more base genealogies of ‘power knowledge’ and non-economic forms of power. Thus for Foucault, power is used not only to discipline and regulate, but also to determine truth and contradiction. CDA utilizing Foucault is thus a keenly positioned method to “reveal the contradictions within and between discourses…the means by which discourses make particular statements

---

717 “‘Eligible’ Bachelors and ‘Frustrated’ Spinsters: Corpus Linguistics, Gender and Language,” 74.
718 Ibid.
seem rational and beyond all doubt, even though they are only valid in a certain time and place” 721.

In the topic-specific research program under discussion, the task at hand is to examine post-millennial, anti-statist texts produced by clandestine networks utilizing political violence, and to understand these texts in light of the actions and ideologies they produce, report and transmit. In this sense, identifying the nature of the relationship between discourse, ideology, and action is essential. Within the Foucauldian CDA framework, this relationship amounts roughly to: “since consciousness determines action, discourses determine action…thus guide[ing] the individual and collective creation of reality…Consciousness does not passively reflect reality, but actively takes hold of it.” 722.

If discourse does determine action as a mirroring of consciousness, then texts reflective of that consciousness can be analyzed to examine their causal links to action. In other words if the insurrectionary communiqués surveyed can be seen for the ideological standpoints they transmit, these discursive trends will be a telling input for the generation of action (i.e. attacks against the state and capital), and the creation of a collective and milieu-specific social mobilization identity723. Moreover, the discursive practices (which

722 Ibid., 37, 39.
723 This is a decidedly post-left (e.g. advocating social insurrection and opposing movement organizing commonly linked to ‘the Left’), framework which is most closely linked conceptually to what has become known as “post-anarchist” (i.e. poststructuralist, postmodern, defined initially by May The Political Philosophy of Poststructuralist Anarchism. and Bey T.A.Z. the Temporary Autonomous Zone, Ontological Anarchy, Poetic Terrorism, sec. Post–Anarchism Anarchy. and heavily influenced by the work of Bourdieu, Butler, Foucault, Deleuze, Derrida, Guattari, Lacan, Lyotard, and Nietzsche and anarchist thinkers such as Emma Goldman, Gustav Landauer and Max Stirner and others. “Post-anarchism” is also linked to the
are reflective of the consciousness) form the objects they emanate from, or to quote Foucault, the discourse can be seen to “systematically form the object of which they speak” as we understand that “human actions are meaningful because they are based on thought and consciousness”. In this manner, texts describing insurrectionary attack (e.g. communiqués, zines, action ‘report backs’, etc.) transmit knowledge and duly form future insurrectionary attacks through an adaptive movement’s self-consumption of its own texts.

As the object of analysis is not a single person but a multinational, networked movement, “the subject [of the CDA] is of interest not as an actor, but as a product of discourse”. This discourse can be seen when the sum total of the texts are understood as a collectivity, a corpus with definable in-group, out-group distinctions. Thus as a group of texts, discourse can be seen in repetition and pattern.

A single text has minimal effects, which are hardly noticeable and almost impossible to prove. In contrast, a discourse, with its recurring contents, symbols and strategies, leads to the emergence and solidification of ‘knowledge’ and therefore has sustained effects. What is important is not the single text, the single film, the single photograph and so on but the constant repetition of statements.

---


724 Michel Foucault, The Archaeology of Knowledge & The Discourse on Language, Reprint (Vintage, 1982), 54.


726 Ibid., 37.

727 Ibid., 38.
The ‘sustained effects’ of such ‘solidified knowledge’ are the production of more acts of political violence; more windows broken, more banks burned, more McDonalds’ painted in the name of an amorphous war for total liberation through direct attack.

**Applying Corpus Linguistics to the FAI**

To provide an initial, pre-corpora, example exhibiting CL at work, in what I will argue is a *foundational* text, the Italian branch of the Informal Anarchist Federation (FAI) released a seven page communiqué in September 2011 entitled, “Do Not Say That We Are Few.”\(^728\) This document was republished and distributed by a host of networked Internet sites including [325\(^729\)](http://325.nostate.net/), [War On Society\(^730\)](http://waronsociety.noblogs.org/), [Act for Freedom Now!\(^731\)](http://actforfree.nostate.net/), [The Guerilla News Network\(^732\)](http://guerrillanews.wordpress.com/), [Indymedia\(^733\)](http://www.indymedia.org/), [Contra Info\(^734\)](http://en.contrainfo.espiv.net/), [The Anarchist Library\(^735\)](http://theanarchistlibrary.org/) and [Anarchist News\(^736\)](http://anarchistnews.org/). In viewing this text through a CDA lens and via CL (preformed manually not by computer), one can generate a number of collocations that determine descriptively the ways in which words are biased. These works have specific, intentional (non-accidental), associations. For example, the FAI generates a number of telling collocations between “we” and “our.” The sheer number of occurrences of such phrasings (called concordances within CL) speaks to a strong in-group/out-group rendering (i.e. container metaphor) for not only the FAI network, but also of the larger insurrectionary

\(^728\) “Do Not Say That We Are Few - Statement from the Italian FAI.”
\(^729\) [http://325.nostate.net/](http://325.nostate.net/)
\(^730\) [http://waronsociety.noblogs.org/](http://waronsociety.noblogs.org/)
\(^731\) [http://actforfree.nostate.net/](http://actforfree.nostate.net/)
\(^732\) [http://guerrillanews.wordpress.com/](http://guerrillanews.wordpress.com/)
\(^733\) [http://www.indymedia.org/](http://www.indymedia.org/)
\(^734\) [http://en.contrainfo.espiv.net/](http://en.contrainfo.espiv.net/)
\(^735\) [http://theanarchistlibrary.org/](http://theanarchistlibrary.org/)
\(^736\) [http://anarchistnews.org/](http://anarchistnews.org/)
anarchist movement. The use of personal (“we”) and possessive (“our”) pronouns speaks to a collectivist politic held by the FAI; a globalized, networked identity that is vaguely bordered. The communiqué authors speak of “our view”, which utilizes a weak or low linguistic modality. In other words, by explaining a political analysis as “our views” one marks the thoughts an uncommon, non-authoritative.

Strong modal phrasings such as “the reality is” when compared to weak phrasing such as “in our view” indicate the FAI’s willingness to be challenged and debated, avoiding absolutist terms. Finally, one can venture farther from the base and note that while the concept of “state” is persistent and central to insurrectionary analysis, in the FAI’s key text, the concept is only employed to mention specific nation-states (Italy and Greece). From the predominance of “we” and “our” and the disappearance of “state” one could posit that the author(s) is discursively writing from a visionary politic that prefigures a stateless world; a central tenet of anarchist and insurrectionary thought. Maybe “we” is a counter marker to indicate the alternative to the rule of the nation-state? Maybe by not naming the state, by only briefly referencing it, one is attempting to negate the state and by focusing on the self (e.g. “we” and “our”), one imagines a post-state world of autonomy, informal association and boundless freedom. Without further comparative analyses, these are of course guesses at best, but they are elaborated to show the analytical possibility of a CL approach in this manner. Through an analysis of these word choices and collocations, one can generate annotations that function to explain the metaphor, affect, emotion and meaning of the patterned language.
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For the FAI, the use of pronouns is a function of their self-identity as the regulator of the federated network, the determiner and judge of inclusion and exclusion. It is at this juncture that one can see the convergence of CL and CDA. While CL allows for the production of the aforementioned annotated meanings from the FAI text, CDA allows us to further theorize about the relationships of power that inform these language choices.

To return to Foucault, through their texts, the FAI and other actors generate the “power of discourse” providing the “range of ‘positive’ statements which are sayable…[and simultaneously] a range of other statements which are not sayable.” 737 Through this logic, and through the production of paired sets of annotated collocations, one can observe the linguistic and ideological boundaries of the milieu’s texts. In other words, the lexical analysis allows for the construction of a sort of rule list which states what texts can be included in the neo-insurrectionary urban guerilla canon, and which by the nature of their content, must be excluded. Moreover, the CL approach allows for a reliable discussion of metaphor and word choice that is less subjective, as it can demonstrate associated meaning through pattern marking. For example, if the FAI uses “we” and “our” far more than “I” or “they”, this quantifiable pattern can be subjectively interpreted, yet remains observably ‘true.’ The FAI example is meant to demonstrate that despite its specific methodological positions, CDA is more valuable as a framework and not a proscriptive toolbox. One can imagine CDA as a non-method, but instead a
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perspective, position or attitude, placing it alongside previous discussions of the ‘critical turn’ in the analysis of security, terrorism and political violence.

Approaching Discourse Analysis

If terrorism is said to be a communication process (or an attempt at one) using media, or public spectacle for visual consumption as many have debated, then the explicit written
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texts produced by those actors should be instructive in understanding the social critique behind one’s actions. This premise underlies the present analysis. Those carrying out acts of political violence, and subsequently contextualizing and reporting those actions via Internet communiqués, desire for their words to be read and considered. In actuality, the desire to communicate may be the primary motivation for one’s decision to break a window, blow up a car or slash a tire. Not only does the action carry with it communicative properties, but by carryout that act, one warrants the issuing of a communiqué which creates further space for elaboration. These texts, authored by the clandestine window breakers and fire starters, can be analyzed critically both in terms of conceptual deployment and language choice, in order to further understand the actors’ politics and their critiques of the dominant socio-political order.

As some have pointed out, not all analysis of written discourse can or should be understood as critical. While Critical Discourse Analysis is typically reserved for examining how power and social relations are inscribed through ideological reproduction found in language—for example the analysis of gender stereotyping in alcohol advertisements—it can also be employed to examine how language is used to disrupt these same power relations by offering insurgent ideologies through spectacular violence.

In her focus on media discourse, Colleen Cotter develops three categorical approaches to the study of such content: 1.) Discourse analytic, 2.) sociolinguistic, and 3.)


740 Cameron and Panovic, Working with Written Discourse, 62–63.
nonlinguistic. For Cotter, *critical* implies an examination of social impact, inequality, political economy, etc., whereas sociolinguistic involves the examination of “variation and style in the media or a similar close analysis of language.” Discourse analysis is thus a term reserved for “discourse-level matters related to larger stretches of talk and text.” The third approach, the “nonlinguistic” is more broadly defined as a social science application of basic linguistic content analysis—focused on what is said and written not necessarily its interpretation—for the discussion of media. The linguistic analysis attempts to make sense of a variety of language levels, discussed collectively, though compartmentalized in their usage. These levels include *pragmatics* (the interaction between author and audience), *semantics* (“meaning, structure of lexicon”) and *syntax* (internal organization of text).

From this taxonomy, the examination of insurrectionary communiqués can best be described as a sociolinguistic CDA with nonlinguistic applications as it is based in a close reading of text and the conceptual application of this corpus to movement-wide (i.e. discourse-level) questions of power, inequality, violence and resistance. This is informed by a generalizable content analysis applied through a Communications and Sociological lens, thus fitting Cotter’s “nonlinguistic” approach. The task at hand is thus to “consider what aspects of language are most significant for the purpose of ‘being critical’—that is, identifying the ideological presuppositions of a text and understanding how it constructs a
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particular version of reality”\textsuperscript{745}; in this case, a version of reality in revolt against the social order. This concept of ideology understands the term as a “belief system…shared by members of a social group…comparable to socio-cultural knowledge as it is shared by (epistemic) communities…[and] linguistic communities.”\textsuperscript{746} These are beliefs which are “socially relevant” for the insurrectionary milieu and collectively constitute an ideology that promotes and defends those communities’ interests.\textsuperscript{747}

This is the approach adopted in the study of the insurrectionary corpus. It is discourse because it attempts to interrogate macro concepts and values held collectively across national borders, self-identities and other atomized units. It is sociolinguistic because it is based in a close reading of a finite text in terms of style and word choice. It is nonlinguistic because while it is a close read, this is based around a more broadly imagined content analysis understood in terms of sociological, anthropological and communications theory. Finally, it is critical as the language-derived discourse is interrogated for its deployment to disrupt control, expose inequality, agitate for change and demand revolution.

**Refining a Corpus for Analysis**

In order to facilitate the analysis of discourse, a corpus was constructed from publicly-available documents hosted on the four most prominent websites\textsuperscript{748} constituting the

\textsuperscript{745} Cameron and Panovic, *Working with Written Discourse*, 67.
\textsuperscript{747} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{748} These were determined to be “325” [http://325.nostate.net/], “War on Society” [http://waronsociety.noblogs.org/], “Act for Freedom Now!” [http://actforfree.nostate.net/], and “Contra Info” [http://en.contrainfo.espiv.net/]
“informal international translation and counter-information network”\textsuperscript{749}, often defied here in the shorthand of the ‘insurrectionary community.’ This method is chosen in an attempt to create a “full text corpus”\textsuperscript{750} focused on the insurrectionary community. This network of websites was selected for their recurring prominence and their intentional function as nodes of distribution. Other sites were surveyed but their archives were not included in the corpus as the content was deemed to be included elsewhere and thus constituted a form of intentional replication and redundancy provided by the networks. The youngest of these sites surveyed, Inter Arma, began in the final days of 2013, and clearly stated its approach to insurrectionary communication in its initial posting. In their self-descriptive account, the site’s authors state:

Inter Arma is an international counter-information project of New Anarchy. It is international, because we consider that the anarchist war is being fought all over the world, surpassing the boundaries of authority...It is a counter-information project, because we deem necessary the communication between comrades from different countries and directions. Because the diffusion of attack is equally important as the attack itself.

Inter Arma, through its function, promotes the informal organization of anarchist structures. It cooperates with fellow media networks in Greece and abroad, strengthening the dynamics of the international network and increasing its range. It does not intend to be a centralized type of medium, but a junction of counter-information and diffusion that can be assisted by comrades that wish to do so.

Inter Arma clearly promotes the continuous anarchist insurrection. It has nothing to do with propositions for a partial or total management of the existent nor with the groups, bodies or persons expressing them, whether from the left or the anti-authoritarian and the so-called anarchist movement...\textsuperscript{751}


\textsuperscript{750} Baker, Hardie, and McEnery, A Glossary of Corpus Linguistics, 76.

While Inter Arma is the youngest such insurrectionary hub, and at the time of writing solely creates redundant archives of texts found on other sites, its infancy allows for a more complete reading of their intent. They aim to adopt dual-use technologies (e.g. blogs, encryption, Twitter) to distribute propaganda to a global audience while eliciting little feedback in return.

This decentralized method of dissemination operates from behind the obfuscation of the Webmaster and managed through relatively little effort. In her discussion of the use of similar technologies by online jihadists, one author writes:

> In the new lateral social media environment control over content is decentralized. Anyone can participate. Distribution is decentralized via ‘hubs’ and volunteers use mainstream interactive and inter-connected social media platforms, blogs, and file sharing platforms. Cross-posting and re-tweeting content on social media by volunteers is a low-cost means of dissemination to wide audiences…The widespread use of lateral integration across multiple file sharing platforms builds redundancy through the manifold postings of the same document and resilience against disruption and suppression by government and Internet service providers.752

Sites such as Inter Arma do not seek to build online community apparatuses such as message boards, forums, etc. but instead work as one-way message boards. In an explicit treatment of this intention, the site, which functions in Greek and English, states its intention to “establish a minimum level of interaction among comrades…to give emphasis to dialectics, analysis and theoretical elaboration within the insurrectionary and new anarchy.”753 For Inter Arma, only one month prior, media and police connected the

---

752 Klausen, “Tweeting the Jihad: Social Media Networks of Western Foreign Fighters in Syria and Iraq [Accepted Manuscript],” 5.
site to guerilla attacks, which may have prompted its functional redirection. In attempting to explain why such accusations may have been levied, the site’s authors write: “The enemy has long ago realized the role that counter-information and translation projects play in the diffusion of Black International and in the communication between guerrilla formations all around the world.”

It is difficult if not impossible to know for certain the determinations made by website administrators as to what content (e.g. communiqués, claims of responsibility) is posted and what is rejected. 325, another prominent hub of communiqué distribution, in a postscript listed in their contact page, approximates such a set of guidelines writing:

325 is an anarchist / anti-capitalist information clearing house and DIY media network for social war. This new-media project is part of an international informal network…[that] publish[es] direct action reports from active revolutionary groups. In this way, 325 aims to help revolutionary individuals and social movements bypass the corporate media’s manipulative stranglehold on information.

Our solidarity is not based on whether the contributions which we receive via our web-based contact form fit a strict ideological checklist. Each contribution sent to us is unique and we give consideration to every report we receive. We do not impose ideological limits on our solidarity, although we DO NOT support people that provide information to law enforcement or snitch on allies or co-defendants.

We have no connection to the direct action groups which send us anonymous reports, other than in our general support for actions taken by individuals or groups in the fight against capitalism, against the state, and for earth, animal and human liberation…Similarly, any direct action listed on this website does not imply our participation or personal involvement in it, unless we specifically stated this ourselves. 325 reaffirms a commitment to the polymorphous revolutionary struggle and to all forms of resistance against exploitation, be they sit-ins,

---

leafleting, occupations, graffiti, general assemblies, strikes, sabotage and attacks against property or the oppressors themselves.\(^{755}\)

This statement shows the purely functional and ideological nature of 325’s inclusion/exclusion decision making process. The site seeks to publicize the actions and texts of ideologically-agreeable actors and makes no claim to avoid censoring content outside of that field. Therefore, while this study has sought to collect a wide and representative corpus of texts representative of the clandestine, illegalist, insurrectionary milieu, this collection will inherently be limited by an opaque decision making process by anonymous individuals managing these online services.

In developing the corpus\(^{756}\) as derived from the four most prominent websites, each website’s archives were read—beginning from their earliest entry up until the last day of June 2014—and those entries meeting a set of criteria (defined below) were assembled into country-specific datasets. These resulting datasets were then combined into a single dataset for global analysis. Paul Chilton and Christina Schäffner have utilized this approach in previous studies such as their analysis of French language texts from sectarian leftists.\(^{757}\) In this study, the author “establishes a corpus…consisting of separate texts and make comparisons on the basis of relative frequencies…[to develop]”


\(^{757}\) Chilton and Schäffner, “Discourse and Politics,” 306.
macro-sociological and historical questions of political discourse.” In the study of insurrectionary communiqués, the final dataset/corpus was built around a decision tree designed to standardize results for in-group/out-group sorting. In order to be included in the corpus, a document must meet five criteria:

1. It must be a claim of responsibility, for an act of political violence (e.g. vandalism, sabotage, arson, etc.), carried out by a clandestine actor/actors. It cannot claim responsibility for an aboveground social movement’s actions such as various forms of nonviolent civil disobedience (e.g. a lock down, tree sit or protest march).

2. It must be posted originally in English or translated into English by the counter-information site.

3. It must contain a political statement, rhetoric, justification or other explanation/elaboration for the action.

4. It must appear within the websites: “325,” “War on Society,” “Act for Freedom Now!,” or “Counter-information network.”

5. It must have been posted between 21 February 2008 and 30 June 2014.

Many other forms of political speech and movement documentation were excluded from the dataset such as those documents that had a primary purpose such as:

1. Announcing/analyzing/reporting a political action/protest (with or without incidental violence), for example, a protest march that turned violent when met with police...
repression.\textsuperscript{761} These incidents are understood as \textit{events} when the corpus is meant to embody \textit{attacks}. Therefore 200 marchers breaking windows in commercial area would be \textit{excluded} yet one individual breaking a single window and claiming it via a communiqué would be \textit{included}.

2. Reporting violence committed by police and other security forces, or similarly, reports of violence directed at the ‘left’ by members of the ‘right’ such as white supremacists, neo-Nazis, etc.

3. Transmitting a political statement, but with no act of violence or claim of responsibility.\textsuperscript{762}

4. Issuing a ‘call to action’ prior to an event such as a protest march, demonstration outside of a prison (often called a ‘noise demo’), or a public convergence such as a conference or rally outside of a courthouse.

5. Announcing/reporting on arrests, trials, demonstrations, hunger strikes, etc.

Based on these criteria, over a nearly six and a half year period (21 February 2008 and 27 June 2014), 962 total communiqués and claims of responsibility were located and included for analysis. These 962 separate communiqués, issued from within 36 distinct geographic boundaries\textsuperscript{763}, on 6 continents excluding Antarctica.

\textsuperscript{761} For example see: http://325.nostate.net/?p=40\#more-40
\textsuperscript{762} For example see: http://325.nostate.net/?p=108\#more-108
\textsuperscript{763} Argentina, Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the Ukraine, the United Kingdom, Uruguay and the United States
CL necessitates the construction of a corpora comprised of ‘naturally-occurring language’, in other words one showing “typical language patterns rather than the innovative or literary.”\textsuperscript{764} Certainly this is a difficult task given the community of authors surveyed. Can the meticulous authorship of any text—communiqués included—be considered “typical” or “natural” language? Certainly the conceptual construction and word choice are highly scripted by the greater discourse, but within that discursive milieu, the language is natural. It would be unnatural to pair the word “cop” with the word “hero”, just as it would be unnatural to pair “capitalism” with “equality,” or “state” with “freedom.” The placement of these (communiqué) texts in a public forum makes them part of the ‘naturally-occurring’ conversation of insurrectionary violence despite the intentionality of their construction.

While texts are likely to contain literary devices (e.g. metaphor, allegory, etc.), they will likely be more “conventional metaphors,” those which “might often go unnoticed in everyday life.”\textsuperscript{765} These texts, compiled as a corpus and taken as a whole, represent consistency amongst one another, yet when compared to a more generalized corpus of, for example, news media accounts of the economy, they are highly atypical and abnormal. Moreover, the sample constructed aims at generalizability in the hopes that it can be useful in discussions of more temporally dispersed insurrectionary texts, and one that offers texts not translated into English and deposited on the Internet. Therefore, in the collection and reading of texts, the aim was to follow the suggestion offered to those locating interview respondents to “keep adding to the sample until you are hearing

\textsuperscript{765} Ibid.
nothing new”\textsuperscript{766}, in the hopes of surveying a wide enough variety of texts that particular nuances were highlighted and not ignored.

In organizing and sorting the communiqués, attention was paid to stable, easy to decipher markers such as moniker, date and country. Though the country where the author(s) resided was used to sort text and establish separate sets, the significance of national borders is quite small. Not only is the nature of the movement and network counter to the idea of sovereignty and nationalism, the fluidity of these networks is ever present as cells and multi-cell networks regularly transcend national borders in their communications, analysis, and acts of violence. Such a deterritorialization of non-state actors follows a similar trend in ‘orthodox’ (counter) terrorism studies and the discussion of security issues within the mainstream media. For example, in a 2014 \textit{Financial Times} article discussing ongoing armed conflicts in the Middle East (and written prior to the establishment of the “Islamic State” spanning Iraq and Syria), the author suggests that wars in Lebanon, Syria and Iraq and merged into a single Shia v. Sunni war wherein borders are porous and inconsequential. In this account of media misrepresentation, the author writes:

While few believe that the map of the region is about to be redrawn, the emerging conflict represents a dangerous breakdown of the nation states created in the Sykes-Picot agreement sealed by French and British colonial overlords 90 years ago.\textsuperscript{767}

Such observations within media coverage of a Middle Eastern war is indicative of the era of deterritorialization and globalization⁷⁶⁸, one wherein the boundaries of the nation-state are transcended, and political, social and sectarian identities rise in prominence. Thus while country of origin was used as a stable sorting method to establish separate corpora, it provides little analytical depth. On the other hand, markers such as date and moniker are quite telling as the former speaks to the dialogical nature of asynchronous communication, and the latter to the dispersion of identities used to self-label and claim community.

Based on these understandings of space and place, and utilizing the decision tree outlined above, a corpus of communiqués was generated. Contained in these communiqués are 428,219⁷⁶⁹ total words, 21,049 sentences, and 2,189,230 total characters (excluding spaces). On average, a single communiqué contained 445 words and 2,276 characters. The average word length for the dataset is five characters, and the average sentence length is 20 words.

The Quantitative, Lexical Analysis of Insurrectionary Text

*Our student quickly came to appreciate, however, that there is no analytic routine through which a text can be run, with a critical description issuing automatically at the end...on this basis we can offer some help to the aspirant in critical linguistics. To our students doing fieldwork in sociolinguistics we said ‘we cannot*  

---


⁷⁶⁹ For some calculations this total word count will vary. For example, when calculating word frequencies, \(n = 429,572\), a difference of 1,353 words which were removed to refine processing. These 1,353 words were URLs, blocks of computer script include in hactivist communiqués and citation/source information.
tell you in advance what constructions are going to be significant in the texts you collect.  

The decision to analyze linguistic choice in the object of the communiqué reflects the intentionality (i.e. non-spontaneity) in written, political communication. While speech acts such as graffiti, live debates and interviews can reveal a great deal about a subject’s ideological approach, they lack the ‘meticulous preparation’ that accompanies a pre-written text such as a communiqué. The “non-spontaneous, planned and edited nature” of written text makes it ideal for analysis. In this manner, word choice can be understood as intentional, non-incidental, and as expressive as the writer can produce. It is precisely because of this manner of speech construction that the object of the communiqué was selected for analysis. Furthermore, the lexical intentionality makes the analysis of text via CL a natural pairing as such methods are predicated on the assumption that word choice is reflective of large discursively-constructed ideologies. As early critical linguistics Roger Fowler and Gunther Kress explain:

It is well known that the linguistic forms of speech and writing express the social circumstances in which language occurs. The relationship of style to situation is very precise and functional, so that an analysis of linguistic structures reveals the contexts of language with considerable accuracy.

In this manner, the preparation and construction of a communiqué is more akin to that of a Presidential speech, then a rebel’s soapbox speech as the former is constructed for

---

maximum rhetorical impact within a confined set of language rules and the latter the product of spontaneity peppered with ideology.

Despite its intentional construction, the deployment of ideology and discourse through language choice is observable through “naturally occurring data”\(^ {774}\). The decisions to use some words and not others, or to more frequently employ certain types of speech and not others can constitute patterned data yet remain unintentional. In his discussion of the role of theory and ideology in crafting news accounts, political theorist and discourse analyst Tony Trew writes:

> To the extent that the concepts in a discourse are related to a system, they are part of a theory or ideology, that is, a system of concepts and images which are a way of seeing and grasping things, and of interpreting what is seen or heard or read. All perception involves theory or ideology and there are no ‘raw’, uninterpreted, theory-free facts.\(^ {775}\)

This is true for CNN as much as it is for the anonymous authors of a communiqué claiming responsibility for gluing the locks of an army recruiting center. In the authorship of a communiqué, though word choice is deliberate, its patterned usage across authors, groups, national borders, etc. is ideologically driven, not intentionally coordinated or orchestrated authoritatively. Therefore, when an attacker in Chile and another in the Ukraine both describe a bank as ‘parasitic’, this is obviously determined by their political analysis and not some coordinated decision to speech in a singular voice—such as a press office’s construction of talking points. Fowler and Kress make this point in their research, arguing that “lexical items, linguistics forms and linguistic processes carry specific


meanings.” The critical turn in CDA seeks to determine the role of discourse in shaping these lexical practices including word choice. Thus, linguistic analysis can readily be used to study ideology—specifically as it relates to power and authority—since one understands linguistic meaning as inseparable from ideology.

Foucault spoke of discourse in this formative manner calling it ‘practices which systematically form the objects of which they speak.’ There are strong, dependent, and causal relationships between linguistic structure and the discursive community though which the text is authored. These relationships between language and society are dialectical, occurring not as independent functionaries, but rather as co-constituting, social phenomena. Therefore the meaning making of words, as established through discourse, is not a reflection of political subjectivities, but instead is politics itself. As a result, text can ‘embody’ an interpretation of the subject, crafting static portrayals that span multiple texts emanating from the same author community. The text can thus be viewed to interpret the power in the discourse as well as the power behind the constriction of that discourse. Therefore this study seeks to identify the ‘practices’ that form the object of the communiqué, through the construction, regulation and enforcement of discursive realities.

---

777 Ibid.
778 Foucault, The Archaeology of Knowledge & The Discourse on Language [as quoted in Baker, 2010, p. 121].
780 Ibid., 23.
782 Fairclough, Language and Power, 43.
In order to allow CL to guide the analysis, a primary, exploratory overview of the text was performed involving the examination of word frequency patterns. This purely quantitative search through the assembled corpora serves to guide and inform the subsequent, and increasingly qualitative analysis, as frequently occurring words and concepts are then interrogated for “discourse-level phenomena [and] rhetorical function.” In this manner, the initial calculations guide one towards relevant, observable phenomena, exposing what is deserving of focus; hinting at what we might find. Therefore, while the focus of the subsequent analytical techniques is focused on the unit of the word, this is meant to be reflectively indicative of larger ideologically-driven choices recurrent in the wider dataset and the milieu that produced it.

**Frequency, Clusters, Concordances** and **Collocations**

In determining how best to interpret the assembled corpus, a variety of software tools and operations have been employed. Voluminous texts exist which detail the various functions utilized in computer-assisted linguistics, some of which were surveyed in

---

784 It is important to remember that concordance can be thought of as a form of frequency analysis as it is precisely an examination of frequency occurrences in context, focusing on words located in close proximity to the target word. A more expanded definition can be found in: Baker, Hardie, and McEnery, *A Glossary of Corpus Linguistics*, 42–43.
785 A quick reference for distinguishing these methods (and terms) of analysis is included in the Analytical Techniques of Corpus Linguistics section following the Recurring Abbreviations page prior to Chapter One.
designing this approach. Separate analyses were conducted using three main pieces of software. Occasionally, these software packages generated slightly different statistical findings with the same data inputs. This tendency is noted in discussion of computational procedure, and is due to the manner through which these programs interpret nontraditionally formatted text, how text is ‘machined’ into a readable format, and/or how much automated ‘cleaning’ is done to the files internally by the software before the results are displayed. These irregularities were deemed to be inconsequential, as for example, the +/- 1-2 frequency count of a term, a minute fraction when calculating nearly 1,000 distinct texts comprised of more than 428,000 words. Though the various software suites have diverse functionality, generally, computational linguistics/CL software allows the user to generate word lists, word frequency lists, concordances, collocations, and to calculate various measures of language such as word length, word/character/syllable count and lexical density.

It is important to remember that any observations made of this specific corpus are likely to be reflective of linguistic patterns found in extra-corpus texts, as the rhetoric of


787 The main pieces of software used are AntConc 3.2.4m, Concordance 3.3 and Wordsmith 6.0, all operated on a MacBook Pro (OS X 10.7.5). Concordance and Wordsmith, having been designed to operate on a PC, and were run on the OS X platform with the help of the Wine 1.6.1 emulator package.

788 See for example Krippendorff, *Content Analysis*, 264.
insurrectionary attack is still a function of the language through which it was penned. In other words, in examining word frequencies, clusters, etc. one will likely find results that are reflective of a more general deployment of the English language. Word frequency specifically serves as a great starting point for the analysis of lexical choice, linguistic reality and the role of ideologically-mediated language precisely because the overrepresentation or underrepresentation of key terms can be strong evidence for bias, which is then grounds for qualitative examination. This basic level word frequency can perhaps best be displayed as a word cloud. The figure below is a word cloud, made up of the most frequently occurring words in Corpus A. Note that the frequency of the words occurring in the text dictates how prominently the words are featured in the cloud. Therefore, in this example, the most prominent (and thus frequently occurring) words appear to include “action”, “attack”, “police”, “system”, “solidarity” and “comrades.”
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789 Baker, Sociolinguistics and Corpus Linguistics, 127.
790 The word cloud was produced from Corpus A using the online service Wordle, available at http://www.wordle.net/
791 The various corpora are described for quick reference in “Appendix Table 4.1: Key to identifying corpora”.
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Furthermore, observable differences in these comparisons—between the corpora assembled and that of non-insurrectionary language—can be the site of great interest. For example, before examining the specific word use of the insurrectionary milieu, one can review the analysis of word choice in more generalizable corpora. One study serves to compare three corpora (dissertations on politics, dissertations on science, the Bank of English corpus), and although these materials have vastly different contents, when examining word frequencies, they appear nearly identical. These findings are displayed below in Table 4.1:

---

792 Adel, “How to Use Corpus Linguistics in the Study of Political Discourse,” 596.
Table 4.1: Word frequency comparisons across corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>Bank of English (General corpus)</th>
<th>“Materials science” corpus</th>
<th>“Politics” corpus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>THE</td>
<td>THE</td>
<td>THE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OF</td>
<td>OF</td>
<td>OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>AND</td>
<td>TO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AND</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>THAT</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>THAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>THIS</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>THAT</td>
<td>WAS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accordingly, in the revolutionary corpora under analysis, one should expect similar patterns, though some scholarship has concluded that “terrorist rhetoric is comprised of a simpler structure…than non-terrorist rhetoric.” In sum, as concluded by Hunston

“grammar words are more frequent than lexical words; indeed, the words the, of, to, and, a and in occupy the top six places in each corpus.” This pattern will also persist in the study of communiqués, and thus as an initial findings of the corpus at large, it is structurally similar to other English language texts despite undergoing translation from numerous dialects of Spanish, Greek, Italian, German, Russian and others.

This study presents unique methodological and analytical challenges as a large number of communiqués were not originally written in English. These texts were written in their native languages—Spanish, Greek, Italian, etc.—and were subsequently sent to

---

various online repositories where they were translated into English through a standardizing process. This process relies on a select group of multilingual volunteers—referred to often as the “informal international translation and counter-information network” yet in all likelihood a small handful of individuals—who manipulate the text for English language consumption. As a result, this process is reflective of conventions found within the wider field of English language composition, and reports similar broad findings to that of the above-mentioned corpora of comparative study (e.g. the higher frequency of grammar words versus conceptual terms). Therefore, while sentence construction and other mechanical features are examined, the study focuses more on word choice and conceptual development and can thus be more precisely categorized as *lexical* analysis and not linguistic analysis.

Beyond typical and atypical frequencies, the analysis of collocations is key in this study. To review, collocation is “the phenomenon surrounding the fact that certain words are more likely to occur in combination with other words in certain contexts…a word which occurs within the neighborhood of other words.” These collocations are key sites for examination as ideologically-driven discursive realities lead to certain words being paired and such pairings becoming “entrenched in language use”, making their

---

797 Anarchist-nihilists against the activist establishment, “Fuck Indymedia and the Anarcho-Left.”
798 Future studies could benefit from examining texts in their original form; one that preserves native language as well as stylistic aspects such as font, spacing, color, etc. that may be obscured, standardized or simply ignored in their publication via the web. Therefore, a key question for future research could be: What does it mean when a communiqué changes from a richly-stylized piece of ephemera to a plaintext/HTML assemblage?
separation difficult and their co-occurrence frequent. Therefore, like word frequency (a product of recurrent word choice), collocation must be understood as intentionally authored yet unintentionally patterned, in other words, while the choice to describe realities through certain terms in a communiqué are carefully fashioned choices made by a writer, the creation of such patterns across the corpora is an unintentional product of a collectively-developed, transnational, critical ideology. Word frequency, collocation and other measurable elements of political speech can be understood to be “instrumental” to their larger discourses precisely because they “contribute to the production of another message or act”\(^{801}\), in this case, attacks that follow.

In the following sections we will explore these words choices through an analysis of frequency, clustering, collocation and concordance\(^{802}\) as observed in the assembled corpora of insurrectionary attack.

**“Against”**

One of the first observations concerning the corpus at large is the frequent occurrence of the word “against.” This preposition occurs 1,470 times—equating to more than once per communiqué—and is the 30\(^{th}\) most frequently occurring word following (in ranked order) “the”, “of”, “and”, “to”, “in”, “we”, “a”, “that”, “for”, “is”, “with, “on”, “are”, “our”, “this”, “as”, “not”, “it”, “by”, “their”, “who”, “all”, “they”, “from”, “was” “have”, “at”, “will”, and “be.” As the most frequently occurring, conceptually relevant word, against deserves attention before one explores more complex phrases and ideas.


\(^{802}\) A further explanation of these terms and analytical techniques can be found in the “Quick reference: Analytical Techniques of Corpus Linguistics” included in Chapter One, before the introduction.
When “against” is viewed in terms of concordance clusters—multi-word phrases that include the target word—one can observe the prominent posturing best described as anti-state, anti-systemic, and against the “techno-industrial system.” Some targeting preferences emerge such as those targeting “the state” and “the police” as well as tactical patterns, such as the preference for “incendiary attacks” over, for example, explosive attacks. The word clusters clearly demonstrate a common positioning counter to the state, and in favor of “struggle”, “war”, “attacks” and “action.” This is to be expected as the milieu’s most identifiable characteristics is its anti-state posturing and its promotion of a pro-attack, confrontational strategy. Lastly, one can begin to understand the amorphous nature of insurrectionary conceptual frameworks through the prominence of such vague concepts as “the state,” “the system”, the “system of domination”, “state capital” and “techno industrial.” These concordance clusters are displayed below in Table 4.2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>Frequency (of cluster)</th>
<th>Word cluster phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>AGAINST THE STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>ATTACK AGAINST THE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>THE STRUGGLE AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>STRUGGLE AGAINST THE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>AGAINST THE SYSTEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>WAR AGAINST THE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>[AGAINST] THE STATE AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>INCENDIARY ATTACK AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>AGAINST THOSE WHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>AND AGAINST THE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

803 “incendiary attack against” occurs 25 times, whereas “explosive attack against” occurs only six times and “bomb attack against” eight times.
Because the word “state” has many different senses or meanings (e.g. ‘state of mind’ v. ‘state of Pennsylvania’ v. ‘state a fact’, etc.), when it is used to describe some amalgamation of governing bodies, it tends to associate with expected patterns. Just as ‘state’—when used to denote a sub-national political territory—is often patterned as ‘the state of Pennsylvania/Virginia…’, so to are its other uses patterned. This “preferred sequencing” or “fixed’ phrasing” is what Hunston calls phraseology. Borrowing from John McHardy Sinclair804, a CL pioneer, Hunston notes that such phraseology is “at the heart of language description…[as] the tendency for words to occur in preferred sequences has…important consequences.”805 Phraseology is thus properly captured in a discussion of collocation as this method examines the target word in proximate pairings,

---

analyzing not only how frequently the target word occurs, but also how that word functions within a larger linguistic structure.

Through a concordance analysis\(^{806}\) that incorporates collocations, one is able to determine not only how words are commonly grouped together, but in what structural position these commonalities occur. For example, if “attack” often appears alongside “cops” does it typically proceed it, precede it, follow after an article, etc. This form of mapping utilizes the target word (in this case “against”) as the center of a model, and then examines the words to the right (R1) to the left (L1), the word two positions to the right (R2) and so on. In examining the collocation of “against” one can observe the prominent of the phrase “against the” as “the” occupies an extremely high collocation in the R1\(^{807}\) position. Following this pattern, there is a stiff drop-off. While “against the” occurs 608 times, the next most frequently occurring word position is “of” in the R3 spot, such as the phrase “against all/some/appearance/functions... of.” This phrasing occurs approximately one third as often as “against the”, appearing 174 times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.3: “AGAINST” Collocation [Corpus A]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Word</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{806}\) For a very clear and complete guide to concordance analysis in corpus linguistics, see: Ibid., chap. 3, (pp. 38–66).

\(^{807}\) In plotting sentence structures the following coding is used. The target word = “center”. The word appearing to the left of the target word is L1. The word appearing to the right of the target word is R1. The word appearing two positions to the left of the target word is L2 and so on. The following sentence is annotated to display this, while “jumped” is the target word:

The (L3) brown (L2) dog (L1) **jumped** (center) through (R1) the (R2) green (R3) hoop (R4).

The word and position markers are indicated with underlines/non-underlines to show the paried sets.
This manner of analysis can be used to interpret other, less commonly occurring terms explored below in individual subsections.

“State”

A key task is ideological concept mapping is the location and disentanglement of key hubs of content. In pursuing this task, the concept of “state” is central, just as it has been throughout the past eras of anarchist and anti-authoritarian thought. In order to determine how the concept is deployed, one can examine concordance clusters wherein the term “state” is viewed within its context of appearance, and these appearances are grouped.

The results of this concordance cluster analysis is displayed below in Table 4.4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>Frequency (of cluster)</th>
<th>Word cluster phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>THE STATE AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>OF THE STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>AND THE STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>BY THE STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>AGAINST THE STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>STATE AND CAPITAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>STATE AND THE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: “STATE” Concordance Clusters [Corpus A]
This is a variation on traditional concordance analysis in that once these pairs have been identified, they are grouped by the words that surround them. In examining the most prominent concordance clusters, after the expected appearance of frequently occurring articles ("the"), conjunctions ("and"), and prepositions ("of", "by"), one finds:

- "against the state" (58 occurrences)
- "state and capital" (58 occurrences)
- "the Chilean state" (23 occurrences)
- "state and capitalism" (20 occurrences)
- "the Greek state" (19 occurrences)

Also appearing frequently were the phrases "state repression", "police state" "Spanish state", "state apparatus", "state violence", "anti-state" and "para-state." Furthermore, when collocates of "state" are examined, one finds the high frequency of "capital" and
“against” following the appearance of the expected “the”, “of”, “and”, “in”, “to” and “by”.

Through the collocation analysis, “capital” appears most frequently as a term proceeding “state” to the right (45 occurrences in the R1 position) such as the phrase, “We seek to smash state capital.” This collocation pattern is displayed below in Table 4.5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total left</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Center</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Total right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CAPITAL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As demonstrated by the above chart, “capital” follows “state” more than three times as often as it precedes it. Also commonly occurring (39 times) is “capital” in the R2 position such as in the phrase, “We seek to smash the state and capital.” The second most commonly collocated word of note, “against”, is most commonly seen preceding “state” with one word in between (55 occurrences in the L2 position) such as in the phrase, “We are against the state.” This collocation pattern is displayed below in Table 4.6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total left</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Center</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Total right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similar to the heavy predictive patterning of “capital” coming after “state”, “against” appears before “state” overwhelmingly. As to be expected, the most common “state” collocate is for the word “the” which most common appears in the L1 position (527 occurrences) such as in the phrase “the state.”

From this data crawl, one can observe a number of key findings. First, the most common portrayal of the state is as the recipient of critique (“against the state”). In this manner, the state is deployed as a concept to describe an attack (e.g. “Last night we carried out an attack against the state.”) Furthermore, from the collocations, we can see that the concept of state is often closely paired to that of capital. Therefore, if one were to seek a singular descriptor of the manner by which “state” appears discursively, one could claim that it is understood oppositionally and existing in inextricable linkage to capital.

“Violence” & “Power”

In examining the word clusters for the term “violence” we observe that there are far less commonly occurring and dominant clusters. While the term appears frequently in the corpora, its clustered pairs are less consistent. Though these pairs are less pervasive than other grouping, those that do appear are consistent with the abovementioned patterns. This indicates, at least on a cursory level, that the concept is less uniformly deployed by writers speaking to the diverse manner through which the nature of power is described. Excluding patterns based around prepositions, articles, etc., the most commonly occurring cluster patterns for “violence” are:

- “violence against” (20 occurrences)
- “revolutionary violence” (15 occurrences)
- “police violence” (9 occurrences)
• “state violence” (7 occurrences)
  • “daily violence” (4 occurrences)

This manner of grouping is notable, most obviously because the first two pairs describe the actions of the insurrectionary attacker and the last three describe the actions of their opponent; police, the state, and the structure of the mundane. In examining the frequency cluster table below, the operative term is often featured as the active element in the phrase. For example, in the majority of phrases—“violent against [the]”, “violence of”, “the violence”, “violence and”, “violence is”, “[the] violence of the”, “violence that”, “violence in”—it is the violence which is doing the acting, not a secondary, alternative subject. In the rare phrases where violence is not the active component of the phrase—“of violence”, “revolutionary violence”, “police violence”, “state violence”, “with violence”, “daily violence”—this focus is often shifted to the enemy of the movement. These frequency clusters are displayed below in Table 4.7:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>OF VIOLENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>VIOLENCE AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>VIOLENCE OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>REVOLUTIONARY VIOLENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>THE VIOLENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>VIOLENCE AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>VIOLENCE IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>VIOLENCE OF THE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>POLICE VIOLENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>THE VIOLENCE OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>STATE VIOLENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>VIOLENCE AGAINST THE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>VIOLENCE THAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In analyzing the use of the term “power”, a combined concordance/cluster approach is employed. First, a simple frequency cluster analysis was conducted and the results are displayed below in Table 4.8:

Table 4.8: “POWER” Frequency Clusters [Corpus A]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>OF POWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>POWER AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>THE POWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>AGAINST POWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>AND POWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>POWER IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>POWER TO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>THEIR POWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>TO POWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>POWER OF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All other words = <10 occurrences

From this frequency cluster one can observe that “of power” is clearly most prevalent (74 occurrences) and is followed by a steep drop off. The third most frequently occurring cluster (“the power”) occurs exactly half as frequently as the first, showing this rather severe decline. These findings persist when “power” is seen in light of a collocation analysis focused on the L1 and R1 positions, and these findings are displayed below in Table 4.9:
Thus as can be expected, while “of power” is quite common (74 occurrences), “power of” is exceedingly uncommon (11 occurrences). Similarly, while “power and” occurs 53 times, “and power” occurs only 17 times.

Having determined that “of power” is by far the dominant usage of the term, one can explore this two word phrase for its concordances—the concordances relating to “of power” and not simply “power”. These multi-word concordances are very instructive in interpreting the discourse’s understand of power and include the following usages:

“abuse(s) of power”, “agents of power”, “apparatus of power”, “business of power”, “clutches of power”, “dogs of power”, “entities of power”, “forces of power”, “forms of power”, “game of power”, “gears of power”, “heads of power”, “hosts of power”, “instrument of power”, “lapdogs of power”, “minions of power”, “network of power”, “onslaught of power”, “position(s) of power”, “relations of power”, “representatives of power”, “structures of power” and “symbols of power”.

These phrasings display power as an external other; something that acts upon the self, not something the self produces towards another. These terms speak of the disembodied, omnipresent, disciplinary nature of power as conceived of by its detractors. Power is thought of as a force that is abused, forced and gamed by entities that are agents, apparatuses, dogs, forces, heads, minions and representatives of the state. Only a single concordance phrase speaks of the self in an active (i.e. non-passive, non-acted upon)
relation to power. In this communiqué, claiming responsibility for an act of graffiti in Buenos Aires, Argentina, the author(s), quoting Felicity Ann Ryder\textsuperscript{808}, writes: “I am proud of being an anarchist of being an enemy of power, authority, and the state.”\textsuperscript{809}

If one carries forward a frequency analysis of the two-word phrase (“of power”), the set occurring more than twice is “structures of power” which is found four times. This image—“structures”—speaks to the amorphous, deterritorialized nature of the insurrectionary conception of power. While four incidents is far from significant amongst nearly one thousand communiqués, the non-occurrence of alternative frequency sets demonstrates that great variety exists in the conception of power, and in only a few instances, agreement and similar phrasings are utilized. In other words, the absence of highly frequent pairings tells us something nonetheless important, that the language used in these texts is conditionally patterned yet highly varied. Conversely, if a great consensus existed concerning the way in which power operated and was manifested, one would expect to find increased frequencies of phrases involving the target word. This lack of consensus is displayed below in Table 4.10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>OF POWER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{808} Felicity Ann Ryder is an Australian anarchist militant currently living underground and wanted by police in relation to the attempted bombing (27 June 2012) in Mexico. In this incident, anarchist Mario “Tripa” López was injured when an IED he was handling exploded prematurely. During subsequent investigations of López, Ryder’s passport was discovered in his possession and she became a person of interest and a fugitive.

Since such a pattern was not observed, we can conclude that though power is a frequently recurring concept, its usage varies widely, with 328 occurrences divided amongst 66 concordance usages (58 of which occur only a single time each).

“Attack”

After gaining a qualitative familiarity with the texts, “attack” feels like one of the most commonly written words within the insurrectionary discourse. In terms of word choice cluster analysis, utilizing the concept term “attack” we find the highest frequencies as displayed in the phrases below:

- “attack on” (247 instances)
- “the attack” (168 instances)
- “to attack” (147 instances)
- “attack against” (130 instances)
- “attack the” (82 instances)

All other occurrences were found less than 50 times. When such a cluster analysis is extended to a slightly longer phrase (three words instead of two) we find the same pattern:

- “attack on the” (56 instances)
- “attack against the” (48 instances)
- “to attack the” (38 instances)
“incendiary attack on” (33 instances)

All other occurrences were found less than 30 times. This simple frequency clustering shows the offensive nature of the texts. Had the texts focused on the repression and violence directed upon the perpetrators, one would expect high occurrences of “were attacked” (31 instances) and/or “attacked by” (22 instances).

The insurrectionary tendency, in terms of praxis and rhetoric, is one of continual agitation and the fostering of conflict, and as such, active language choices of this nature can be expected. This language choice is especially interesting when recalling earlier discussions regarding “power.” In describing “power”, the concept is nearly always understood as external, acting upon the self, while the use of the term “attack” is predominantly displayed as an act by the self against the external. This pattern further supports the finding that in the insurrectionary corpora, texts tend to focus on discrete attacks against targets that are far less clearly defined. In sum, while the power of the attacker is constrained into episodic outbursts of violence, the ills of their enemy are vast, vague and obscured in the construct of systems.

When the use of the term “attack” is further interrogated through its collocations, one finds the high prominence of “on” in the R1 position (242 occurrences), such as in the phrase “We carried out an attack on a bank.” Also commonly occurring is the word “to” in the L1 position (140 occurrences), such as the phrase “We left the house to attack the police.” Finally, we see the high frequency of the paired words of “attack” and “against” with the latter occupying the R1 position (127 occurrences) such as the phrase...
“We carried out an **attack against** the police.” These collocations are displayed below in Table 4.11:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Total left</th>
<th>Total right</th>
<th>L4</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Center</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R3</th>
<th>R4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATTACK</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ATTACK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>ATTACK</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>ATTACK</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ATTACK</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>ATTACK</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>ATTACK</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ATTACK</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>ATTACK</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>ATTACK</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ATTACK</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In examining simple frequencies one can observe the occurrence of preferred methods of attack such as “incendiary attack” (63 instances), “arson attack” (37 instances), “explosive attack” (28 instances) and “bomb/ing attack” (18 instances). If we presume that one reference equals one communiqué—something commonly true with some exceptions—totaled together, these figures constitute 100 attacks involving fire and 46 involving explosions. Throughout the entire dataset, “attack” is the 39th most frequently appearing word (937 occurrences) and the first substantive word (e.g. non-article, non-preposition, non-pronoun) after “against” (1349 occurrences). The plural

---

810 The words appearing in the frequency chart prior to the word “attack” are (in order of frequency): “the,” “of,” “and,” “to,” “in,” “a,” “that,” “we,” “is,” “for,” “with,” “are,” “on,” “our,” “as,” “not,” “this,” “We,” “by,” “who,” “their,” “it,” “The,” “all,” “was,” “they,” “have,” “from,” “will,” “be,” “at,” “against,” “or,” “which,” “an,” “us,” “those” and “were.”
form, “attacks” occurs another 373 times and is the 116th most frequently occurring word. “Against” appears as the most commonly occurring, conceptually-descriptive word. This is expected as the language choices foster oppositional framing wherein the actor largely sees themselves as against the status quo and its systems of support, rather than in the service of a newly utopian post-state world.

The strategic function of this deployment of a single word—“attack”—is fundamental to the insurrectionary modus. The acts preformed through the use of offensive (i.e. non-defensive) language are integral to not only the construction of group identity, but also for the purposes of collective radicalization, constituent mobilization, and target coercion. This final point, that of coercion, may appear initially to be counterintuitive. While the larger anti-state, anti-capitalist, anarchist milieu is primarily concerned with the elimination of coercive forms of power and domination, the use of coercive power appears to be essential to the discourse of insurrectionary struggle. As explained in terms of linguistic function, coercion and its counter force, resistance, function through language to provide “clear examples…[of] acts backed by sanctions.”

In other words, while anti-authoritarians are opposed to the use of coercive power by the state—both in terms of direct sanctions such as prison and indirect sanctions such as criminalizing dissent—the milieu appears to embrace coercive speech acts found in frequent threats, denouncements and demands made anonymously to faceless centers of power. The focus on attack, not defense is a simple manner through which the language

---

of power is subverted by a weaker, more broadly based opponent in an asymmetric conflict.

**US v. Them**

The frequency of small parts of speech—especially personal pronouns (e.g. I, me, you, he, him, she, her, we, us, you, they, them, it) and possessive pronouns (e.g. mine, ours, yours, his, hers, theirs)—can be instructive in one’s investigation of conflict framing and conceptual construction through the examination of how one chooses to refer to self and other. In their examination of the use of persuasive language in social movements Stewart, Smith and Denton write:

> A barrage of simple pronouns such as we, our, and us in place of leader-centered and individualistic pronouns such as I, me, and mine invites a feeling of common ground—a common bond. Audiences sense active involvement together in a great moral struggle.

In the analysis of communiqués, a pronoun-centric frequency analysis uncovers the higher frequency of “we”, “our” and “us” (11,499 in total) above “their”, “they” and “them” (4,783 in total). This finding is expected as the texts are claims of responsibility, which primarily function to report one’s actions (“we”, “our”, “us”) targeting the property of another (“their”, “they”, “them”). These findings related to pronoun usage are displayed below in table 4.12:

---


If one were to analyze the pronoun findings of this corpus in light of a more
generalized (i.e. non-insurrectionary, non-communique) set of text, say for example the
“general corpus” presented by Hunston\(^{814}\) notable differences exit. For example, while
“we” is the sixth most commonly occurring word in the insurrectionary corpus, in
Hunston’s general corpus, “we” is the 33\(^{rd}\) most frequently occurring word. This would
mean that the insurrectionary corpus is far more reflective of an imagined community, a
collectivity, than the general deployment of (English) language. This aligns well with the
movement’s mentality and identity markers. The use of “we” is common throughout
political rhetoric\(^{815}\) as it is used to discuss self and one’s constituency (e.g.
insurrectionary actors, sympathizers), while excluding opponents and their supports


(reformists, the state and others known as “they”). In this manner, the predominance of “we” signals a reinforcement of group identity with a shared politic, “creat[ing] boundaries around behavior”\textsuperscript{816} vis-à-vis a broadly defined state opponent. This essential (yet obscured) “construction of ‘the self’” within discourse serves to develop social identities and domain boundaries.\textsuperscript{817}

Within the construction of a social movement, especially one that is developed through anonymous, asynchronous, communications, pronoun choice allows the discourse to intentionally “reduce ambiguity…[and] encourage cooperation”\textsuperscript{818} by creating more clearly defined in-group/out-group distinctions, and reducing the potential for positional disagreements leading to movement factionalization\textsuperscript{819}. The implication denotes harmony in intent and belief, as “persuaders use plural pronouns to imply identification and a common purpose and struggle.”\textsuperscript{820} This tendency has ben noted in prior literature analyzing political propaganda. In a 2014 study of the vastly different world of neo-Nazi and jihadi texts the author writes:

Propagandists maximize out-group/in-group conflict by framing…problems according to…ideology. Semantic boundaries are a primary method by which groups solidify characteristics that are defined as ‘in’ and those identified as ‘out.’ They are socially constructed and symbolically interpreted through images, practices, narratives, oaths, and rituals.\textsuperscript{821}

Within the insurrectionary milieu, conversely, while “I”—the most common manner in which one refers to self—is the 12\textsuperscript{th} most commonly occurring word in the general

\bibitem{817} Norman Fairclough, Discourse and Social Change (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1993), 137.
\bibitem{818} Stewart, Smith, and Denton Jr., Persuasion and Social Movements, 160.
\bibitem{819} Joosse, “Leaderless Resistance and Ideological Inclusion.”
\bibitem{820} Stewart, Smith, and Denton Jr., Persuasion and Social Movements, 161.
\bibitem{821} Morris, “Networking Vehement Frames: Neo-Nazi and Violent Jihadi Demagoguery,” 166.
corpus, in the insurrectionary set it is the 166th. This is again an expected observation as communiqué texts rarely reference the individual self and instead speak of an other (“they”, “their”, “them”). Interestingly, the use of “they” is similarly ranked in the general and insurrectionary corpora, occupying the 27th and 23rd positions respectively. These patterns of lexical items are indicative of the precise deployment of language, specifically pronoun usage, to draw lines of distinction, inclusion, exclusion and implied community amongst an audience obscured by deterritorialization.

**Beyond Communiqués: A Broader Insurrectionary Discourse**

While the discourse embedded in claims of responsibility is indicative of ideologies of attack and strategy, the broader discussion in the forms of letters from prisoners, collectively-penned statements, analyses, and other texts is also instructive. To this end, a separate dataset was constructed from letters (from prisoners, fugitives, etc.), collective statements (from blockaders, rioters, etc.) and other public, inter-movement texts. These documents were located through the same website network, and similarly included/excluded through a decision tree. This process resulted in a corpus of over 488,200 words, comprised of data from 32 countries. Many of these documents are signed using the same anonymous monikers as the communiqués, such as FAI, CCF, ELF and national networks such as the Mexico-based CARI-PGG.

---

822 This dataset is termed Corpus C.
823 This is made up of documents from Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Indonesia, Italy, Mexico, Netherlands, Peru, Portugal, Russia, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States and Uruguay.
The focus of this study is on the discourse of insurrectionary struggle as presented through the medium of the *communiqué*, and therefore an extended exploration of the other forms—such as letters from prisoners—is not warranted. Nonetheless, a brief comparative analysis between these texts and that of the communiqués is warranted. Surprisingly (and completely unintentionally), the datasets are of a comparable size, with the collection of communiqués totaling approximately 428,000 words from 36 countries and that of the letters totaling 488,000 words from 32 countries! Interestingly, when examining basic word frequencies, both datasets have quite similar patterns. For example, the most frequently occurring substantive word (excluding articles, conjunctions, prepositions, etc.) is “against”, appearing 1,642 times, followed by related words such as “struggle” (1,322 occurrences). If one ventures a bit farther down the word frequency one can notice a number of key terms as displayed below in Table 4.13:

Table 4.13: Conceptual & Key Word Frequencies [Corpus C]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>ANARCHIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td>PEOPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>SOLIDARITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>PRISON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>COMRADES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>POLICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>POLITICAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>POWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>REVOLUTIONARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>LIFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>ORDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>SYSTEM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What we see is that there is actually a greater variety of word choice in this non-communiqué dataset. To demonstrate this point we can once again examine the term “against.” In the communiqué dataset, “against” appears as the 30th most frequently occurring term. In the non-communiqué set, it is slightly less frequent, appearing as the 35th most frequently occurring word. Concerning pronoun usage, both sets of text show the predominance of the pronoun “we” followed by “our.” Also, in the position of third most frequently occurring pronoun we again witness expected patterns. For communiqués, the word is “their”—speaking of multiple subjects—while for the non-communiqués, it is “I”—speaking to the actions and thoughts of the individual narrator. These pan-corpus findings are displayed comparatively below in Table 4.14:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7,106</td>
<td>WE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,846</td>
<td>WE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3,153</td>
<td>OUR</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,913</td>
<td>OUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2,061</td>
<td>THEIR</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2,677</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14: Top three pronoun usage comparison [Corpus A and Corpus C]

| Total # words in corpus: 428,219 | Total # words in corpus: 488,202 |

National Case Study: Mexico
In determining a variety of methods for examining the data, a brief exploration of a
country-specific corpus is warranted. In choosing a country to examine, I chose Mexico.
The Mexican state produced the fifth highest occurrence of communiqués in the dataset
(65 of 963). Despite not being the highest producer of individual communiqués, the
Mexican cells are by far the highest producer of words. The average Mexican
communiqué has 1,126 words which is nearly double the length of the next closest
country (Grecian communiqués on average have 740 words). It is precisely because of
the verbose nature of the Mexican texts that they were selected for a more personalized
analysis.

In reviewing the Mexican corpus—termed Corpus B—one notices a few
important findings. The first finding is that most common pronouns are “we”, “our” and
“they.” This is nearly identical to findings in the larger, global dataset (Corpus A)
wherein the most common pronouns are “we”, “our”, “their” and “they.” Secondly, after
excluding the non-functional words (e.g. “the”, “of”, “and”…) we find that the most
commonly occurring conceptual words are “against”, “system”, “anarchist” “state” and
“attack.” These initial findings continue the observations seen earlier in the larger corpus,
reinforcing the notion that the insurrectionary discourse is not heavily influenced by
country and is in fact a more globalized conversation.

Through isolating “against” as a key conceptual term, and processing this via the
a Mexican concordance cluster analysis, we once again see the commonality of what this
milieu opposes through how the term is paired with subjects. These key concordance
clusters are displayed below in Table 4.15:
Table 4.15: “AGAINST” concordance clusters [Corpus B]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>AGAINST ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>AGAINST CIVILIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>AGAINST POWER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>AGAINST DOMINATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AGAINS TECHNOLOGY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All other words = <4 occurrences

These clusters clearly show the Mexican exceptionality of a focus on a more primitivist, anti-civilization-influenced target set. The common usage of “against civilization” and “against technology” are unique to the Mexican corpus and are reflective of frequent attacks targeting scientists, university personnel and others contributing to the ‘techno-industrial system.’ Civilization as a term by itself (i.e. non-clustered) occurs 144 times in the Mexican corpus and is thus the 56th most frequently used word. “Technology” appears just after that, with 125 occurrences and a frequency rank of 63. When these terms are examined through individual cluster analyses, one finds the predominance of “anti-civilization” and “anti-technology” in high frequency, further supporting these findings. Therefore, to summarize, the Mexican dataset supports larger discursive trends such as pronoun usage and the commonality of oppositional conceptual terms (e.g. “against”, “attack”), but has a starkly different relationship with the concepts of technology and civilization. Not only do these concepts appear with notable frequency in this country’s corpus, when they do, they are nearly always negatively associated; appearing as “anti-technology/civilization” and “against technology/civilization.”
Finally, in the Mexican corpus, one can observe interesting phenomena related to the intentional ‘misspelling’ of words. For example, the word *compañero* (meaning companion or comrade) is often misspelled as *compañerxs*\(^{824}\) to de-gender the word (*compañeros* = masculine, *compañeras* = feminine) through the replacement of gender-indicating letters. In this example an “x” replaces the gender-dependent letter (“a” or “o”). In one example, the anonymous authors write, “Strength, compañerxs imprisoned from the Conspiracy of Cells of Fire!”, using the gender-less spelling followed by “Strength, compañero Tortuga!”\(^{825}\), using the masculine spelling as this is directed as a single, male-identified individual. This has also been seen in other Spanish-language documents such as those in Chile\(^{826}\) and Bolivia\(^{827}\). Similar, intentional misspellings

---


\(^{825}\) Anonymous Anarchist Action / Informal Anarchist Federation (AAA/FAI) et al., “Joint declaration of the insurrectional anarchist and eco-anarchist groups of Mexico (second public communique).”


occur throughout such as the insertion of “@”, shorthand for the anarchist ‘circle A’ symbol in words (once again) such as “compañer@s”.

**Blended National Case Study: The United States**

The final form of analysis is an attempt to develop a blended qualitative-quantitative approach. The intent of this process is to curate a readable dataset for systematic analysis, which is distilled from the sheer verbal bulk of the original text. In identifying the key analytical components of the text (for example the verbs used to describe a tactic) a few key elements can prove to be enough evidence to locate and outline patterns of interest. This method of data extraction and categorization is described below and it’s results offered in full in the appendix. The approach is most akin to a content analysis, as informed by a formal treatment of the subject, and a more specially-tailored approach as defined in the securitization and intelligence gathering fields. The following discussion is thus meant to accomplish two tasks: first, it is meant to provide a side glance at the corpus data, a different way to examine similar trends on terms of lexical choice and self-description. Secondly, this discussion of method is meant to explore new

---


829 The development of this method of content analysis was done in tandem with Jessica Anderson, a Georgetown University undergraduate student whom I mentored and who subsequently served as a research assistant for this portion of the project. Ms. Anderson and I collaborated to write this process description and she was instrumental in helping to code and compile the data as displayed in the appendix.

830 In this discussion “dataset” is meant to describe the qualitative and quantitate data displayed in the appendix, and “corpora” is meant to identify the US-specific communiqué text used for analysis.

831 Krippendorff, *Content Analysis*.

832 Heuer Jr. and Pherson, *Structured Analytic Techniques for Intelligence Analysis*. 
analytical approaches to the reading of text that are both transparent, structured, fruitful and adaptable. This multiplicity of analytical approaches responds to calls from traditionally quantitative fields (such as intelligence analysis) asking for “the use of multiple method during the course of a single analytic project..[to] be the norm, not the exception.”

In the development of this method of textual analysis, the US corpus—termed Corpus D—was intentionally chosen for its original authorship in English. While I have argued that the translation of texts through the informal network of insurrectionary translators helps to obscure complex issues of standardization, it remains true that the diverse abilities of these multi-lingual translators affect the reading of text. Therefore, when faced with the opportunity to analyze a given country’s materials, one that did not undergo such a hidden process of editing is an obvious choice. From these constraints, I was able to choose from a pool of texts originating from Australia (23 communiqués), Canada (35 communiqués), the UK (129 communiqués) and the US (133 communiqués). The US was chosen as it presented the largest number of non-translated communiqués.

In order to analyze the US corpora, the 133 communiqués comprising 44,077 words, and 217 pages of text, were first color coded, annotated and sorted. The text dataset was built around the five overarching analytical categories: group name, cell name, tactic, target, and country. These categories were chosen to highlight language that described how (and to some extent why) groups committed acts of political violence. From these larger texts, categories were simplified while retaining enough detail to

---

833 Ibid., 24.
delineate (not obscure) broad patterns. Text that fit these five categories was color-coded in the corpora for quick identification, and the most succinctly accurate sample of text in each category was entered into the dataset.

Nouns are used to identify targets, verbs to identify tactics, and proper nouns to describe collective identity claimed through anonymous group names. While this may appear as an initially simply task, the methodology of extracting and cataloging phrases—the production of a phrase bank constituting “expert-generated data”\textsuperscript{834}—goes beyond mere reduction to purposeful simplification. In its approach, this construction of a dataset from a text corpora is meant to sift and sort (as it simplifies), retaining the details that will be most relevant for the investigation at hand. For example, the dataset captures that in 46 cases, attackers chose a tactic involving some application of paint or drawing medium, but also that among those 46 cases, roughly half specify the writing of a message, and the remainder most commonly involve paint "thrown" either by hand or via the use of paint projectiles (e.g. light bulbs filled with paint). On a more detailed level, the method allows the grouping of 11 cases of “gluing or sealing” but maintains the distinction between applying this tactic to locks and applying it to ATMs. In this manner, “sorting” is a technique unto itself wherein the categorization and grouping of data can yield patterns not visible without the creation of subcategories and lists\textsuperscript{835}. This curating produces a dataset already streamlined for pattern identification through both quantitative and qualitative forms of analysis, enabling the analysis of more than 200 pages of

\textsuperscript{834} Ibid., 23.
\textsuperscript{835} Ibid., 45, 60–62.
original text to draw meaningful conclusions about the authors’ motivations and intentions.

**Group, cell, and country text**

Text in the corpora was considered to be a group name if it was used as a signature to end the communiqué and claimed a specific group identity. Had there been text that fit the preceding characteristics and included the word “cell”, it would have been considered a cell name. However, no cell names appeared in the US claims dataset. If a country was referred to explicitly in the text as the location of the attack, this text was included under the category of “country”. If no country was directly identified, textual clues and previous coding of the claim under a specific country were used as implicit identification of that country.

**Tactical text**

Tactical text was identified predominantly by the use of verbs that implied damage, disruption, or the publicizing of information. In the few rare cases when no verbs were used to describe the tactic, nouns such as “vandalism” were entered as the best available description of the tactic. Actions that simply facilitated or coincided with the purpose of the attack (to damage or to publicize) were excluded from the dataset, as were the results of the tactical action unless such information was essential to understanding the tactic. Minimal detail about the immediate object of the tactical action was included as necessary to understand the tactic. For example, one communiqué released by a cell of the ALF included: “After jumping a barbed wire fence, we made our way to the main
breeding facility where we dismantled a huge section of an aviary that held between 75-150 pheasants; liberating them into the night sky. From this sentence, the phrase “dismantled a huge section of an aviary” was extracted and entered as tactical text. The phrasing about jumping the fence and entering the facility were excluded because they facilitated the tactic, and the description of “liberating” the pheasants was excluded because it explained a result of the tactical action rather than the tactic itself.

**Target Text**

Target text was identified as the object or location receiving the main focus of the attack. It was generally identified at the level of detail that most accurately captured the motivation for the attack, which most often meant extracting the name (e.g. Wells Fargo) or at least category (e.g. bank) of the organization or group targeted. The ALF communiqué cited above begins with the sentence: “Last night, the night of March 14th, we infiltrated the property of Queener Ridge Pheasant Company (40485 Queener Drive, Scio, OR) which breeds ringneck pheasants primarily to be murdered in commercial canned hunts.” From this sentence, the phrase “Queener Ridge Pheasant Company” was extracted and entered as the target of the attack, as it provided the minimum sufficient detail to capture the motivation for the attack.

**Use of subcategories**

Tactic and target entries were grouped when the language used to describe the action or target was identical or nearly so (e.g. using different conjugations of the same verb).

---

837 Ibid.
Subcategories were created within the overarching tactic and target categories when entries were added that either were distinct enough from existing entries that analytical value would be lost by subsuming them in the larger categories, or had become numerous enough relating to a specific theme that creation of a subcategory made it easier to see the uniqueness of and variations within that theme. For example, within the field of “Target”, subcategories were created for “consumer/luxury goods” and “media”. This was done to preserve the motivation and justification for choosing such target, as to explain them simply as ‘business’ or ‘corporate’ targets would have hidden the attackers’ critique. Though each of these subcategories contained only one or two entries, the subcategories were maintained as separate because to combine them into a larger category would have masked important differences explaining attackers’ motivations.

The aim of this approach was to capture succinctly why a specific site was targeted—to focus on intent as understood by the attacker. If two automobiles were burned, one because it was a police car and one because it is a luxury sports utility vehicle (SUV), these targets were understood to occupy different categories: ‘law enforcement’ and ‘luxury goods’ respectively. Conversely, entries relating to police vehicles, police buildings, and police personnel were kept within the subcategory of “law enforcement, military, security” because each set was targeted for its attachment to the institutions of law enforcement and security. Groupings were created within subcategories to capture such variations in the mode of target attacked—when the class of target (tied to motivation for the attack) was shared across entries but the specific iteration within that class varied (e.g. vehicle, building, person).
Dataset Findings

In order to interpret these results, they will be discussed in terms of the variables through which they were sorted: group name, cell name, tactic, target and country. Beginning with group name, we see that from 133 communiqués, we were able to identify 31 unique monikers. In 73 communiqués, no group name was included. From amongst those attacks which were claimed through an identifiable “author”, 27 chose to do so through self-identifying as “anarchists.” This includes ten attacks claimed by “some anarchists”, nine attacks claimed by “anarchists” and two claimed by the anarcho-symbol of the “(A).” These findings, concerning the recurrent use of ‘anarchist’ identifiers, is displayed below in Table 4.16:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USED MORE THAN ONCE</th>
<th>USED ONCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>some anarchists” (7)</td>
<td>“A.A.W. (Anarchists Against Windows)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Some anarchists” (1)</td>
<td>“some anarchists on the grey coast”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Some Anarchists” (2)</td>
<td>“anarchisterabpplz”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Anarchists” (7)</td>
<td>“Portland Anarchists”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“anarchists” (2)</td>
<td>“A few anarchists”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“(A)”: 2</td>
<td>“FAI – OREGON”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondly, involving group names (i.e. monikers used to claim responsibility), one sees the extremely high occurrence of so-called hactivists networks reporting cyber strikes via the international insurrectionary networks. In 11 communiqués, cyber attacks were claimed through identification with some variation of the Anonymous and/or
Antisec\textsuperscript{838} networks. Like the ALF, CCF or FAI, “Anonymous” and “Antisec” are adoptable monikers that attackers can select to claim attacks. Though the names are typically limited to attacks akin to digital service disruption (i.e. hacking), data theft and website defacement, there is no central author regulating the moniker’s use and thus it suffers (or benefits) from the same difficulties in determining in-group/out-group identifies of the ALF/et. al. Also notable is the commonality of Queer-insurrectionary monikers and points of reference such as “‘some ticked off trannies with knives”, “The CeCe McDonald\textsuperscript{839} Brigade”, “Queer Attack Squadron” and “THE RIGHT HONORABLE WICKED STEPMOTHERS’ TRAVELING, DRINKING AND DEBATING SOCIETY AND MEN’S AUXILIARY”, the latter of which claimed an attack against property belonging to the Human Rights Campaign (HRC) in Washington, DC.

More interesting than group name is the tactics described in these communiqués. While a text-based analysis is less precise than, for example, an incident-based statistical

\textsuperscript{838} Anonymous, and its various factions (e.g. AntiSec, LulzSec,) is a globally-dispersed, loosely-federated network of social justice-motivated hackers, known as ‘hactivists’ in the modern parlance. In general, they fight around issues of censorship, government repression, freedom of assembly, and in support of various aboveground social movement campaigns. The activists work to disrupt, hijack and vandalize websites and other networked infrastructure belonging to governmental and corporate interests. The network has been active since around 2003 and is often visually associated with the wearing of Guy Fawkes masks.

\textsuperscript{839} CeCe McDonald is a transgender woman of color who was temporarily incarcerated and became a rallying cry for solidarity attacks. On 5 June 2011, while CeCe walked to a store with other Queer and trans people of color, the group was verbally harassed and physically attacked by a group of older, white, cis-gendered bar patrons. CeCe was hit in the face with a bottle that punctured her cheek and lacerated her salivary gland. During the assault, one of the cis-gendered attackers, Dean Schmitz was fatally stabbed. Though witnesses describe CeCe’s actions as defensive, she was arrested for Schmitz’s death and charged with second-degree murder. On 2 May 2012, CeCe accepted a plea bargain, (2\textsuperscript{nd} degree manslaughter) and was sentenced to 41 months incarceration. CeCe was released 13 January 2014.
study, in deducing tactics from attackers’ narrative, one is able to witness not only the frequency of specific methods, but also the diversity through which these methods are described. For example, the dataset shows us that in 57 attack communiqués (nearly half of all US communiqués) the attacker damaged the windows of their target. Despite the seemingly simple nature of describing a broken window, the dataset eloquently displays the 12 categories through which this is accomplished. Most commonly is the use of the term “smash(ed)” to describe such attacks on windows. In 20/57 (35%) usages, attackers described their target in these terms. These phrase patterns have been extracted and are displayed below:

“A window got smashed”, “3 windows where [sic] smashed”, “had all its windows smashed out”, “had their windows smashed”, “had its windows smashed”, “had it’s [sic] windows smashed”, “smashed the windows”, “smash out the windows”, “smashed the windows out of”, “smashed the windows”, “smashed several windows”, “smashed every window we could”, “Multiple windows were completely smashed”, “smashed out the windows”, “smashed…had multiple windows smashed out”, “3 windows… 2 Windows… smashed”, “smashed out many windows”, “smashed the windows”, “smashed out the front windows”

If one were to expand this to those communiqués that speak of ‘smashing with rocks,’ or ‘smashing with bricks,’ etc. the frequency is even higher. In 9/57 (16%) attacks targeting windows, the sites were hit with etching fluid that is designed to damage windows and allow messages to be written in a style similar to the application of paint. These phrases have been extracted and displayed below:

---

“etching fluid was used to ruin at least three windows”, “etching fluid was thrown onto their windows [of police vehicles]”, “had all of its windows covered in etching fluid”, “corrosive material splattered on its windows”, “the windows were permanently etched”, “had its windows etched out”, “covered the windows and windshields… with glass etching fluid”, “covered the door and 5 windows… with etching fluid”, “windows were etched”

Continuing forward with this manner of tactical analysis, one finds only five occurrences of arson in the US corpora. By grouping these thematically, one can observe that in two incidents the attackers threw a Molotov cocktail, in two other incidents a window was smashed in conjunction (or to allow for) the throwing of a Molotov cocktail, and in only one incident, the attacker placed some form of time-delayed IID, described as, “containers of accelerant were placed beneath a row of 14 trucks with 4 digital timers used to light 4 of the containers and kerosene-soaked rope carrying the fire to the other 10 [trucks].”\textsuperscript{841} 

Though this type of qualitative-leaning tactical analysis is less precise then a multi-variable statistical analysis, from this manner of text extraction one can make some preliminary tactical observations concerning attacks occurring in the US and reported through the international, insurrectionary network.

1. Tactics tend to focus on the damaging of windows or the application of paint. Other forms of vandalism are less common.

2. Cyber attacks are frequent and typically are described with detailed accounts.

3. Attacks are frequently described with vague or unclear phrases that make it difficult to deduce what actually occurred. This includes describing one’s actions in terms such as “sabotaged,” “struck,” “attacked” or “disabled.”

4. Attacks which follow an animal liberationist politic typically involve the release (not theft) of animals or the sabotage of breeding facilities.

5. Tactics involving the use of fire are rare, and those involving explosives are exceedingly rare, occurring in only 1 of the 133 (0.75%) communiqués surveyed.

In terms of using text-based data to analyze the targets of attack, 18 broad categories were created based on the stated or presumed motivation of the attacker. Therefore someone targeting a McDonald’s because of its “greed” (target group = “corporate”) would be sorted into a different category than someone targeting the same site for its “speciesism” (target group = “animal industry”). Through a process of sorting, grouping, and defining categories, the following groups of targets were identified based on attacker motivation:

1. Corporate: offices of multinational corporations and other businesses, franchise locations (e.g. Starbucks) and retail locations.

2. Capital/banking: bank branches, bank offices and ATMs.

3. Government: embassies, consulates, city hall buildings, courthouses and city infrastructure (e.g. parking meters, public transit).

4. Law enforcement, security, military: police cars, police stations, law enforcement offices (e.g. Department of Corrections, parole office, recruiting centers), police websites and law enforcement officials (e.g. police officers, security guards).


7. Surveillance technology: automobile identification scanners, traffic cameras and closed circuit television cameras.

8. Fascism: spaces allowing fascist speakers to present, fascist/neo-Nazi graffiti and sympathetic publishers.

9. Railways: infrastructure used by trains.

10. Media: reporters and news network property.


14. Education: college administrative buildings.


17. Scientific research: college research departments.

18. Other social institutions: fraternity houses.

From this manner of sorting and grouping, it can be argued with great accuracy that the trend for US insurrectionary actors is to target sites associated with corporate profits and power, banking, government and law enforcement above all else. This quantitative finding supports and reinforces the portrayal of this milieu as argued throughout. Moreover, these entities clearly fit into the construction of flattened categories used in binary oppositional frameworks, such as the insurrectionaries’ opposition to “capital”
(which includes the categories of “corporate” and “capital/banking”) and “the state” (“government” and “law enforcement”). Furthermore, the subcategory breakdown based on phraseology can continue to delineate these target sets. For example, amongst attacks on corporations, Starbucks is attacked most frequently. In strikes focused on capital accumulation, there is a tendency to target bank ATMs, and the branch offices of Wells Fargo, Bank of America, Chase and Key Bank (in that order). Attacks on law enforcement are strongly focused on police cars and police stations, and for the hactivists, police websites.

Finally, there is analytical richness in discussing what is not described in the data. Though the variable of “cell” was developed to help maintain the various factions of the FAI, CCF and ALF that have spring up since their respective periods of deterritorialization, in the US corpus, cell name was not a dominant feature. While in other country corpora it is common to see, for example, the “Two Sequoias” cell of the FAI alongside that of the “Felicity Ryder Anarchist Cell”, in the US, these inner-moniker identifiers did not occur. Secondly, in recording the variable of country nearly no recognizable information was catalogued. This is because in 130/133 (98%) communiqués, the country where the attack is being carried out is not referenced. In 2/133 (1.5%) communiqués, the author(s) identifies the attack country as “USA”, and in only one communiqué is the abbreviated name of the United States used! While an extended elaboration of North American exceptionalism is beyond the scope of this discussion, by not mentioning the country in question, the US becomes the absent referent as readers are presumed to know the country based on the city where the attack
occurred. This is not the case in other national corpora, where one finds extended descriptions to locate targets outside of major American or European cities. Attacks carried out in Bolivia, Indonesia, the Ukraine and a variety of other locales are often very descriptive in terms of city and nation-state, presuming the readers’ unfamiliarity.

Conclusion

Based on these findings, one could construct an archetypal insurrectionary communiqué. If we are to assume it is based on an attack in the US (though it is far more likely to have occurred in Greece), the incident would not be claimed via a known moniker, but would target a chain bank by smashing its windows. The author would use the pronoun “we” implying more than one attacker, and the vandalism would likely be described as an “attack against the state” in a communiqué of 339 words. Besides an extended discussion of why the particular target was chosen and whom the attack was dedicated to, it would likely include sentences such as:

Last night, we carried out an attack against the state and capital by targeting a Wells Fargo Bank. The bank has all its windows smashed out. This attack on the bank was chosen to show we are against all forms of power.

In this 42-word example the bolded and underlined words are borrowed directly from the most frequently occurring words of their category in the US dataset and are therefore statistically the most likely to occur. Moreover, this approach is meant to provide the quantitative foundation for the subsequent qualitative analysis. In the following chapter, we will explore these findings in depth, through a reading of insurrectionary communiqués.
CHAPTER FIVE

By a revolution, the [revolutionary] Society does not mean an orderly revolt according to the classic western model—a revolt which always stops short of attacking the rights of property and the traditional social systems of so-called civilization and morality. Until now, such a revolution has always limited itself to the overthrow of one political form in order to replace it by another, thereby attempting to bring about a so-called revolutionary state. The only form of revolution beneficial to the people is one which destroys the entire State to the roots and exterminated all the state traditions, institutions, and classes.842

-- Sergey Nechayev, The Revolutionary Catechism [1869]

The force of an insurrection is social, not military. Generalized rebellion is not measured by the armed clash but by the extent to which the economy is paralyzed, the places of production and distribution taken over, the free giving that burns all calculation and the desertion of obligations and social roles. In a word, it is the upsetting of life. No guerilla group, no matter how effective, can take the place of this grandiose movement of destruction and transformation. Insurrection is the light emergence of a banality coming to the surface: no power can support itself without the voluntary servitude of those it dominates. Revolt reveals better than anything else that it is the exploited themselves who make the murderous machinery of exploitation function. The wild, spreading interruption of social activity suddenly tears away the blanket of ideology, revealing the real balance of strength.843

-- Anonymous, At Daggers Drawn... [2001]

842 Nechayev, “The Revolutionary Catechism.”
843 Anonymous, At Daggers Drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critics, 25.
Introduction

The following chapter is meant to be read in conjunction with the preceding historical account of illegalism, propaganda of the deed, revolutionary guerilla warfare, and the evolution of post-millennial, insurrectionary networks of attack. In addition, the linguistically-based, quantitative analysis is meant to paint, in broad brush strokes, the wider insurrectionary discourse as located in its deployment of language. This mixed quantitative-qualitative method is meant to be a single effort as the former is capable of establishing recurrent themes that can be explored in the present discussion. The political histories contained in Chapter Two and Chapter Three act in conjunction with the textual objects under analysis to co-constitute a modernist, insurrectionary canon.

In attempting to trace this evolutionary genealogy, we will examine the strategy of Blanquism, the contribution of ‘classical anarchists,’ the influence of the largely French, post-millennial theorists such as Tiqqun and TIC, and the contributions of shorter, anonymously authored publications. Following this account, we will focus on the contributions of Queer insurrectionary praxis before attempting a final description of the insurrectionary tendency through its most cohesive values. In attempting to develop these markers of insurrectionary theory, the goal is to identify the tendency’s values, and how it understands itself as a counterculture vis-à-vis not only mainstream political culture—its “conflict with the values of the dominant culture”844—but also from allied trends in anti-state, anti-capitalist (i.e. anarchist) revolutionary theory. This modeling develops the

---

insurrectionary milieu as a Radical Social Movement, conceived of as a “synergy” between Social Movement Theory and Counterculture Theory.\textsuperscript{845}

The central thesis of this study is that through a genealogical review of the insurrectionary tendency, one can construct the broad outlines of a canon, which serves to inform contemporary action such as the attack strategies of the CCF, FAI and others. In attempting to develop this canon, the following section will first explore the key theoretical contributions of select individuals, linking their texts to their modern implementation. As there is no clearly demarcated, linear path from the nineteenth century to the modern era, this journey will inherently be punctuated by the most obvious and unmistakable signposts available, and in doing so will without a doubt exclude a variety of key texts and thinkers.

**Blanquism and its Detractors**

Based partially on his experience in the revolution of July 1840 and several armed demonstrations in 1870, Louis Auguste Blanqui (1805-1881) was a careful political tactician with a keen focus on revolutionary method and strategy. He was an influential figure in the defense of the 1871 Paris Commune, and from these experiences, developed a revolutionary framework based in small unit conspiracies; a radical departure from the mass-based approaches of Marxism. Blanqui’s writings are numerous and vary from short, fiery declarations, to more traditional (and lengthy) theoretical discussions. Most notable are his frequent discussion of tactics and strategy (known as Blanquism), and his

\textsuperscript{845} Ibid., 2.
frequent encouragements for the armed masses to confront the state and revolt. The strategic writings were sometimes astoundingly specific, and at other times more comprehensive and broad.

Blanquism as a revolutionary framework was complementary to the socialist project, but because of its dependence on a professionalized minority, and its lack of belief in the power of the workers, both Marx and Engels wrote to distinguish themselves from that of Blanqui. In an essay first published by Engels in 1874, the foundational Marxist thinker writes:

Blanqui is essentially a political revolutionist. He is a socialist only through sentiment, through his sympathy with the sufferings of the people, but he has neither a socialist theory nor any definite practical suggestions for social remedies. In his political activity he was mainly a ‘man of action’, believing that a small and well organized minority, who would attempt a political stroke of force at the opportune moment, could carry the mass of the people with them by a few successes at the start and thus make a victorious revolution.

---


Marxist revolutionary thinker and author Rosa Luxemburg (1871-1919) similarly wrote about Blanquism in her 1904 book, *Organizational Questions of the Russian Social Democracy*. Luxemburg points out what differentiates Blanquism from Leninism writing, “in the place of a handful of conspirators [Blanquism] we have a class-conscious proletariat [Leninism].” Luxemburg also reflected negatively on the elitist and detached nature of Blanquist’s methods of organization outside of the proletariat class. She points out that the Blanquist framework is top-down, minoritarian, and organized without mass participation from the oppressed class, writing:

> Blanquism did not count on the direct action of the working class. It, therefore, did not need to organize the people for the revolution. The people were expected to play their part only at the moment of revolution. Preparation for the revolution concerned only the little group of revolutionists armed for the coup. Indeed, to assure the success of the revolutionary conspiracy, it was considered wiser to keep the mass at some distance from the conspirators. Such a relationship could be conceived by the Blanquists only because there was no close contact between the conspiratorial activity of their organization and the daily struggle of the popular masses. The tactics and concrete tasks of the Blanquist revolutionists had little connection with the elementary class struggle.

In his writing, Lenin also comments on the Blanquist strategy, noting that despite the efforts of some critics (writing of social democratic thinker Eduard Bernstein), it is inaccurate to link the minoritarian approach to the revolutionary Marxism of the time. Lenin is careful to explain the works of Marx in light of criticism and accusations of excluding the proletariat. Lenin speaks of Blanquism as an ‘intellectually-led conspiracy’

851 Ibid.
writing, “Blanquism is a theory which repudiates the class struggle. Blanquism expects that mankind will be emancipated from wage slavery, not by the proletarian class struggle, but through a conspiracy hatched by a small minority of intellectuals.”

More important that its detractors, and those who have distanced themselves from such forms of vanguardism, are the effect Blanquism had on later movements. For example, the approach was influential for the French illegalists who emerged from the Paris Commune of 1871 including the Bonnot Gang. Moreover, Blanqui’s ideas of a minoritarian, professionalized, armed vanguard would reemerge in popularity nearly one hundred years later with the 1960s-1970s urban guerillas such as the WUO, SLA and RAF. These groups continued in the Blanquist tradition of seeking to ‘make the revolution’ beyond (or without) mass mobilization of the proletariat. The revolution was to be a sort of insurrection where the socialists would seize power before delivering that power back to the people. This approach—that which seeks to seize power in the interim—is rejected outright by anti-statists, including all brands of anarchists, but remains a salient tendency amongst the Leninist left and other non-anarchist revolutionaries. Therefore, while Blanqui served to influence the evolution of insurrectionary combat in terms of means, it differs greatly in terms of a strategic vision for the destruction and reconstruction of the socio-political order.

**The Classical Anarchists & Illegalists**

---

Following Blanqui and the conflicts of the late nineteenth century, the period of ‘classical anarchism’—approximately from the beginning of the twentieth century until the end of World War II—continued to advance theories of revolutionary warfare, insurrection and revolt. As these works have been the subject of a great deal of anarchist scholarship\textsuperscript{855}, they only require a brief exploration before proceeding to the less-studied works. Around World War I, the main trend in violent anti-state theory came from the so-called illegalists, largely based in France. This illegalist tendency demonstrated methods such as financial expropriation, common in 1910s France, as well as direct attacks against the state which occurred throughout Western Europe and the US. From the robberies of the Bonnot Gang to the frequent bomb attacks by Galleanists, the illegalist trend has never strayed from the insurrectionary tendency, or that of a minoritarian, armed revolutionary force.

Works that embody this period include Sergey Nechayev’s \textit{Catechism of a Revolutionary}\textsuperscript{856}, Johann Most’s \textit{Attack is the Best form of Defense} (1884) and \textit{Science of Revolutionary Warfare} (1885), Giuseppe Ciancabilla’s \textit{Against Organization} (~1900), Luigi Galleani’s \textit{The Health is Within You} (1905), and Renzo Novatore’s \textit{My Iconoclastic Individualism} (1920). These pieces comiled with shorter essays, pamphlets, and


\textsuperscript{856} This was likely written in conjunction with Mikhail Bakunin (1814-1876).
speeches of propagandists of the time including those by Errico Malatesta (1853-1932), Alexander Berkman\textsuperscript{857} (1870-1936), Victor Serge\textsuperscript{858} (1890-1947), Bruno Filippi (1900-1919)—who published Iconoclasta along with Novatore—and Severino Di Giovanni (1901-1931), who published and contributed to Culmine. Once settling in the US, Galleani was involved in the publication of Cronica Sovversiva [The Chronicle of Subversion]\textsuperscript{859}, an influential Italian-language, anarchist newspaper active 1903-1920, which would carry works by anarchist figureheads such as Peter Kropotkin, Mikhail Bakunin and Errico Malatesta\textsuperscript{860}. The paper infamously included a hit list profiling members of the ruling class, termed ‘enemies of the people.’ These classical texts, along with intersecting influences such as those of the nihilists, individualists, egoists and communists amounted to a large volume of revolutionary works. This period of thought, which ebbed alongside World War II, developed the theoretical foundation for decades of armed struggle that would unfold through the world less than 25 years later. After the start of the Vietnam War, and the resulting protest movement, a new era of insurrectionary theory began to emerge from Italy before quickly expanding to a global audience.

**The Modern Insurrectionary Turn**

\textsuperscript{857} These include Berkman’s editorship with newspapers such as Mother Earth and The Blast.

\textsuperscript{858} In the period around 1908, Serge aligned himself as an anarchist, publishing anarchist essays and sympathizing with anarcho-individualism/illegalism. He was arrested for his involvement with the anarcho-illegalist Bonnot Gang in 1913, yet around 1919, he joined the Bolsheviks after arriving in Russia.

\textsuperscript{859} A large portion of the Cronaca Sovversiva issues are preserved online and houses at the Library of Congress’s National Endowment for the Humanities, ‘Chronicling America’ archive, available at: http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/2012271201/issues/

We must build a rhythm of struggle which resonates in our bodies and builds the links between attack, memory, and the...terror we experience in daily life. It is simple enough to begin a discussion of insurrectional strategy with the notion of the attack. Yet many confuse this process with merely smashing a random bank and writing a communiqué telling the cops to fuck off. Of course, I’m not interested in condemning such a practice, I’m merely more interested in examining the ways in which various notions and methods of attack are positioned in relation to our memory and all of the emotions that have built up over time due to all of the...violence we’ve endured.\textsuperscript{861}


While the majority of the twenty-first century insurrectionary canon is derived from a history of actions as reported via communiqués, a number of more central texts are consistently referenced and make up a sort of pre-history for the tendency. These texts are often anonymously authored and lengthy. They include the publications of Alfredo Bonanno, Tiqqun, TIC and The Institute for Experimental Freedom (IEF). These texts differ from the historically produced canonical texts of revolutionary theory. While Karl Marx wrote the texts later collected as the Grundrisse from the comforts of British Museum Reading Room, the insurrectionary canon is often penned by active revolutionaries, living (semi)clandestine existences, and engaged in acts of anti-state illegality. Furthermore, these texts are inherently products of an international, frequently un-attributing/plagiarizing form of “intertextuality” where authors “habitually cite, allude to and otherwise reference other texts...[where] readers do not treat each text they read as a discrete item.”\textsuperscript{862} In constructing this canon, it is useful to first identify what is meant by the term, as anarchists have an understanding reminiscent to that of the Biblical canon.


\textsuperscript{862} Cameron and Panovic, Working with Written Discourse, 71.
In his explanation of this term, anarchist philosopher Nathan Jun writes:

The ‘Western canon’…describes a standard set of literary, scientific, historical, philosophical, and religious texts that are considered especially significant in the historical development of Western culture. When anarchists speak of a ‘canon,’ we generally have in mind something similar to a Biblical or cultural canon—that is, a standard set of texts (or thinkers, or theories) regarded as authoritative for anarchist thought and practice or especially significant in the historical development of anarchism.\(^{863}\)

Therefore, the task becomes identifying these ‘texts, thinkers and theories regarded as authoritative for [insurrectionary] anarchist thought and practice.’ In doing so, this chapter will briefly detail these works, and unveil a chronological history of the development of modern insurrectionary theory as told through text.

Following this historical, canon-centric exploration, the remainder of the chapter seeks to construct the basis for an insurrectionary framework based around a shared politics. This approach borrows from insurrectionary theory’s rejection of strict ideological encampments as understood through self-imposed identities (e.g. anarchist, Green/anti-civilization anarchist, illegalist…), and instead focuses on the basis of overlapping affinity\(^ {864}\). Therefore, the insurrectionary borderlands can be traced through examining where these affinities begin and end, where political analysis and calls for action overlap and diverge. The values embodied in the insurrectionary canon are constituted from a hodgepodge of lesser texts, none of which carry the suggestion of centrality on their own, but collectively constitute the modern insurrectionary discourse—as told through the words and actions of the rock throwers, fire starters and


bomb builders whose names we never know.

**Alfredo M. Bonanno**

Beginning in the mid 1970s, Italian Alfredo M. Bonanno (b. 1937) began publishing insurrectionary essays in conjunction with his translator and co-collaborator Jean Weir. Bonanno rose to prominence during the 1960s when Italy saw an increased presence from so-called ultra-left direct action networks. Through publications such as *Anarchismo Editions*, which Bonanno edited, the informal, networked, decentralized direct action model was developed, refined and expanded. It would be this model that would eventually prefigure the FAI, CCF and others. In his time, Bonanno lived an insurrectionary praxis involving numerous forms of agitation. In the late 1990s, Bonanno was arrested in connection with the bombing of Milian’s Palazzo Marino (25 April 1997), and in 2003 was sentenced to six years in prison for his involvement in an insurrectionary-armed robbery. He was arrested again in 2009 along with a Greek anarchist and accused of involvement in an additional bank robbery. He was sentenced to four years in prison and served approximately one year.

A full detailing of Bonanno’s writings is beyond the scope of this study as his works span 40 years and include (chronologically): *Revolution, Violence, Anti-Authoritarianism - A Few notes*, *Class War*, *Armed Joy*, *Why A Vanguard*,
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867 Bonanno, *Armed Joy [La gioia armata]*.


Bonanno, From Riot to Insurrection: Analysis for an anarchist perspective against post-industrial capitalism.


Bonanno, A Critique of Syndicalist Methods.


2003), and numerous more works written in Italian and not widely circulated in English. Bonanno’s writings deal with the theory, strategy, tactics and communications of armed insurrection. He speaks about prisoner negotiations, cell formations, economic analysis and theories of symbolism, language and individualism.

Bonanno’s advocacy for the need for immediate attack is perhaps his most significant contribution to the insurrectionary tendency. His promotion of direct confrontation with the state is clearly encapsulated in Armed Joy, which was so provocative, Bonanno was jailed for 18 months by the Italian state following its release. In it Bonanno writes:

People are tired of meetings, the classics, pointless marches, theoretical discussions that split hairs in four; endless distinctions, the monotony and poverty of certain political analyses. They prefer to make love, smoke, listen to music, go for walks, sleep, laugh, play, kill policemen, lame journalists, kill judges, blow up barracks…

Hurry comrade, shoot the policeman, the judge, the boss. Now, before a new police prevent you.

Hurry to say No, before the new repression convinces you that saying no is pointless, mad, and that you should accept the hospitality of the mental asylum.

Hurry to attack capital before a new ideology makes it sacred to you. Hurry to refuse work before some new sophist tells you yet again that “work makes you free”.

Hurry to play. Hurry to arm yourself…

Later in the text Bonanno reassures the reader of the feasibility of armed revolt, writing:

It’s easy. You can do it yourself. Alone or with a few trusted comrades. Complicated means are not necessary. Not even great technical knowledge.

Capital is vulnerable. All you need is to be decided.  
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880 Bonanno, Armed Joy [La gioia armata], 19.
In a piece authored decades after *Armed Joy*, Bonanno responds to the rhetorically-posed question ‘Why are we insurrectionalist anarchists?’ with seven reasons, one of which states: “Because we are for the immediate, destructive attack against the structures, individuals and organizations of Capital and the State.” He also reasserts the call for immediacy writing:

Because rather than wait, we have decided to proceed to action, even if the time is not ripe.

Because we want to put an end to this state of affairs right away, rather than wait until conditions make its transformation possible.

Bonanno’s large, multi-decade body of work offers a central thesis: Attack is possible, effective, and immediately necessary as a means to confront the drudgery, alienation, and abstraction of life under late capitalism and state domination.

**Tiqqun & TIC**

Following widespread protest in France (December 1997-January 1998), known as the ‘movement of the unemployed’, radical social theory commenting on the events drew influence from the autonomist and poststructuralist tendencies. It was within this spirit that the Tiqqun collective assembled and published two editions in France in 1999 and
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881 Ibid., 22.
883 Ibid.
2001. The articles are anonymously authored and some members of the collective have been linked to acts of sabotage and political violence. In its two issues, the journal mixes insurrectionary anarchist theory with that of poststructuralism (especially the work of Giorgio Agamben and Michel Foucault), post-Marxism, Communization and showing heavily stylistic influence from the French Situationists, Lettrists, and Dada-Surrealists. They have been described as post-Situationists, Communizationists, ultraleftists, or simply insurrectionary. Many of the journal’s more popular pieces have been frequently translated into English and published by university presses including *Preliminary Materials for a Theory of the Young-Girl*, *Introduction to Civil War*, *This is Not A Program* and *Theory of Bloom*. Agamben’s influence is central to Tiqqun, especially the author’s work on forms-of-life, state of exception and biopolitics. Also, the title of the foundational insurrectionary work *The Coming*
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887 A French avant-garde movement of 1940s Paris rooted in Dada and Surrealism.


890 Tiqqun, *This Is Not a Program*.

891 Tiqqun, *Theory of Bloom*.

892 This exact phrase “forms-of-life” is frequently seen in writings by Tiqqun (including in “Theory of Bloom,” “Call”, “How it is to be done”, “Introduction to Civil War”, “This is not a program”, “Raw Materials for a Theory of the Young-Girl”, “Theses on the terrible community”, “The cybernetic Hypothesis”, “The Problem of the Head”, “Theses on the Imaginary Party”, and “What is metaphysical criticism?”) and The Invisible Committee appearing in “Spread Anarchy, Live Communism” (p. 5, 8), *The Coming Insurrection* (p. 67). It also appears in other insurrectionary texts such as those dealing with Queer insurrectionary network Bash Back!, see for example: Tegan Eanelli, “Bash Back! Is Dead; Bash Back Forever!: Concluding Notes” (The Anarchist Library, 2011), 6, http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/tegan-eanelli-bash-back-is-dead-bash-back-forever. In this text, the author(s) define Agamben’s ‘form-of-life’ as “a life that can never be separated from its form” (p. 6).
Insurrection, authored by TIC, is a reference to Agamben’s work, The Coming Community. The overlapping nature between European poststructuralism/continental philosophy and the works of Tiqqun and TIC is sometimes difficult to trace. Despite the insurrectionary tendency away from strict attribution and historicizing ideas, there are undeniable links with the works of Agamben (the “whatever singularity”), Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari (the “war machine”), Martin Heidegger (a critique of metaphysics), Alain Badiou (the “event”), Georges Bataille (nihilism), Carl Schmitt (sovereignty), and Walter Benjamin (“divine violence”). From these thinkers, the insurrectionary Tiqqunistas and TIC members borrow most heavily from Michel Foucault’s notion of “biopower,” Antonio Negri’s notion of “Empire” (developed alongside Michael Hardt) and Guy Debord’s “Spectacle.”

Though the exact authors of the journal are unknown, it did involve Jean Coupat (b. 1974), a French activist indicted as part of the “Tarnac 9.” Coupat was jailed 11 November 2008 and released 28 May 2009; the other eight arrestees having been released prior. The nine individuals were described as “an anarcho-autonomist cell,” and in its
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894 This brief review of continental philosophy was provided by Wood as referenced in: Wood, The Cultural Logic of Insurrection, 7–8.
897 Debord, Society of the Spectacle.
898 The Tarnac 9 were accused of sabotaging French TGV train lines in November 2008, an act the French state termed “terrorism.”
prosecution, the state claimed that Coupat along with other Tiqqunists, were members of TIC, responsible for authoring The Coming Insurrection. The “Invisible Committee” moniker appears in Tiqqun #2, presenting the Committee as a faction from the larger Tiqqunist milieu for some interpreters. The Committee has gone on to produce subsequent texts such as Spread Anarchy, Live Communism presented at the Anarchist Turn conference hosted by the New School for Social Research conference in 2011. In this presentation, the unnamed speakers described as “The Accused of Tarnac”, presented their paper in view of the audience, but asked for the talk to not be filmed, allowing only audio to be recorded.

Tiqqun’s basic framework—assuming such a philosophically complex set of texts can be described as basic—is for the immediate implementation of full communism. Its analysis is predicated on an inherently poststructuralist reading of power, one that understands force and violence to be without a physical base (deterritorialized); it is without “a center to attack…a castle wall to breach.” Therefore, without the grandiose, clearly demarcated enemy of The State or Capitalism, one engages in a resultantly fluid

900 The Invisible Committee, The Coming Insurrection.
903 This audio lecture was recorded and preserved as part of the Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies (ACDS) journal, and is available at http://anarchist-developments.org/index.php/adcs_journal/article/view/27/28
strategy of combat, one that is “wild, untamed—guerrilla-style, if not entropic—
resistance.”\footnote{Ibid., 274.} The strategy advocated by TIC—here understood as the oldest children of
Tiqqun—is to continue to foster confrontation aimed at increasing the frequency and
density of so-called “zones of opacity”\footnote{The Invisible Committee, The Coming Insurrection, 107–109.}: milieus and physical areas of anti-state
resistance which become unreadable by state authority. This desire for confrontation
defines the milieu vis-à-vis its established opponent, what Tiqqun satirically terms
“building the Party.” The fostering of the ‘us v. them’ framework—the “continuation and
intensification of encounters…[to] further the process of ethical polarization”\footnote{Tiqqun, This Is Not a Program, 14.}—serves
to spatially define those in revolt from those in power, or as Tiqqun writes:

Building the party no longer means building a total organization within which all
ethical differences might be set aside for the sake of a common struggle; today,
building the Party means establishing forms-of-life in their different, intensifying,
complicating relations between them, developing as subtly as possible civil war
between us.\footnote{Ibid., 13 [Emphasis in original].}

The practitioners of this strategy of civil war are not seeking to govern a separatist
territory, but rather to gather from within the confines of the metropolis, and while living
amongst it, make it a site of revolt and full communism. Practically, this can be
c methodologies through the occupation of public space, the construction of communes and
squats, and through clandestine sabotage and disruption. Because Tiqqun and TIC
understand the powers of state control to be endlessly multifaceted, and because this
model is without a front, rear or flank to attack, the authors advocate “indirect,
asymmetrical attack…[as] the most effective kind [of attack], the one best suited to our
This reading of strategic posturing is carried forth in modernist cell networks that seek to strike manifestations of the enemy where they are most available.

Beyond Tiqqun’s notions of strategy and war, are its understandings of power that are representative of the larger insurrectionary tendency. The authors borrow from Foucault’s “biopower”—the management of the body including issues of life/death through institutions and other systems of power—asserting that the “management of maintenance of life-itself” is within the purview of institutional domination (e.g. state and capital). This is interrelated to their reading of Empire, as this post-Marxist concept rejects bordered understandings of nationalism, imperialism and sovereignty in favor of “the liquidation of...political differences in favor of a totalizing control of society or civilization itself.” These concepts of biopower’s management of the self and Empire’s ever-present, non-physically-linked power dictate the insurrectionary critique of ‘The Totality’: a boundless, fluid reading of domination which seeks to emancipate all beings from all forms of control. Power is understood to be a totalizing force of ever-present coercion that extends from the material to the spiritual. In this manner, the insurrectionary position offered by Tiqqun and the TIC extracts the elements of poststructuralism that are most amenable to their argument; any texts where they can find “the seeds of insurrection lay[ing] dormant.” In other words, one of the key contributions of Tiqqun and the Committee are their abilities to bring poststructuralism into the discourse of insurrection, and to find elements of insurrection throughout the
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911 Ibid., 9.
912 Ibid., 12.
European critical philosophical tradition.

Magazines, Zines and Anonymous Texts

Throughout the end of the twentieth century and the early years of the twenty-first, a variety of shorter, often anonymous works were written that contributed to the insurrectionary tendency. These include often-cited essays contained in *Insurrection Magazine* such as *Autonomous Base Nucleus*, *The Affinity Group*, *Beyond the Structure of Synthesis* and *Beyond Workerism, Beyond Syndicalism*. Other publications series of this nature include *Killing King Abacus*, *Willful Disobedience* and *A Murder of Crows*. Also widely cited are essays and pamphlets such as *At Daggers Drawn with the Existent, its Defenders and its False Critics*, *Rebelling Against our Domestication: Towards a Feral Revolution!*, *The Question of Preservational Violence*, *Insurrectionary Mutual Aid*, *Toward the Queerest Insurrection*, and *In*.
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917 Anonymous, *At Daggers Drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critics*.
921 A Gang Of Criminal Queers, *Towards the Queerest Insurrection*. 
Greece, Here, Elsewhere, Everywhere\textsuperscript{922}, a leaflet found in France and published in Non Fides N.3. There were also several recurrent publications that emerged from the 2009 student occupations centered in California, in response to University of California tuition hikes. These occupations of university properties took a decidedly insurrectionary character and through these collective actions, several influential texts were written and circulated including Communiqué from an Absent Future\textsuperscript{923} and 20 Theses on the Subversion of the Metropolis\textsuperscript{924}. In the early years following the millennium, longer works by the IEF including Politics is Not a Banana\textsuperscript{925} and Between Predicates, War: Theses on Contemporary Struggle\textsuperscript{926} served to keep such ideas current and under development.

During the era of deterritorialized insurrectionary attack, other pieces would be written by clandestine cells and widely circulated, constituting another portion of the insurrectionary library. These include longer essays by cells of the FAI such as “Rain & Fire”\textsuperscript{927}, “Do Not Say that We are Few”\textsuperscript{928} and “The Urgency of the Attack”\textsuperscript{929} written by Nicola Gai, one of the shooters of Italian nuclear chief Adinolfi. Similarly, cells of the

\textsuperscript{922} Anonymous, “In Greece, Here, Elsewhere, Everywhere” (Non Fides N. 3 (republished by The Anarchist Library), December 2008).
\textsuperscript{923} Research and Destroy, “Communique From an Absent Future: On the Terminus of Student Life” (Self published, 2009), https://archive.org/details/CommuniqueFromAnAbsentFuture.
\textsuperscript{925} The Institute for Experimental Freedom, Politics Is Not a Banana.
\textsuperscript{926} The Institute for Experimental Freedom, Between Predicates, War: Theses On Contemporary Struggle.
\textsuperscript{927} International Informal Anarchist Federation/FAI, “Rain & Fire’ - Statement from a UK FAI Sector” (325.nostate.net, September 13, 2011), 325.nostate.net/?p=3032.
\textsuperscript{928} FAI Artisans Cooperative of Fire and Similar (occasionally spectacular), International Revolutionary Front and FAI 20th July Brigade, International Revolutionary Front, “Do Not Say That We Are Few - Statement from the Italian FAI.”
CCF have written widely circulated pieces, which have contributed to the development of insurrectionary theory including “The Direct Urgency of Attack”⁹３⁰, “Let’s become dangerous... for the diffusion of the Black International”⁹３¹ and “The Sun Still Rises.”⁹３² There have also been a great number of well-circulated publications that re-mix and aim to distribute the writings and analysis of CCF, FAI, etc. These include English-language publications such as *A Conversation Between Anarchists*... ⁹³³, *Escalation*... ⁹³⁴, and *Why We Set Your Nights on Fire*⁹³⁵ as well as foreign language publications such as *UpprorsBladet*⁹³⁶ in Swedish and *La Nueva Guerrilla Urbana Anarquista*⁹³⁷ in Spanish. Other neo-urban guerrillas, such as Greece’s Revolutionary Struggle, have also been chronicled in their own publications such as *Revolutionary Struggle*⁹³⁸.

There is an inherent difficult in establishing how these texts have or have not influenced the attackers that strike within the same (anti-)political framework. Rarely do
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⁹３¹ Conspiracy of Cells of Fire FAI/IRF Imprisoned Members Cell, “Let’s become dangerous... for the diffusion of the Black International.”

⁹３² Tsakalos et al., “The Sun Still Rises.”


communiqué authors include citations to previous works, and while announcements often make reference or quote prior communiqués or statements from jailed fighters, there is not as vivid an argumentative discourse as Rosa Luxemburg with Eduard Bernstein in *Reform or Revolution*[^939] or those of Karl Marx and Mikhail Bakunin around the First International. Therefore, the works that I have tried to identify are those that speak to original approaches—as opposed to publications that largely compile news, and the words of others such as *Fire to the Prisons* (12 issues, 2007-2015)—and those that aim towards the creation, refinement and critique of *theory*. Other contemporary insurrectionary publications surveyed but not discussed herein include international magazines such as *325 Magazine*[^940] and *Dark Nights*[^941], national publications such as Mexico’s Spanish-language *Conspiración Ácrata*[^942], and regional US publications including *Modesto Anarcho*[^943] (Modesto, CA) and *‘Til it Breaks*[^944] (Denver, CO).

**An Overview of Insurrection**

*Insurrectionary anarchy is a revolutionary theory, practice, and tendency which emphasizes attack and a refusal to negotiate or compromise with enemies. It is critical of formal organizations such as labor unions and federations and instead...*

[^939]: Rosa Luxemburg, *Reform or Revolution* (Online: Rosa Luxemburg Internet Archive/Marxists.org, 1900), http://www.marxists.org/archive/luxemburg/1900/reform-revolution/.
[^944]: See for example: ‘Til it Breaks, “‘Til It Breaks #1” (‘Til it Breaks, Summer 2009), http://itbreaks.files.wordpress.com/2010/02/itbreaks1.pdf.
advocates informal organizations and small affinity groups.\textsuperscript{945} -- riotous incognitx, A Queer, vegan, anti-fascist, insurrectionary zine [2014]

In her comprehensive account of twentieth century European leftist militants, political violence theorist Donatella della Porta wrote, “in the left-wing underground, justifications for violence are sought in the traditional, revolutionary discourse of the Left.”\textsuperscript{946} But a key motivation for my choosing to examine post-millennial insurrectionary networks is precisely that they defy assertions of this sort, by abandoning the stagnant criticism of Marxism, Maoism, Leninism, Trotskyism, anarchism and other libertarian socialist tendencies and instead, demanding a new reframing informed by poststructuralism, Queer theory and most importantly, centuries of experimental street politics delivered through broken windows, scorched banks and explosive bravado. The insurrectionary violence, embodied in the FAI, CCF and others is a newly revisioned discourse that does not seek justification, mediation, or assimilated acceptance but rather embraces the fostering of social tension and the furtherance of socio-political ruptures. These newly emergent networks, while informed by the structural Marxism of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, have sought to embrace a newly disembodied subject, a deterritorialized power that is omnipresent, ever oppressive and vulnerable to attack.

The nature of the socio-political order that insurrectionary action seeks to attack is based in the notion of governance at large, not in particular institutions, methods or applications. This approach, constituting a totalizing critique of power and domination that is familiar to both insurrectionary proponents and poststructuralists and thus weds the

\textsuperscript{945} Anonymous, “Terms and Definitions Which Reflect the Content of This Zine,” \textit{Riotous Incognitx}, October 2014.
\textsuperscript{946} Della Porta, \textit{Clandestine Political Violence}, 208.
two nicely. While Marxists understand the nature of power to reside in the logic of capitalism and the stability of the state, this is largely due to the proscriptive strategies for social change (e.g. how the proletariat organizes for revolution). For insurrectionary action, the focus is on the present, eschewing contemplation of a future utopia beyond the state, capitalism and other manifestations of the dominant order. In this sense, insurrectionary visioning resists the construction of a modeled utopia, asserting instead that the present embodies the real, and the future—what will come after the fall of the state—is to be determined only at that point in the future when individuals are provided the autonomy and temporal space to consider new possibilities.

This is the goal of the insurrectionary network: not to raise the revolutionary consciousness of the proletariat to join a workers’ revolution but rather to attack, attack, and attack again in order to show the erroneous nature of the social spectacle and expose the violence inherent in everyday life. For the subjects spoken of by della Porta, conflict framing by the non-state actors revolved around the ‘working class’ v. ‘fascist state’ (for the Italian RB)\(^{947}\), and the marginalized yet revolutionary subjects of the Third World and urban metropolis v. the imperialist nation-states (for the German RAF)\(^{948}\). These outmoded, traditionally Leftist positions have been reconfigured through the contributions of poststructuralism that understand discursive control, knowledge production, ascribed legitimacy and coercion as various assemblages of a central power. When gay bashing, ecological destruction, economic racism and police brutality can be

\(^{947}\) Ibid.
\(^{948}\) Ibid., 209.
understood through a central thesis—as the insurrectionary framework posits\textsuperscript{949}—then the era of worker v. boss, student v. teacher, citizen v. leader have long since been left by the revolutionary wayside.

Emerging in the latter part of the twentieth century and the early years of the twenty-first, a strong nihilist\textsuperscript{950} and postmodern/poststructuralist influence began to be surface within anti-authoritarian theory. This combined with the urging of immediate attack, an abandonment of the protracted preparatory stage of revolutionary mobilization, and a rejection of mediation coalesced into what I am terming the insurrectionary framework. It is part collectivist anarchism, part nihilist, individualistic-egoism, and part poststructural, \textit{queered} critique of power. Insurrection refigures social struggle as war-like, with a large set of actors dressed in enemy garb—cops, soldiers, politicians, bankers, developers, loggers, homophobe, etc. The goal of insurrectionary warfare is to expose these ‘sides’ and to damage one’s opponent at any site of contact. It is not campaign-driven activism but insurrectionary insurgency. An anonymous, insurrectionary-aligned think tank publishing as The Institute for the Study of Insurgent Warfare, in an essay

\textsuperscript{949} For examples of such intersectional analysis as a theoretical presumption see: A Gang Of Criminal Queers, \textit{Towards the Queerest Insurrection}; The Institute for Experimental Freedom, \textit{Politics Is Not a Banana}; Tiqun, “Tiqqu #1, Conscious organ of the imaginary party, exercises in critical metaphysics”; Tiqun, “Tiqqu #2, Organ of liaison within the imaginary party, zone of offensive opacity”; The Invisible Committee, \textit{The Coming Insurrection}.

\textsuperscript{950} Although the role of nihilism as an influence on insurrectionary anarchism is strong, a thorough literature review of this material is outside the scope of this study. For discussions of these influences can be seen through a variety of works including: Novatore, \textit{Toward the Creative Nothing}; Anonymous, “Uncontrollable: Contributions Towards a Conscious Nihilism” (Anarchistnews.org (republished by Untorelli Press), December 2011), http://untorellipress.noblogs.org/post/2011/11/11/uncontrollable-contributions-toward-a-conscious-nihilism/; Aragorn!, “Nihilism Anarchy and the 21st Century”; Attentat, “Attentat - the Journal of the Nihilist Position #1” (Pistols Drawn, June 2013); Bædan, “Bædan: Journal of Queer Nihilism (Vol. #1)” (Bædan, 2013).
entitled What is Insurgency speak to this strategy of dis-identifying with Leftist forms of activism, writing:

An activist’s enemies then are the particular set of abstract bad things they endeavor to set aright and their opponents are fellows who merely happen to be on the wrong side of the issue. By comparison, an insurgent’s enemies are never abstract, but rather discrete entities of flesh, stone, or steel, from bodies to buildings, which at a specific time and place obstruct their interests. These enemies are not party to the insurgent’s project and are instead defined by their exteriority to it, making elimination of the opposition the basic mode of conflict.951

This critical ‘us v. them’ approach is focused on the boundless, structurelessness nature of intersectional systems and the best way to bring them crashing down. Such a diffuse critique is visible in the language choices of the attackers, for example, imprisoned members of the CCF who describe their efforts as “new sabotages against the authority of the social apparatus”952. Furthermore, Foucault himself wrote of coercive power in a manner that is often repeated by modern insurrectionary actors. For instance, Foucault explains the concept of 'domination', describing it as "power relations [that] are fixed in such a way that they are perpetually asymmetrical and allow an extremely limited margin of freedom."954

This manner of insurrectionary, action-oriented analysis borrows a great deal from earlier strands of anti-authoritarian theory, including the ‘green’ elements of anarchism typically associated with primitivism. One such centrally located publication,

952 The use of the term “apparatus” is seen in numerous critical, anti-capitalist thinkers including Louis Althusser and Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari.
953 Conspiracy of Cells of Fire FAI/IRF Imprisoned Members Cell, “Let’s become dangerous...for the diffusion of the Black International.”
Green Anarchy (published 2000-2009), carried an article that provides a breakdown of green anarchist theory. The four benchmarks identified in this essay mirror those discussed in the subsequent section and are therefore deserving of some attention. In the essay Play Fiercely! Our Lives are at Stake!: Anarchist Practice as a Game of Subversion, famed anti-civilization, post-left, insurrectionary anarchist Wolfi Landstreicher\textsuperscript{955} describes the method of the “anarchist revolutionary outlaw”\textsuperscript{956} as being comprised of four tendencies.

This methodology can be summarized as follows: 1) direct action (acting on our own toward what we desire rather than delegating action to a representative); 2) autonomy (refusal to delegate decision-making to any organizational body; organization only as coordination of activists in specific projects and conflicts); 3) permanent conflict (ongoing battle toward our end without any compromise); 4) attack (no mediation, pacification or sacrifice; not limiting ourselves to mere defense or resistance, but aiming for the destruction of the enemy).\textsuperscript{957}

Within this milieu is a host of writers advocating for ‘social war’ against the entirety of the world around them. For the insurrectionists\textsuperscript{958}, their target would include and extend beyond merely the state, and thus for these theorists, the old Marxist enemy of the

\textsuperscript{955} Wolfi Landstreicher is also known (and publishes as) Feral Faun, and Apio Ludd.

\textsuperscript{956} Wolfi Landstreicher, “Play Fiercely! Our Lives Are at Stake!: Anarchist Practice as a Game of Subversion,” Green Anarchy, Summer/Fall 2006, 12.

\textsuperscript{957} Landstreicher, “Play Fiecely! Our Lives Are at Stake!: Anarchist Practice as a Game of Subversion.”

\textsuperscript{958} Often times this subset of the larger revolutionary left, which I am referring to by the shorthand of “insurrectionist” is termed the “communicationists.” Though the communicationist label is less common, it sees increasing use, and is explained by one writer in the following text:

It is not easy to define what the word communion refers to, and it has often been used more as a slogan, a nickname, or even worse a ‘brand’, than forces together very different perspectives and analyses. What we find ‘in’ communication is often a weird mixing-up of insurrectionist anarchism, the communist ultra-left, post-autonomists, anti-political currents...I want to give some initial points of orientation [these actors are those] that pose struggle as immediate, immanent, and as anti-identity.

Noys, Communization and Its Discontents, 8.
market, or the anarchist enemy of the state becomes “the totality” encompassing religion, family, politics, markets, patriarchy, capitalism…. It is a “war…being waged. A war that can no longer be called simply economic, social, or humanitarian, because it is total.”

**Insurrectionary Queer Theory**

One of the main overlapping discourses contributing to insurrectionary theory is that of Queer theory, specifically anti-assimilationist, postmodern Queer theory. This strand of thought problematizes identity-based politics and furthers a theory of intersectionality. Prior to exploring the main tenants, or *canon* on insurrectionary thought as developed through communiqués, a brief exploration of *Queer* insurrectionary politics is warranted as these conceptual components are derived from the same foundational texts and are commonly hosted and distributed through the same online channels. In discussing an application of Queer theory it is important to note that such a cross-disciplinary pairing is not reserved for revolutionary critique, as a recent issue of *International Studies*

---

959 Such totality encompasses not only a large, grandiose physicality but also one of temporality. Therefore, many insurrectionary anarchists will assert the constant presence of a war-like atmosphere in the social ordering. Such a timelessness in one’s mapping of conflict can also be seen in the poststructuralist critical theorists such as Derrida who states:

> As soon as war is possible, it is taking place...Whether the war takes place, whether war is decided upon or declared, it is a mere empirical alternative in the face of an essential reality; war is taking place; it has already begun before it begins, as soon as it is characterized as eventual (that is, announced as a non-excluded event in a sort of contingent future). And it is eventual as it is possible.


Review, a mainstream International Studies journal, featured six short pieces based around the application of Queer theory to the field of International Relations.

Drawn from Queer theory and abstracted from the specificity of sexuality and gender, contemporary insurrectionary theorists have argued for the destabilization of identity-based politics through a refocusing on what constitutes ‘us’ and ‘them.’ This is reflecting of dominant trends in postmodern Queer theory, which furthers a non-essentialist view of self vis-à-vis social hierarchies (e.g. sex, gender, sexuality, race) and a severing of the inherent linkages between embodiment (e.g. sex) and identity (e.g. gender). One way this Queered us/them identity is made clear is through Tiqqun’s concept of “community” developed in their work, Introduction to Civil War. For Tiqqun, the divergent lines drawn between the LGBT "community" and the Queer experience can clearly be seen. Liberal NGOs rallying around a perceived community (e.g. the NAACP, NOW, HRC) create identity-based constituencies, yet Tiqqun argues that the individual becomes a member of a community, a "we", as they experience and understand themselves in relation to power. In ‘chapter 13’ Tiqqun writes:

When, at a certain time and place, two bodies affected by the same form-of-life meet, they experience an objective pact, which precedes any decision. They experience community... There is no community except in singular relations. The community doesn’t exist. There is only community, community that circulates... Community never refers to a collection of bodies conceived

---

963 Introduction to Civil War (Semiotext(e), 2010).
964 Ibid., 37–46.
independently of their world. It refers to the nature of the relations between these bodies and between bodies and their world.  

For Tiqqun, the shared nature of identity is what is experienced as "form of life," and thus two male-bodied persons who have sexual contact with two other male-bodied persons might both be members of different "communities" as both experience these "forms of life" (i.e. the homosexual act) divergently in relation to regimentation. One may be a male-bodied, white-skinned, homosexual, member of Congress who passes, and another, a transgendered, undocumented citizen, financially struggling as a transient sex worker. If both of these male-bodied individuals engage in fellatio with another male, that act will be disciplined differently despite the similarly homosexual nature of the performance. Thus it is not the act that defines identity but how one understands oneself vis-à-vis the disciplining powers of the body. Additionally, this disciplining is reflective of not only how one understands self vis-à-vis the disciplining powers of the body, but because identity is a product of social interaction, it is also constituted through notions of how one understands self vis-à-vis others.

Another way to understand insurrectionary theory’s Queerly informed rejection of identity is to discuss it as an opposing force to affinity. In this manner, milieus are formed not from those who self-identity as “anarchists” or “revolutionaries” or “militants” but rather a shared sense of ethics. In an anonymously authored insurrectionary critique of the environmental direct action network Earth First!, the author explores this concept,

---

urging action on the basis of shared affinities and not the various ghettoized
campments of the Left.

If…one’s priority is to perpetuate a general culture (and develop new practices) of
revolt, it makes more sense to be antagonistic to the Left but tight with one’s
neighbors or co-workers or ‘non-political’ friends, whomever one judges might
go crazy with you when the shit hits the fan. Affinity rather than political identity
becomes the center of gravity of the relationship. What someone ‘thinks about the
environment’ is meaningless to me. Do they hate the police? Do they hate work?
Do they hate having mercury stored up in their gut? Do they hate some aspect of
capitalist life? Do they want to knee-cap nuclear execs? Do we do similar kinds of
crime to get by? Could I be friends with them, and do we have meaningful skills
or ideas to share…?”

This framework of community on the basis of affinity disrupts identity-based politics and
instead offers a demarcation on the basis of the "objective pact...[of] community,” a
community of those negating identity. The notion of hegemonic forces as disciplining the
physical, emanates from Foucault’s *biopower*, which according to Foucault, acts as, “an
indispensable element in the development of capitalism...[through] the controlled
insertion of bodies into the machinery of production, [leading to] segregation and social
hierarchization…guaranteeing relations of domination and the effects of hegemony.”
The regimentation of Queer bodies via biopower serves to engender social outliers
towards assimilation for the purposes of faux-pluralism within the framework of the
tranquil, tolerant nation-state.

---

967 s.t., “The Issues Are Not the Issue: A Letter to Earth First! From a Too-Distant Friend,” 3.
970 For expansion and application of this argument, see: Slavoj Žižek, “Multiculturalism, Or, the Cultural
Logic of Multinational Capitalism,” *New Left Review* I, no. 225 (October 1997),
28, no. 2 (Winter 2002): 542–66; Michael Loadenthal, “Professor Xavier Is a Gay Traitor! An Anti-
While one influential insurrectionary thinker (Tiqqun) attempted to problematize the ‘us-versus-them’ nature of identity politics, another collective of radical actors worked to flatten these distinctions, creating clearer demarcations. Though it is anonymously authored, *Towards the Queerest Insurrection* further develops the insurrectionary tendency, problematizing the identity of “Queer” while simultaneously simplifying the division between ally and enemy. The authors of this text *queer* the notion of Queer identity, stating:

‘queer’ as synonymous with ‘gay and lesbian’ or ‘LGBT.’ This reading falls short…queer is not a stable area to inhabit. Queer is not merely another identity that can be tacked onto a list of neat social categories, not the quantitative sum of our identities. Rather it is the qualitative position of opposition to presentations of stability – an identity that problematizes the manageable limits of identity. Queer is a territory of tension, defined against the dominant narrative of white-hetero-monogamous-patriarchy, but also by an affinity with all who are marginalized, othered and oppressed...Queer is the cohesion of everything in conflict with the heterosexual capitalist world. Queer is the total rejection of the regime of the Normal.

This set of distinctions exists at the heart of the insurrectionary critique of identity-based, movement building efforts but is not solely the product of this movement. In his book *Saint Foucault*, David Halperin repeats a similar idea, stating, “Queer is by definition whatever is at odds with the normal, the legitimate, the dominant.”

For those seeking to intervene and transform protracted social conflicts where insurrectionary actors are present, this Queer positioning has important ramifications.

---


971 
972 A Gang Of Criminal Queers, *Towards the Queerest Insurrection.*


example, if one envisions their battle as attempting to confront domination wholesale and not simply legalistic challenges to LGBT equality, this framing has a wide-reaching impact on the potential intractability of the conflict. Secondly, insurrectionary tendencies to reject involvement with the political process further complicate propositions for a piecemeal solution where the passage of legislation (e.g. the repealing of Don’t Ask Don’t Tell), or similar actionable program could be marked as successful. Insurrectionary Queer theory positions Queers as those contesting normative identities and those oppressed by the forces of ‘The Totality.’ In *Towards the Queerest Insurrection*, the authors argue that Queer liberation is predicated on “the annihilation of capitalism and the state” arguing that to inhabit Queerness, to claim this rejectionist self-moniker, is to “challenge oppression in its entirety…total negation of this world…[to] become bodies in revolt…to destroy not only what destroys us, but also those who aspire to turn us into a gay mimicry of that which destroys us…[to] be in conflict with regimes of the normal…[to] be at war with everything.”

Such calls for ‘total social war’ encapsulate the insurrectionary tendency both in terms of critique and the action such criticism demands. Both the problematized notion of “community” as presented by Tiqqun and that of a newly contested Queer identity (as presented in *Towards the Queerest Insurrection*) demonstrate how this revolutionary politic not only complicates the gay-straight binary, but also more nuanced delineations that would lead one towards an identity-based conflict. While the construction of an

---

974 A Gang Of Criminal Queers, *Towards the Queerest Insurrection*, sec. VII.
975 Ibid., sec. IX.
insurrectionary *Queer* canon poses the same problems as that of a generalized (i.e. non-Queer) canon, one can nonetheless identify some central texts and publications that are recurrent throughout this milieu. This includes *Towards the Queerest Insurrection*[^976], *Militant Flamboyance*[^977], *Queers Read This*[^978], *Terror Incognita*[^979] the writings of Bash Back! compiled through projects such as *Bash Back! an unofficial zine*[^980], and *Queer Ultraviolence*[^981], and the multi-issue zine *Pink and Black Attack*[^982]

The Political Violence of Queer Insurrection

It is obvious that the Queer insurrectionary politic is inherently revolutionary and thus challenges state authority and other more diffuse forms of power. Because of their direct attacks on state forces and institutions, the insurrectionary, anti-statist tendency has garnered a negative framing, placing it into an oppositional relationship with state forces. This is of course now solely the domain of this specific brand of non-state actors. Violent non-state, sub-state and quasi-state actors are regularly defined as illegitimate within the linguistics of statecraft. Those choosing to disengage from traditional representative politics, or those choosing to violently interact with the system of governance, quickly

[^976]: A Gang Of Criminal Queers, *Towards the Queerest Insurrection*.
[^981]: Eanelli and Baroque, *Queer Ultraviolence: A Bash Back! Anthology*.
[^982]: See for example: Pink and Black Attack, “Pink and Black Attack #6” (Pink and Black Attack, Fall 2010), http://zinelibrary.info/files/PABA6.pdf.
become targets of the state’s defamatory rhetoric (i.e. framing, labeling, legislating), as well as direct, actualized violence (i.e. police, military). When a state, be it the UK, Israel or the US, sets preconditions for negotiations with non-state actors, typically involving a “renouncing of violence,” the state is in effect delegitimizing the rejectionist actors’ production of violence—a challenge to the state’s solitary claim to force and coercion.

It is at this site of the violent reification of rejectionism where one can understand why the state would seek to interrupt the advancement of an insurrectionary Queer tendency within LGBT politics—such an ideology could threaten citizens’ social and civil engagement, further adding to networks that advocate direct attack. State forces would prefer if Queer concerns were handled in the ‘depoliticized’ private spheres, and thus not present a challenge to the codified system of social relations or economic structures. The Queer networks producing and transmitting these challenges have sought to create praxis mirroring their politics of negation, anti-assimilation and social war. To these ends, a number of acts of property destruction have been carried out through cell-based, direct action networks similar to that of the CCF, FAI, ALF and others. The most

983 For example, Irish Republicans who were disaffected by the assimilationist and reformist incarnations of Sinn Féin, formed dissident factions that carried out acts of violence timed to derail political processes. As their dissident rejectionism denied the group an opportunity to engage at a negotiation table, those Republicans rather engaged the political realm through extra-legal acts of violence. This is a similar pattern seen in a series of bomb attacks targeting the Israeli citizenry carried out by Palestinian rejectionist factions (e.g. Hamas) choosing to engage in direct, disruptive violence as an act of protesting bilateral, Palestinian-Israeli negotiations for which the group was excluded. In these cases, when reading a state’s continuum of legitimacy, the more reformist elements (e.g. PIRA/ Sinn Féin, Palestinian Authority/Fatah) are portrayed positively, while the violence-producing rejectionists (e.g. Continuity IRA/Real IRA, Hamas-Islamic Jihad) are presented as purposely disruptive and incorrigible.

prominent of these networks, was Bash Back!\(^985\) (BB!), an insurrectionary Queer network, based in the US, and active from 2007-2011.

From BB! and ideologically-aligned networks of insurrectionary-styled Queer resistance, numerous attacks have been carried out targeting reformist, corporate and state-based institutions purporting to help non-heterosexual communities. These attacks amount to an anti-assimilationist, non-rights-based critique of heterosexism, patriarchy, capitalism, transphobia, etc. as developed within an insurrectionary politic of direct confrontation. A variety of these actions have targeted festivals and other public gatherings linked to gaining rights for non-heterosexuals. Examples of such incidents include:

- **7/2/08**, Chicago, IL: BB! joins Pride parade and carries banners critiquing the event. One such banner reads, “No Pride in Corporate Greed,” in reference to Pride’s corporate sponsorship. BB! also distributes “barf bags” with the words “Corporate Pride makes me sick” written on them.\(^986\)
- **8/26/08**: Denver, CO: BB! protests HRC party held in conjunction with the Democratic National Convention. Flyers distributed critique HRC for ‘dumping transgender people,’ receiving corporate funding, and “rather then saving the lives of queers here and in Iraq, HRC fights to stockpile the military with queer fodder for Bush’s crusade.”\(^987\)
- **10/5/08**, Washington, DC: BB! pickets outside of an HRC, “$250/plate” fundraiser held to benefit “the force of gay assimilation.”\(^988\)


• 10/12/08, Chicago, IL: BB! attends an event commemorating the 10th anniversary of the murder of Matthew Shepard and leads confrontational chants directed at police and endorsing property destruction.

• 10/10/09, Washington, DC: “Queers Against Assimilation” vandalize HRC’s headquarters with graffiti reading “Quit leaving queers behind.”

• 6/26/11, Seattle, WA: “Some Queer Hooligans” disrupt Pride events (for the third year in row), distributing a flyer titled, “Queers Fucking Queer: NO Homonationalism, NO Homomilitarism, NO Assimilation.” During the illegal march, two police cars, a Bank of America, an American Apparel, and a Ferrari dealership were attacked.

• 6/29/11, Washington, DC: “The Right Honorable Wicked Stepmothers’ Traveling, Drinking and Debating Society and Men’s Auxiliary” vandalize the HRC gift shop with pink paint projectiles, and by painting “Stonewall” on the sidewalk. The group claimed the act in a lengthy communiqué released the following day.

Taken as a collectivity, these actions represent a critique of the LGBT, equal rights lobby, what some rejectionist Queers have termed the “Gay Non-Profit Industrial Complex.”

The decisions made by BB! and others to attack an organization like HRC is important in understanding proscribed methods of socio-political engagement. While both HRC and BB! oppose contemporary state policy, only HRC acts to change such laws. On the opposing end, BB! seeks to widen the gap between gay proponents of voting and lobbying and Queer advocates of social war. This politically strategic duality, is critical in understanding Statist efforts to regiment dissent. For the state, the legalistic


993 Ibid.
efforts of HRC fail to challenge the distribution of power within the society even if such efforts were able to effect change. In order to maintain the systematizing of protest, the state presents the efforts of HRC as the fruits of tolerant pluralism, as ‘democracy in action,’ while the attacks of BB! are framed as ‘mindless vandalism’ by unappeasable extremists. This good citizen/bad citizen, good protestor/bad protestor dichotomy is used to delegitimize strategies of political engagement that challenge the state’s monopoly on violence and advocate a cultural reality that is inherently anti-state centric.

A secondary problem for statist efforts to dictate how dissent it to be managed comes in the form of the insurrectionary rejection of identity-based politics. Such a political framework, wherein one sees the fragmented creation of a Civil Rights movement (i.e. black African Americas challenging racism), a Women’s Rights movement (i.e. female bodied, female gendered persons challenging sexism), etc. allows the state to be challenged in disparate venues but segmented, single issue groups. Judith Butler, in her discussion of a groups’ struggle for collective rights, repeats this analysis writing:

When we argue for protection against discrimination, we argue as a group or a class. And in that language and in that context, we have to present ourselves as bounded beings—distinct, recognizable, delineated, subjects before the law, a community defined by some shared features. Indeed, we must be able to use that language to secure legal protections and entitlements. But perhaps we make a

---

mistake if we take the definitions of who we are, legally, to be adequate descriptions of what we are about.\textsuperscript{995}

The Queer analysis supports this line of argumentation as it advocates \textit{against} a “bounded…delineated” legal subjectivity. Instead, the insurrectionary tendency seeks to blur these lines of boundary, to present an \textit{un}bounded, \textit{non}-delineated politic that only separates the oppressed from the oppressor. Whereas HRC seeks to draw lines between the LGBT ‘community’ and the hetero community, Queers deny this simplification and argue that \textit{who} one desires sexually is not the ultimate determination of what community they occupy. The Queer community, as discussed by Butler, is a \textit{non}-class, unbounded by the limits of group description. This newly articulated, queered form of \textit{identity}, inherently leads one towards an alternative method of analyzing conflicts. An identity-based, single-issue movement is preferable to the state as it is bounded by the ability to be appeased and recuperated through piecemeal, legalistic concessions. For the forms of state control, such \textit{identity-based} conflicts, groups and movements are smaller, more fragmented, and thus easier to contain when faced with the opposing option of a generalized revolt in the form of insurrectionary social war.

\textbf{An insurrectionary cannon? More like an insurrectionary cannon!}

Insurrection can be understood as “the \textit{whole} of social relations opening up to the adventure of freedom”\textsuperscript{996}, and total war with the forces of domination, control and governance. There is a goal to ‘interrupt all social activity and paralyze normality.’\textsuperscript{997} In

\textsuperscript{996} Anonymous, \textit{At Daggers Drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critics}, 15.
\textsuperscript{997} Ibid., 23.
trying to trace the borderlands of the current study, one is tempted to speak of an
insurrectionary ideology or worse yet, an insurrectionary canon. While both of these
terms are inadequate to explain the boundaries of poststructural-inspired theory, a
discussion occurs through words and one is limited to the vocabulary one possesses.

Therefore, while this discussion prefers the use of descriptive nouns such as tendency and
framework, it is instructive to examine a definition of ideology—borrowing from social
movement theorist Roberta Garner—that most closely resembles the task at hand. In her
efforts to define, Garner writes:

Ideology refers to the discourse of the movement, to what people think and say. The ideology is the ideas held by the people who see themselves as connected to the movement...Usually, an ideology has some degree of coherence; the ideas hand together in some way. The discourses are interconnected. The discourses specify some way of looking at reality. They specify what is really important. They are a way of making sense of life experiences and situations. The discourses spell out what the current situation is and why it should be changed. They identify some preferable state of affairs that becomes the goal of the movement...Movement discourses speak about some elements of reality, not others, and this selection of a sphere of discourse contains the why of the movement.\textsuperscript{998}

Ideology, at large, can thus be read as a “belief system”\textsuperscript{999} with its corresponding
discourse and practices. These systems by their very nature are inherently multi-person,
community-level groupings “comparable to socio-cultural knowledge...shared by
(epistemic) communities”\textsuperscript{1000} and can be quantified, in a limited sense, as “the
fundamental, ‘axiomatic’ beliefs shared by a group, that is general beliefs that control—and are often derived from—more specific beliefs about concrete events, actions and

\textsuperscript{998} Garner, Contemporary Movements and Ideologies, 15–16 [Emphasis in original text].
\textsuperscript{999} Dijk, “Discourse and Ideology,” 382.
\textsuperscript{1000} Ibid.
situations with which group members may be confronted.” It is through this discourse-centric understanding through which ideology will be utilized and discussed.

The following discussion will attempt to outline the insurrectionary ideology as best as it can be quantified. It will examine the recurrent themes found in theory, propaganda and claims of responsibility to identify the discourse of insurrection, the insurrectionary ‘way of looking at reality,’ and how the revolutionary struggle is the means to transform the whole of lived experience. This exercise in canonization is conducted without the luxury of hindsight. The task at hand is to trace the outlines of a process of canonization that is not yet in the past but is rather ongoing, in flux. Philosopher Cornel West cautions us against such pursuits, writing, “Any attempt to expand old canons or constitute new ones presupposes particular interpretations of the historical moment at which canonization is to take place.” Certainly this is true in relation to the insurrectionary project. What is precisely being attempted here is the constitution of a new canon, presupposing the understanding of history as a cumulative record of international attack. This reading of history posits that while the People’s Will of 1880s Russia is not a direct ancestor of the post-millennial FAI, in constructing the canon in the present, what remains of the nineteenth century philosophy will inherently be understood through the particular political realities of modern conflict. In other words, in support of West’s assertion, this discussion presupposes an interpretation of the historical account of illegalism and insurrection as intertwined and formative for the

---

1001 Ibid., 383 [emphasis in original].
modern discourse.

In determining where this canon begins and ends, a certain amount of judgment is employed by the author. Since revolutionary actors do not often provide taxonomic labels when writing, it is up to the researcher to determine in-group and out-group distinctions. This task is likely easier with sectarian Communist movements as these organizations are keen to self-identify as Marxist-Leninists, Trotskyists, Council Communists, etc. In the anti-authoritarian, clandestine networks of attack, this sort of self-labeling is less common but does occur. In one example, an American anarchist self-identifies as an insurrectionist in a letter distributed announcing his return to the US after living in Canada for a time to resist state efforts to convene a grand jury. The activist, Steven Jablonski, writes of his support for the insurrectionary attack\textsuperscript{1003} that began the state’s grand jury:

\begin{quote}
I also want to be clear that I stand in full solidarity with those anonymous vandals who attacked the William Kenzo Nakamura Courthouse in Seattle on May 1st 2012. There are few things I desire more than to see institutions of power targeted and attacked. I strongly identify with the insurrectionary anarchist tendency and believe that those acts of crime and rebellion that occurred on that day in Seattle serve as a small example of how people can physically attack institutions of Capital in their never-ending quest for liberation.\textsuperscript{1004}
\end{quote}

Despite Jablonski’s clear self-labeling, other texts are more difficult to categorize.

A prime methodological determination of categorization rests in where the document was located (i.e. insurrectionary versus non-insurrectionary website), as well as

\textsuperscript{1003} On 1 May 2012, anarchists in Seattle, Washington, assembled for a demonstration to coincide with May Day, an internationalist workers’ holiday celebrated around the world. During the march, a black bloc engaged in a series of attacks on property including the targeting of a courthouse. Following these demonstrations, the federal government convened a series of information-gathering grand juries to coercively subpoenaing activists to provide information or risk imprisonment for ‘contempt.’

\textsuperscript{1004} Steve Jablonski, “Grand Jury Resister Steve Returns Home!” (Anarchistnews.org, April 13, 2014), http://anarchistnews.org/content/grand-jury-resister-steve-returns-home.
the presence of certain terms, rallying cries and group monikers. In another example of self-labeling, the announcement of a new Greek anarchist website described the site’s content as “Promoting anarcho-individualism, insurrectionary anarchism, anti-social and anti-political nihilism. For total liberation of humanity! Against capitalism, state and mass-society!”\textsuperscript{1005} Not only does this announcement explicitly self label as insurrectionary, anti-political, individualist nihilists, but it also evokes the ‘total liberation’ position; all key markers of the insurrectionary tendency. In a notably similar announcement for another counter-information website, the anonymous authors write: “What is the purpose of this project? Promoting anti-social and anti-political nihilism, individualism, egotism, insurrectionary anarchism. For total liberation! Against state, capital and society!”\textsuperscript{1006} Often times these clear word choice demarcations are absent, as anarchist praxis is meant to exemplify political tendencies to a far greater degree than hollow self-labelings. Therefore, in constructing the ‘ideological canon’ of the insurrectionary tendency, a certain amount of judgment is employed, informed by familiarity with the literature, and the wider social movement’s language choices.

Finally, it is important to understand the assumptions about society contained within the insurrectionary logic that are specific to its position. While the milieu’s conceptions of power and structure are discussed throughout, they are based in a reading of domination that is fluid, invisible and ever-present. Though not stated explicitly, there exists the notion that attacks lead to more attacks that lead to more wide spread conflict.

\textsuperscript{1006} Nihilist Abyss, “Nihilist Abyss - New Anarchist Website” (Anarchistnews.org, July 5, 2013), http://anarchistnews.org/content/nihilist-abyss-new-anarchist-website.
Though not an insurrectionist in the sense presented in this study, American urban guerrilla Ed Mead\footnote{Ed Mead is a Marxist communist in his 70s who served 18 years in prison for armed guerrilla actions with the George Jackson Brigade. He was released from prison in 1993.} argues in *The Theory and Practice of Armed Struggle in the Northwest*, “revolutionary violence will help build the aboveground movement, in addition to other positive effects.”\footnote{Mead, *The Theory and Practice of Armed Struggle in the Northwest*, iii.} Mead, a Marxist advocate of armed struggle, presents an understanding of the strategic role of *terrorism* in revolutionary social change. In 1976, while Mead was imprisoned, he wrote:

> It is true that terrorism as the principal form of political action, as a strategy for revolution, cannot be the means or the liberation of the masses and is therefore incompatible with Marxism…But not all revolutionary violence is terrorist. Terrorism is a tactic, not an entity, and it is a tactic used by people who have a political grievance. Terrorism is eliminated by addressing the political problems that give it birth…In addition to communicating a state of mind to the enemy, terror, if correctly applied, can be an important deterrent to some of the most flagrant manifestations of fascism, and a tool for raising the consciousness of the masses.\footnote{Ibid., 22–23.}

Mead’s presentation of terrorism as an effective tactic, freely adoptable, in response to a political grievance resembles the insurrectionary presumption concerning the positive influence of armed actions against the state, and their legitimacy despite terrorist trappings. Though the insurrectionary vision concerning the steps between isolated acts of disobedience and insurrection is far from a revolutionary program crafted by a Party, it does carry with it a set of presumptions about human behavior and the way social movements interact with the state.

Despite the frequency with which insurrectionary texts are penned, very little of this writing is focused on a paced prediction for social transformation, despite Bonanno
titling his essay, *From Riot to Insurrection*. In this essay, despite its misleading name, Bonanno rejects the need for such a plan, an answer to *How is It to be Done?*, writing:

...the only possible strategy for anarchists is an informal one. By this we mean groups of comrades who come together with precise objectives, on the basis of affinity, and contribute to creating mass structures that set themselves immediate aims, while constructing the minimal conditions for transforming situations of simple riot into those of insurrection...What is dead is the static anarchism of the traditional organisations, based on claiming better conditions, and having quantitative goals. The idea that social revolution is something that must necessarily result from our struggles has proved to be unfounded. It might, but then again it might not. Determinism is dead, and with blind law of cause and effect with it. The revolutionary means we employ, including insurrection, do not necessarily lead to social revolution.\footnote{Bonanno, *From Riot to Insurrection: Analysis for an anarchist perspective against post-industrial capitalism*, 22–23.}

Bonanno asserts that while social revolution may not be the outcome of insurrectionary attack, it contains the possibility of such an outcome. Therefore it is difficult to determine *how* the insurrectionary tendency understands the connection between increasing attacks against the state, and the subsequent stages of revolutionary conflict. However, the approach presumes that by engaging in individual-level acts of illegal, anti-social attacks against power, one can spread an oppositional posture (vis-à-vis the state, capital, etc.) and lead to a more generalized revolt and rupture with systems of power. This largely open, unpredictable, and un-mapped method is a clear differentiation from eras of past armed struggle.

This method of prescriptive, ordered visioning is common in the revolutionary left texts from urban (largely Marxist) guerrillas of the 1960-1980s. Book-length texts such as Guevara’s *Guerrilla Warfare*\footnote{Guevara, *Guerilla Warfare*.}, the WUO’s *Prairie Fire*\footnote{WUO, *Prairie Fire*.}, the BLA’s *Message to...*
“the Black Movement”\textsuperscript{1013} and \textit{The Politics of Bombs}\textsuperscript{1014} all contain discussions of how small-scale armed vanguards transition into more generalized armed revolt and then more direct confrontation with the state. Quoting the RAF, the anonymous authors of \textit{The Politics of Bombs}, write, “The mass armed capability which will destroy the state has its beginnings in very small armed actions, and through these guerilla actions the armed mass capability develops.”\textsuperscript{1015} The authors, no longer quoting the RAF, continue their prescriptive analyses writing:

By engaging in armed struggle, even in its most formative stage, the guerrilla raises the issues of militant armed resistance to the capitalist State from a dimtheoretical (sic) concept to an immediate practical possibility…While this preliminary armed resistance will, de facto, receive only limited support, even on the left, this limited support is the potential nucleus for the eventual armed struggle that will be necessary for revolutionary change to occur in any nation-State.\textsuperscript{1016}

In this text, likely authored by associates or allies of the DA5, the strategic nature of small-scale violence is explained as laying the groundwork for its expansion. The WUO make similar claims as well writing, “From the very beginning of guerrilla action, mass armed capability develops. Its spontaneity will be slowly transformed into the energy of a popular armed force.”\textsuperscript{1017} In the words of the WUO, RAF and DA5, the period between isolated vanguardism and broad revolt appears to be little more than a matter of scale.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[1014] Anonymous, \textit{The Politics of Bombs, Armed Struggle in Canada: Direct Action Wimmin’s Fire Brigade Vancouver Five}.
\item[1015] Quoting the “Red Army Fraction” (sic): Ibid., 5.
\item[1016] Ibid., 5–6.
\end{footnotes}
Therefore to increase the rate and support for attacks is integral to this strategy. While the Marxist-aligned left makes these sorts of arguments with great frequency, the macro strategy advocated by the insurrectionists must be understood as the sum total of the still-ongoing discourse.

**Establishing Eight Values of the Insurrectionary Canon**

Important taxonomic questions persist such as: ‘Whose participation constitutes this discourse?’ Where this movement begins and ends is even more difficult to determine. Though no strict, easy to identify, in-group/out-group determination exists, one can *choose* to think of such camps in binary terms. Though such a modeling has obvious limitations, it can be useful to understand self and other in this regard. To quote the anonymous Italian author(s) of *At Daggers Drawn...*, “One part of this society has every interest in its continuing to rule, the other in everything collapsing as soon as possible. Deciding which side one is on is the first step.”

In the following sections we will explore these ‘parts of society’ found in the insurrectionary milieu by examining eight recurrent, ideological tendencies.

1. **Attack: continuous, immediate and spontaneous**

   *We must take another step further. And what should this step be? Attack. Demonstrative at first, for goodness sake! I do not want to talk about a definitive attack, as basically only the militarist illusion feeds off this kind of thing to the point of indigestion. I mean an attack on the concrete targets that establish, nurture, guarantee, justify, and finance the management of such a monstrosity...After all, anarchists, even on their own, have historically been capable of carrying out actions of attack, which in their small dimension and reproducibility have inspired those who suffer exclusion, exploitation, and*

---

1018 Anonymous, *At Daggers Drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critics*, 5.
Social revolution cannot be postponed to an indefinite future, nor be limited to an indistinct projectuality. It requires constant revolutionary action in the present time, and involves the organization and formation of a ground-breaking revolutionary movement that will elaborate and define its strategic steps, and clash with the establishment’s centralized policies. It involves the political process and willingness to put specific revolutionary proposals into practice.

The insurrectionary tendency towards attack is not based around an attempt to ‘out flank’ and defeat the state in head-to-head warfare, but instead attempts to harm and destabilize the system with a constant string of ideologically-linked attacks that collectively constitute a revolutionary force. While these attacks are certainly carried out to urge system-level rupture and eventual collapse, this is a secondary goal wherein individual acts of resistance are quantifiable victories in themselves. Some insurrectionary actors explain that while they do not envision defeating the state in a classical two party, winner/loser model, they nevertheless feel motivated to act by a personal politic that furthers the political outside of politics through the deployment of continual attack. The Mexican eco-insurrectionary network of vandals, arsonists, bombers and gunmen known as ITS write of their vision in their eighth communiqué, issued in 2014, which claims responsibility for a series of parcel bombs sent to scientists and researchers. In this text, the ITS write:

---

…with these attacks we have executed we are not trying to win or lose (because who thinks they will win, since that time, has already lost). Our attacks address the system and that which sustain it, our acts demonstrate that we have NOT submitted, we have NOT accepted their values, we remain human rather than robots, that we have NOT fully domesticated our behaviour, that we are reluctant to join their lies and their negotiations, covenants that we do not want. We do not want something more beneficial or less harmful. We want confrontation, war to the death against this dirty system.  

Here one can see that ITS attacks without a false, utopian vision for the system conceding. This pattern is repeated from the 1960s when a variety of armed groups waged campaigns of direct attack against the state “regardless of what the major theories said about the likelihood of success.”

Some insurrectionary theorists have argued against the revolutionary’s dependence on weaponry as not only does it set the non-state actor up for likely defeat, but it also creates clear lines of demarcation between those in revolt and those not. This military minded perspective is explored in At Daggers Drawn..., wherein the authors write:

The more extensive and enthusiastic the rebellion, the less it can be measured in the military clash. As the armed self-organization of the exploited extends, revealing the fragility of the social order, on sees that revolt, just like hierarchical and mercantile relations, is everywhere. On the contrary, anyone who sees the revolution as a coup d’etat has a militaristic view of the clash…The most useful thing one can do with arms is to render them useless as quickly as possible…

...we feel just as far removed from those who would like to desert daily normality and put their faith in the mythology of clandestinity and combat organizations, locking themselves up in other cages. No role, no matter how much it outs one at risk in terms of the law, can take the place of the real changing of relations. There is no short-cut, no immediate leap into the elsewhere. The

---

1021 Individualists Tending Toward the Wild, “8th Communique.”
1023 Anonymous, At Daggers Drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critics, 27.
revolution is not a war.\textsuperscript{1024}

The modern insurrectionary attackers understand that massive interlinked apparatuses of governance will not likely be toppled through sporadic attacks on property and individuals, but they strike regardless. These attacks are aimed at creating a space, however temporary, for insurrection to occur; for anti-systemic ideas to foster, and for spontaneous revolt to find a home. In this manner, \textit{spontaneity} as a tendency is also quite important. These spontaneous forces seek to disrupt the system, to demonstrate its fallibility, but not to seize power after its fall. It does not seek to lead, but to fight. This is functionally different from socialimt movements that often seek to foment armed insurrections with the goal of eventually taking power though the vehicle of the party, council, trade union, etc.. While discussing Marxist revolutionary warfare theory, one prominent strategist notes the opposing tendencies to fight militarily yet not seek state power. In this text, the famed foco-theorist Debray writes:

\begin{quote}
Just as spontaneity does not aspire to political power for the exploited and consequently does not organize itself into a political party, self-defense [i.e. armed vanguards] does not aim at military supremacy for the exploited and consequently does not aspire to organize itself as a popular regular army.\textsuperscript{1025}
\end{quote}

Indeed the spontaneous, ad hoc, self-defense units of the insurrectionary underground do not envision military supremacy nor eventual integration into a post-revolutionary state. Instead they understand the notion of attack, the need to remain on the offensive, and the psychological and propaganda purposes of operation beyond simple reactionism.

Certainly, one of the hopes behind the carrying out of attacks and the publication

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{1024}{Ibid., 30 [Emphasis in original].}
\footnotetext{1025}{Debray, \textit{Revolution in the Revolution? Armed Struggle and Political Struggle in Latin America}, 29–30.}
\end{footnotes}
of claims of responsibility is to inspire additional actions. This notion is historical-rooted in the anarchist tradition and has often been termed “propaganda of the deed.” The era of the anarchist “propaganda of the deed” lasted from approximately 1878-1901, and ended when, following the assassination of US President McKinley, Congress passes anti-anarchist legislation limiting immigration.\textsuperscript{1026} For the anarchists, such a deed understands that “only violent action...would impress the world [of] both the desperate nature of the social situation and the ruthless determination of those who wanted to change it.”\textsuperscript{1027} For example, in 1886, Charles Gallo threw a bottle of sulfuric acid into the Paris stock exchange and fired three shots from a pistol into the air. At his trial he shouted “Long live revolution! Long live anarchism! Death to the bourgeois judiciary! Long live dynamite!”\textsuperscript{1028} When he was sentenced, he “gave the jury an hour and a half lecture on anarchist theory and said specifically that he had intended to carry out ‘an act of propaganda by the deed for anarchist doctrine.’”\textsuperscript{1029} “Propaganda of the deed” has its roots in the ideas of famed anarchist Mikhail Bakunin who turned towards insurrectionary tendencies around the fall of 1873 when he declared “nowhere are there more favorable conditions for the Social Revolution than in Italy.”\textsuperscript{1030} Bakunin argued for such individualistic violence following the failure of a general insurrection in Italy in 1874.\textsuperscript{1031} These ideas were developed contemporarily alongside that of Errico Malatesta

\textsuperscript{1026} Joll, \textit{The Anarchists}, 145.  
\textsuperscript{1027} Ibid., 121.  
\textsuperscript{1028} As quoted in ibid., 131.  
\textsuperscript{1029} As quoted in ibid.  
\textsuperscript{1031} Joll, \textit{The Anarchists}, 120–121.
who similarly saw the failure of organized armed revolts in Naples in 1876.\textsuperscript{1032}

Such acts of demonstrative armed propaganda have proven successful from some non-insurrectionary, guerilla movements such as the Uruguayan Tupamaros who deployed it as a focus during their height (early 1969 to mid 1970).\textsuperscript{1033} According to scholarship focused on this group, armed propaganda was distinct from “classic guerilla strikes against the security service” and consisted of the “transmitting [of] political messages through violence of a spectacular and symbolic, yet measured, nature.”\textsuperscript{1034}

These strikes are designed primarily as message generators and transmitter, and therefore unlike traditional guerrilla tactics, are not primarily aimed at ‘degrading the capacities’\textsuperscript{1035} of the target. Anarchist sociologist Jeff Shantz, author of a series of books on radical social movements and anti-authoritarian philosophy speaks to this tradition writing:

…”propaganda of the deed,” a notion popular in the nineteenth century that exemplary acts against representatives of the state and capital might serve as pedagogical tools in the process of de-legitimizing bourgeois morality and encouraging the oppressed to shed such ingrained values as respect for property and the law…[thus] attacks on corporate property, represents a dramatic, if symbolic, shattering of hegemonic corporate claim on ownership and property rights which are deeply ingrained but which anarchist hold to be illegitimate…[They are] a rushing wave of negation crashing against the material manifestations of the most central and vigorously defended beliefs of capitalism and liberal democracy\textsuperscript{1036}

Here one can understand “propaganda of the deed” to embody not only a proof of concept for the attacker, but also a functional attack on state/capital as well as the

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{1032} Ibid., 121.
\bibitem{1034} Ibid.
\bibitem{1035} Ibid., 390.
\bibitem{1036} Shantz, Active Anarchy, 53.
\end{thebibliography}
embodiment of *negation*. This negation rhetorically challenges reformism, bureaucracy, traditional politics and instead offers a radically divergent alternative, that of struggle through armed confrontations with all discernable targets of power, control and oppression. To attack is to negate other, more mediated forms of politics; to critique their methods while simultaneously offering a revisioned praxis of social change that is both nihilistic and utopian at the same time. This ability for the dominated to act through negation is essential as “the exploited have nothing to self-manage but their own negation.”

The utopianism offered by negation is of a post-conflict works based on the principals of, amongst others, freedom, autonomy, mutual aid, voluntary association, informality and horizontalism. This new era of conflict is ignited and continued permanently, until the breakdown of the present system and the space is created to envision another that allows for the imagining of new forms of social relations.

**Attack to learn to attack…attack now!**

*With this we make a call to all the lone wolves or affinity clans who are indecisive about attacking the system, let’s not wait any longer, we don’t have the luxury of waiting any longer, it’s true that even though we do what we do, everything will turn into a technological pile of garbage, but before that happens, we have decided to attack and resist the system’s barrages, without glory or victory, just with our individual dedication to continuing the war, which our fierce huntergatherer nomadic ancestors started centuries ago against the invader, European outsider or native outsider.*

-- Obsidian Point Circle of Attack [2014]

The strategic imperative for insurrectionary attack is also based in a temporal logic that states that to delay acting is to fail to act. The insurrectionary tendency towards

---

1037 Anonymous, *At Daggers Drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critics*, 11.

1038 Obsidian Point Circle of Attack, “Communique for Package Bomb Sent to the Rector of UNAM.”
Immediate action is not only strategic, it is also pedagogical; in other words, one learns to attack through attacking and through no other means. In one of the most often quoted pieces of insurrectionary prose, the author(s) of *At Daggers Drawn*..., write:

> The secret is to really begin. The present social organization is not just delaying...The only way to learn what freedom is, is to experiment it...Insurrection does not come up with the answers on its own, that is true. It only starts asking questions. So the point is not whether to act gradually or adventureistically. The point is whether to act of merely dream of acting.\(^{1039}\)

The method of spreading attacks is a form of struggle that carries a different world within it. To act when everyone advises waiting, when it is not possible to count on great followings, when you do not know beforehand whether you will get results or not, means one is already affirming what one is fighting for: a society *without measure*.\(^{1040}\)

These notions are consistent; learning through action, the need to ‘simply begin’ and that the crossing of a threshold to move from theorizing to acting is itself a liberatory act. In the appropriately title essay *Insurrectionary Anarchy: Organising for Attack!* the anonymous author(s) clearly make this point writing, “It is through acting and learning to act, not propaganda, that we will open the path to insurrection, although analysis and discussion have a role in clarifying how to act. Waiting only teaches waiting; in acting one learns to act.”\(^{1041}\) In communiqués, essays and letters from prisoners the message is repeated: attack, attack, attack! In a September 2014 essay, Mexican insurrectionist Carlos López, known as Chivo, wrote *That which stagnates rots*, wherein he explains:

> We understand insurrectionary anarchy as an action born from individuality, like the rupture that everyone carries with themselves, transforming the entirety of what surrounds them...If something identifies with the insurrectionary struggle it is precisely that which carries one farther away from illusion and words, of taking

\(^{1039}\) Anonymous, *At Daggers Drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critics*, 15.  
\(^{1040}\) Ibid., 18.  
\(^{1041}\) Anonymous, “*Insurrectionary Anarchy: Organising for Attack!*”
the initiative in the conflict of classes and breaking with the passive attitude of resistance to go into action, without limiting oneself to waiting to be repressed, to therefore have justification to attack; but rather doing it already, here and now. Permanent conflict, we carry it in our daily life, in our heads and hearts, always seeking to generalize it in the neighborhoods, colonies, towns, and beyond; to come to organize ourselves—through base nuclei [i.e. the cell model].

Here we can see not only the emphasis on individualism, self-identification and preemptive attack, but it also employs the concept of “rupture” often discussed. The insurrectionary logic and strategy utilizes the concept of rupture, an “upsetting [of] the imperatives of time and social space…to imagine new relations and surroundings.”

This involves not only breaking from commodity fetishism, wage slavery, alienation and other such concrete manifestations of social control, but one must also “snatch time and space from social obligation” “breaking social normality by force.”

In one final example, we can see these themes made more explicit in an excerpt from a short lived Denver, Colorado-based insurrectionary magazine known as ‘Til It Breaks. In an article entitled “Strategic Social War” contained in issue two, the collective authors write:

Our [insurrectionary anarchist] subculture has come to emphasize the attack. We are compelled to act immediately, despite the sheer impoverishment of our revolutionary context. We cannot wait until the ‘right moment,’ the progression of capital is too rapid to spare even one more second. To the quiet satisfaction of our most intelligent enemies, the ethos of attack has come to imply a neglect of a developed long-term strategy. We of course understand that every recruiting center, police station, and real-estate development needs to be razed as soon as possible. But we ask: is attempting to do this all right now the most efficient or strategic approach? Here, we ask those not concerned with efficiency to

1043 Anonymous, At Daggers Drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critics, 10.
1044 Ibid., 13.
1045 Ibid., 14.
reconsider; we desire an efficient destruction of capitalism. A destruction that is efficient not only in the overthrow of the social order, but also in the production of love, rage, and revolutionary joy. A destruction that is efficient, not in the sense of Taylor’s assembly line, but in the sense of his worst nightmare: the disassembly of the assembly line.1046

This text is interesting not only because it advocates attack, but also for its acknowledged strategic concessions. The author(s) seeks to explore the notion of tactics of attack versus the strategy of insurrection, and concludes that to utilize such a means may not be “efficient” but in doing so exemplifies the rejection of such concerns.

2. ‘Making the Social War’

This is not to be a POLITICAL revolution. Its object will be to overthrow not governments but the economic and technological basis for the present society...The two main tasks for the present are to promote social stress and instability in industrial society and to develop and propagate an ideology that opposes technology and the industrial system.1047

-- Theodore Kaczynski/FC, Industrial Society and Its Future [1995]

The insurrectionary strategy, as articulated by high theory consumed amongst the milieu, is based in the task of creating social conditions akin to combat and termed, ‘social war.’ Theory posits that if, to borrow from nineteenth century Prussian general and military theorist Carl von Clausewitz (1789-1831), ‘war is politics by other means,’ and Foucault’s inversion1048 which states “war as strategy is a continuation of politics”1049, then the insurrectionary task is the creation of social tension, putting the state within a defensive state of siege, negating political solutions, and cultivating revolt. This revolt creates a

1046 Til it Breaks collective, "Strategic Social War," Til It Breaks (Denver, CO), October 2009, 17.
1048 This process is described at length in: Beatrice Hanssen, Critique of Violence: Between Poststructuralism and Critical Theory (London, UK: Routledge, 2000), 97–158.
1049 Foucault, Discipline & Punish, 168.
rupture in the social fabric, a temporary space where new forms of power and organization can develop. The theory is based in a form of nihilist anti-politics which engages in the revolutionary discourse through state terms (e.g. war, capital, power) yet envisions a post-state society which is also post-war and post-politics. One of the more theoretically-situated, insurrectionary groupings, the IEF, write of warfare and strategy, stating:

To use war as a means for dispute management between nations is the prerogative of the state; to use war as the means to negate society based on classes is the strategy of insurrection. When these two distinct types of war blur in spectacular society, then we have entered into the biopolitical stage of warfare, that is social war... war cannot end until the specific, historical form of total management known as politics ends. To escape war requires a subtraction from politics, an act unregulated by law and indecipherable in discourse. By reversing Napoleon’s maxim: that ‘it is not for a event to govern politics, but for politics to govern events,’ we find a hint of how to accomplish this. An event that ‘governs’ politics, in essence, destroys it. It is up to us to make such events possible.

The roots of this insurrectionary strategy of conflict may be most directly derived from the theory of “civil war” as developed in Tiqqun #2, that having been adopted from Situationist Guy Debord’s spectacle (e.g. virtual) war, and earlier, Foucault’s “social warfare”.

This deployment of Foucault is tricky. In its older, outmoded understanding, war (including social war) functioned outside of the state and against the state yet subsequent understandings exhibit state power as working for the state. In his discussion of
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1050 Napoleon’s “How to Make War” as quoted in Politics Is Not a Banana, 135.
1051 The Institute for Experimental Freedom, Politics Is Not a Banana, 134–135.
1052 This issue includes the texts Introduction to Civil War, and This is Not a Program.
Foucault’s application to concepts of war, International Relations theorist Julian Reid writes:

Originally conceived in terms of their exteriority to the state certain of these historico-political discourses are reconceived…discourses of war and politics undergo a marked shift. No longer is the politics that war continues a war against the state in which state institutions are the source of domination and subjugation but instead politics becomes a continuation of a war for the state.\textsuperscript{1055}

Therefore while war is often understood as something that is carried out against the state’s authority, the same posturing is adopted for statist aims; for the continuation of ‘politics through other means.’\textsuperscript{1056} In his series of lectures collected in \textit{Society Must Be Defended}\textsuperscript{1057}, Foucault develops his reading on the connection between war and politics, especially in light of Clausewitz\textsuperscript{1058}. Clausewitz argued that war occurs when politics fails—continuing forward to accomplish the political goals\textsuperscript{1059}—Foucault’s assertion that the motives of politics resemble those of war seems an obvious conclusion.

Therefore the insurrectionary position can be read as a third stage in this evolutionary idea. If politics \textit{is} as Clausewitz suggests, ‘the continuation of war through other means’, and therefore both forms of social change are sometimes indistinguishable, it is a fair assumption that with the insurrectionary rejection of \textit{politics} in the Clausewitzian and Foucauldian sense, there is a resulting increase in war. This aligns


\textsuperscript{1057} Foucault, \textit{Society Must Be Defended}.


\textsuperscript{1059} Ibid., 22.
well with the generalizable insurrectionary position, which rejects political representationism and abstracted forms of decision-making in favor of direct confrontation between opposing forces. Therefore it appears entirely possible to chronologically order these positions—from Clausewitz, to Foucault and to the insurrectionists such as TIC—as a continuation of a single discourse concerning war and politics as a solution to class-centric tensions created by a less-than-egalitarian society.

For Foucault, social classes are constantly in conflict in an attempt to establish their own power\textsuperscript{1060}. Ruling class ideology is maintained through constant war and until such control is subverted and challenged, it will continue to reproduce. The strategy involves the creation of ‘full communism’ in the immediate. The modernist interpretation of this civil/social war, is most clearly articulated by TIC in both The Coming Insurrection and subsequent essays. In a talk given in 2011, an anonymous member of the Committee states:

> There is a war going on—a permanent, global civil war...the meaning of this war is not understood. Everything said about the asymmetrical shape of the so-called ‘new wars’ only adds to the confusion. The ongoing war we speak of does not have the Napoleonic magnificence of regular wars between two great armies of men, or between two antagonistic classes. Because if there is an asymmetry in the confrontation it is less between the forces present than over the very definition of the war itself. That is why we cannot talk about a social war: for if social war is a war that is led against us, it cannot symmetrically describe the war that we wage from our side and vice versa. We have to rethink the words themselves in order to forge new concepts as weapons.\textsuperscript{1061}

Here TIC speaks to the ongoing and ever-present nature of structural conflict (i.e. the “permanent, global civil war”), noting its shift from traditional forms of violent conflict.

\textsuperscript{1060} Geoff Danaher, Understanding Foucault (New Delhi, IN: Motilal Banarsidass Publ., 2002), 86.

\textsuperscript{1061} The Invisible Committee, “Spread Anarchy, Live Communism,” 2013, 1–2.
And while they take issue with labeling it a social war, they do argue that the powers of domination are ‘leading a social war against us.’

The insurrectionary social war is a strategy just like guerrilla warfare is for Leninists. It seeks to initiate conflict with the state and force tension. Insurrectionary attack is not defensive despite often employing justifications based in a position of defensive violence. The strategy of insurrectionary social war is fought through the tactics of the clandestine network of attack. The role of the wider propagandist and mobilizing structures are thus to create waves of activity, temporary spaces of insurrectionary revolt. Though globally dispersed and often minimally disruptive, the constant strikes by clandestine attackers create an atmosphere where the social war can thrive.

There was Social War last century during the Vietnam War, an era filled with draft-dodgers, soldier riots on US military bases, troops blowing up their commanders (fraggings), and calls for ‘Bring the War Home.’ Further back, one could perhaps look to the Scorched Earth strategy. The contemporary theory and application of Social War largely focuses on sabotage, rioting, human strike, and squatting reclaimed space…Can Social War resist the urge to simply return to guerrilla acts or can it explode across every terrain of present existence, and if so, how would that look? Could manifestations of Social War include something other than a kind of drop-out culture that might include willful participation in the economy with the aim of amassing resources and capital intended to be used as a force of social destruction?1062

Here we see a clearly articulated link between the tactics of insurrectionary movements and the strategy of insurrectionary, anti-social warfare. TIC writes of this tactical praxis as well, arguing that tactics such as vandalism are part of strategy, “This whole series of nocturnal vandalisms and anonymous attacks, this wordless destruction, has widened the

Thus the politics of insurrectionary attack aim to create space and tension between the means of governance (i.e. “politics”) and the struggle of liberation (i.e. “the political”).

The creation of a political space devoid of politics is a matter of autonomy, albeit a temporary autonomy. Hakim Bey’s concept of a “temporary autonomous zone” (TAZ) reflects this tendency. Bey’s TAZs emerge “like an uprising which does not engage directly with the State, a guerilla operation which liberates an area (of land, of time, of imagination) and then dissolves itself to re-form elsewhere…before the State can crush it.” For Bey, these TAZs are the creation of spaces of resistance and revolution beyond the various apparatuses of state power; “’areas free of the State’ in which to elaborate new ideas and practices.” These temporary areas are filled by the actions of affinity groups, cells and networks which dissolve following the action/protest/attack, only to be reconstituted in another locale, at another time, with newly configured participants. According to some scholars writing about autonomist tendencies in social movements, “autonomy has become…a central figure in the articulation of social movements”, and in this manner, insurrectionary anarchism fits squarely within such an analysis. The insurrectionary tendency borrows from autonomism and “seek[s] autonomy from capital, from the state, and from international interstate
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1064 Bey, T.A.Z. the Temporary Autonomous Zone, Ontological Anarchy, Poetic Terrorism.
1065 Ibid., 101.
1066 Anonymous, At Daggers Drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critics, 13.
1068 Feigenbaum, Frenzel, and McCurdy, Protest Camps, 23.
organizations.” The concept of a TAZ is expanded upon by the insurrectionary theorists into a ‘zone of opacity’, the fostering of communities which, through their “density” and “solidarities” are “opaque to all authority.” Hence, the creation of zones of opacity does not usurp or succeed lands from the state or seek to possess territory, but rather is seeks to “be the territory.”

These urgings of direct attack recall earlier, Marxist strategies. Guerilla foco theorist Debray wrote of the need for not only defensive revolutionary apparatuses but offensive ones as well. In prose that is repeated in spirit in the insurrectionary tendency, Debray writes, “self-defense is partial; revolutionary guerilla warfare aims at total war by combining under its hegemony all forms of struggle at all points within the territory.” Insurrectionary theory would certainly agree; the purpose of war-like struggle is the fostering of “total war” in all physical locales and within all manifestations of power, domination, and violence.

**3. An end to intersectionality: total liberation & ‘The Totality’**

*The social body is not made up of a pyramid of orders or of a hierarchy, and it does not constitute a coherent and unitary organism. It is composed of two groups, and they are not only quite distinct, but also in conflict. And the conflictual relationship that exists between the two groups that constitute the social body and shapes the State is in fact one of war, of permanent warfare. The State is nothing more than the way that the war between the two groups in question continues to be waged in apparently peaceful forms.*
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The Insurrectionary epistemology rests in a poststructurally-infused articulation of anarchism which seeks to locate a form of ultimate intersectionality, a total liberation philosophy that does not rest its critique in institutions or specific hierarchies (e.g. racism, colonialism). Frequently, it is described as an anti-oppressive framework that links human, animal and eco concerns, through the typically anthropocentric notion of intersectionality. For example, one self-described “anti-social individualist nihilist anarchist” defined “total liberation” as “liberation of human animals, non-human animals and the earth…the total liberation that I am speaking about could be nothing less than aggressive and in total conflict with the existent.” Such a notion of ‘aggressive conflict’ is often repeated in reference to “total liberation” as it strives towards the “end[ing] of every concession.”

The insurrectionary critique, sees its opponents everywhere, in all manners of society, governance and civilization. In its widely-distributed announcement, the organizers of a 2014 California anarchist convergence decided to focus the year’s events on the theme of ‘social war,’ the insurrectionary strategy of sorts. In their call for participants, the organizers describe this unbridled critique, writing:

What if our opponent was the whole of society and our will was the destruction of
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1075 This emergent post-structuralist influence on traditional anarchism has been termed ‘post-anarchism’ and ‘poststructuralist anarchism’.
1077 Anonymous, At Daggers Drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critics, 22.
1078 Included in this mapping of one’s opponents is the pre-emancipated social self, in other words, a critical reflection on the nature one has with the social world that surrounds and constitutes oneself. This tension within the individual can be seen as a barrier to a total liberationist reading of individualism, problematizing the discourse of autonomy and egoism.
the complex network of social ties that hold together and reproduce the present? What would that kind of war look like and how might it happen? How would we grapple with the reality that we, too, as anarchists with our own identities and cultures, are part of that complex network that is to be torn asunder? Is Social War, perhaps foremost, also the incessant war waged by Society against all destabilizing forces?¹⁰⁷⁹

If this milieu understands a post-binary opposition between themselves and “the whole of society…[that] reproduce[s] the present”, what does this mean for defining a liberationist framework?

The total liberation, insurrectionary framework borrows from the anarchist critique of domination as a core principle for its epistemology. In his discussion of anarchist perceptions of power and authority, anarchist and political theorist Uri Gordon writes:

…the word domination is more comprehensive than another concept often used by anarchists—hierarchy. While hierarchy is an apt description for the structure of many of the social relations making up domination, it does not express them all. In hierarchical relations inequalities of status are visible, either because they are formalized (say, in the relations between a CEO and a secretary), or because one can identify their presence in a particular behavior or utterance. But the domination of human beings is often an insidious dynamic, reproduced through performative disciplinary acts in which the protagonists may not even be conscious of their roles. Many times, the dominated person can only symbolically point to an embodied source of her or his unfreedom. These insights feed into an anarchist critique of power which goes beyond the structural focus on hierarchy, and points to new avenues for resistance.¹⁰⁸⁰

The insurrectionary project can be understood as a further excavation of these social relations, behaviors, utterances, “performative disciplinary acts” and ‘embodied sources of unfreedom.’ While insurrectionary theory (especially ‘high’ theory such as is offered by Tiqquen) serves to expose these manifestations through a poststructuralist lens, the

¹⁰⁷⁹ BASTARD, “Request for Workshops - BASTARD 2014: Social War.”
¹⁰⁸⁰ Gordon, Anarchy Alive! Anti-Authoritarian Politics from Practice to Theory, 51–52.
methodology of attack seeks to locate these sites in the physicality of the lived world, through the targeting of government, state, corporate, religious, scientific and private properties. Further conflict can be located in the personal—the conflict with the self—though such a discourse is noticeably less frequent within communiqué texts.

These ‘embodied sources of unfreedom’ abound in the social, political, economic and cultural realms. To specifically locate them is an individualistic act, and therefore, cells are left to their own internal processes to identify appropriate targets for attack. This targeting variety is related to the wide, expansive critique offered by the insurrectionary attackers. In a communiqué penned by imprisoned members of the CCF, the authors describe the borders of these areas of domination writing:

The war is raging with thousands of faces. With the face of the techno-industrial totalitarianism, of the economic crisis, of the plunder against nature, the repression, the military operations, the tele-propaganda of the spectacle… Economic misery, poverty, arrogant exploitation by the bosses, bank dictatorship, corporatism, electronic policing, digital world, genetic experiments, laboratory diseases, nanotechnology, deforestation, water and air pollution, extermination of animals through vivisection, massive meat-eating, new high-security prisons, concentration camps for immigrants, arrests of anarchists, police everywhere, army against demonstrators, hecatombs of dead in ‘humanitarian’ military operations, nuclear and chemical weapons, propaganda by journalists, uniform aesthetics in advertising, despotism of dead commodities… Authority cannot be found on a single point. That’s why we want FAI and affinity groups to meet also on new grounds. To combine blown up banks with the debris of an advertising company. To spread our hostility towards the techno-industrial section, corporate exploitation of nature and animals, pharmaceutical industry, civilization and every compromise, that enslaves us. We promote the anti-civilization anarchist tension and invent a new way of life. Away from the fantasies of an idealized primitivism, we want to attack each structure, that exploits and murders nature, animals and humans. Away from the fetishisms of the value of human life, we clarify that our goal is not only the building facilities,
but also the individuals who manage them, so we promote and practice the executions of human targets.\textsuperscript{1081} This is perhaps the clearest articulation of an insurrectionary anarchist form of boundless intersectionality—one wherein a nanotechnologist, meat eater, boss and cop are all understood as constituting the same enemy class or potential target set. It is yet another articulation of ‘The Totality,’ and as such, act in a shared system of oppression and domination. The individualistic development of cell-level policies (e.g. whom to target, whom to \textit{not} target) is integral to networks of “leaderless resistance” and serve to develop, evaluate and expand the movement’s notion of an intersectional totality. This “Totality” is clearly discussed in texts such as \textit{Towards the Queerest Insurrection} and aims at identifying the \textit{causes} of domination, coercion, oppression and system-level violence at their most base terms. The totality reading of intersectionality speaks beyond the police, banks and multinational trade bodies and focuses at the roots of power, seeing the larger enemy as “not simply as an assemblage of machinery, but as a social relation, a \textit{system}.”\textsuperscript{1082} This is precisely why the insurrectionary concept of a totality is functionally open and descriptively fluid; it is not meant to be a litmus lest for attack but rather an overarching framework to inform analysis and action.

\textbf{4. Against managed struggle & social movements, for temporary informality}

\textit{Because this is what anarchist urban guerrilla exactly means: bringing the attack in first person and present tense, without needing the camouflage of social protest...At the same time, various anarchist politicians and clowns satisfy their conscience by participating in opportunistic street-fights and fantasize the social

\textsuperscript{1081} Conspiracy of Cells of Fire FAI/IRF Imprisoned Members Cell, “Let’s become dangerous...for the diffusion of the Black International.”\textsuperscript{1082} Anonymous, \textit{At Daggers Drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critics}, 20.
revolution of the masses. It is them, who using social struggles as an alibi, characterize the anarchist urban guerrilla as an outdated and self-destructive choice...For us, as Conspiracy of Cells of Fire, the bet is simple. Through ‘social struggles’, we want to create bridge, so that rebellious and unsatisfied minorities can cross over to the anarchist urban guerrilla, where the attack is continuous.  

-- Conspiracy of Cells of Fire—FAI/IRF, Imprisoned Members Cell [2013]

In the opening pages of the IEF’s 2013 mini-book, Between Predicates. War... the collective of insurrectionary theorists caution, “‘Contemporary struggle’ is our way to conceptualize what links the events of our epoch—events that cannot be defined as social movements or categorized within leftist conceptions of reform and revolution.”¹⁰⁸⁴ The authors write that even the language we use to understand social movement—that of “justice, democracy and equality”—are without merit as they are part of a discourse controlled by “the enemy”¹⁰⁸⁵ Insurrectionary positions are oppositional to so-called social movements in a number of key ways. First they oppose the reduction of struggle to issues which are then ghettoized into movements with specific socio-political aims. This would include the animal rights movements, women’s rights movement, global debt relief movement, etc. Not only are these often portrayed as piecemeal, reformist and myopic, they are burdened with the weights of age-old discourses of liberalism, namely “the grammar of justice, democracy, and equality.”¹⁰⁸⁶ Therefore, not only is insurrectionism opposed to this form of reductionism, it is also opposed to the emphasis on mass, workerism and organization. In other words, the insurrection does not require

¹⁰⁸³ Conspiracy of Cells of Fire FAI/IRF Imprisoned Members Cell, “Let’s become dangerous...for the diffusion of the Black International.”
¹⁰⁸⁴ The Institute for Experimental Freedom, Between Predicates, War: Theses On Contemporary Struggle, 9.
¹⁰⁸⁵ Ibid., 12.
¹⁰⁸⁶ Ibid.

378
for revolt to be broad-based, situated in the working class or the result of capacity building from movements. This notion of rejecting ‘mass’ as an undesirable measure or hindrance is repeated by anarcho-primitivist and insurrectionary proponent Kevin Tucker, who writes in, Revolution And/Or Insurrection: Some Thoughts on Tearing This Muthafucka Down:

I’m not for any kind of ‘mass consciousness’ or mass anything, in fact, ‘mass’ is one of the underlying problems that comes with civilization. I’m most interested in autonomous resistance…Insurrection is the act of people who simply refuse to sit by and wait for revolutions…Insurrection remains a tactic for those who seek an outlet for their rage against the great domesticating force.  

Modern insurrectionary theorists thus critique the failing of the mass-centric movements of the 1960s-1990s, arguing that they “created the conditions for general self-management [of dissent]” and that in actualizing the freedoms for specific classes (e.g. people of color, non-heterosexuals, women, etc.) the systems of governance and state have been able to integrate these new avenues into capitalist commodification and new form so social control. Moreover, insurrectionary logic posits that the social movement’s tendency to act as a tangible representative of collective dissatisfaction are self-serving and exploit the hardships of the community for the mobilization of the party. It is worth noting that concurrent strands of anti-state, poststructuralist thought similarly maintain a central rejection of representation, such as poststructural anarchism.
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According to insurrectionary theorists, representationism becomes ever more
distant as those speaking for the exploited (i.e. the social movement participants) grow
detached from the actual communities they claim to represent, and the work of
representationship becomes akin to a job The anonymous authors of *At Daggers Drawn*...make this case, writing:

Too often revolutionaries have claimed to be the exploited’s consciousness and to
represent their level of subversive maturity. The ‘social movement’ thus becomes
the justification for the party (which in the Leninist version becomes an elite of
professionals of the revolution). The vicious circle is that the more one separates
oneself from the exploited, the more one needs to represent an inexistent
relationship. Subversion is reduced to one’s own practices, and representation
becomes the organization of an ideological racket—the bureaucratic version of
capitalist appropriation…We do not want to direct or support social movements,
but rather to participate in those that already exist, to the extent to which we
recognize common needs in them.\(^\text{1091}\)

This strategic frame often comes in the form of rejection of more traditional forms of
leftist action. For example, insurrectionary proponents who may have partially come of
age politically in the realm of anti-globalization protests, anarchist infoshops and group
houses have moved past this, seeing these tired forms of lifestyleism and activism as
insular and unwinnable. In their essay “Taking Communion at the End of History,”
contained within the IEF’s larger work, *Politics is Not a Banana*, the author(s) write:

The rhythm anarchists in the US have grown accustomed to—that of food not
bombs, of collective living, of bicycle programs, and of black blocs and summit
hoping—are merely improvised practices with a certain force of resonance. Each
begins either as an intentionally ritualized practice or as an experiment at opening
up new practices.\(^\text{1092}\)

---

\(^{1091}\) Anonymous, *At Daggers Drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critics.*

\(^{1092}\) The Institute for Experimental Freedom, *Politics Is Not a Banana*, 63.
These ‘rituals’ thus begin to lose meaning as forms of resistance and become ends in themselves, robbing them of their disruptive and hence revolutionary potentials. This ritualization of resistance is abhorrent to the insurrectionary as they advocate direct confrontation through informal organization, not abstracted advocacy through mass-movement organization building. There is a constant urging to abandon the constraints of the movement, the organization, the party and the committee and to simply begin the attack as displayed in the text excerpt below. In a communiqué claiming responsibility for a parcel bomb sent to a Mexican university employee, the author(s) write:

> We abandon words and analyses in order to begin with our war, the war against what kills us and consumes us, against the invincible megamachine which only wild nature or its very own technology can collapse. We do not seek victories, triumphs or results from what we do or have done, we are not revolutionaries, platformists or anarchists.\(^{1093}\)

The author(s) are careful to note their distance from those advocating the building of movements and organization, whom they group into the camps of “revolutionaries, platformists or anarchists”, choosing to see themselves as something else, something more direct in its confrontation and contestation with the system at large.

---

**Rejecting the Left**

These forms of rejectionism are recurrent in critiques of social movements, representative politics, platformism and also the concept of an organized Left. Leading the charge against the Left are the writing of Theodore Kaczynski who offers a substantial portion of *Industrial Society and Its Future* (also known as the ‘Unabomber’s\(^{1093}\)
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\(^{1093}\)Obsidian Point Circle of Attack, “Communique for Package Bomb Sent to the Rector of UNAM.”
Kaczynski notes that leftists often rely on personalized identification with oppressed classes (e.g. non-white communities) which hides the former’s feelings of inferiority toward the latter.\textsuperscript{1094} He argues that the Left mobilizes based on a rejection of the “strong, good and successful…”\textsuperscript{1095} Kaczynski thus rejects the left’s cultural relativism\textsuperscript{1096} and their claim that their actions are motivated by “compassion or by moral principles”\textsuperscript{1097} He argues throughout numerous works\textsuperscript{1098} that Leftists as “disorganized, irrational types” that are ruining the anarchist/anarchoprimitivist movement\textsuperscript{1099} and participating in a form of “escapism.”\textsuperscript{1100} The author’s analysis shifts between the personal, political and the psychological as Kaczynski argues that the Left chooses to engage in struggle out of a “need for rebellion and for membership in a movement”\textsuperscript{1101} of like minded persons. He equates Leftism to a form of religion, rejecting the psychological crutch it serves, and describing the movements as a “totalitarian force”\textsuperscript{1102} Therefore for Kaczynski and insurrectionary networks that draw inspiration from him (e.g. ITS), the Left as a constituency is a self-serving, non-revolutionary force of mentally weak individuals who capitalize on the oppression of

\textsuperscript{1094} Kaczynski, “Industrial Society and Its Future,” 41.
\textsuperscript{1095} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1096} Ibid., 42.
\textsuperscript{1097} Ibid., 43.
\textsuperscript{1099} Kaczynski, “Letters to David Skrbina,” 272.
\textsuperscript{1100} Ibid., 317.
\textsuperscript{1101} Kaczynski, “Industrial Society and Its Future,” 106.
\textsuperscript{1102} Ibid., 108.
others who feel called upon to act. It is for this reason that critics choose to reject the Left’s efforts and distance themselves from their parties, movements, subjectivities and initiatives.

This perception of Leftism—which is by no means resigned to only Kaczynski—asserts that the channeling of dissent and contestation into rights-based campaigns is a central method of indirect repression (and recuperation) designed to defang modes of radical resistance to the state and capital. In his discussion of the Left’s policing of more militant forms of resistance, anarchist author Doug Gilbert terms this a “recuperative element…within social struggles.”

For Gilbert, Leftism is a form of mediated social relations between the people and the state where disparate revolt is methodically channeled into rights-based campaigns which can be appeased with piecemeal concessions such as the passage of new laws, the hiring/firing of individuals, or the establishment of new governmental bodies (e.g. a new office to oversee Latino police affairs). This form is Leftism is routinely exploitative of the population’s discontentment, as it seeks to collect the general dissatisfactions expressed throughout the society, and target it at a campaign—for example a campaign for the rights of women, homosexuals, differently-abled individuals, non-human animals, or campaigns which seeks to oppose or support a specific individual, law or initiative. Therefore it should be clear that a rejection of this style of Leftism is not simply offered by Kaczynski, but is common throughout the insurrectionary discourse. Returning to Gilbert, the author states that a dichotomy exists

between “self-organized [forms of] struggle” such as riots and building occupation (such as those seen at California universities in 2009), and forms of mediated struggle that the Left seeks to organize and direct. Gilbert describes these latter groupings as “official organizations which seek to manage people and their struggles…and people who seek to lead people into politics…and political parties.”\footnote{Ibid., sec. 11:57–12:50.} This is representative of the larger insurrectionary discourse which seeks to critique ‘managed struggles’ and embrace those which are based around spontaneity, immediacy, and confrontation, pronouncements traditional Leftism (in this preparative usage) rejects.

**Informal, temporary collectivities of affinity**

*For us, the starting point is informal anarchist organization...Informal, because we dislike the conditions and norms of predefined roles and organizational statutes. The roles of the orator who captivates the audience in assemblies, of the thief, the bomber, the author of communiques and the arsonist, divide and fritter life and our capabilities. Division is the principle of authority. The informal authority of roles, which we often be encountered in anarchist circles, is more insidious than the institutional authority, as it remains well camouflaged and in this way invisible and invulnerable. We say EVERYTHING FOR EVERYONE. Each of us, away from roles and specializations, can develop his/hers skills and test everything through comradely mutuality... robberies, arsons, bombs, executions, texts, conversations and any other form of expression, which promotes new anarchy.*\footnote{Conspiracy of Cells of Fire—FAI/IRF, Imprisoned Members Cell, “Let’s become dangerous...for the diffusion of the Black International.”}

"Let’s become dangerous...for the diffusion of the Black International.”

*It is the horizontal link that concretises the practice of liberation: an informal link, of fact, without representation.*\footnote{Anonymous, At Daggers Drawn... [2001]}

"Let’s become dangerous...for the diffusion of the Black International.”

The idea of a vanguard, and specifically a vanguard party, is (in)famously developed by
Vladimir Lenin who argued that proletariats were unlikely (or incapable) of independently reaching class-consciousness, and furthermore, the proletariat as a whole is unable to form a revolutionary organization beyond the reformism of trade unions. Therefore, if the masses were unable to form such a mechanism on their own, this became the task of a vanguard party to organize the workers, teach class-consciousness and foment revolution. In this model, the vanguard party hijacks the agency of the people and uses it to accelerate their radicalization and self-organization. While insurrectionary theory posits that the riotous ruptures of a minority can lead the way for mass withdrawal of consent and revolt, the movement does not see itself as a leadership destined to guide and teach. This of course carries with it a presumption about the nature of struggle and human behavior—for example that the ruptures of the few can lead to the withdrawal of consent by the many. Furthermore, it presumes that in a general sense, the population is already quite dissatisfied and thus ripe for rebellion. In opposition to the vanguardist model, insurrectionary theory seeks to create the conditions for mass revolt through exposing contradictions and violence within the system itself and by creating physical and temporal spaces for the articulation of rage, resistance and new forms of being.

While the organizational and hence strategic rejection of vanguardism has been discussed in previous chapters, it is useful to further explore the nature of these philosophical rejections. Curiously, if one is against vanguardism, how can a minority help to foment revolt on a large scale? Insurrectionary logic advocates for ad hoc, groupings through voluntary association and mutual aid in line with ‘classical’ anarchism. In this manner, collectivities of individuals freely associated through
informal, temporary, networks and in doing so, act autonomously (as ‘cells’, collectives, individuals, affinity groups) and collectively (as federations, informal networks, moniker-based networks). This modeling is repeated by the author(s) of *At Daggers Drawn*... who write, “Not only does acting in small numbers not constitute a limit, it represents a totally different way of seeing social transformation... Authentic federalism makes agreements between free unions of individuals possible.”1107 The temporary, cell-sized, affinity group model is familiar to older networks such as the ALF, which has been active in the UK since the early 1970s. The ALF model has certainly influenced contemporary insurrectionary strategies. Not only have joint ALF/FAI cells carried out attacks, paying homage to the anti-speciesist saboteurs, but the moniker-based, communiqué-driven methods are recurrent. One FAI activist, in an interview from his jail cell spoke to these connections, writing:

To comrades like me, formed during the struggles of the 90’s in Italy, the contribution of the groups of action ALF and ELF, with their international network, concerning the revolutionary anarchist imaginary and how to organize into affinity groups, was very important. Their environmentalist, animalist perspective has changed the view of many anarchists. In Italy, their propensity to affinity groups was greeted with enthusiasm as a concrete example of informal organization.1108

The interviewee, jailed for the kneecap shooting of an Italian nuclear executive, goes on to say that he objects to the ALF/ELF’s ban on attacking humans and notes that because of this position, he feels more closely aligned to the Mexican ITS who have embraced an “anti-civilizational, wild, anti-ideological”1109 politic.
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1107 Ibid.
1108 Cospito, Interview by CCF – Imprisoned Members Cell with Alfredo Cospito (Greece, Italy).
1109 Ibid.
Though the affinity group model is common within the direct action history, it remains isolated; not commonly part of wider, and more commonly known social movements. In other words, while affinity groups may interact within a wider social movement, the wider movement context is not necessary for the continuation and activity of the affinity groups. The social movement at large can therefore be thought of as a collectivity of affinity groups ranging in size from the individual to the multinational, all constituted by groupings of people tied together through a shared affinity. This structure allows segments of the population to act from amongst the generalized milieu while often continuing to maintain ‘normal’ lives the majority of the time. In this form, a minority of the population can be an active force for social change without leading or establishing agenda, speaking for the marginalized, or other forms of representationism. The insurrectionary, minority vanguard can thus emerge from the population, be a part of the population and help to foment dissident trends. The author(s) of *At Daggers Drawn*... wrote, “revolt is always the work of a minority.”<sup>1110</sup> The authors expanded this discussion writing, “Although minoritarian (but in respect to what unit of measure?) in its active forces, the insurrectional phenomenon can take on extremely wide dimensions, and in this respect reveals its social nature.”<sup>1111</sup>

These forms of informal, minoritarian, and sometimes vanguardist collectives act in an intentional praxis—“the act of will that finds its immediate expression in an act”<sup>1112</sup>—allowing the means of the attack to mirror the pre-figurative vision of the
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<sup>1110</sup> Anonymous, *At Daggers Drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critics*, 26.
<sup>1111</sup> Ibid., 27.
<sup>1112</sup> The Institute for Experimental Freedom, *Politics Is Not a Banana*, 123.
attackers. Therefore, tactical, strategic and organizational decisions become not merely a matter of utility or pragmatism, but rather reflective of a political ethic:

This, then, is how action in small groups of people with affinity contains the most important of qualities—it is not mere tactical contrivance, but already contains the realization of one’s goals. Liquidating the lie of the transitional period…means making the revolt itself a different way of conceiving relations.¹¹¹³

On occasion, communiqués have used the language “anarchists of praxis”¹¹¹⁴ to delineate those that participate actively in creating attacks and those that “belong to pseudo-ideologues drowning in words, without ever having been tested in practice.”¹¹¹⁵ This self-labeling—‘the anarchists of praxis’—distinguishes those in movements from those within the insurrectionary war, further widening the gap between the civil and the uncivil.

5. Anti-reformism, against ‘democracy’, and mediated interaction

"We are not looking for a comfortable chair in local administration so we can afford to do what needs be done. We don’t accept moanings like: ‘Violence is bad, we shouldn’t be torching vehicles, we should get more signatures under petition, so as to be heard by federal government.’ This reminds us of the fears of a person who’s afraid to lose the goodwill of powers-that-be…It is time to stop hiding your inability to act behind phrases like: ‘we shouldn’t act, this is violent tactics’ or ‘this is too machist’ or ‘this is illegal’. If you want to ask for permission to protest, you must understand that you’re in fact selling yourselves. Only uncontrollable forms of resistance can hope to remain free. Any protest coordinated from under liberal umbrella organization is doomed to a failure. Gather your strengths, stay free and be wild, god damn it!”¹¹¹⁶

-- International Revolution Front/Earth Liberation Front, Moscow [2014]

Traditionally, scholarship positioned social movements into one of two camps: reformist or revolutionary. As social movement theorist Roberta Garner explains, “[Reformist

¹¹¹³ Anonymous, At Daggers Drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critics, 18.
¹¹¹⁴ CCF-FAI/IRF, “Parcel bomb sent to the police precinct of Itea.”
¹¹¹⁵ Ibid.
movements] were defined as having limited goals and operating within legitimate political structures…[revolutionary movements] were defined as having large goals and using nonlegitimate means, like terrorism and armed struggle.”

Though Garner herself explains that this is often a false dichotomy, within the insurrectionary tendency, the movement is decidedly anti-reformist, anti-legitimacy and pro-armed struggle. Thus while a Garner is correct in asserting that a great variety of movements are “challeng[ing] these boundaries,” the insurrectionists are firmly planted in the realm of revolutionary, system-level change.

The lack of interest in reformist measures has its roots in core ideological concepts, but also in movement histories and their exposure to violence, specifically violence from state repression. Social movement theorists argue that violent repression by the state constitutes a prime point of consideration for potential participants. Therefore, revolutionary-minded activists who engage in street-level protests can be further radicalized through exposures to state repression. This logic posits that the more repressive the experience of the activist, the higher one perceives the potential collective benefit to mobilized action to amend such ills. Furthermore, activists’ exposure to severe violence—epitomized by the death of an ally by police—may demonstrate for
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1121 A prime example is the further radicalization of activists affiliated with the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) after the killing of four students at Kent State University in Ohio in May 1970. This event led to the further radicalization of SDS and encouraged the growth of an underground, clandestine splinter,
reform-minded activists that the political sphere is the realm of an “unfair state”\textsuperscript{1122} which serves to discourage political engagement as institutions are seen as unresponsive, undemocratic and illegitimate. As the wider insurrectionary milieu has witnessed numerous activists’ deaths and many more imprisoned, it is logical to assume these occurrences have served to harden those that remain, and to reinforce their anti-reformist tendencies. This is especially true of those who formerly participated in mass convergence/summit protests, which were often the site of police violence directed at demonstrators.

The anti-reformist tendency, which understands reformist ‘revolutionaries’ as comparable with the enemy (e.g. police, army, capitalists), is prevalent throughout the insurrectionary and broader militant discourse. In his lengthy analysis of the Italian RB, author Alessandro Orsini notes that the Brigade’s “hatred of reformists is even greater than their hatred of capitalists.”\textsuperscript{1123} For the Brigades, those proposing sub-system level change were penned as “ultrareactionary and counterrevolutionary”\textsuperscript{1124} This criticism included not only those who sought less-than-militant action, but also those proposing the Weather Underground Organization, which had begun to form in June 1969. Other notably-radicalizing martyrs killed by police during the period of heightened repression of the 1960-1970s include (but are certainly not limited to) Black Panther Bobby Hutton (1950-1968), killed by Oakland police, Panthers Fred Hampton (1948-1969) and Mark Clark (1947-1969) who were both killed in 1969 by Chicago police, Panther George Jackson (1941-1971) who was killed in 1971 during a prison escape attempt and George’s younger brother, Jonathan P. Jackson (1953-1970) who was killed in 1970 in an attempt to take hostages and facilitate his brother’s release. Decades later, the death of Italian anti-globalization protestor Carlo Giuliani (1978-2001) during protests against the G8 in Genoa, would serve powerful rhetoric functions for over a decade as the demonstrators name was often invoked in a discourse of martyrdom against the state and capitalism.

\textsuperscript{1122} Donatella Della Porta, \textit{Social Movements, Political Violence, and the State: A Comparative Analysis of Italy and Germany} (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
\textsuperscript{1123} Orsini, \textit{Anatomy of the Red Brigades}.
\textsuperscript{1124} Ibid., 43.
solutions through democratic parliamentarianism. In a 1977 communiqué, the Brigades write:

What you [Communists] call ‘democracy’ is only and always a form of politics that conceals the dictatorship of big capital…there is no continuity between our democracy and yours, as false as a lead coin, but an absolute historic antagonism that has its roots in the class structure of the capitalistic way of production, this is, in the unshakable antagonism that sets the exploited classes against the exploiting ones.1125

The insurrectionary attack network opposed to democratic reformism acts in furtherance of this goal through both direct attacks against the systems of abstraction and those involved with representationism. In one example, a cell of the FAI/IRF in Indonesia, carried out a series of arsons throughout the island nation to not only preform a critique of so-called ‘civil anarchists’ but also the political system at large that speaks of liberalism, participation and democracy. The attackers used their communiqué to not only claim responsibility, but to state plainly that they are organized to attack, not recruit, convince or mobilize the masses. In a 2014 communiqué offered as the 12th attack in the international Phoenix Project, the attackers write:

We performed our disagreement with [politicians and civil anarchists]…by burning down two offices of the general election committee…We won’t stay away and let our enemy play around with their party of democracy. We directly sent our anger and transformed it into fire. We are not abstaining in this war. We attack…We are not those anarchists who went to voting spots and painted slogans and chants on the ballot boxes. We won’t smear our values by letting our finger be painted with purple ink, a sign used by the authorities to identify who voted and those who did not. We won’t let one single inch in our body be polluted by our enemy. On the contrary, we attacked them without compromise…Abstaining [from voting/electioneering] by not giving our voices is not enough for us. We want to bring this confrontation to be more wild than mere words or posters. We want to speak through fire…But we don’t invite anyone to join us. We are not interested to have new members. We are not a party nor an anarchist collective.

1125 Ibid., 44.
We are an armed group of the tendency of violence. To attack, and not to open a dialogue with our enemies.¹²²⁶

Embedded in the rejectionist logic targeting democratic reformism, is the notion that Athenian forms of governance centered around participation and civic engagement are no more; that “democracy has successfully conquered the terrain of political utterances.”¹²²⁷ Therefore, if one is to accept that “the sphere of political representation has come to a close”¹²²⁸ then the only strategy of social change exists outside of representationalism, and politics as one understands it.

This rejection of mediation and compromised politics is at its base a rejection of representation, as this is seen as a measure of abstraction, separating individuals from actual forms of power. As the authors of Politics is not a Banana... write, “[social] war cannot end until the specific, historical form of total management known as politics ends.”¹²²⁹ Thus to insurrectionary analysis, the nature of this mediation is inconsequential, as the indirect manner of decision making and management is in itself the problem. As the author(s) of At Daggers Drawn… write:

‘Nothing resembles a representative of the bourgeoisie more than a representative of the proletariat,’ [Georges] Sorel wrote in 1907. What made them identical was the fact that they were, precisely, representatives. To say the same of a right or left wing candidate would be banal…The point is that power does not allow for any other kind of management [beyond representative politics].¹³³⁰

¹²²⁷ The Institute for Experimental Freedom, Between Predicates, War: Theses On Contemporary Struggle, 41.
¹²²⁸ The Invisible Committee, The Coming Insurrection, 23.
¹²²⁹ The Institute for Experimental Freedom, Politics Is Not a Banana, 135.
¹³³⁰ Anonymous, At Daggers Drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critics, 7.
…Any demand that is addressed to a precise interlocutor carries its own defeat within it, if for no other reason than that no authority would be capable of resolving a problem of general significance even if it wanted to.\textsuperscript{1131}

The authors clearly argue that the nature of the representation is nearly insignificant as its form dictates its function. As a result of this logic, the authors reject voting, arguing:

“Even if they were to vote against it nothing would change as, to be authentic, such a question would exclude the existence of voters. A whole society cannot be changed by decree.”\textsuperscript{1132} The insurrectionary networks of attack are against mediated politics, and in favor of directly confronting the systems of domination. They are against the “sacralization of democracy” as they are against the “management” of society’s decision making\textsuperscript{1133}. Partially this is because of the abstracted and self-serving nature of electoral and representative-based politics, but also because the milieu understands that to increase one’s interaction with liberalism and democracy means the “deepening [of] a social system that hides the conflict emerging within it, the very conflict on which it is founded.”\textsuperscript{1134} Instead of these methods, the authors advocate direct action, writing:

“Uncontrollable anarchy is not subjected to democracy and its values. It does not speak of majorities, consensus, or fundamental rights.”\textsuperscript{1135} Reformism is opposed precisely because it serves to hinder the population’s ascent towards insurrection through neutralizing their anger. There is the implied belief that the enemies of insurrection—such as reformism, recuperation, pacification, normalization, assimilation—already exist
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in the heads of the oppressed. Therefore, reformism in this regard is simply the outward expression of something already present in the minds of the population, namely a tendency towards resigning oneself to a life of drudgery, alienation, oppression and unfreedom.

Finally, it deserves noting that this rejection of democratic forms of liberal change offered by insurrectionists aid in their enemies’ (e.g. the state, media) negative portrayals. As the sacred nature of democracy is upheld in the venue of the state, a rejection of this form of representationalism serves to embolden the anti-insurrectionary dismissal and its resulting repression. As one author explains while discussing contemporary anti-authoritarian movements, “just as liberal narratives of progress erase radical critiques from legitimate forms of dissent, liberal discourses of threat criminalize activism that is militant or illegitimate.”¹¹³⁶ In the case at hand, this is certainly true. As long as the state and media can continue to portray insurrectionary attack as an incorrigibly misguided rejection of the entire democratic political sphere, those acting as narrative architects are more able to justify militarized policing, aggressive surveillance, infiltration, and a generalized atmosphere of a criminalized dissent.

6. For illegalism, against “civil anarchists:

_Last week...In the suburbs of London (in Tottenham) two of our Russian comrades attacked the accountant of a factory and, pursued by the crowd and the police, held out in a desperate struggle, the mere recounting of which is enough to make one shiver...After almost two hours of resistance, having exhausted their munitions, and wounded 22 people, three of them mortally, they reserved for_
themselves their final bullets. One, our comrade Joseph Lapidus...killed himself; the other was taken seriously wounded. Words seem powerless to express admiration or condemnation before their ferocious heroism. Lips are still; the pen isn’t strong enough, sonorous enough. Nevertheless, in our ranks there will be the timorous and the fearful who will disavow their act. But we, for our part, insist on loudly affirming our solidarity...We today insist on saying loudly and clearly: The London ‘bandits’ were at one with us!1137

-- Victor Serge [1909]

The (false) dichotomy typically presented for the purposed of categorization is one wherein anarchism has two approaches, one of organization and another of explosive spontaneity. More accurately, one could summarize them as a fluid debate—one that pits direct confrontation with authority against organizing to undermine that same authority.1138 An integral component of the abovementioned rejection of democratic reformism is a further critique of the broader tendencies within the anarchist movements towards ‘civil’ (i.e. legal or rather non-illegal) form of protest. This tendency goes two ways: one motion which insists that insurrectionary anarchists support those on the aggressive fringes of the social war, and secondly, that supporters do not condemn militant actions. While reviewing the quote above from illegalist anarchist bomber Victor Serge, one sees this tendency as well as the author writes, “in our ranks there will be the timorous and the fearful who will disavow their act. But we, for our part, insist on loudly affirming our solidarity.”1139 Here Serge clearly demarcates a line between those on the left (i.e. “in our ranks”) who claim “solidarity,” and those that choose to “disavow.”

Often times, modern insurrectionary attackers have expressed sentiments of betrayal and

1138 Amster, Anarchism Today, 50.
1139 Serge, “Anarchists - Bandits.”
disappointment with supposed allies within the anarchist left. For example, the famed “Imprisoned Members’ Cell” of the CCF write of a similar tension between “anarcho-individualists of praxis…[the] unrepentant anarchist urban guerillas” and what they term “anarcho bosses.” In a 2014 statement, imprisoned insurrectionary fighters make this point writing: “Today, urban guerrilla in Greece has to face not only the iron state repression but also the anarcho-bosses of the anti-guerrilla tension of the anti-authoritarian milieu.”

Similar expressions of betrayal have been levied at institutions such as the Indymedia network that developed to provide news coverage of the millennial anti-globalization movement. In once such statement issued in 2013, author(s) identifying as “Anarchist-nihilists against the activist establishment” contend that the Indymedia structure has been complicit with state efforts and has been coopted to “smear and denigrate the insurrectional project, that of the FAI/CCF/IRF, 325 and the anarchists of praxis.” The anonymous author(s) accuse Indymedia of “spreading lies and falsities” and failing to protect the anonymity of demonstrators through posting pictures without first blurring the faces of participants. Furthermore, the document argues that the civil anarchists, including Indymedia, are attempting to reign in and police the more militant (i.e. insurrectionary) portion of the movement dedicated to the creation of social war through direct attack.

They [Indymedia & civil anarchists] sought to impose their discrimination on the [insurrectionary] attacks and upon the action groups, aiming at having a
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dominating influence on their behavior, like the civil anarchists who also believed through their hysterical denunciations they could impose their own servility on the uncontrollables.\textsuperscript{1143}

This narrative is akin to the anti-reformist positioning of the RB and many other manifestations of inter-movement rivalry and criticism. The document proposes that the insurrectionary movement abandons these outmoded structures for counter-information and points to the newly established “informal international translation and counter-information network” (e.g. 325). In their critique of “Indymedia and the Anarcho-Left”, the author(s) calling themselves “Anarchist-nihilists against the activist establishment” write:

The new anarchist international war also does not need or require such useless people, because it has created its own information structures and helped co-create and form many more, that have solidified struggles in the ‘social’ and ‘anti-social.’ The informal international translation and counter-information network has a specific reality that comprises much more than any of its individual parts, one that has eclipsed many Indymedia sites that have been based on a very weak set of political and social values, largely based in the phony social contract of civil rights, negotiation and legal defiance of democracy that characterized the ‘anti-summit’/‘anti-globalisation’ period from where it sprang 13 years ago. The informal internet anarchist network overcomes many of these previous sites of information activism, and an ongoing development is taking place internationally. Many of the prior spaces of the ‘movement’, physical and virtual, are now in the hands of the enemy, or might as well be.\textsuperscript{1144}

This statement makes clear the chronological narrative. Whereas the anti-globalization movement of 1999 Seattle and 2001’s riots in Quebec City and Genoa may have created Indymedia, and in their time, may have been championed by those who today self-identify as anti-social, illegalist, insurrectionaries, despite these genealogies, the time has come for the outmoded to be replaced by a newly revolutionary, anti-civil network.

\textsuperscript{1143} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1144} Ibid.
While the outside observer may see little difference between the webpages of Indymedia and those of 365.nostate, War on Society and others, a great deal of difference exists. Akin to their informal, ad hoc praxis, the insurrectionary sites are often blog-based, abandoning the Indymedia model of formal websites with stable web presences. In the insurrectionary network, a series of often-redundant blogs are created, operate for a few months or years, and then go silent, only to be replaced by new ones. The blogs inter-link to one another, borrow and repost content, mirror translated documents, and publicize similar if not identical prisoner pleas, events and convergences. The nature of the new sites is to announce, not organize. In this sense they are uniquely different from their Indymedia predecessors. They are meant as one-way bulletin boards to disseminate announcement, not Internet-based forums for activists to plan around. While Indymedia was used to plan, 325 is used to proclaim. In this manner, the Indymedia v. 325 debate embodies the civil v. insurrectionary split, marking the former as counter-revolutionary and capitulating and the latter as uncompromising and militant.

7. Against domestication & technology, for re-wilding

...an ideology, in order to gain enthusiastic support, must have a positive ideals as well as a negative one; it must be FOR something as well as AGAINST something. The positive ideal that we promote is Nature. That is, WILD nature; those aspects of the functioning of the Earth and its living things that are independent of human management and free of human interference and control. And with wild nature we include human nature, by which we mean those aspects of the functioning of the human individual that are not subject to regulation by organized society but are products of chance or free will...1145

-- Theodore Kaczynski/FC, Industrial Society and Its Future [1995]

While classically, anarchism has located misery and domination in the forms of the state and capital, for some portions of the anarchist milieu—often termed Green, Luddite, anti-civilization or primitivist—the roots of modern human oppression originate at an earlier locale, namely the formation of civilizations marked by non-nomadic living, tool usage and of course, technology.1146 While a host of contemporary thinkers write from these positions, a growing number of clandestine cells have used these theories in the development of their attack methodologies; adopting a critical reception of scientific experimentation in their selection of targets for attack. These groups of attackers—sometimes bluntly referred to as “anti-science anarchists”1147, “eco-anarchists”1148, “extremist anarchist”1149 or simply “terrorists”1150—advocate vanguardist violence to bring fourth insurrection leading to the destruction of industrial civilization. This rejection of scientific experimentation, technology and the like is developed from more familiar Marxist and anarchist critiques having to do with alienation, abstraction, subordination and centralization. Though a complete review of these tendencies is a

1149 Corral, “Stand up against the Anti-Technology Terrorists.”
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project of its own merit, this manner of critique can broadly be generalized in the following text, written by Kaczynski, titled *Industrial Society and Its Future*. In this lengthy essay, common referred to as the ‘Unabomber Manifesto’ the author writes:

> We attribute the social and psychological problems of modern society to the fact that society requires people to live under conditions radically different from those under which the human race evolved and to behave in ways that conflict with the patterns of behavior that the human race developed while living under earlier conditions…Among the abnormal conditions present in modern industrial society are excessive density of population, isolation of man from nature, excessive rapidity of social change and the breakdown of natural small-scale communities such as the extended family, the village or the tribe.\(^{1151}\)

The preceding text points to the generalizable anarcho-primitivist critique of civilization and technology, a consistent critique found amongst insurrectionary theory. Sometimes this is due to the specifics of the advancement itself (e.g. nanotechnology, genetically-modified organisms, hydraulic fracturing, robotics) and sometimes it is more comprehensive, relating to a biopolitical reality. The author(s) of the influential text *At Daggers Drawn*... call this the “technological administration of the existent”\(^{1152}\) referring to means of technology designed to manage life, death and social control.

ITS, the network responsible for a long series of attacks in Mexico for several years has focused its attacks on the techno-industrial system at a specific form of science, namely nanotechnology. The network explains their targeting logic, writing:

> We employed direct attacks to damage both physically and psychologically, NOT ONLY experts in nanotechnology, but also scholars in biotechnology, physics, neuroscience, genetic engineering, communication science, computing, robotics, etc... because we reject technology and civilization, we reject the reality that they are imposing with ALL their advanced science. We deny a life imposed on us by the system that dictates that we must walk mindlessly, obligatorily obeying orders

\(^{1151}\) Kaczynski, “Industrial Society and Its Future,” sec. 46, 47.

\(^{1152}\) Anonymous, *At Daggers Drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critics*, 5.
from large organizations (industrial giants that tell you what to eat, what not to do, to say, to wear, where to go, etc.) and people outside our inner circle. We negate the artificiality and we cling to our past as Warriors of the Earth who cling to our darkest instincts of survival, and although we know we are civilized humans, we are awake and we claim ourselves as fierce individualists in TOTAL WAR against all that threatens our nature and Wild Nature that is left.”  

Prior to the emergence of insurrectionary networks, the radical forbearers held critiques of technological society that would closely mirror those developed years later. As one scholar explained in describing the congruence of postmodern resistance movements:

The critical discourse in ELF and EZLN communiques reflect the same basic critical interpretation of technology—namely, that technology is a historical and ontological formation, rooted in western metaphysics and centering on synthesizing entities including, ultimately, people into cybernetic systems. Technology is not simply a neutral set of tools and methods but a cultural imperative that everything yield to efficient systematization.

There is a marked sense of immediacy within the action sensibility of direct action advocates. When viewed in terms of the ecological and animal liberationist tendencies, these relate to quantifiable lives spared or conversely, quantifiable lives lost due to hesitation, inactivity and the morbidly slow pace of democratic reformism.

For the eco/animal liberationists (e.g. ELF, ALF) there is a very real sense that civilization may exist on the brink of system collapse perpetuated through human action related to resource extraction, energy production, and industrial farming. Certainly mainstream science backs up the claim that the current era of modernity presents real risks for catastrophic and violent ecological crisis. A 2014 National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)-sponsored study concluded “global industrial civilisation could collapse in coming decades due to unsustainable resource exploitation and
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increasingly unequal wealth distribution.”¹¹⁵⁵ Furthermore, the report stated that not only is such crisis predictable, it is expected as "the process of rise-and-collapse is actually a recurrent cycle found throughout history."¹¹⁵⁶ Interestingly, the fault lines of this cyclical collapse demonstrated in the NASA study closely resemble the rallying cries entombed by the so-called radical eco-left.

The study echoes the recurrent predictions of the insurrectionary eco tendency concluding that “the most salient interrelated factors which explain civilizational decline, and which may help determine the risk of collapse today: namely, Population, Climate, Water, Agriculture, and Energy.”¹¹⁵⁷ The study similarly speaks to the ill effects of a widening economic gap stating, “accumulated surplus is not evenly distributed throughout society, but rather has been controlled by an elite. The mass of the population, while producing the wealth, is only allocated a small portion of it by elites, usually at or just above subsistence levels.”¹¹⁵⁸ Finally, it even warns of the predictable reaction from upper echelons of society who are likely to downplay the structural nature of the problem.

While some members of society might raise the alarm that the system is moving towards an impending collapse and therefore advocate structural changes to society in order to avoid it, Elites and their supporters, who opposed making these changes, could point to the long sustainable trajectory 'so far' in support of doing nothing.¹¹⁵⁹

If state-funded, mainstream science, presented through mainstream media can reach conclusions reconcilable with the insurrectionary tendency for immediate action,

¹¹⁵⁶ Ibid.
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certainly a nuanced and academic reading of social movement ephemera is warranted. Scientists report “unprecedented” heat waves, glacial melting described by NASA as “irreversible,” seven million people killed annually from air pollution and have concluded that ongoing climate change is “substantially correlated” to rises in violent crime and group conflict (i.e. war). With such predictable patterns in mind, it is no matter that eco-crisis is a highly motivating factor for a variety of actors across the revolutionary spectrum—especially as these apocalyptic findings are consistently said to be “human-driven.” Even the US President seemed to foster a sense of urgency, when for example, he stated in May 2014:

We want to emphasize to the public, this is not some distant problem of the future. This is a problem that is affecting Americans right now...Whether it means increased flooding, greater vulnerability to drought, more severe wildfires - all these things are having an impact on Americans as we speak.

Given authoritative reports of such a nature, is it surprising that a variety of individuals feel the urgency to attack?

Despite these scientific findings and motivating factors, certain sectors of the eco-motivated insurrectionary tendency have articulated a strong rejection of technology and even a broader rejection towards the methods of modern scientific interventionism. While this is best demonstrated in the attacks of certain Mexican direct attack networks, it can be seen in multiple settings throughout. In a Brazilian communiqué claiming responsibility for anti-state attacks—including the use of fire and explosives—the authors write:

Modern civilization has reached a huge level of devastation of the earth, waters, and all life that inhabits this planet. It’s the result of this sick logic of understanding that everything exists to serve some human being and be transformed into money…Technology is developed to better serve the interests of this logic. To believe in the neutrality of technology is like believing in the neutrality of a police officer or a judge. Technologies blatantly favor domination, control, profit-making. Hydroelectric plants, industries, agribusinesses, microchips, surveillance cameras, transgenics, biometrics, virtual world of social networks. Will the new generations be even more obedient and manipulable?1167

This anti-technological/industrial system discourse is especially active in Mexico and in the writings of American mail bomber, Ted Kaczynski. Several contemporary Mexican insurrectionary networks adopt a Kaczynskian-type analysis and identify most closely with this tendency, such as ITS and OPCA. In an April 2014 communiqué from the newly announced OPCA, the group argues for the ceasing of analysis and the increasing of attacks, writing:

We abandon words and analyses in order to begin with our war, the war against what kills us and consumes us, against the invincible megamachine which only wild nature or its very own technology can collapse. We do not seek victories, triumphs or results from what we do or have done, we are not revolutionaries, platformists or anarchists. We only seek confrontation with the system, the sharpening of the conflict against it. From this day we publicly put aside the word ‘analysis,’ in order to become The Obsidian Point Circle of Attack.\(^{1168}\)

Later, after claiming responsibility for a “package bomb with a considerable quantity of Shrapnel”\(^{1169}\) to a rector at UNAM, the communiqué author(s) articulate their anti-technological stance in reference to why the individual was targeted, writing:

We bitterly oppose the progress of the technological or industrial system, its cultural values and its slave society, since progress is the enormous bunch of attacks against wild nature. It is for progress that rivers, seas and oceans are contaminated, that forests and jungles are deforested, that the species are exterminated from the various environments where they exist on this earth, that other worlds inside and outside of the Milky Way are examined in order to corrupt them like this one, the physique, character and mentality of the human being is manipulated and dominated now by machines, our deepest and darkest natural instincts are domesticated with their propaganda on television, radio, internet, newspapers, schools, jobs and universities. Progress kills, sickens and makes everything artificial and mechanical.\(^{1170}\)

Clearly the ecological and anti-technological motivations are strong currents within many realms of insurrectionary thought. They are a natural partner to the milieu’s embedded sense of urgency, and combined with rhetorical support from the mainstream scientific community, may remain the most salient component of an often silenced political and social critique.

**8. Wild egoist individualism**

*One of the results of these recent movements is the understanding that henceforth*
a real demonstration has to be ‘wild,’ not declared in advance to the police."\textsuperscript{1171}

-- The Invisible Committee, \textit{The Coming Insurrection} [2007]

\textit{We can choose not to live. That is the most beautiful reason for opening oneself up to life with joy... We can choose not to act, and this is the most beautiful reason for acting.}\textsuperscript{1172}

-- Anonymous, \textit{At Daggers Drawn...} [2001]

\textit{I should admit, though, that I personally am strongly inclined to individualism. Ideally, I shouldn’t allow my individualistic predilections to influence my thinking on revolutionary strategy but should arrive at my conclusions objectively. The fact that you have spotted my individualistic leanings may mean that I have not been as objective as I should have been.}\textsuperscript{1173}

-- Theodore Kaczynski [2010]

The evoking the notion of a pre-anthropocene period of ‘the wild’ is common throughout insurrectionary rhetoric, especially that which is critical of science, technology and civilization. The concept of \textit{wild} harkens to an untamed, free, egalitarian and plentiful state of non-anthropocentric nature seen in stark comparison to “the realm of human greed and ecological despoliation.”\textsuperscript{1174} Therefore, as Randall Amster states, green infused eco-anarchism centers around \textit{wildness} not the physical wilderness.\textsuperscript{1175} The wild ethics of pre-modern (i.e. primitive) societies and ‘natural’ “biospheric egalitarianism” assumed to be outside of the techno-industrial civilization of modernity are models for not only personal lifestyleism, but a revolutionary utopianism to be found in the construction of a post-state community.

The individualist framework\textsuperscript{1176} dovetails with insurrectionary anarchism’s

\begin{footnotes}
1171 The Invisible Committee, \textit{The Coming Insurrection}, 127.
1172 Anonymous, \textit{At Daggers Drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critics}, 35.
1174 Amster, \textit{Anarchism Today}, 70.
1175 Ibid.
1176 The individualist tradition has long roots in Europe and North America. While a complete history of all involved is far beyond the scope of this review, famed individualist anarchists include: In France—
\end{footnotes}
rejection of “organized anarchist movements” and typically endorses the use of individual acts of violence to achieve one’s aims. This is true in explicitly insurrectionary acts of political violence—like those of the CCF, FAI, IRF—as well as the older models such as the ELF/ALF. The ELF/ALF—employing tactics of “monkeywrenching”—use such means because “monkeywrenching is specifically constructed as: individual, not organized, dispersed, diverse, deliberate and ethical.”

In its most general terms, the individualist tendency, borrows from the classically liberal notion of individual sovereignty, “extend[ing] it until it [becomes] incompatible with the idea of a state.” Individualism is often spoken of—within the anarchist tradition—as closely linked to illegalism, as many illegalist anarchists closely aligned with the individualist logic. In his description of the illegalist mentality, an anarchist scholar writes that they “expressed their desperation and their personal, violent rejection of an intolerable society...[acts of...
illegality] were clearly meant to be exemplary, invitations to revolt.”

There is an aesthetic of wildness that is pervasive in the self-descriptions of insurrectionary actors. Prominently you have violence-prone eco-insurrectionary networks such as ITS (Individualists Tending Towards the Wild) employing such images as a namesake. The author(s) of *At Daggers Drawn...* write that insurrectionary warriors who are honest with self will understand themselves to be ‘wild’, stating:

If they do not wish to deceive themselves and others, those struggling for the demolition of the present social edifice must face the fact that subversion is a game of wild, barbarous forces. Someone referred to them as Cossacks, someone else hooligans; on fact they are individuals whose anger has not be quelled by social peace."

Here one can see that not only is the author(s) speaking of a wildness, but also of a more generalized uncontrollable nature; an association with those that are ‘wild, barbarous, hooligans.’ Cells carrying out attacks have even self-labeled as such, naming themselves, “Commando of Free, Dangerous, Wild and Incendiary Individuals for the Black Plague – FAI” and “Luddites Against the Domestication of Wild Nature – FAI.”

Similar sentiments are conjured with the egoist influence and an embracing of an anti-political, anti-social analysis. This is clearly articulated in a communiqué composed by OPCA wherein they write:

We care little what they call us, such as ‘barbarian,’ ‘foolish,’ ‘mediocre,’ etc, we do not want to give any ‘good impression’ to their eyes, we do not want to be, nor are we, nor will we be, the traditional ‘social fighters’ of Mexico, we are egoist radicals, politically incorrect, irreverently individualist at war against the progress

---

1180 Imrie, “The 'Illegalists.'”
1181 Anonymous, *At Daggers Drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critics*, 11.
1182 FAI Artisans Cooperative of Fire and Similar (occasionally spectacular), International Revolutionary Front and FAI 20th July Brigade, *International Revolutionary Front*, “Do Not Say That We Are Few - Statement from the Italian FAI.”
1183 Ibid.
of the technindustrial system.\textsuperscript{1184}

The image of a barbarian horde that cares little for social convention and political correctness was also invoked by Victor Serge, the famed early twentieth century Bonnot Gang rebel. In 1909, Serge wrote:

Let this be known. Let it be finally understood that in the current society we are the vanguard of a barbarous army. That we have no respect for what constitutes virtue, morality, honesty, that we are outside or laws and regulations…We prefer combat. Against us, all arms are good; we are in an enemy camp, surrounded, harassed. The bosses, judges, soldiers, cops unite to bring us down. We defend ourselves – not by all means, for the most peremptory response we can give them is to be better than them—but with a profound contempt for their codes, their morals, their prejudices…Your codes, your laws, your ‘honesty’: you can’t imagine how we laugh at them!\textsuperscript{1185}

It is not just the fighting barbarian army image that is deployed, but other pre-modern fighting forces, often romanticized and reinterpreted to match contemporary political tendencies. For example, in the text below, an anonymous author(s) urges anarchists to avoid attending May Day demonstrations and other manifestations of the left, and instead, let the destructive force of insurrectionary violence speak for itself:

So on May Day, let us say fuck all to the funeral dance of the left. Do *not* attend the protests of the left...Street demonstrations are both tired and predictable. The terrain is rigged and the audience is small. We rely on the media to tell our story rather than people reading our story by the devastation we leave throughout a city.

The Vandals were a tribe before they were associated with any individual that engages in some level of property destruction…they set a precedent and all property destroyers wear the name of their tribe as a crime.

I say we remake the Vandals. We remake the tribe and commit its crime. We don't walk in one mass in a city, but as small vandal units, striking where we can,

\textsuperscript{1184} Obsidian Point Circle of Attack, “Communique for Package Bomb Sent to the Rector of UNAM.”

\textsuperscript{1185} Serge, “Anarchists - Bandits.”
damaging the most public of things that we can get away with…Let the battle of
the Vandals be May Day! May the tribe of destruction be reborn!

Here you can see an embracing of the sort of individualistic, yet collectively experienced
violence typically associated with a riot or insurrection. The author(s) invokes criticisms
of social movement methods and urges activists to not engage in self-sacrifice but to
strike, escape and strike again. Insurrectionary logic privileges the individual; their
desires, their abilities. The force of a spreading of insurrection, from small acts of rupture
to a more generalized revolt and disruption is a process of individuals acting outside of
central coordination or control. This point is made clearly in *At Daggers Drawn*…

wherein the author(s) write:

> Insurrection is the process that unleashes this strength [of the exploited], and
> along with it autonomy and the pleasure of living; it is the moment when we think
> reciprocally that the best thing we can do for others is to free ourselves. In this
> sense it is ‘a collective movement of individual realization.’

Furthering this individualist motivational logic, one’s ability to *not* revolt makes the act
of revolting an actualized freedom. The desire to seek joy and freedom serves to anchor
the individualist in their pursuit of fulfillment through autonomous action. Max Stirner
(1806-1856), the name most often associated with the egoist tendency, authored *The Ego
and His Own* in 1843, arguing the complete denial of absolutes and institutions in favor
of the human individual. Stirner’s philosophy approaches the nihilist position—
borrowing a great deal from Friedrich Nietzsche. Stirner’s ideas are informed by a
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1186 Anonymous, “Vandal Demonstration May Day 2014” (AnokChan, April 28, 2014),

1187 It should be acknowledged that the human being is often said to be a ‘social being’ and this includes
the social construction of self, created through social encounters with others. In other words, one can
only understand what individualism is in light of their understanding of self in relation to others.


rejection of a base law for human kind and instead offer another model. According to
anarchist historians, Stirner’s writing:

…sets forth as his ideal egoist, the man who realizes himself in conflict with the
collectivity and with other individuals, who does not shirk from the use of any
means in ‘the war of each against all,’ who judges everything ruthlessly from the
viewpoint of his own well-being and who, having proclaimed his ‘ownness’, may
then enter with like-minded individuals into a ‘union of egoists,’ without rules or
regulations, for the arrangement of matters of common convenience. Stirner’s suggestions
of achieving such a reality speaks to “vaguely insurrectionary
means” through which a conflict is created of a “perpetual and amoral conflict of
wills.” This sentiment helped to inform the illegalist tradition popular around the turn
of the twentieth century, and as exemplified by the Bonnot Gang and other illegalists.
Part of this insurrectionary logic is the creation of the revolution within the site of the
individual, not the entire socio-political sphere. This premise carries with it the
rejection of a revolutionary class of proletarian masses and instead understands the world
as a collectivity of individuals, each of which must personally achieve revolutionary
liberation. This framework has led to some criticism of so-called lifestyleism such as
essays by Social Ecologist-anarchist Murray Bookchin. Lifestyleist sentiment can be
seen throughout radical discourse—including those over and beyond the insurrectionary
tendency—and are frequent in communiqués. In June 2012, following the a car bomb
targeting the Athens office of Microsoft, a cell of the IRF calling itself “Deviant

1190 Ibid., 95.
1191 Ibid.
1194 Ibid.
Behaviours for the Spread of Revolutionary Terrorism” wrote, “Our struggle is, first and foremost, the fight against OUR OWN contracts, OUR fears, OUR imperfections.”

Stirner’s exclusion of collective efforts for revolution led some prominent anarchists, such as Emma Goldman, to consider him outside of their philosophical camp. Within the egoist, individualist logic the state must be destroyed as it stands in conflict with human will, or according to anarchist historian George Woodcock, the state is the “negation of individual will.” Thus the ideal utopianism of these thinkers is an existence devoid of slaves and masters and inhabited only by the egoist striving towards their own ‘ownness.’ Stirner shared a base insurrectional contention, namely the assertion that engagement with “politics” in the traditional sense is utterly futile.

Conclusion

The insurrectionary position, as cobbled together from its most visible and widely circulated texts, is a constellation of tendencies and ideas informed by poststructuralism and Queer theory and borrowing from a number of anti-state, anti-capitalist and nihilist positions. While an insurrectionary ‘points of unity’ is yet to be written—and would likely be seen as counter to the sprit of unrestrained insurrectionary assembly—points of affinity, overlap, repetition and rearticulation can allow one to assemble this framework.

Based on a reading of scores of communiqués, proclamations, letters and more traditional

1196 Deviant Behaviours for the Spread of Revolutionary Terrorism – International Revolutionary Front, “Full communiqué for the high-profile vehicle-bomb against Microsoft by Deviant Behaviours for the Spread of Revolutionary Terrorism – International Revolutionary Front (Greece)” (325.nostate.net, June 27, 2012), http://325.nostate.net/?p=6793.
1197 Shone, American Anarchism, 222.
1199 Shone, American Anarchism, 223.
texts one can describe the insurrectionary position as being comprised of the following eight points.

First, the forces of domination must be confronted through direct attack that is immediate, continuous and spontaneous. One only learns how to act through experimentation and thus anyone is capable of acting in furtherance of greater freedom through the production of easily reproducible attacks targeting whatever localized manifestation of the enemy one can locate. Secondly, the wider conflict with the state and capital takes the form of a social war which seeks to create points of rupture in the social order through exacerbating existing tensions, dissatisfactions and points of alienation present in the society and produced by the nexuses of power and control. Thirdly, in locating the enemy one must move beyond identity-based politics and seek a more all encompassing idea of intersectionality wherein the goal is confrontation with ‘The Totality’ and total liberation. This understanding is based around a rejection of domination, not specific systems of oppression such as sexism, racism or homophobia. Therefore the battles of the non-heterosexual and those of the non-white are inextricably interlinked as they both emanate from a single source of power.

Fourthly, forms of protest and contestation must be unmanaged, temporary and outside of the Left's traditional conceptions of social movements. This rejection of representation, mediation, and ritual must be recognized in all aspects of praxis. The prized model for insurrection is thus the fostering of informal, temporary collectives of individuals aligned through friendship and ties of affinity. Fifthly, the insurrectionary vision for social change rejects reformist measure and Western notions of democratic
participation typically regarded in the liberal tradition as sacrosanct. Reformists are seen as the enemy of radical social transformation yet are commonly portrayed as allies in resistance. Sixthly, insurrection is inherently illegal, and embraces a historical notion of illegalism including the expropriation of capital from the wealthy and a rejection of "civil" (e.g. those who follow the law) engagement. Seventhly, the influence of the ecological crisis, domestication and technology is counter to the insurrectionary agenda as it further alienates individuals from the world around them, and is rapidly on the path towards a global collapse. In the final, eighth point, the collective insurrectionary milieu seeks to be constituted by individualists, acting in their own right, informed by a sense of wild egoism. The notion of 'the wild' runs throughout this understanding and evokes an untamed, pre-capitalist world view.

Taken as a collection of values, these components constitute a basis for insurrectionary affinity. In doing so, this manner of inquiry informs a central question of this exploration of discourse, namely: What constitutes the insurrectionary canon? While there are certainly some texts which appear to recur more often and with more wide endorsement throughout the networks, the major body of work is made up of thousands of smaller texts authored at the level of the cell, typically following some transgressive act of anti-social, anti-state and/or anti-capitalist violence. The space created by a temporary disruption to the status quo is used by the insurrectionary actor to speak via the mechanism of the communiqué. In doing so, the actor further develops the political analysis of the wider milieu and creates another page in the fluid, amorphous canon. The community of insurrectionary networks meets at these points of ideological, rhetorical
and strategic affinity, and it is on this basis of affiliation that the movement is formed, grown and reproduced.
CHAPTER SIX

People often think that insurrectionalism is a whole, made of concepts and theories frozen in time, in their ‘ideological’ rigidity...Nothing is permanent over time. Women and men through their actions forge ideas. It’s not up to those three or four well-known comrades, with their books and articles, to show us the way, not even a matter of the long and inconclusive assemblies. It’s those unknown comrades with their practice of attack that push us forward, leading us to life.\textsuperscript{1200}

-- Alfredo Cospito, jailed for FAI kneecap shooting of a nuclear executive [2014]

\textsuperscript{1200} Cospito, Interview by CCF – Imprisoned Members Cell with Alfredo Cospito (Greece, Italy).
Introduction

This final chapter seeks to first evaluate the two central questions of this study, termed the “canon hypothesis” (H1) and the “poststructuralism hypothesis” (H2). These dual hypotheses will first be evaluated in light of the preceding discussion of insurrectionary theory before delving into a final analysis of the nature of discourse. After evaluating the hypotheses of this study, we will explore an interpretation of insurrectionary action, explaining it in terms of performative spectacle, and finally, examining the connection between the communiqué and discourse.

“Canon hypothesis” (H1): Incorrect

The original aim of this approach was to trace the borders of an insurrectionary canon, from Marxism, through anarchism and poststructuralism concluding at modern insurrectionary theory. I hypothesized that the dense theoretical forbears such as Tiqqun and Bonanno inform these attacks and their ideology. After surveying the literature produced by the anarchists of praxis, the contemporary urban guerillas, one can observe that in fact, the corpus of communiqués does not demonstrate any strong, recurrent, theoretical points of reference. This observation mirrors accounts of anarcho-nihilism—a prominent forebear to modern insurrection—described as lacking “a singular, or even a particularly disciplined, body of thought.”1201 Instead of being comprised of a canon, nihilism/anarcho-nihilism is understood as an “approximation to a body of ideas rather than a body of ideas.”1202 It is not apparent that all of the attackers have read or are

---

1202 Ibid.
responding to these thinkers, but instead the networks’ members seem to be well informed about previous attacks far more than about previous texts. This is similar to understandings of non-insurrectionary guerrillas. For example, though Abraham Guillén’s influential text *Strategy of the Urban Guerrilla* served to inform his mentorship of the leftist, Uruguayan, guerrilla warfare-advocating Tupamaros (i.e. MLN-T), the militants remarked, “action, practice, came first, and then theory,”\(^\text{1203}\) implying the supremacy of experienced combat over canonical fluency.

While the lack of stable, centrally-located, canonical texts in insurrectionary anarchism may invalidate a hypothesis of this study, this finding does *not* break from the traditional understanding of terrorism. In her discussion of European leftist networks employing clandestine political violence, Martha Crenshaw notes that militants “selected fragments of doctrine from other contexts”\(^\text{1204}\), building up ideology, beliefs and justifications from a “selection of fragments of compatible theories.”\(^\text{1205}\) This is precisely why, for the insurrectionists, some are explicit in their reference to anarchist, poststructural, nihilist, Situationist and primitivist thinkers are others are keen to present their ideas without attribution, reference or within a clear intellectual tradition. Though often not explicitly quoting Tiqqun or Bonanno, insurrectionary attack communiqués uniformly make reference to previous attacks, previous attackers and current prisoners. The internationalization of rally cries, coordinated targeting and a call-and-response

\(^{1203}\) As quoted in: Gillespie, “The Urban Guerrilla in Latin America,” 155.


\(^{1205}\) Ibid., 99.
upping the ante can be seen clearly in campaigns such as those linked to the Phoenix Campaign and others responding to international calls to action by the FAI and CCF.

In this manner, the issuing of texts (e.g. communiqués, prison letters) acts to facilitate a method of coordination for an internationally decentralized network. This coordination role appears far more impactful then the development of traditional theory. In other words, the interplay between texts (and the cells that write them) is necessary for the continuation of an internationalized campaign of attack as well as the continuation of a decentralized discourse. This phenomenon has been noted before, for example in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, where anonymous leaflets resembling insurrectionary communiqués in form were authored, circulated and debated, forming a “substitute leadership”\textsuperscript{1206} for the Palestinian uprising. Through this “pamphlet leadership”\textsuperscript{1207}, nationalist and religious movements debated policy, developed strategy and distributed criticism from behind the relative safety of anonymous statements read widely in the occupied Palestinian territories. This method of coordination was adopted by all manner of militant factions regardless of ideology—from secular nationalist (e.g. Fatah, United National Command), to Islamists (e.g. Hamas) and Marxist (e.g. Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine). In both the Palestinian and insurrectionary pamphlet-communiqué ‘leaderships’, there is little consistent reference to canonical texts such as Abdullah Azzam’s *Defense of the Muslim Lands*\textsuperscript{1208} or Tiqqun’s *This is not a

\textsuperscript{1206} Mishal and Aharoni, *Speaking Stones*, 25.
\textsuperscript{1207} Ibid., 29.
program\textsuperscript{1209}. Therefore, the construction of an insurrectionary canon is, from its origins, a moot task. If one is to locate a source of commonality and a shared politic, this must be understood as emanating from the events themselves. To put it simply, the events themselves are the canon, and through their methodology of attack, social critics demonstrate their fluency with this contemporary insurrectionary history and its actors, through constant recall and reference to prior combatants.

Certainly this assertion is not a simple one. There exists a dynamic relationship between theory, analysis and practice which cannot be easily observed or measured. For example, though some may have only heard it discussed, what role can we say \textit{The Coming Insurrection} had on the students who occupied California university buildings in 2009 and penned poststructuralist-infused, insurrectionary-themed\textsuperscript{1210} texts? Without interviewing the participants in the occupations and the authors of the texts such discussion is merely speculative. Without a doubt key texts have had a direct or indirect impact on subsequent authors but precisely how and to what degree is unknown. In thinking through such a calculation, one can revisit past eras of rebellion such as the riots and varied methods of protest seen commonly in African-American urban communities in the 1960s. In the period between 1964-1969, racially-motivated riots occurred in Rochester, the Harlem neighborhood of New York, Philadelphia, the Watts neighborhood of Los Angeles, Cleveland (Hough and the ‘Glenville’ incident), Omaha (1966 and

\textsuperscript{1209} Tiqqun, \textit{This Is Not a Program}.

1969), Newark, Plainfield, Detroit, Minneapolis-Saint Paul, Chicago, Washington DC and Baltimore. While these riots and other displays were spontaneous and were often provoked by community-level incidents rather than theoretical critiques and social denouncements, subsequent Black Power theorists such as Malcolm X\textsuperscript{1211} (1925-1965), Stokely Carmichael (1941-1998) and Bobby Seale\textsuperscript{1212} (b. 1936), engaged in the production of analysis and interpretation which had an undeniable (yet un-measureable) influence on subsequent assembles. In other words, while the structural violence (e.g. racism, economic inequality, police violence, etc.) set the stage for the riots, the actions of the citizens created the events which were necessary for the production of subsequent theorizing. Theory did not produce action in a Marxist sense, but rather served a role of interpreting the events after the fact, and as a result, informing future includes of a similar nature. Therefore a relationship certainly exists between a canon, the events that come before, and those that emanate after. This relationship is difficult if not impossible to map, and invisibly borrows ideas from a fluid collection of texts as well as events.

Rather than borrowing and challenging points of argumentation from centrally-positioned texts—in the manner that a Leninist could critique a Maoist—insurrectionary theory borrows from emotive phraseologies commonly invoked in radical, anti-authoritarian politics. Through a combination of elements of illegalism, autonomism, primitivism, Situationism, post-left anarchism and others, authors are able to develop a political perspective that “align their discursive frames with various transnational

\textsuperscript{1211} Malcolm X was born Malcolm Little and in the late 1950s, after accepting Islam (and completing the Hajj), was known as El-Hajj Malik El-Shabazz.
\textsuperscript{1212} “Bobby” Seale was born Robert George Seale
This hodge-podge approach to insurrectionary theory is related to that of poststructuralism’s constitution. Supporting this claim, in their discussion of the role of poststructuralism in CSS, the authors state, "Poststructuralism’…is a fragmentary assemblage of diverse social, political, and philosophical thought." The intentionality of this insurrectionary openness is reflected in the structure of networks, and cells that allow for great diversity amongst their ranks in terms of ideology, strategy and tactics. This model, which at times is encapsulated as “leaderless resistance,” allows for individuals, cells and networks to adapt to changing environments in real time as future attacks and texts reflect back on that that came before. This non-rigid theorizing prevents movement factionalization, reduces ideological infighting, and allows the movement to develop, grow and refine as events unfold.

Just as illegalism and propaganda (of the deed) strikes built a momentum for anarchists of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, in the twenty-first century, global attacks linked through a network of names and digital dissemination points unite disparate attacks into a movement. While attackers often share a critical framework with obvious Marxist, anarchist, poststructuralist and Tiqunist, Kaczynskian or CCFian thought, the events build from one another and not a shared text-centric critique. This interaction can be understood as a form of pan-national, constructive, play—through which disparate actors build off of one other through understandings that the original
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1214 Vaughan-Williams and Peoples, Critical Security Studies, 63.
1215 Joosse, “Leaderless Resistance, Radical Environmentalism, and Asymmetrical Warfare.”
1216 Joosse, “Leaderless Resistance and Ideological Inclusion.”
author may not share. The theory seems more to inform the discursive possibilities rather than the act that creates them (i.e. the attack), thus the political maneuvering (i.e. the post-attack text) becomes a task of fitting critique to target, and method to strategy. In the end, the communicative goal is to make a convincing, impassioned, and logical explanation via the communiqué that ties one strike to many and hopes for more to follow. This is the intent of the action-communiqué pairing, though one can not claim that it is a constant occurrence, ample evidence has been presented demonstrating that such a reflexive relationship is common.

“Poststructuralism hypothesis” (H2): Correct

At first reading, it is easy to conclude: “Though the insurrectionary critique borrows from poststructuralism, it tells us little about the nature of structural violence. It tells us how a broad-based milieu is critical of the present order but it provides few if any solution to a better way.” Despite its lack of a platform, insurrectionary theory does answer the question of ‘What is to be done?’ It expands upon the concept of social war, and a radical condemnation of power and politics as key targets for attack. It also introduces an emboldened critique of domination and social pacification through the boundless enemy embodied in “The Totality.” To explore this hypothesis we will first examine the deterritorialization of power as conceived of by pre-insurrectionary theorists before examining the modern concept of “The Totality” as a new reading of structural violence.

The Neo-Marxist & Poststructural Basis for a New Intersectionality
The poststructural reading of power—one wherein control is disembodied from a physical site and is instead transnational, omnipresent, and yet operating invisibly—is a highly influential aspect of modern insurrectionary critique. Where the clandestine authors of Tiqqun and TIC may have popularized this idea of a totalizing yet obscured regimentation of violence, neo-Marxist continental philosophers such as Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri, Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari preceded them by offering further nuanced conceptions of operationalized state power and its inherent violence. These works, as well as others, are adopted (largely without attribution) by the insurrectionary theorists; taking what provides utility and rejecting that which does not. In this manner, the insurrectionary theorists pillage other traditions—harkening back to Hobsbawm’s wild bandit image—and only borrow that which aids in the furtherance of their analysis. In his discussion of the contributions of Tiqqun and TIC, Alden Wood speaks of this form of ideological banditry writing:

[Tiqqun and TIC] mark a definitive break from previous radical political theory, their thought depends on the critical evaluation, synthesis, and appropriation of earlier theorizations of existence within capitalism. As this is necessarily the case for all theory, it also allows for a reading of earlier theory in which the seeds of insurrection lay dormant. Here Wood rightly points out that the insurrectionary method of analysis, while heavily indebted to the poststructural tradition, is conducted through an exploration of text aimed at synthesizing conceptions of power found in continental philosophy with those found in more contemporary anti-state theories. This position is supported by other anarcho-

---


scholars who have argued that “Foucault has been tamed by many academics” and that in reading such texts through the lens of insurrectionary theory, one is able to “provide a productive challenge to the all-too-safe reading of Foucault found in the American academy.”

The analytical positionings of Hardt and Negri are built upon earlier works within continental philosophy’s poststructuralist and critical fields, most notably Deleuze and Guattari’s A Thousand Plateaus. To their own admission, Hardt and Negri borrow from Deleuze and Guattari in their ‘demystification of structuralism’—a theory of a deterritorialized power—and in the diagraming the social production (and reproduction) of biopower amongst the “social machines in their various apparatuses and assemblages.” Deleuze and Guattari’s work is also more explicitly instructive in their
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1219 Andrew Culp, “Insurrectionary Foucault: Tiqqun, The Coming Insurrection, and Beyond” (Rethinking Marxism, University of Massachusetts, Amherst: Academia.edu, 2009), 1, https://www.academia.edu/371340/Insurrectionary_Foucault_Tiqqun_The_Coming_Insurrection_and_Beyond.

1220 Deleuze and Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus.

1221 Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of “assemblage” is seen by many as a critical alternative to understanding structure as it has been traditionally understood. For Deleuze and Guattari, it can be deployed as a systems analysis approach based in concepts of a multiplicity of deterritorialized functionalities and not the stoic uniformity of Marxist structuralism. This shift towards the fluid, structurelessness of “assemblage” has been explained by poststructural Queer theorist Jasbir Puar in her numerous works see for example:


Puar also argues that contemporary scholarship focused on intersectionality—such as that seen in feminist, gender studies and Queer theory literatures—has the tendency to imply a structuralist position and thus, poststructural work dealing with assemblage might function as a more useful framework for diagraming oppression.

1222 Hardt and Negri, Empire, 28.
diagraming of the state’s development into a collectivity enacting “relations of
domination,” writing:

The State was first this abstract unity that integrated subaggregates functioning
separately; it is now subordinated to a field of forces whose flows it coordinates
and whose autonomous relations of domination and subordination it expresses...It
is no longer the transcendent law that governs fragments; it must fashion as best it
can a whole to which it will render its law immanent.1223

In this description, the state as a physicality is a false construction as the state “has never
actually existed, [but instead]…its function is purely theoretical: it mediated between the
primitive territorial machine and the modern capitalist machine.”1224 In this
understanding of state-led systemic violence, the apparatus functions as an intermediary
between sovereignty and nation, and capital accumulation. The state is thus an ordering
mechanism, an arranger of apparatus that functions to inscribe a hierarchical logic upon
more horizontalist communities. This state control over order is expanded upon in A
Thousand Plateaus, wherein the authors write:

[The State] operates by stratification; in other words, it forms a vertical,
hierarchized aggregate that spans the horizontal lines in a dimension of depth. In
retaining given elements, it necessarily cuts off their relations with other
elements, which become exterior, it inhibits, slows down, or controls those
relations…Thus the central power of the State is hierarchical.1225

Thus for Deleuze and Guattari, the state is less a physicality then a patterned behavior
and function of organization. The state gives new hierarchical order to previously (more)
horizontal methods; the state transforms the agrarian pre-state community into the

1223 Deleuze and Guattari, Anti-Oedipus, 221.
1224 Ian Buchanan, “Power, Theory and Praxis,” in Deleuze and Politics, ed. Nicholas Thoburn and Ian
Buchanan (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008), 27.
1225 Deleuze and Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus, 433.
industrial private property state through divisions of labor, centralization of capital and
maintenance of a logic of unequal exchange.

Following after Deleuze and Guattari, Hardt and Negri develop a framework for discussing statecraft as superior to traditionalist sovereignty, and strive to combine a Marxist interpretation of superstructure with a Foucauldian inclusion of biopolitics. This is used to argue that not only is the operational logic of neoliberal statecraft transnational, but that its operationalized form via biopower is a far more invasive manner of social ordering than any manifestation of law. This is not to be confused with the structural Marxist emphasis and critique of imperialism, as explained by poststructuralist Todd May:

…empire is distinct from imperialism precisely in that the latter is structured by discrete nation-states pursuing their interests through subjugation and exploitation, whereas empire is structured by fluid and intersecting political and economic networks with no particular centre and only relatively demarcated geographic boundaries.

In this sense, while Hardt and Negri’s Empire serves an analysis of statecraft and structure, Foucault allows for an analysis of power and bodies; a Foucauldian power analysis of the state and the ideology of statehood. What Hardt and Negri develop within this critical genealogy is the commonality behind all states, and in this sense they continue the anarchist project of critiquing the nature of the state and not simply its oppressive policies, laws or actions.

1226 Hardt and Negri’s work is further interpreted and adapted in the post-millennial, insurrectionary-influenced texts surround student occupations, and the rise in global anti-austerity protests. One such publication which borrows heavily from Hardt and Negri’s Empire is the anonymously penned “Twenty Theses on the Subversion of the Metropolis” and “Communiqué from an Absent Future”
This poststructural analysis moves beyond and advances traditionalist Marxism by not focusing on the singular subjectivity of class, and instead looking at the totalizing effects of power and how Empire inscribes itself over all relations (i.e. social, political, economic) through Foucauldian biopolitics. Through Foucault’s understandings of disciplinary power one can then interpret the micro politics of control and subsequently adopt a biopolitical approach to examine power’s more macro control sites. Thus Hardt and Negri complement earlier Marxist and anarchist positions arguing that the target is a deterritorialized, super-national capitalist apparatus, not European-era imperialism. These understandings of biopower’s relations to Empire and totalized control have not escaped the insurrectionary anarchist theorists, who borrowing from both Foucault and the Marxists, speak to a similar social ordering. The anonymous authors of Tiqqun, in their paper “Preliminary Materials for a Theory of the Young Girl,” write:

Under the hypnotic grimaces of official pacification, a war is being waged. A war that can no longer be called simply economic, social or humanitarian because it is total... Paradoxically, it’s because of the total character of this war—total in its means no less than in its ends—that it could be invisible in the first place... What’s at stake in the ongoing war are ‘forms of life,’ which for the Empire, means the selection, management, and attenuation of those forms of life.  

The authors later call these Empire-controlled forms-of-life the “bio-political monopoly” speaking to the power/knowledge dominance Foucault spoke of in his work. What we see in the work of Tiqqun is the constant and intentional shift between micro and macro forms of power—from the (micro) biopower of individual psychologies, to the macro ordering of the totality of the social, political, economic, and related spheres of activity. In sum, the newly deterritorialized reading of power as developed by the European
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continental and post-Marxist philosophers paves the way for the post-millennial
insurrectionary turn which begins from this fluid subject and attempts to explain power
through its ever-present manifestations through the concept of “The Totality.”

The ‘Totality’ and system-level violence

In one well-circulated insurrectionary anarchist publication, the anonymous authors
define their critiqued subject—“The Totality”—as:

Normalcy…the tyranny of our condition; reproduced in all of our relationships
and…violently reiterated every minute of every day. The Totality being the
interconnection an overlapping of all oppression and misery. The Totality is the
state. It is capitalism. It is civilization and empire…It is the brutal lessons taught
to those who can’t achieve Normal. It is every way we’ve limited ourselves or
learned to hate our bodies.  

Reminding one of a more classical leftist position, the authors of the text argue that
liberation is predicated on “the annihilation of capitalism and the state” via “social
war.” Numerous other examples of this framing can be found in a host of post-
millennial insurrectionary publications. For example, the introductory passages from the
zine, Dangerous Spaces explains violence:

There is a violence that dominates. It is gay bashing. It is rape. It is the clear-cut
and the vivisection lab. It is the bank and the local coffee shop. It is the patrol car
and the prison. It is your job, your late rent, your rotting teeth, your wounds that
won’t heal. It is the silence that maintains all of the above. There is a violence that
liberates. It is the murdered homophobe. It is the knee-capped rapist. It is the
arson and the mink liberation. It is the smashed window and the expropriated
food. It is the cop on fire and the riot behind bars. It is work avoidance, squatting,
criminal friendship, and the total refusal of compromise. It is the chaos that can
never be stopped. The maintenance [sic] of this world depends on the
internalization [sic] of the former, and the total suppression of the latter.  

1229 A Gang Of Criminal Queers, Towards the Queerest Insurrection, sec. II.
1230 Ibid., sec. VII.
This “violence that dominates” can find its basis in the actions of typical target sets (e.g. police, politicians, corporate heads) but also more unacknowledged areas one could be tempted to term ‘counterrevolutionary’ milieus. For example, in their self-assessment zine, imprisoned member of the CCF write:

The enemy can be found in every mouth that speaks the language of domination…It doesn’t just consist of rulers and the whole potbellied suit-and-tie dictatorship. It is also the proletarian who aspires to be a boss, the oppressed whose mouth spits nationalist poison, the immigrant who glorifies life in western civilization but behaves like a little dictator among his own people, the prisoner who rats out others to the guards, every mentality that welcomes power, and every conscious that tolerates it.1232

Here one can see that the focus is on the actions (i.e. class aspirations, nationalist jingoism, snitching) not on the identity of typically subjugated classes (i.e. proletariat, immigrant, prisoner).

In a more generalized viewpoint, other thinkers within the largely French, post-millennial insurrectionary milieu have theorized on “The Totality” of oppression drawing more from Foucault’s reading of power than other thinkers’ focus on politics. Such themes are recurrent throughout Tiqqun1233 as well as The Coming Insurrection1234. The authors of The Coming Insurrection, in a talk given in 2011, give more texture to this idea of fluid power and domination stating:

When we talk of ‘apparatuses’, we don’t only invoke the New York Police Department and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, surveillance cameras and body scanners, guns and denunciation, antitheft locks and cell phones. Rather, in the layout of a town like New York—the pinnacle of the global petit-organic-hipster-bourgeoisie—we mean whatever captures intensities and vitalities in order
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1234 The Invisible Committee, The Coming Insurrection.
to chew them up, digest them, and shit out value…We call hostility that which governs almost completely the relationships between beings, relationships of pure estrangement, pure incompatibility between bodies.\(^{1235}\)

In these insurrectionary texts, structural Marxism is replaced with a more affective, subjective fluidity that likens the hierarchal violence of heterosexism with, for example, the construction of “normal” in terms of mental illness\(^{1236}\). These texts epitomize the amorphous description of the state/Empire as a delocalized form of biopower, a “rhythm that imposes itself, a way of dispensing and dispersing reality.”\(^{1237}\)

An exemplary display of this intellectual tendency can be found in an anonymously authored text which describes socio-political contestation as boundless, not constrained by the issue-specific politics of social movements, and thus a new form of a more totalized revolt. The authors of the IEF write:

‘Contemporary struggle’ is our way to conceptualize what links the events of our epoch—events that cannot be defined as social movements or categorized within leftist conceptions of reform and revolution. Events are the common form that struggles take after the collapse of the historical subject and the zone of the social. We define contemporary struggle as a vast set of heterogeneous practices of revolt that appear to have everything as their object; that is to say, events whose antagonisms are not directed against the state or capitalism per se but against techniques of government, against the productive power of government…Government no longer sits in a closed chamber of educated men; it acts through each of us and through every apparatus that orients us and amplifies our senses in a particular direction. Government doesn't just repress, it produces a distributed multiplication of governable subjectivities.\(^{1238}\)

\(^{1236}\) This authoritative establishment of norms, truths and knowledge should remind one of Foucault's work, especially that within Discipline and Punish wherein the author speaks to how the institutions of the school, clinic and prison regiment knowledge/power through the development of numerical record keeping and the evaluation of such figures based on a scale of normal-abnormal.
\(^{1237}\) The Invisible Committee, The Coming Insurrection, 13.
\(^{1238}\) The Institute for Experimental Freedom, Between Predicates, War: Theses On Contemporary Struggle, 9–10.
Here you can see not only the description of an amorphous and fluid state apparatus, but also an implicit nod to political reproduction via biopower, or as the 2013 authors write, ‘government produced subjectivities.’ Globally, the insurrectionary movement is situated within the larger anarchist, communist and anti-authoritarian movements but has served to redefine the subject vis-à-vis systemic violence. By pointing their critical finger at an even more deterritorialized and ambiguous set of institutional manifestations, the insurrectionists destabilize the traditionalist leftist critique that focuses on the largess of the state and capitalism.

For the insurrectionary anarchists, the violence is much more interwoven to the fabric of the society, and includes everything hierarchical and exhibiting dominance; racism, poverty, monogamy, heterosexism, etc. This is precisely why the insurrectionary, poststructuralist-informed method of analysis is relevant for interpreting the changing nature of structural violence. The clandestine attackers clearly understand violence in structural forms, not as local manifestations that can be reformed away. In one example, after claiming responsibility for the arson of a UK courthouse, the attackers write:

The system is not interested in changing the root causes of much ‘crime’ (poverty, alienation, boredom, etc) at more than a tokenistic level, but simply manages its distribution while keeping the exploited at each other’s throats. This is especially true as the market now makes a booming business out of prisoners’ low-cost labor and from the private detention industry. Everything stays in line so long as the personal neighborhoods of bosses and judges remain sanctuaries free from the discontents of the class society they maintain: a sanctuary we fully intend on breaking.1239

Here one can see how power and social change are diagramed. The system is understood to be violent, and moreover, that violence serves dominant class interests and thus will not be changed via reform. Therefore, the object of attack becomes destabilized, moved beyond the simplicity of the state, and thought of in system-level terms. If ‘the system’ is the problem then ‘the system’ can never provide the solution beyond ‘tokenism’ and reform. This reading of structure understands ‘the system’ as a closed, often impenetrable set of networks, where outsiders may be allowed to interact but are incapable of effecting change.

It is precisely at this point of a critique of power that insurrectionary anarchism joins with poststructuralism. The insurrectionary theorists share not only the anti-state praxis of anarchism but also the de-localized poststructuralism. Foucault specifically bears noting as his work “visualized a resistance to power that is completely decentralized, ongoing, and not in direct confrontation with the state as a coercive apparatus.”1240 Therefore it is not a surprise when insurrectionary theorists such as the IEF describe their opponents in the social war in interconnected forms, stating:

> [our] enemies are constellations of hostile forces which manage our potential, structure our needs, code our territory and determine our time…the cop, the bureaucrat, the politician, the activist, the boss, the leader, the economist, the owner, the fascist, the racist, the sexist—these are all points of conflict…which reveal the public enemies of a social war.1241

For the insurrectionary milieu, its confrontation praxis directly confronts state power through localized manifestations (e.g. police property, corporate property, etc.) but avoids

1240 Garner, Contemporary Movements and Ideologies, 391.
1241 The Institute for Experimental Freedom, Politics Is Not a Banana, 136–137.
direct, face-to-face battles like those fought by the FARC and other non-state armed movements. For this intellectual tradition, the root to explaining state-facilitated structural violence thus begins with Marx’s expose of the socio-political/economic, explained as an enduing concept through ideology and hegemony, and operationalized in the state as described by the anarchists. The anarchist inquiry paves the way for poststructuralism’s searches into power and knowledge construction just as the critical theorists allow for subsequent examinations identifying and explaining structural manifestation of violence. The final melding of poststructuralism and insurrection is thus found in not only the understanding of power (e.g. “biopower”, “Empire”) but also in a newly understood spirit of total rejection and revolt.

Moreover, insurrectionary theory builds upon the so-called critical turn in Security Studies through, for example, challenging the state’s relationship to the administration of the physical (i.e. biopolitics) through a preconception of what constitutes security. Foucauldian biopolitics posits that “[power] emanates from a belief in a particular way of organizing society for a particular outcome, and this power is not solely centralized but is instead disseminated throughout multiple sites which enforce a government’s rationale.”1242 Therefore, by not only rejecting the state’s vision for a social peace1243, and proposing alternative manners of organization (e.g. the commune, the council, the squat, the TAZ, the ‘zone of opacity’, etc.), insurrectionary theory rejects a conception of security based in the interests of the state and its desired outcomes.

1243 Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy, Human Security, 72.
Insurrectionary actors precisely seek to “break the lie of social peace,” and in doing so, redefine what constitutes biopolitical security as more than simply the absence of direct forms of violence. Furthermore, as biopolitical power seeks the subjugation and control of the collectivity at the “capillary or micro-political level…target[ing] the individual from the vantage point of the mass of the population,” insurrectionary praxis is primed to offer a new understanding as it is precisely these “micro-political levels” that insurrectionary methods of attack are motivated by rejections of broader, more existential social conditions—complacency, alienation, “imposing the dominant order” and “manifest[ing]…blind discipline.” In other words, a biopolitical perspective is valuable for consideration precisely because of its focus on the minuitia of the human experience as defined through a reading of security beyond that of the nation-state.

Finally, the insurrectionary position further challenges orthodox notions of security by encouraging the insecurity for the state—the central unit of analysis in Security Studies—while reimagining human security beyond survival. Insurrectionists posit that the nature of the state places human society (as well as the non-human) in an ever-present condition of insecurity, where one not only is victim to “direct threats” but
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also “the more indirect but no less real threats that come from structural oppression such as poverty.” In this manner, insurrectionary theory aligns with the critical critique of securitization, labeling the statist determinations as “narrow, inadequate and immoral in the context of ‘real’ security threats to the individual.” The state-centric security rejected by anti-state theorists “prioritized order over justice and human emancipation,” something the insurrectionary position seeks to reconfigure, placing the emancipation of all life as central. Security theorist Ken Booth, a key figure in the critical turn in the field, explains a disjuncture between “survival” and “security”, describing the latter as “survival-plus.” In this manner, “plus” equates to the sum total of the human experience of self-actualization beyond mere survival, something the insurrectionists attempt to move more centrally to critiques of the social order.

Therefore, in evaluating the original hypothesis (H2), I argue that a boundless and inherently ever-expanding understanding of the manifestations and causes of oppression (The Totality) is akin to a diagraming of structural, system-level violence as articulated by peace scholars, anthropologists and other theorists. Though insurrectionary theory

1250 Ibid., 121.
provides few centrally located texts, it does constitute a discursive interpretation of violence as structural and security as human-centric, while maintaining a poststructuralist focus on power. The explicit influence of European ‘continental’ and critical theorists is common; as the works of Foucault, Agamben, Deleuze and Guattari and others comingle with theorists involved in armed expropriations, mail bombs and regicide. The theory of structural violence is told through fractured texts, collectively authored by unknown numbers of individuals and small groups. Communiqués, essays, calls to action, news reporting, letters to and from prisoners, court statements, anonymous rage and insight all function to constitute an (anti-)canon which simultaneous rejects the abstracted class privileged, insular naval gazing of academics, but assumes its readers and critics to understand references to ‘biopolitical order’ and ‘forms-of-life.’ In its function, insurrectionary theory adds teeth to critique, and anti-social violence to praxis.

Conclusions: On performativity & spectacle

It appears clear from the aforementioned history that the performativ, spectacular nature of insurrectionary attack is more prized than substantive changes to the totalizing structures of governance and control. The symbolic, propaganda and message-orientated results of a scorched bank or a packaged explosive sent to a politician are more meaningful, more impactful than the lost capital or the scared official. By stringing together thousands of acts into movements, one creates the specter of change, which opens the possibility of change actually occurring. Terrorism scholar Mark Juergensmeyer builds off this point as a central basis for his work, recently writing:

…most acts of terror are instances of performance violence. They are dramatic events meant to shock, and to lure the viewer into the perpetrators’ worldviews. These are performances intended for very specific audiences, including the worldwide audience on television and the Internet…\(^{1254}\)

Certainly when cells are deciding which target to strike, through what means, and how to explain it to a globally-situated, Internet-accessing audience, the performative value is not lost. Propaganda of the deed relies on this calculation, as does the insurrectionary strategy of creating social conflict, leading to rupture and then culminating in direct conflict with the forces of domination; this process too requires demonstrative violence to intimidate the enemy, inspire the ally and communicate to the populace. Therefore, the communiqué, as the main medium for communicative talk between actor and audience must be seen as not a byproduct of violence, but an integral component; the sign below the abstract expressionist painting ensuring that the broad strokes of erratic color are read

as more than simply splatter. But once again one must consider the symbiotic, dependent relationship between the act and the text. Does the desire to write a specific message dictate the attack? Does the attack require the text in order to be understood? Does the text require an act in order to be written?

**Political Violence as Performative Spectacle**

After consuming troves of communiqués, anonymous proclamations and other claims of responsibility, one must wonder: What is the function of all this violence? If a masked anarchist does not believe that breaking the window of a bank will serve to create a rupture with the iron grasp of capitalism, why would she risk her freedom to do it? What is the effect of a single broken window? The answer may be hidden in the performative\(^{1255}\) nature of the attack far more than the substantive impediment it creates for the accumulation and centralization of capital. Postmodern Queer theorist Judith Butler discusses the performative nature of gender, stating that its production is “manufactured through a sustained set of acts.”\(^{1256}\) The hundreds of broken windows, burned banks, and explosive packages dispatched through the mail collectively constitute these “set of acts,” and in producing these events, one is performativity constructing a
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\(^{1256}\) Butler, *Gender Trouble*, xv.
counter-reality—a break from the normative violence of society toward a non-normative display of society’s violence.

These acts serve symbolic functions and thus some have argued that terrorism itself is a semiotic act—one that serves as “a signal, a message, a symbol, and/or media image”1257—namely the production of spectacularly violent live sights and preserved images, as well as signs of that violence. In this regard not only does terrorism seek to produce spectacle, but also to reconfigure the reading of its associated signs—the ways through which individuals understand the representations maintained in these images. Political violence serves to “alter the functions of established cultural symbols of power and legitimacy”1258 disrupting the reading of these symbols of state power with revolutionary, anti-social critique. This production of spectacle as a motivation for acting moved the actor away from the purely ideological motivations and towards a more audience-centric, performative, strategic framework. This embracing of performative violence—and the resultant distancing from other articulations of violence such as those that are purely ideological—may be a result of possibilities offered by emergent communications technologies, most obviously, the Internet.1259 With this in mind, it is likely that with further increases in accessible forms of global communication, these

1258 Ibid., 51.
attacks will increase\textsuperscript{1260}, as the communiqué as a globally-circulated vehicle of propaganda becomes even easier to produce\textsuperscript{1261} and circulate.

The generation of attacks allows the actor to circulate their critique via the communiqué. The communiqué is thus the product of the attack on par with the actual financial damage to the target. In his discussion of the 9/11 attacks, sociologist and cultural theorist Jean Baudrillard writes:

One tries after the event [of 9/11] to assign…meaning, to find any possible interpretation. But there is none possible, and it is only the radicality of the spectacle, the brutality of the spectacle that is original and irreducible. The spectacle of terrorism imposes the terrorism of the spectacle…It is both the sublime micro-model of a nucleus of real violence with maximal resonance - thus the purest form of the spectacular, and the sacrificial model that opposes to historical and political order the purest symbolic form of challenge.\textsuperscript{1262}

The creation of meaning through the radical brutality of spectacular violence is meant as a living, breathing critique against power, coercion and domination as located in the monotony and drudgery of human existence within the confines of the state and capitalism. To disseminate voluminous descriptions of “real violence” (i.e. the

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{1260} This presumption for increased attack may be influenced by a growing discourse offered by anti-technology attackers. While some, such as Kaczynski have argued that technology serves an instrumental role in the battle against technology, others have urged for the battle to be taken entirely offline. Though the explicitly anti-technology strand of insurrectionary theory is likely a minority, its critique of the means towards a shared end may have influence on the future of digitally-mediated forms of organization and attack.

\textsuperscript{1261} In discussing the "ease" of writing such texts, I am reminded of the ‘Automatic Insurrectionary Manifesto Generator,’ a self-critical and satirical website which cobbles together common insurrectionary rhetoric into a veritable Mad Lib of propaganda. In a single click the user is delivered a hodgepodge of keywords strung together through faux-insurrectionary language. The generator is available at: http://objectivechance.com/automatic_insurrection. An explanation for why this was created is offered at: https://github.com/johm/automatic_insurrection.

\textsuperscript{1262} Baudrillard, "The Spirit of Terrorism." 
\end{footnotesize}
communiqué) to be held up against the structural and cultural violence of the social order is the aim of insurrectionary attack.

The enacting of direct violence (e.g. a bomb targeting a government building), understood as both a substantive strike against one’s enemies as well as a method of communication is applicable to a variety of diverse incidents often lumped together descriptively as terroristic. Therefore, diagraming the communicative intent simultaneous to the intended audience for those communications is key. To provide a non-insurrectionary example, one can look to the individualized acts of anti-social violence such as the 5 November 2009 killing of 13 people (and the wounding of 29 others) at Fort Hood in Texas, by US Army Major Nidal Hasan. Hasan’s attack, which generated the highest rate of casualty on an American military base in history, was primarily directed at those he fired upon—US military personnel. In the shooting, Hasan, an army psychiatrist, killed 12 members of the military and one civilian medical personnel at the Soldier Readiness Processing Center, a medical facility where Hasan worked. The intended recipient for such a generated spectacle is multifaceted, and represented in the chart below. Despite the very direct nature of Hasan’s attack, there was a second target audience for the attack (TA2), namely the American military at large that was exposed to this sort of attack. If one expands outward, a tertiary target of the attack (TA3) was the citizenry and socio-political order that insulates American militarism, Empire and
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1264 Galtung, “Cultural Violence.”
1265 This is modeled below as “Target audience #1” or “TA1”
1266 This chart is adapted from Tuman’s “Figure 2.2” in: Tuman, Communicating Terror, 33.
one’s feeling of safety and security. This communicative relationship is displayed below in Figure 6.1:

![Diagram showing communicative relationship between Hasan's violence, target audience, and associated audiences.]

Figure 6.1: Secondary and tertiary target audience concept map

This conceptual map is meant to demonstrate the communicative relationship between the act of violence, its direct audience, and its associated audiences. In this example, while Hasan may have focused his performance outwardly towards the soldiers and military personnel on site, numerous secondary audiences would look to the target’s experience, and be *spoken to* through those acts. For example, a soldier deployed at a Forward Operative Base in Afghanistan can view a news account of a crying window in Texas and in doing so, constitute a secondary audience for the traumatic violence. With the rapid semi-synchronous consumption of information regardless of national border,
time zone and language makes the tracing of these non-primary communicative audiences nearly innumerable.

The terroristic nature of the attack sought to sever one’s sense of stability that is enshrined in ‘peace time.’ This interpretation is supported by Juergensmeyer—a scholar writing on issues of religious terrorism—who argues that violent attacks are “dramas designed to have an impact on the several audiences that they affect. Those who witness the violence—even at a distance, via the news media—are therefore a part of what occurs.”1267 This assertion has been recurrent throughout decades of terrorism scholarship, such as a 1974 essay published by RAND, which states:

[Terrorist] violence must be all the more dramatic…Terrorist attacks are often carefully choreographed to attract the attention of the electronic media and the international press…Terrorism is aimed at the people watching, not at the actual victims. Terrorism is theater.1268

Not only does this author employ the use of intentional descriptive language (e.g. dramatic, choreographed, theater), but he drives home the point of the violence’s aim towards a secondary and tertiary audience. Similarly, writing of the nature of terrorist violence’s communicative potential, early Terrorism Studies scholars Alex P. Schmid and Janny de Graaf write:

Terrorism, by using violence against one victim, seeks to persuade others. The immediate victim is merely instrumental, the skin on a drum beaten to achieve a calculated impact on a wider audience. As such, an act of terrorism is in reality, an act of communication.1269

1269 Schmid and Graaf, Violence as Communication, 14.
Though Hasan would argue in his legal proceedings that his attack was carried out to defend Taliban leaders in Afghanistan\textsuperscript{1270} from the US military, his attack against the state was largely performative and symbolic. It is unlikely that he believed that the loss of these soldiers would harm the US war effort just as an insurrectionary actor does not believe that a destroyed police car will bring down the security state. These strikes serve as harbingers of resistance, movements against ‘the existent’\textsuperscript{1271}. If we can assume Hasan is capable of calculated decision-making, then we can assume he attacked his colleagues not to defend Taliban fighters abroad, but to raise awareness of the political impacts of the war at home. Hasan knew what scholars have long argued, that often awareness and resolution of a particular political issue is brought about through “the success of...terrorists in bringing their cause violently and dramatically before the eyes of the world.”\textsuperscript{1272}

In creating these spectacular events, the form and function of the attack and its communication strategy are of prime concern. Commentators reporting on insurrectionary attack have often likened its violence to the methods of more traditional non-state actors (i.e. nationalist separatist ‘terrorists’ such as the PIRA, FARC, Hamas or Lebanese Hezbollah). The rhetorical function of these generalized accounts—those which portray the FAI as on par with al-Qaeda\textsuperscript{1273}—muddy the waters between paramilitary,


\textsuperscript{1271} Borrowed from the title of an influential, insurrectionary text, “At Daggers Drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critics.”

\textsuperscript{1272} Jenkins, “International Terrorism: A New Model of Conflict,” 6.

\textsuperscript{1273} Loadenthal, “Deconstructing ‘eco-Terrorism’: Rhetoric, Framing and Statecraft as Seen through the Insight Approach.”
militia and insurgent/guerilla movements and those best portrayed as a militant tactical tendency within a largely law-abiding social protest movement. One historian, in describing the Islamic State (the Syrian-Iraqi-based armed secessionist jihadi movement also known as ISIS, ISIL) likened them to ‘19th and 20th century anarchist and nihilist rebel movements who fought against the centralization of state power.’ In an article for mainstream press, historian John Merriman, speaks of this comparison writing:

Anarchists believed that dynamite would level the playing field, and for terrorists now, it’s roadside bombs that level the playing field...Both anarchists and terrorists now believe that they can bring down the superstructure, of capitalist states in the case of the anarchists, or the United States and their allies in the case of terrorists now.

If networks like the FAI and CCF really are the decedents of anarchist king slayers, it is fitting that the post-9/11 era of insurrectionary attack came of age within this active image—that of the masked Islamist fighter carrying a Kalashnikov and planting an IED. While the CCF is a far cry from the Islamic State in nearly every way, it selects to continue within a tactical, strategic and communicative mode that is interpreted by many as showing little to no difference.

Despite such a negative framing of insurrectionary violence in light of a globally invigorated abhorrence of ‘terrorism’ post-9/11, clandestine attack networks continue to posture as more traditional ‘terrorists’, through methods such as detonating explosives, issuing communiqués, condemning the state and wearing masks. These individuals are plainly conscious of the discourse on terrorism as they interact and react to it routinely in

---


1275 John Merriman, as quoted in: Ibid.
writing. When understood in light of the assertion that the War on Terrorism is a “battle over representation...[a] ‘war of images’”\(^{1276}\), this is especially intriguing. When insurrectionary and other clandestine actors do not outright reject a frame that is universally rejected, it begs the question: can the adoption of such methods by anti-state revolutionaries constitute a sort of “culture jamming”\(^ {1277}\) of the Global War on Terror? Are clandestine attackers responding and “appropriating”\(^ {1278}\) the cultural capital of intimidation created in the wake of 911 by embracing the image of the masked villain for maximum spectacle value? Are the clandestine networks of insurrectionary attack selecting to make use of the state's investment in fear mongering (to mobilize public policy) for their own performative benefit?

Clearly there is a performative function of this method of self-representation and aggressive action. However, beyond the creation of spectacle, one’s involvement in transgressive acts is in itself a powerful step. In his discussion of the “society of the spectacle” the influential Situationist (anarchist) Guy Debord argued that reality had become something that individuals looked at and thought about but did not directly experience\(^ {1279}\). It had become an abstraction, a representation of a representation, viewed from behind screens—television screens, computers, car windshields—which all served to act as filters, mediating the interaction between individual and society. As a result of these mediated interaction with reality, individuals grew accustomed to accepting


\(^{1279}\) Debord, Society of the Spectacle.
representations as reality, and as such, became increasingly alienated (to borrow from Marx) from real experience. These conditions served to further encourage spontaneous, informal, anti-social attacks against systems of power, as these outbursts equate to ‘the real’: unmediated, directly targeted, non-representative actions which serve to rupture the abstracted, normative reality of every day life.

Insurrectionary logic encourages the fostering and replication of these moments when individuals carry forth the Situationist call to “create situations—moments of life directly lived—that undermine the dominant logic of passive consumption and alienated representation.” The targets of attack are therefore routinely those institutions and physical manifestations of this spectacle. For example, in November 2014, a clandestine cell bombed a Mexican telethon office aiding disabled children not as part of “demands for social justice” but rather because the charity and the wider mass media it summons serves to “implement alienation through the technoindustrial system’s values.”

Debord’s abstracted “society of the spectacle” is seen in the function of the larger state apparatus, as according to Giorgio Agamben, “spectacle is the logical extension of the commodity form under late capitalism.” Therefore, attacks on this arena of commodity can serve to disrupt and materially damage the spectacle’s disengagement with ‘the real’, tying the attacker back into a moment of resistance, actualized in experiential violence.

---

The spectacle of the attack is thus a co-constituted performance—a “theater of terror”\textsuperscript{1283}—wherein the attacker is responding to the abstraction of reality by inserting radical critique as a dramatized play for the benefit of the audience. Here the spectacle creates the desire to act—to disrupt the mediated role played by society on the individual—and in doing so, simultaneously creates a newly revolutionary event for a new audience to view and interpret. These efforts to display ruptures to the society of the spectacle contest the media’s explanatory model of events that seek to act as an “insertion between man and his (sic) environment…[creating] a pseudo-environment.”\textsuperscript{1284} The strategic violence of asymmetric warfare thus attempts to carry through a largely symbolic salvo in a war against domination. The attack demands the gaze of the audience in the hopes of drawing them away from the spectacle, and towards an actualized, lived experience. One scholar, speaking of the spectacle and alienated action writes: “Insurrectionary actions are ultimately expressions of truth in a postmodern age that stridently disavows any such affirmation.”\textsuperscript{1285}

Thus for the attacker, not only is the strike a demonstration of their truth but is also allows a break from the mediated interactions of spectacle; a real, gritty, texture-rich experience wherein one is able to place politics outside the realm of theory and into the venue of action. This action resultantly requires a discursive explanation (i.e. a communiqué) to ensure that the experience is understood through its intended frame. This is precisely why insurrectionary actors follow up their strikes with a communiqué, as to

\textsuperscript{1285} Wood, \textit{The Cultural Logic of Insurrection}, 40.
strike without explanation is akin to telling a joke without the punch line. Sociologist Erving Goffman’s\textsuperscript{1286} theory of dramaturgical analysis\textsuperscript{1287}, expanded upon by Kenneth Burke\textsuperscript{1288}, posits that one’s engagement with public performance, directed at an audience, in order to influence the recipient’s perception of not only the targets of the attack, but the attacker as well. By displaying their critique through actualized violence, the insurrectionary actor is attempting to influence the audience, to engage in a dialogue that leads the passive social actor towards an emancipatory understanding of reality. This is a multi-pronged discourse which attempts to speak to the citizenry, the forces of authority, and its own inter-network community.

**Form and (Discursive) Function**

The communiqué as an object, delivered via the Internet, is beholden to the constraints of that medium. Certainly it is a banal assertion to write that radical social movements, armed nationalist insurgents and all types, and violent non-state actor use the Internet for a variety of purposes. This is obvious. In his descriptions of the post-9/11 rise of al-Qaeda terrorism scholar Bruce Hoffman speaks of these tech trends writing:

> The growth and communicative power of social networking platforms...has transformed terrorism: Facilitating both ubiquitous and real-time communication between like-minded radicals with would-be recruits and potential benefactors—thus fueling and sustaining these struggles to a hitherto unprecedented extent...The advantage of the new social media to terrorists are manifold. Ease, interactivity and networking, reach, frequency, usability, stability, immediacy, publicity, and permanence are benefits reaped by those terrorist groups exploiting and harnessing these technologies. A new generation of celebrity fighters is also

\textsuperscript{1286}Goffman’s work on framing is also cited frequently in the analysis of propaganda and political texts such as: Morris, “Networking Vehement Frames: Neo-Nazi and Violent Jihadi Demagoguery,” 165. 


\textsuperscript{1288}Kenneth Burke, *Dramatism and Development* (Barre, MA: Clark University Press, 1972).
being created, heralded and extolled in a familiar vernacular to Facebook friends and Twitter followers alike.\textsuperscript{1289}

This assertion is repeated throughout the literature, often truncated to reflect the idea that “this [propaganda] war, which was previously fought in written text, audio messaging, or small groups in free spaces is now unfolding across the Internet in unprecedented volume.”\textsuperscript{1290} This symbiosis between the creators of violence (i.e. terrorists) and the recipients of its reporting (i.e. the news-consuming population) is not a new phenomena\textsuperscript{1291} emanating from the transnational powers of the Internet. In a survey-based study conducted in the early 1980s, Terrorism Studies scholars associated with The Centre for the Study of Social Conflicts report quite simply that “the media play…an important role in the diffusion of terrorism.”\textsuperscript{1292}

While such assertions are commonplace, what is less obvious is how these technologies are used for revolutionary aims. Often times, the atypicality of radical media is presumed but may prove to district from the more mundane and common uses of communications technology. In her discussion of jihadis’ use of Twitter and other social media, political theorist Jytte Klausen writes, “The focus in the terrorism literature…overshadows the reality that terrorists also use the Internet for the same reasons everybody else does; for organization and planning, proselytizing and

\textsuperscript{1290} Morris, “Networking Vehement Frames: Neo-Nazi and Violent Jihadi Demagogy,” 164.
\textsuperscript{1292} Schmid and Graaf, \textit{Violence as Communication}, 126.
entertainment, and to educate the believers.” Furthermore, surveys of computer materials seized during post-terrorist attack investigations have shown that while fighters utilized these digital mediums to self-train in tactics their computer contained three times more material aimed at radicalization and propagandizing. Therefore it is not most centrally the digital form that is novel but rather the function it supports, namely the collection, translation and redistribution of claims of responsibility.

After reviewing thousands of communiqués and their associated acts of political protest, what can we say is the nature of the connection between form and function; between the text and the discourse? First, to borrow from Fairclough’s taxonomy, the approach pursued throughout the preceding study has been to incorporate both ‘textually-linguistically-orientated discourse analysis’ (TODA) as well as Foucault's more abstracted methods analyzing discourse. In the analysis of diverse texts, a TODA approach has been adopted for finer grain lexical analysis (e.g. word frequency, pronoun usage, conceptual collocation) and Foucault-inspired CDA has been used to zoom outward, to interpret those linguistic findings within a wider venue of discussions of power, governance and violence. More precisely, this endeavor has sought to 'put

1293 Klausen, “Tweeting the Jihad: Social Media Networks of Western Foreign Fighters in Syria and Iraq [Accepted Manuscript],” 3.
1294 This 1:3 ratio is based on an analysis of a USB thumb drive seized during investigations of the 2004 Madrid train bombing ad described in Klausen, 2014, 3.
1295 Klausen, “Tweeting the Jihad: Social Media Networks of Western Foreign Fighters in Syria and Iraq [Accepted Manuscript],” 3.
1296 Fairclough, Discourse and Social Change, 37.
Foucault's perspective to work\textsuperscript{1297} not apply it as a top down methodology in the traditional sense.

The preceding examination of corpora has been chiefly concerned with "discursive practices as constitutive of knowledge"\textsuperscript{1298}, in this case the constructed knowledge of a particular social milieu, critical tendency and socio-political direct action movement for insurrection. The production of communiqués and other texts through a particular linguistic reality is exemplary of discursive limiting. Speaking of Foucault’s \textit{archeology of knowledge}, Fairclough explains:

\begin{quote}
…the objects of discourse are constituted and transformed in discourse according to the rules of some particular discursive formation, rather than existing independently and simply being referred to or talked about in a particular discourse...discourse as constitutive—as contributing to the production, transformation, and reproduction of the objects...language signifies reality in the sense of constructing meaning for it, rather than that discourse is in its passive relation to reality, with language merely referring to objects which are taken to be given in reality.\textsuperscript{1299}
\end{quote}

Thus the linguistic choices made by communiqué authors are constituted through the movement’s macro discourse, as established through the forum of the “informal international translation and counter-information network.”\textsuperscript{1300} This network is therefore not simply discussing and presenting the discourse of the communiqués' struggle against the state, but rather they function to constitute the discursive content including its goals, methods, identities, lexical choices and rhetorics. While this may appear as a one-way

---


\textsuperscript{1298} Fairclough, \textit{Discourse and Social Change}, 38.

\textsuperscript{1299} Ibid., 41–42.

\textsuperscript{1300} Anarchist-nihilists against the activist establishment, “Fuck Indymedia and the Anarcho-Left.”
dialogue—the clandestine speaking to the public—it is in fact a conversation occurring in the openness of the Internet, spanning the world. In this relationship, the texts influence the attacks that in turn produce more texts, which influence subsequent attacks. This dynamic relationship is modeled below in Figure 6.2:

Figure 6.2: Communique/attack-form/function concept map
Sometimes, individuals even acknowledge this interrelatedness, for example, thanking those unnamed persons who translated their material. In one such example, an insurrectionary networks based in Mexico concluded their communiqué with, “PS: We give our appreciation to the effort of the translators (of our communiques and claims), through whose effort of diffusion, our words have reached countries that we never thought they would reach.”

The global network thus constitutes discourse through what Foucault describes as establishing and forcing discursive discipline—establishing power-knowledge—as to speak outside of these rules, is to exclude oneself from the network altogether. Such a public disciplinary action can be seen in the case of the now ostracized and excommunicated Bristol Indymedia which is now seen by insurrectionary actors to be complicit in state-led repression and violence. Following a police raid on the website servers of Bristol Indymedia, insurrectionary anarchists voiced their condemnation for the social movement news outlet stating:

[Bristol] Indymedia was previously part of the anti-capitalist movement from the alter-globalist era, but has been recuperated by the liberal democratic system. 325 has long regarded the Bristol IMC project to largely be passed any relevancy and considered it as in the hands of the enemy for some time… It doesn’t surprise us at all that their server is now to become part of the regime’s hand to be used against the new anarchist urban guerrilla operating in the UK…325 was correct to position ourselves in antagonism towards them. Their persistent attempts to denigrate the new urban guerrillas and their lack of any kind of respect when we attempted to communicate to them means they will find no solidarity from

---

us...Bristol IMC’s recent cowardly and civil society orientated “statement” announcing that they were not going to be publishing any more communiqués for destructive attacks on their pages also confirmed that they were the worst kind of pacifist-judiciary and cowards of the tendency of civil democracy.  

This statement reveals the public shaming and denouncement of Bristol Indymedia for refusing to circulate insurrectionary texts, and its resulting criticism from 325’s authors. Similarly, the construction of an oppositional group such as “civil anarchists” facilitates an inter-movement, discursive *othering*, wherein segments who contest bounds of illegality, violence and associated rhetoric can constitute an enemy, not ally, and as a result, be summarily excluded. This disciplining of discourse can be observed inter-textually (i.e. within a single text’s word choices) and amongst various texts that constitute the movement’s messaging at large.  

Moreover, this discussion must take into account the role played by interconnectivity, specially digitally-mediated communities fostered through a global web of exchange, and the impact these spaces have for future struggle. The Internet has allowed for a global audience of insurrectionary actors to witness attacks, integrate these critiques into their own politics, and to then strike in new, responsive ways. In other words, without the availability of sites such as 325 and War on Society, the internationalization of moniker-based networks of attacks would occur in a likely slower and more localized manner. This digital reconstruction of what constitutes a “community or network” reframes the actions of the individual, linking them in action and meaning to...  

---  

1302 325.nostate.net, “Police Investigating the Incendiary Anarchist Minority Raid Bristol IMC, Who Shut down Their Project (UK).”  
an increasingly lengthy history of attack and highlighting the moniker-based “branding” of particular networks (e.g. the FAI ‘brand’). This conundrum—one that problematizes the value added to revolutionary organizing with the advent of online communities—is especially tricky when discussing the networks that seek to abolish industrial civilization and technology as their basis, such as the ITS network. Discussions of this nature are certainly ongoing amongst the theorists of struggle, such as the recent article and interview put out by the CrimethInc. Ex-Workers’ Collective. The loss of physical community is certainly an acknowledged risk with increased digitalization, yet the possibility for greater connectivity has been discussed as a strength of modern protest culture. It is important to note here that the use of online networks for communiqué distribution appear to be a function of emergent technology’s integration into a wider social scheme, and not a necessary component for the continuation of insurrectionary attack. In this regard, one notes the comments made by foundational social movement thinker Charles Tilly, who remarked, “Yes, activists adopt new technologies when those technologies serve their purposes…but purposes override techniques.” In other words, without the online networks, other offline networks

---

would likely arise in their place, and while these divergent forms may dictate some
manner of the action, they will not dictate its complete form.

The communiqué functions as a “transactional and bidirectional”\textsuperscript{1309} message, rhetorically engaging both the attacker and the public in a discourse. The communiqué itself becomes a site of resistance as it is a reaction to violence and a urging for additional violence. This sort of dialogue between globally dispersed actors is only made possible by nearly synchronous communications and translations as offered by the Internet. The acts of violence function to allow the communiqué to be authored, to temporarily focus attention towards the politics of structural violence as manifested in the individual institution that is being targeted. Therefore, though communiqués may report acts akin to traditional terrorism, the strategy of attack-communiqué is not terrorism, but something else. It is a form of asymmetric, decentralized war carried out through networked and ideologically-linked attacks at a non-centralized, fluid target. In a dialogical sense, the violence of the attack creates the space for the critic to ‘be heard’\textsuperscript{1310}, and in doing so, temporarily disrupts the discourse it is critiquing, for example, the infallibility of market capitalism.

This relationship that exists between the producer of texts (e.g. the attacker), their distributors (e.g. website administrators), and the consumer of texts (e.g. the supporter) is

\begin{itemize}
\item [1310] Tuman, Communicating Terror, 33.
\end{itemize}
similarly dynamic and fluid. In one sense, active sympathizers maintain the translation and distribution hubs that serve to liaison between the producer and consumer. Therefore, information flows from the attacker to the consumer via the sympathizer—engaging all level of actor in a process of discursive production and information transmission. This relationship between the three parties is diagramed conceptually below in Figure 6.3:

![Figure 6.3: Knowledge transmission concept map](image)

This model shows that all manner of actor remain in an active (i.e. non-passive) position, as all individuals are either creators, facilitators or recipients of analysis, critique and incitement. The politics, critical analysis and praxis of the ‘ideology’ can only be developed, refined and enacted through action, and reinforced through an inter-movement
form of ‘ideological hegemony’\textsuperscript{1311}—the means of social conditioning that inform and enforce the movement’s culture of operation. Thus only those who light fires are allowed to pontificate, only those constructing fuses and timing devices welcomed to the debate. Those that construct the insurrectionary canon are globally dispersed actors, reacting to one another’s’ actions and texts in a never-ending dialogue, carried out with relative transparency for a global audience. What connects a vandal in Jakarta, a graffiti artist in Berlin, and an arsonist in Bristol is only their epistemological framework and their critique in the broadest sense. They will likely possess different positions on ‘policies’ and ‘alternatives’, but their diagraming of society’s ills will inevitably center around the same components and in their own manner, demonstrate inter-movement hegemony. Therefore, the point of convergence for these disparate actors is precisely the site of systemic violence; what is similar amongst the thousands of pages of radical speech is a shared understanding of an ever-changing, challenging foe, that of violence, coercion, domination, exploitation, alienation and control.

\textbf{Looking Forward Towards the Future}

The preceding chapters have argued for a nuanced, theoretically-informed, and context-embedded understanding of political violence crafted from primary source documents. This broad approach has been an attempt to operationalize a form an action-focused, analytical perspective that asserts itself as against the logic of securitization (i.e. anti-securitization) and de-exceptionalizes political violence from other forms of disruptive occurrence. While critical theorists such as Slavoj Žižek have argued that any attempt to

\textsuperscript{1311} Gramsci, \textit{Selections from the Prison Notebooks}. 
change structural inequality that leads to a disruption in the normal way of living is read as violence\textsuperscript{1312}, all violence is not read with the same lens. Violence that is often labeled as terroristic—that emanating from social movements and other non-state actors and targeting sites associated with the state and economy—is typically treated within a realm of exceptionality; marking it as substantively different from violence carried out for criminal or other idiosyncratic reasons. Why is this the case? Sociologist Robert White suggests that media and academic study of political violence tends to ignore the mundane and instead focus on the “series of spectacular and often gruesome events.”\textsuperscript{1313} This lack of connect ignores the violent conditions that may have preceded, resulted from and helped to constitute the attack.

Therefore it is essential for future scholarship to foster an understanding of political violence that incorporates “the social, political and economic ills that often surround terrorism and render it possible.”\textsuperscript{1314} Therefore, if we can interpret insurrectionary modes of attack through a context-embedded, de-exceptionalized, anti-security framework, the conversation will inevitably arrive at issues of inequality, hierarchy, alienation, coercion, and domestication. This approach is more familiar in discussions of criminal violence, as scholars assert a correlated and often causal linkage between, for example, revenue-generating criminal activity (e.g. distribution of drugs) and poverty. Therefore, while it is commonplace to assert that to reduce crime one must

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{1312} Žižek, Violence.
\textsuperscript{1314} Toros, Terrorism, Talking and Transformation: A Critical Approach, 35.
\end{flushright}
reduce economic inequality, improve access, and level the field of competition, the same cannot be said of political violence. If we were to treat political violence in a manner akin to that of criminal violence, the ‘solution’ to insurrectionary attack is revolutionary change that reduces inequality and other forms of marginalization. These solutions would likely be discounted summarily by policymakers who would prefer a list of targets than a list of arguments for better access to education, housing, transportation, etc. In other words, to ‘solve’ insurrectionary critique would require system-level change aimed at a deconstruction of that very system, and as such, is unlikely to be embraced by power elites. Because the critique is aimed at power itself, to embrace its proscription of change would deny the brokers of that power a great deal of influence and control.

In this sense, to de-exceptionalize terrorism and other forms of political violence is to disrupt the discourse that constructs it. In other words, by shifting the conversation away from broken windows (or burned offices) and towards gentrification (or prisons, animal slaughter…), a discursive shift occurs which steals power from the state’s efforts to mobilize state violence for the purposes of system maintenance and repression.

Furthermore, a focus on methods of conflict transformation—such as the work of Johan Galtung\textsuperscript{1315} John Paul Lederach\textsuperscript{1316}—refocuses attention away from the direct violence of attacks, and towards the “structures of domination and exclusion that generate and


perpetuate conflict.” In other words, by incorporating approaches from Peace Studies, Conflict Analysis, CSS, CTS and other related fields, we can shift the analytical focus from the manifestations to the structures that “generate and perpetuate”, and in doing so, de-center the state as the unit of analysis and focus of our attention.

Such predictive patterns should be of primary concern to those seeking a more peaceful society as counterterrorism efforts typically serve to “reinforce and reify existing structures of power in society”; the very structures insurrectionary action sees to eliminate. This creates a feedback loop wherein the structural violence causes insurrectionary attack, which causes increased securitization, which emboldens further violence at the level of the community, adding fuel to the fire of insurrectionary anger. In this case, the newly reified inequality can lead attackers to redouble their efforts to urgently and radically change the socio-political system. With this loop in mind, poststructuralism appears to once again be an appropriate perspective as it seeks to destabilize power—the hub through which all oppression is derived from.

Without the luxury of hindsight, we are forced to interpret these events as they unfold. While the ‘insurrectionary turn’ in anti-state attack began around the millennium, some movement scholars have argued that this wave has already crested and began to decline, if this is true, the movement’s embers continue to burn quite brightly. While the movement has not succeeded in ‘totalizing the social war’, or ‘bring it all crashing down’,
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1319 Nomad, *The Master’s Tools: Warfare and Insurgent Possibility*. 
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it has served to raise its critique to prominence through the production of spectacular violence. In doing so, the movement has been able to build a revolutionary consciousness, and while it did not yet fundamentally change the political landscape, it has had an undeniable impact. In all likelihood, the attacks of the FAI, CCF and other will continue despite combatants’ capture and imprisonment. Attacks will likely continue to draw strength and inspiration from the words and deeds of these movement forbearers, and the discourse of anti-state attack will continue to develop.

Social movements do not typically have clearly demarcated starting and ending points. The actions of individuals, cells and networks rise and fall as a combination of any number of factors. While larger political realities serve to inform and influence patterns of attack, it is incorrect to predict that the passage of new anti-terrorist laws or the induction of newly elected officials will serve to deter future violence. The nature of insurrectionary attacks understands that at its base, the problem is not found in politicians, their institutions or their initiatives, but instead in the articulation of a system-level critique which rejects political representationalism, abhors domination, and seeks nothing short of ‘total liberation.’ With such frameworks serving to inform the movement’s understanding of success and failure, the arena of battle will extend far into the future. As wealth gaps widen, forms of state control coalesce, and ecological crisis creeps closer, it can be expected that those who choose the bomb over the ballot will continue to strike with greater ferocity.
APPENDIX

2.1 - Chronology of arrests associated with the FAI

1. October 2011: Billy Augustian and Reyhard Rumbayan (known as Eat) were arrested in Indonesia for the arson of a Bank Rakyat Indonesia (BRI) ATM in Yogyakarta’s Sleman district. The two were arrested only hours after the arson, reportedly dropping identifying documents near the scene along with the attack communiqué. The attack was claimed by the “Long Live Luciano Tortuga Cell of the FAI/IRF.” Eat and Billy were charged under a 2002 anti-terrorism law which claimed that the ATM arson “deliberately used violence with the intention of creating a sense of terror and widespread fear amongst the general public.” The two were later resentenced to one and half years, and released in November/December 2012. The two Indonesian men have been the subject of movement celebritydom. After Eat and Billy’s arrests, other individuals continued to carryout attacks in Indonesia using the “Long Live Luciano Tortuga” cell name. This includes an attempted arson of a power plant in Kotamobagu (August 2012), the placement of an incendiary device at an electricity station in Tuminting (31 August 2012), and the arson of luxury cars in Manado (5 November 2012).

2. May 2012: Henry Zegarrundo was arrested in La Paz, Bolivia and linked to 20 attacks claimed by FAI/IRF. A member of an aboveground, platformist anarchist organization provided evidence against him that led to his arrest.

3. September 2012: Nicola Gai, 35, and Alfredo Cospito, 46, both from Turn, Italy, were arrested for the shooting of Roberto Adinolfi, the CEO of Ansaldo Nucleare, an Italian nuclear energy company. The two activists were convicted in November 2013; Gia receiving nine years, four months, and Cospito receiving ten years, eight months. During their sentencing the two remained unapologetic, with Cospito stating, “In a wonderful morning in May I acted, and in the space of a few hours I fully enjoyed my

1320 Luciano Tortuga is a Chilean anarchist whom was jailed June 2011 after losing both hands in an accidental explosion of an IED he was placing at a bank. Since his injury and arrest, his namesake has become a regular mainstay of insurrectional communiqués and a large number of attacks have been specifically dedicated to him.


1322 Ibid.
life. For once I left fear and self justification behind and defied the unknown. In a Europe dotted with nuclear power stations, one of those mainly responsible for the nuclear disaster to come fell at my feet.  

4. July 2013: Andreas Tsavdaridis, a Greek individual was arrested for carrying out Phoenix Project attack #4, the mailing of an explosive device to "Dimitris Horianopoulos, scumbag former commander of the anti-terrorist division."  

5. September 2013: Adriano Antonacci & Gianluca Iacovacci were arrested in Italy in connection to a series of arson attacks claimed by the “Subversive Anti-Civilisation Subversive Individualities, FAI/IRF.” These included incendiary and sabotage attacks targeting banks, a fur store, a landfill, and two corporate offices (ENI and ENEL) in the area of Rome, Italy. Iacovacci has since taken responsibility for some of these attacks. According to sympathetic, inter-movement sources, the pair are accused of “terrorist association with purposes of terrorism, arson, aggravated theft, defacement and daubing of others’ property.” Like many other arrested comrades, following their capture, attacks were carried out in their name including a triple arson of power facilities in Indonesia in May 2014 as part of the Phoenix Project. 

6. June 2014: An unnamed 32/33-year-old man is arrested by UK police and linked to four arsons targeting mobile phone and radio masts. The specific arsons tied to the accused were claimed as Phoenix Project #14. The attacks were claimed by “Live Wires ELF/FAI” and according to police, are part of 50 such attacks carried out 2010-2014. The man was arrested after a car stop on the suspicion he was “going equipped to commit a crime.” Though precise information is unavailable, other arrests in England may have linked a 30-year-old man (arrested 25 July 2013) to a
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1324 Commando Mauricio Morales/FAI-IRF, “Commando Mauricio Morales / FAI-IRF’ Takes Responsibility for the Sending of a Parcelbomb to Dimitris Horianopoulos, Scumbag Former Commander of the Anti-Terrorist Division.”
1326 Ibid., 4.
1327 Live Wires FAI/ELF, “Phoenix Project #14: ‘Live Wires FAI/ELF’ Take Responsibility for 4 Arsons against Bristol’s Cellular Transmission Infrastructure over 24 Hours.”
1330 Ibid.
3 January 2013 arson claimed by FAI’s “New Horizons of Burning Rage” cell. Also on 25 July 2013, a third man, 20-years-old, was reportedly arrested for the burning of a car claimed by the FAI, but was released.

7. December 2014: Though currently at large, police in England have identified 27-year-old Huw Norfolk, known as “Badger”, as a suspect in an arson attack (3 January 2013 arson of a Bath communication tower) claimed by insurrectionary anarchists in the area of Bristol and damage sustained to a newspaper office during a 2011 street demonstration. Norfolk is accused of carrying out attacks causing £100,000 in damages, and police officials took the unusual step of announcing a £10,000 “bounty” for the suspect’s arrest. Though officials are only identifying two specific incidents linked to Norfolk, police have stated that they are exploring his connection to one hundred other anarchist-linked attacks (e.g. sabotage, vandalism, arson) in the UK estimated to account for £20,000,000 in damages.
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1332 FAI/ELF - Rogue Fire Brigade, “FAI/ELF Claim Four Vehicle Fires in Bristol.”
1333 Anonymous, “Two Further Arrests for FAI/ELF Actions in Avon & Somerset (UK).”
2.2 - Chronology of attacks: CARI-PGG

1. 23 January 2010: Two IEDs (mail bombs) targeting Chilean embassy in Mexico.\(^{1337}\)
2. 5 October 2010: Arson of two police cars.\(^{1338}\)
3. 14 October 2010: IED targeting riot police bus.\(^{1339}\)
4. 22 February 2011: Two IEDs (mail bombs) targeting two prison directors.\(^{1340}\)
5. 22 February 2011: IED (mail bomb) to head of Monsanto in Mexico.\(^{1341}\)
6. 22 February 2011: IED targeting a bank.\(^{1342}\)
7. 22 February 2011: IED targeting a Starbucks.\(^{1343}\)
8. 17 September 2011: IED targeting a police car.\(^{1344}\)
9. 23 September 2011: IED targeting the Federal Electricity Commission.\(^{1345}\)

---


\(^{1341}\) Ibid.
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10. 3 October 2011: IED targeting a bank.\textsuperscript{1346}

11. 3 October 2011: IED targeting politician’s home.\textsuperscript{1347}

12. 1 November 2011: IED (mail bomb) targeting Miguel Mancera, Attorney General of Mexico.\textsuperscript{1348}

13. 1 November 2011: IED (mail bomb) targeting Norberto Ribera, the Archbishop of Mexico.\textsuperscript{1349}

14. 12 December 2011: IED targeting Italian Institute of Culture, part of the Italian embassy.\textsuperscript{1350}

15. 20 April 2012: 1\textsuperscript{st} IED (mail bomb) targeting Mexican ambassador to Greece.\textsuperscript{1351}

16. 1 May 2012: 2\textsuperscript{nd} IED (mail bomb) targeting Mexican ambassador to Greece.\textsuperscript{1352}

17. 26 November 2013: IED targeting three banks (BBVA, and two branches of EDOMEX).\textsuperscript{1353}


\textsuperscript{1347} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{1348} Autonomous Cells for Immediate Revolution – Praxedis G. Guerrero, FAI, “The Sole-Baleno insurgent cell of the CARI-PGG claims the package bomb sent to the attorney general.”

\textsuperscript{1349} Autonomous Cells for Immediate Revolution – Praxedis G. Guerrero, Gabriella Segata Antolini cell and Informal Anarchist Federation/International Revolutionary Front, “Gabriella Segata Antolini cell of CARI-PGG claims package bomb to the Archibishop of Mexico.”


\textsuperscript{1351} Autonomous Cells for Immediate Revolution – Praxedis G. Guerrero, Cell of revolutionary action for the destruction of the State, “Cell of Revolutionary Action for the Destruction of the State – Autonomous Cells for Immediate Revolution – Praxedis G. Guerrero claim responsibility for sending 2 explosive packages to the Greek embassy.”

\textsuperscript{1352} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{1353} Praxedis G. Guerrero Autonomous Cells for Immediate Revolution, Nucleus of the Attack Against Power- Black Fir, “Claim for attacks with explosive devices on three banks.”
18. 2 December 2013: IED targeting a riot police bus, damaging the vehicle.\textsuperscript{1354}

19. 2 December 2013: IED targeting a Banamex bank, damaging the building.\textsuperscript{1355}

\textsuperscript{1354} Praxedis G. Guerrero Autonomous Cells for Immediate Revolution, “Mexico.”
\textsuperscript{1355} Ibid.
2.3 - Chronology of attacks: ITS and its various formulations

1. September 2009: Liberation of “several” wild horses at a farm in Aguascalientes. At the time this was claimed by the “Informal Circle of Antagonistic Individualists.”

2. “2009-2011”: Various arson attacks throughout Mexico, at the time claimed as part of the “Luddites Against the Domestication of Wild Nature.”

3. “2010 and 2011”: Placement of fake IED at Pharmacological and Biopharmaceutical Research center and the detonation of an IED targeting National Ecology Institute. Both targets are located in Mexico City’s Tlalpan district. At the time this attack was claimed by the “Terrorist Cells for the Direct Attack – Anti-Civilization Fraction.”

4. 19 April 2011: IED (mail bomb) sent to director of Nanotechnology Engineering at Valle de Mexico Polytechnic University (UPVM). Bomb wounds guard, Alberto Álvarez Vázquez.

5. 29 June 2011: IED targeting Santander bank, Tultitlan, Mexico. At the time this attack was claimed by the “Informal Anti-Civilization Group.”

6. 8 August 2011: IED (mail bomb) sent to Armando Herrera Corral, injuring him as well as college Alejandro Aceves López, both professors at State of Mexico Campus Tec, specializing in nanotechnology/humanoid robotics.

7. 28 August 2011: unspecified attempted attack on Center of Research and Advanced Studies, National Polytechnic Institute, municipality of Irapuato, Guanajuato.

8. 9 September 2011: IED (mail bomb) sent to Flora Ganem Rondero, nanotechnology researcher at UNAM School of Higher Studies (FES) Cuatitlán. No injuries.

---

1356 Wild Reaction, “Kill or Die” Group, “First communiqué of Wild Reaction (RS).”
1357 Ibid.
1358 Ibid.
1359 Ibid.
1360 Individualists Tending Toward the Wild, “2nd Communiqué.”
1361 Individualists Tending Toward the Wild, “1st Communiqué.”
1362 Wild Reaction, “Kill or Die” Group, “First communiqué of Wild Reaction (RS).”
1364 Individualists Tending Toward the Wild, “6th Communiqué.”
9. 14 September 2011: IED (mail bomb) sent to Pedro Brajcich Gallegos, general director of the National Institute of Forestry, Agricultural and Fishery Studies (INIFAP). No injuries.

10. 16 October 2011: Placement of IED that failed to explode targeting Santander bank in Mexico City’s Álvaro Obregón district. No injuries.

11. 16 October 2011: IED targeting Banamex ATM between Tultitlan and Coacalco. At the time this attack was claimed by “Uncivilized Autonomous.” No injuries.

12. November 2011: Failed IED (mail bomb) sent to Dr. Pedro Luis Grasa Soler, general director of Monterrey Tec campus. No injuries.

13. November 2011: Threat (bullets with note) sent to Dr. Manuel Torres Labansat, Director Institute of Physics UNAM and Carlos Aramburo de la Hoz, Director of scientific research, UNAM, Mexico City.

14. 8 November 2011: Shooting death of Ernesto Méndez Salinas, biotechnologist at the UNAM Institute of Biotechnology, Morelos. Salinas was shot in the head and killed in Cuernavaca.

15. 16 November 2011: IED detonated targeting an ATM located in the Federal Electricity Commission in Irapuato, Guanajuato. At the time this attack was claimed by the “Earth Liberation Front—Bajío.” No injuries.

16. 9 December 2011: IED (package bomb) left for Ramón de la Fuente, director of the National Institute of Psychiatry, Tlalpan district of Mexico City. At the time this attack was claimed by “NS—Fera—Kamala y Amala.” Bomb defused by police. No injuries.

17. 15 December 2011: Threat (car bomb) sent via email targeting the National Institute of Psychiatry, Tlalpan district of Mexico City. At the time this attack was claimed by “NS—Fera—Kamala y Amala.”

---

1365 Ibid.
1366 Wild Reaction, “Kill or Die” Group, “First communiqué of Wild Reaction (RS).”
1367 Ibid.
1368 Individualists Tending Toward the Wild, “6th Communiqué.”
1369 Ibid.
1370 contra-info and Individualists Tending Toward the Wild, “Interview with Individualists Tending toward the Wild”; Individualists Tending Toward the Wild, “8th Communiqué.”
1371 Wild Reaction, “Kill or Die” Group, “First communiqué of Wild Reaction (RS).”
1372 Ibid.
1373 Ibid.
18. 25 November 2011: IED (mail bomb) sent to Alejandro Olivera, Greenpeace Mexico.\textsuperscript{1374} No injuries.

19. August 2012: IED (mail bomb) to neurologists at Autonomous Technological Institute of Mexico (ITAM), Mexico City.\textsuperscript{1375} No injuries.

20. 6 September 2012: IED (mail bomb) sent to Dr. Flora Adriana Ganem Rondero, head of UNAM Section of Pharmaceutical Technology and chemistry laboratory, School of Higher Studies (FES) Cuatitlán.\textsuperscript{1376}

21. ~15 September 2012: IED sent to Pedro Brajcich Gallegos, general director INIFAP, Coyoacán neighborhood, Mexico City.\textsuperscript{1377}

22. 11 February 2013: IED (mail bomb) sent to Sergio Andrés Águila, UNAM Institute of Biotechnology (IBT), Cuernavaca, Morelos.\textsuperscript{1378} Visible electronic components led to package being identified and handed over to security forces for destruction. No injuries.

23. 21 February 2013: IED (mail bomb) explodes in Sepomex mailbox in Tlapan, injuring postal worker illegally attempting to open package. Original target unknown.\textsuperscript{1379}

24. September 2013: IED (mail bomb) to Alejandra Lagunes Soto, former director of Google Mexico/current head of National Digital Strategy Coordination of the Presidency of the Republic.\textsuperscript{1380}

25. September 2013: IED (mail bomb) to Guillermo Turrient Schnas, Director of modernization and administration of the Federal Electricity Commission.\textsuperscript{1381}

26. March 2014: IED (mail bomb) sent to Reactor of UNAM, Mexico City. At the time this attack was claimed by the “Obsidian Point Circle of Attack.”\textsuperscript{1382}


\textsuperscript{1375} Individualists Tending Toward the Wild, “8th Communiqué.”

\textsuperscript{1376} Individualists Tending Toward the Wild, “4th Communiqué.”

\textsuperscript{1377} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{1380} Individualists Tending Toward the Wild, “8th Communiqué.”

\textsuperscript{1381} Ibid.
27. April 2014: Bomb threats sent to various academic intuitions in “Michoacán, Mexico State, Mexico City, Puebla and Zacatecas.” At the time these attacks were claims by the “Atatl Group.”

1382 Obsidian Point Circle of Attack, “Communique for Package Bomb Sent to the Rector of UNAM”; Wild Reaction, “Kill or Die” Group, “First communiqué of Wild Reaction (RS).”

1383 Wild Reaction, “Kill or Die” Group, “First communiqué of Wild Reaction (RS).”
2.4 - Chronology of attacks: Phoenix Campaign #1-16

1. 7 June 2013: The “Conspiracy of Cells of Fire-FAI/IRF, Consciousness Gangs-FAI/IRF, Sole–Baleno Cell” [1384] claimed responsibility for the bombing of a car belonging to Maria Stefi, the director of the prison where members of the CCF were being held.

2. 22 June 2013: The “International Conspiracy for Revenge/FAI” [1385] claim responsibility for the bombing of a car belonging to a “hated prison guard in Argos, Greece.”


4. 14 July 2013: The sending of a mailed IED to a former commander of an anti-terrorist police division. The attack was claimed by “Commando Mauricio Morales - FAI/IRF.” [1387]

5. 28 August 2013: The “International Conspiracy for Revenge-FAI/IRF” claims responsibility for the arson of a police training facility in Balikpapan, Indonesia. [1388]

6. 8 October 2013: The “CCF-FAI/IRF Ryo Cell” claims responsibility for a mailed IED sent to the chief prosecutor in the CCF case in Greece. The authors write: “Let this attack become an invitation for such acts of revenge, to all, inside and out of the prison walls…Let’s all attack them with whatever everyone can. From beatings and arsons up to bombs and executions. Only in this way will they understand there is a war.” [1389]

7. 2 October 2013: The ELF/FAI claims responsibility for the arson of a sawmill adjacent to a hunting resort in Western Russia. The attackers write, “we suggest this

---

1385 International Conspiracy for Revenge/FAI, “Explosion Destroys the Personal Car of a Prison Guard – ICR / FAI Take Responsibility as Part of Phoenix Project.”
1386 International Conspiracy for Revenge/FAI-IRF and Anger Unit, “Anger Unit / ICR-FAI-IRF Burn down the Third Floor of Former Sheraton Hotel, ‘The Media Hotel and Tower.’”
1389 CCF-FAI/IRF and Ryo Cell, “Phoenix Project #6: Parcel Bomb Arrives for Dimitris Mokkas, Chief Prosecutor in the CCF Case.”
action to count as out input in PHOENIX project (#7), a project for the revival of
direct action acts and anarchist resistance after repression of 2010-2012.”

8. 16 November 2013: The “Ilya Romannov Cell” attacked the Board of Elections
Office in Santiago, Chile with what they describe as an “incendiary/explosive”
device.

9. 18 November 2013: The “Anti-Civilization Faction of the ELF in affinity with the
FAI” attacked a church, and two banks with IEDs and IIDs. Their communiqué
included a six-verse poem.

10. 9 January 2014: The “Sebastian O. Seguel cell” of the International Conspiracy for
Revenge – FAI” detonated an IED atop an ATM in East Java, Indonesia. In their
communiqué, the authors describe their attack writing: “We blew up one of your
money machine with our small explosive creation. We made the bomb with our
limited knowledge about it from many different sources. We want you and your
abiding citizens know if we will never let our limitations bound our desire to
continually address our anger to all of you.”

11. 8 April 2014: The “Autonomous Cell Christos Kassimis”, in what they term “smoke
signals from Berlin,” claim responsibility for several arson attacks. These targeted “a
vehicle of the municipal regulatory authority, and the car of a security
company...[and] an embassy vehicle belonging to a Greek female diplomat.”

responsibility for multiple arson attacks throughout Indonesia. Targets included “two

---

1390 ELF/FAI, Nestor Makhno Commando, “Phoenix Project #7: ELF/FAI Burn down Sawmill at Hunting
Resort in Bryansk – ‘Some Thoughts on Recent Issues with FAI/IRF’” (From Russia With Love (republished
1391 Romanov is a 46-year-old Russian anarchist, released from prison in 2012 after 10 years, who was
injured in 2013 when an incendiary device he was transporting malfunctioned and tore of his hand.
1392 Ilya Romanov Cell, “Phoenix Project #8 – Action with Incendiary/explosive Device against a Board of
Elections Office and in Solidarity with Mónica Caballero and Francisco Solar.”
Responsibility for Several Explosive Attacks against Banks & Church,” trans. War on Society (Contra Info
1394 Sebastian Oversluij Seguel was a 26-year-old Chilean insurrectionist killed 11 December 2013 by
security guards while attempting to rob a state-run bank in Santiago.
1395 International Conspiracy for Revenge/FAI and Sebastian O. Seguel Cell, “Phoenix Project #10: Malang,
East Java – ATM Bank Bombed by Sebastian O. Seguel Cell / ICR-FAI” (325.nostate.net, January 11, 2014),
http://325.nostate.net/?p=9449.
offices of the general election committee”, “two cars…planned to transfer the ballots”, the “national electric company” and “three power plants.”

13. May 2014: The “Conspiracy of Black Fire – FAI/FRI1397” in Italy claim responsibility for the attempted arson and sabotage of a gasoline pump, as well as the unspecified ‘targeting’ of ATMs.1398


15. 26 March 2015: The “FAI/IRF Poetry of Fire cell” in the Czech Republic claim responsibility of the arson of a police car. The communiqué authors describe the open nature of Phoenix Project, describing it as, “[a] creative game played according to our rules. Everyone can join the game. Everyone can leave the game. When nobody plays the game it will cease to exist.”1400

16. 7 April 2015: The “Arsonist Anarchist Attack, ‘Fire and Consciousness’ Cell (FAI/IRF) – Chile” claim responsibility for placing a timed IID in the offices of a meat company. The attackers spoke of an anti-speciesist motivation and remarked, “The reasons are clear and abound. When we decided to fight for Liberation, we assume struggle in a full and complete way, without hierarchy between species.”1401

1397 “FRI” is likely an alternative translation of “IRF”, the International Revolutionary Front.
1398 Conspiracy of Black Fire - FAI-FRI, “Phoenix Project #13.”
1399 Live Wires FAI/ELF, “Phoenix Project #14: ‘Live Wires FAI/ELF’ Take Responsibility for 4 Arsons against Bristol’s Cellular Transmission Infrastructure over 24 Hours.”
# Appendix Table 3.1 - Attacks claimed by the ALF and ELF, 1970-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chosen moniker</th>
<th>Translated moniker</th>
<th># of attacks</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALF (Animal Liberation Front)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>2140</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALF (Animal Liberation Front)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBF (Djurens BevrielseFronts)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLAM (Frente de Liberación Animal)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELF (Earth Liberation Front)</td>
<td>ELF</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>*global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBF (Tier Befreiungs Front)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLA (Le Front pour la Liberation des Animaux)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALF (Animal Liberation Front)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLA (Frente de Liberación Animal)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALF (Animal Liberation Front)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLA (Fronte Liberazione Animale)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBF (Dieren Bevrijdings Front)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RALF (Russian Animal Liberation Front)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALF (Animal Liberation Front)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALF/ELF jointly</td>
<td>ALF/ELF</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>*global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBF (Tier Befreiungs Front)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFF (Dyrenes Frigjørings Front)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWZ (Front Wyzwolenia Zwierzat Polska)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALF (Animal Liberation Front)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALF (Animal Liberation Front)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVR (Eläinten Vapautus Rintama)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBF (Tier Befreiungs Front)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLA (Frente de Liberación Animal)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLA (Fronte Liberazione Animale)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALF (Animal Liberation Front)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>*online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLA (Frente de Libertação Animal)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLA (Frente de Liberación Animal)</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaelic Earth Liberation Front</td>
<td>ELF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional ALF</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>ALF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7231</strong></td>
<td><strong>36 countries</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix Table 4.1: Key to identifying corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corpus A</td>
<td>Global communiqué corpus of 960 comuniqués</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus B</td>
<td>Mexican communiqué corpus of 65 communiqués</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus C</td>
<td>Global corpus comprised of letters, statements and other documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus D</td>
<td>United States communiqué corpus of 133 comuniqués</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix Table 4.2: Communiqué quantity, words per communiqué, global comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank (# of comuniqués)</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th># of communiqués</th>
<th>Total words</th>
<th>Average words/communiqué (AWC)</th>
<th>Rank (AWC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15,432</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4,308</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,137</td>
<td>379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6,628</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,053</td>
<td>513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6,873</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>34,149</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3,452</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12,351</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>122,803</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9,585</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10,454</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>#</td>
<td># Communiqués</td>
<td># Words</td>
<td># Words per Communique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>44,077</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>38,773</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8,129</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>22,383</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,823</td>
<td>353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total # of communiqués: 963**

**Black cells:** not a significant enough sample (less than 10) to calculate. Not included in “Average # communiqués per country” and “Average # words per communiqué”
## Appendix Table 4.3: Word frequencies, complete corpus [Corpus A]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30648</td>
<td>THE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18235</td>
<td>OF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14111</td>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11005</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9912</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7106</td>
<td>WE</td>
<td>PRONOUN #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6769</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5158</td>
<td>THAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4715</td>
<td>FOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4541</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4020</td>
<td>WITH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3293</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3184</td>
<td>ARE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3153</td>
<td>OUR</td>
<td>PRONOUN #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3027</td>
<td>THIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2731</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2517</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2466</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2140</td>
<td>BY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2061</td>
<td>THEIR</td>
<td>PRONOUN #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>THEY</td>
<td>PRONOUN #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>FROM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>WAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>HAVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>WILL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>CONCEPTUAL #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>AN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>WHICH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>US</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>SOLIDARITY</td>
<td>CONCEPTUAL #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>ATTACK</td>
<td>CONCEPTUAL #3…also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'attacks', 'attacked'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>THOSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>CONCEPTUAL #4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

481
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>ONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>YOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>POLICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONCEPTUAL #5…also cops/pigs/etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TARGETING #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>WERE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>ITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>MORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>THEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50**</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>ALSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>SYSTEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONCEPTUAL #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TARGETING #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>THESE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>SO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>HAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>OUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>COMRADES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>FIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>ANARCHIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SELF/OTHER #1…also ‘anarchists;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>PEOPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>STRUGGLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>TIME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>THERE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>WORLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>BECAUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>SOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>WHAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>INTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>CAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>SOCIETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TARGETING #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>NEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>LIFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>BANK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>492</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>467</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>423</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>408</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>377</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>HAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>WHILE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>OVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>KNOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>SINCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>FAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>AFTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>PART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>CLAIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>GREECE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>THAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>LIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>TAKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>STREET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>DAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>POLITICAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>FRONT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>SECURITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>SUCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>PRISONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>IMPRISONED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>ANTI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>MOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>OURSELVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>LONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>OWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>NET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>FIRST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>HUMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>SEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>MEXICO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>FIGHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>LAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>YEARS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>ANOTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>MEANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>BEFORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>GREEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>INFORMAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>NOSTATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>WINDOWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>MADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>BANKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>INCENDIARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>THEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>THEMSELVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>CELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>NEVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>AROUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>ECONOMIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>LIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>DESTRUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>CONSPIRACY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>UNDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>SET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>CAPITALISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>NOTHING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>LEFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>HOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>DURING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>WITHIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>BACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>DEATH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>DOMINATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>CIVILIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>DON`T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>NOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>CHILE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>COPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>SHOULD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>WORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>ATHENS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>CONTINUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>MUCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>AGAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>SMALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>STRIKE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>DAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>FACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>BOMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>COMMUNIQUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>PAINT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>COME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>ENEMY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>WHOLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>ARRESTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>FIND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>MEMBERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>DESTROY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>FEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>KEEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>MEDIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>GIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>STOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>MONEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>BLACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>SAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>CALLED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>SELF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>STATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>LAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>COMPANIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>REALITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>SMASHED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>ARMED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>BOTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>SOMETHING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>OFFICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>INDIVIDUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>STOCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>TOOK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>AWAY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>REVOLUTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>TECHNOLOGICAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>LIVING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>MOMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>CANNOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>REASON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>SEVERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>THINK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>GOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>JANUARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>FEEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>HAVING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>POINT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>SIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>ACCUSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>MILITARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>POSSIBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>COUNTRIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>THINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>FORM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>RESPONSIBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>OFFICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>ANONYMOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>BETTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>FIGHTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>NECESSARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>MASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>NEED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>ANYONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>SHOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>PROJECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>ALTHOUGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>BRANCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>BURNED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>EVERYWHERE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>FRIENDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>IDEAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>PAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>WALLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>BOMBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>EXAMPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>PROFITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>RESISTANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>FORGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>PROPERTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>FUTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>HISTORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>PARTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>REAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>VEHICLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>HOWEVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>REMAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>TIMES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>TOWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>TOWARDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>ATMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>DUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>MOVEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>ANYTHING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>FASCIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>TOO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>FUCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>PEACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>THOUSANDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>AUTONOMOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>BASED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>THEREFORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>WORKERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>AUTHORITARIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>FORCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>MEMORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>TARGETS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>CCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>FORCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>IRF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>AUGUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>COMPLETELY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>HOPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>IMMEDIATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>ANIMAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>ATM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>FOUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>GOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>GREETINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>MODERN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>PRESENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>RECENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>TRIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>AGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>EVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>482</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>STAND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All other words = <100 occurrences

**Several rows were removed from the chart. These rows represented single letter/symbol errors created by formatting and file conversion. Words whose rows were removed are [written as “word/frequency rank”]: 🍎/51, ™/76, Ū/85, s/144, n/247, І/325, g/399, t/436, m/445, Ő/459, e/480
Table 4.4: Word frequencies, complete corpus [Corpus C]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>36353</td>
<td>THE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21367</td>
<td>OF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17160</td>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13768</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10741</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8359</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6641</td>
<td>THAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6020</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4846</td>
<td>WE</td>
<td>PRONOUN #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4597</td>
<td>FOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3993</td>
<td>WITH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3647</td>
<td>ARE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3588</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3527</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3327</td>
<td>THIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3144</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3033</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2913</td>
<td>OUR</td>
<td>PRONOUN #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2677</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>PRONOUN #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2559</td>
<td>FROM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2524</td>
<td>BY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2458</td>
<td>THEY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2455</td>
<td>THEIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2238</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2107</td>
<td>HAVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2080</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>AN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>WHICH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>US</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1715</td>
<td>WAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1678</td>
<td>WILL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>CONCEPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1408</td>
<td>YOU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>THOSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>STRUGGLE</td>
<td>CONCEPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>ONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITS
MORE
STATE
MY
SOCIAL
CONCEPT
ANARCHIST
CONCEPT
HAS
PEOPLE
SOLIDARITY
THEM
ONLY
PRISON
COMRADES
WERE
THESE
DO
ALSO
OTHER
THERE
CAN
BECAUSE
SO
WHAT
POLICE
IF
WHEN
NO
POLITICAL
BEEN
ABOUT
ANY
ME
TIME
EVEN
POWER
UP
OUT
REVOLUTIONARY
ACTION
INTO
SOME
EVERY
LIFE
ORDER
WOULD
LIKE
NOW
SYSTEM
NEW
WORLD
BEING
SAME
WITHOUT
MANY
WAY
THROUGH
WHERE
SOCIETY
WELL
WAR
THAN
PRISONERS
WANT
HAD
AFTER
YOUR
YOUR
FREEDOM
OWN
HIS
SINCE
ANARCHISTS
YEARS
WHILE
ATTACK
NEVER
HE
MAKE
KNOW
TAKE
PART
DAY
EACH
MOST
GREECE
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>SHOULD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>ANTI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>HOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>JUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>SUCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>CASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>PRISONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>DON’T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>OVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>ACTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>FIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>CELLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>FIRST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>GREEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>LIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>REPRESSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>ECONOMIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>LONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>HERE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>WITHIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>MEANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>MEDIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>ANOTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>FIGHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>VERY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>MUCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>PLACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>BETWEEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>END</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>MUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>THEMSELVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>LIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>MAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>THEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>AUTHORITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>COMRADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>DURING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>NOTHING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>ITSELF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC
TODAY
MADE
TWO
FACT
MOVEMENT
BEFORE
COPS
SELF
AM
NOR
WORDS
AGAIN
IMPRISONED
IT'S
VIOLENCE
UNDER
INTERNATIONAL
DIFFERENT
DOES
OTHERS
OURSelves
CAPITAL
CONTINUE
STILL
DID
ENEMY
GOVERNMENT
SAY
GET
ATTACKS
COULD
AROUND
COURSE
FEW
GO
STREETS
STRIKE
EVERYTHING
IDEAS
ALREADY
FREE
REVOLUTION
SEE
BECOME
MOMENT
UNTIL
CONSPIRACY
ACT
DEATH
GROUPS
LAST
THUS
CLASS
DAYS
PUT
WORK
RESISTANCE
CONDITIONS
TRIAL
NEED
USE
ATHENS
BACK
GIVE
WHY
INSIDE
LETTER
CANNOT
FEAR
SOMETHING
FACE
THEREFORE
CRISIS
FIND
TOWARDS
INDIVIDUAL
COME
FAI
POINT
CALL
RIGHT
THINK
CAPITALIST
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>255</th>
<th>206</th>
<th>HOWEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>POSSIBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>ARRESTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>AWAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>CONTROL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>HUNGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>OUTSIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>SECURITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>STRUGGLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>HUMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>PRESENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>DESTRUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>ANARCHY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>HANDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>CALLED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>EVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>DOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>BELIEVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>AUTHORITARIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>DIRECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>LEFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>LET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>ONCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>REALITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>REVOLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>REPRESSIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>FORM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>CLEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>HER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>BOTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>GOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>MARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>MEMBERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>SITUATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>ARMED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>COURT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>INDIVIDUALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>KEEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>REAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>HIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>NECESSARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>THINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>TIMES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>TOGETHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>CHILE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>FAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>BUILDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>ACCUSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>EVERYONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>OFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>LAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>DOMINATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>FORCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>WORKERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>ONES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>STRENGTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>EXPLOITATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>SIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>STREET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>BEHIND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>DAILY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>DEMOCRACY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>HAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>MONTHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>SAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>REASON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>FRONT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>STOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>TOO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>CCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>INFORMAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>ATTEMPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>LIBERATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>MASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>PRACTICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>USED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>ANYTHING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>FEEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>MILITARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>COLLECTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>COMMON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>EXAMPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>CAPITALISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>RATHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>PROJECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>REGIME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>TOOK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>HAVING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>SMALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>OPEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>PRISONER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>TAKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>AMONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>ARREST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>FORCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>SPACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>SPREAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>DOESN'T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>FORMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>REMAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>SET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>HISTORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>LIVING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>THREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>ABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>ETC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>ANYONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>FIGHTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>NEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>WHOLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>FUTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>HELD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>LEGAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>MYSELF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>PERSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>SIMPLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>WHETHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>CELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>CERTAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>ORGANIZED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>POSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>JANUARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>KNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>SPEAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>STAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>ABOVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>TRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>VIOLENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>DESPITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>MAKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>TERRORIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>URBAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>ITALY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>JUNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>LESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>PAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>BASED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>ROLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>SEVERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>WALLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>MATTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>OPPRESSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>GUERRILLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>LATER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>LET’S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>PROPAGANDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>SPACES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>FOUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>FRIENDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>STRUCTURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>STRONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>TRYING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>BROTHERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>MEMORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>OFTEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>RELATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>AREA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>GREAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>IMPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>NIGHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>PROJECTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>SPECIFIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>BLACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>GIVEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>LITTLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>QUESTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>NATIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>BOSSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>CONDITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>ESCAPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>LOVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>DECIDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>SHOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>BIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>VALUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>ACCORDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>DUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>INSTEAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>JUSTICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>LEAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>POOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>THOUSANDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>ALONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>IDEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>SHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>SILENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>CHOICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>CREATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>EVENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>HEART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>YET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>CONSIDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>DIDN’T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>TURN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>PARTICULAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>ANARCHISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>ENTIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>EXPERIENCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>SENSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>SOMEONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>CAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>EITHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>IMMIGRANTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>NATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>SISTERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>THING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>CASES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>NEWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>NON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>PARTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>TERROR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>BANK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>COMES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>WANTED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All other words = <100 occurrences*

**Several rows were removed from the chart. These rows represented single letter/symbol errors created by formatting and file conversion. Words whose rows were removed are [written as “word/frequency rank”]: ፣/96, ʧ/113, Ū/117, s/209, Ӡ/342, Ӫ/490, c/513
## Appendix Table 4.5: Word frequencies, Mexican corpus [Corpus B]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4972</td>
<td>THE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3053</td>
<td>OF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2324</td>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>THAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>WE</td>
<td>PRONOUN #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>FOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>WITH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>THIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>ARE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>HAVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>OUR</td>
<td>PRONOUN #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>THEY</td>
<td>PRONOUN #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>THEIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>BY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>CONCEPT #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>WHICH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>FROM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>WILL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>SYSTEM</td>
<td>CONCEPT #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>AN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>ONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>HAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>MEXICO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>THESE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>US</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>WHAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>WAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>MORE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>ITS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>ONLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>ANARCHIST</td>
<td>CONCEPT #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>THOSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>WOULD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>SO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>CONCEPT #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>ATTACK</td>
<td>CONCEPT #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>BECAUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>THEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>CIVILIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>SOLIDARITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>THERE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>ALSO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>FIRE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>STRUGGLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>MANY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>SINCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>CELLS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>PEOPLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>YOU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>HIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>INDUSTRIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>WILD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>LIFE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>SOCIETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>HUMAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>LIKE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>WITHIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>BEEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>BEING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>DOMINATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>NATURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>WITHOUT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>ORDER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>WAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>WANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>OUT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>TECHNOLOGICAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>WORLD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>ACTIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>INTO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>MAKE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>NOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>WERE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>ATTACKS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>EVEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>TIME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>WAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>ANY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>POLICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>COMRADES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>EXPLOSIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>FREEDOM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>WHEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>KNOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>SAID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>POWER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>OURSELVES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>NOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>DIRECT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>EARTH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>LIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>SAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>TWO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>DESTRUCTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>TOWARD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
509
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>COMMUNIQUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>DEVICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>JUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>FAI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All other words = <50 occurrences

**Several rows were removed from the chart. These rows represented single
letter/symbol errors created by formatting and file conversion. Words whose rows were
removed are [written as “word/frequency rank”]: û/41, n/127, /150
US ‘Phrase Dataset’ [Corpus D]\textsuperscript{1402}

**Group name**

3. “allied #anonymous and #antisec vessels”, “Antisec & Anonymous”, “Anonymous & Antisec”, “AntiSec… Anonymous” [one used in title, one in body of text], “Antisec / Anonymous” (2): 6
4. “Antisec”, “ANTISEC… the #OCCUPYWALLST CRACKDOWN RETALIATION TASK FORCE… Anti-Security… #AntiSec”, “#AntiSec”, “#Antisec”, “AntiSec… #ANTISEC”: 5
5. “Anonymous”: 2
6. “Animal Liberation Front”: 2
7. “(A)”: 2
8. “A.A.W. (Anarchists Against Windows)”: 1
9. “Portland Anarchists”: 1
10. “The Blood Thirsty”: 1
11. “some anarchists on the grey coast”: 1
12. “A few anarchists”: 1
13. “THE RIGHT HONORABLE WICKED STEPMOTHERS’ TRAVELING, DRINKING AND DEBATING SOCIETY AND MEN’S AUXILIARY”: 1
14. “Rocky Mountain Antifa”: 1
15. “The Gordon Shumway Brigade”: 1
16. “anarchistcrabplz”: 1
17. “The Terry Merrorista Brigade”: 1
18. “some ticked off trannies with knives”: 1
19. “Some angry proles”: 1
20. “some folks”: 1
21. “hooligans”: 1
22. “The Malaka Brigade”: 1
23. “Vengeance Committee”: 1
24. “Matthew Mattison Accountability Committee”: 1
25. “The CeCe McDonald Brigade”: 1
26. “Network of Wisconsin Snapper Turtles”: 1
27. “Queer Attack Squadron”: 1

\textsuperscript{1402}This dataset is based on 133 communiqués.
28. “Some Animals in Human Attire”: 1
29. “Brigada Maricones”: 1
30. “FAI – OREGON”: 1
31. “Friends in struggle”: 1
32. no group name listed: 73

Tactical Analysis

Tactics involving paint (or other drawing/writing/coloring substances)
1. “some paint thrown on the facade”, “had paint thrown on its exterior”, “paint was thrown on”, “had paint thrown on it [police car]”, “Black paint was also thrown of [sic] the facades”, “Paint was also splattered on the side of the building”, “paint splattered on its facade”, “had paint thrown all over its sign”, “put… out of commission by splattering paint on it”: 9
2. “anti-police graffiti was painted across the buildings [sic] facade”, “Dont [sic] Fuck With Oakland’ being painted”, “painted the phrase ‘LONG LIVE ANARCHY’ on the street-facing garage doors”, “painting ‘Rapist get out of town’ on the front door”, “A circle ‘A’ was painted on the building”, “anti-state/anti-capitalist slogans were painted”, “anarchist graffiti painted on it”: 7
3. “throwing a paint bomb through the shattered window”, “gave it a new paint job… Five paint bombs gave the storefront a beautiful facelift”, “attacked… with another paint bomb”, “paint bombed”, “had its windows and walls paint bombed”, “was paint bombed”: 6
4. “‘NO PRISONS (A)’ was spray painted on the side of the building”, “the words ‘Yuppie Scum’ spraypainted on the exterior”, “had been subject to the vandalism of the trans symbol, circle a’s, the largely sprayed proclamation ‘Too Many Trans Deaths, Not Enough Dead Pigs’ and 20 feet of silver letters across a darkly painted business rooftop reading ‘Vengeance for Shelley Hilliard!!!! (A) Bash Back!’”, “spraypainting ‘Stop Northwest FBI Oppression’” [“visited with knives and spraypaint”], “had a door defaced with spraypaint with another message of solidarity”, “spray-painted ‘FUCK THE GRAND JURY—<3 FOR PNW (A)’”: 6
5. “anti-development slogan [sic] written on the wall”, “Against Prison’ was written on the building”, “wrote, ‘Vengeance for Kenny’”, “had graffiti written on it with the message, ‘Destroy All Prisons (A) FTP (A)’”: 4
6. “re-decorated the building with a few anti-snitching slogans”, “left two messages. One being a circle A, and the other being ‘ For Oakland’”, “leaving the painted message ‘YOU ARE NEVER SAFE. GO LOG IN HELL (A).’”, “Leaving where is yr god on the wall [sic]”: 4
7. “covered the building and windows in black paint”, “had its door and façade covered in paint”, “had windows covered in paint”: 3
8. “attacked… with paint”: 2
9. “had paint thrown on it with the message ‘Oscar Grant was here, Rest In Power Brother’”: 1
10. “spray painting the building”: 1
11. “tagged it with a big ACAB and the words ‘Ya’ll [sic] are murderers.’”: 1
12. “cover up the filth ['Nazi graffiti'] and leave an antifascist message” [accompanying pictures show use of spraypaint]: 1
13. “took extinguisher paint to [targets], damaging the buildings, windows, and security cameras”: 1

Total # of references in attack communiqués to this tactic: 46

Tactics involving damage to windows (paint not specified)

1. “A window got smashed”, “3 windows where [sic] smashed”, “had all its windows smashed out”, “had their windows smashed”, “had its windows smashed”, “had it’s [sic] windows smashed”, “smashed the windows”, “smash out the windows”, “smashed the windows out of” (2), “smashed the windows”, “smashed several windows”, “smashed every window we could”, “Multiple windows were completely smashed”, “smashed out the windows”, “smashed… had multiple windows smashed out”, “3 windows… 2 Windows… smashed”, “smashed out many windows”, “smashed the windows”, “smashed out the front windows”: 20
2. “etching fluid was used to ruin at least three windows”, “etching fluid was thrown onto their windows [of police vehicles]”, “had all of its windows covered in etching fluid”, “corrosive material splattered on its windows”, “the windows were permanently etched”, “had its windows etched out”, “covered the windows and windshields… with glass etching fluid”, “covered the door and 5 windows… with etching fluid”, “windows were etched”: 9
3. “windows broke”, “break all the windows of”, “About a dozen windows were broken”, “had its windows broken”, “broke out the windows”, “had some of its

This number (“Total # of references in attack communiqués to this tactic”) is closely correlated to, but not precisely the same as the total number of individual communiqués which reference the tactic. As a single communiqué may contain multiple references (e.g. author writes “[We added] some paint thrown on the façade” [and it] “had paint thrown on its exterior”), this would be counted as two incidents as it utilized two distinct phrasings. Similarly, if a single communiqué mentioned a broken window and an arson, this would be counted in two distinct phrase headers but be representative of a single communiqué. Thus the numbers indicate the total number of references to this tactic in the total communiqué corpora.
windows broken”, “breaking out all 24 of their windows”, “had some of its windows broken”: 8
4. “smashed with rocks the windows of”, “9 windows… where [sic] smashed out with rocks”, “rocks took out the windows”, “rocks shattered their large external windows”, “cracked the front windows with rocks”: 5
5. “windows were smashed out with bricks”, “two bricks shattered the window”, “was attacked and windows cracked when several bricks were thrown at it”, “Three Bricks [sic]… were launched through the windows”, “threw bricks through the windows”: 5
6. “windows... shattered to the ground”, “had their windows busted out”, “busted all of the front windows out”: 3
7. “had the majority of its windows ruined”, “an attack… was made. One window was damaged”: 2
8. “Rocks and bricks were thrown through its windows”: 1
9. “A garbage can was also sent through a plate glass window”: 1
10. “smashed out the windows... hammers through their windows”: 1
11. “multiple broken windows and doors”: 1
12. “a brick was thrown through [a window] with a note attached”: 1

Total # of references in attack communiqués to this tactic: 57

Tactics involving other or mixed forms of vandalism
1. “were smashed up... received a few love taps that they won’t be forgetting anytime soon”, “smashed-up”, “smashed up” (3), “being smashed to shit”, “fucked up” [paired with descriptions of smashing other targets]: 7
2. “Bricks and paint bombs”, “vandalized” [pictures show spraypainted messages and a broken window], “poured pink paint into light bulbs, grabbed hammers, and went party party party! all over [the HRC gift shop]” [tactics also described as “trash and glamdalize” earlier in the same communique]: 3
3. “damaged the plumbing in both the male and females [sic] bathroom with quickset cement”: 1
4. “covered up” / “putting a bag over”: 1 [alternate descriptions of the same action within the same claim]
5. “destroyed by climbing the street lamps and smashing the spy cameras with a large poll [sic]”: 1
6. “removing [several fascist stickers in the area] in preceding weeks”: 1
7. “attacked… changing the signs to say suicide our cops [sic]” [changing letter boards, not using a paint/drawing medium]: 1
8. “a concrete planter was also liberated into a few pieces during the action”: 1
9. “shoved a dumpster into”: 1

**Total # of references in attack communiqués to this tactic: 16**

**Tactics involving cyber attack**

1. “have stolen massive amounts of confidential documents and personal information… to be released very soon”, “releasing the User Info Database of MyBart.gov”, “leaking over 38,000 private emails”, “dumped 6GBs of private mail spools [and] cleartext credit card, password, and home addresses”, “dropping the md5-hashed passwords and residential addresses… sharing several private mail spools [and] moar private police documents”, “[stole and released] 1,000,001 Apple Devices UDIDs linking to their users and their APNS tokens”: 6
2. “defacing their websites and destroying their servers”, “defaced with a youtube hip-hop video… and a statement from Antisec [sic]”: 2
3. “hacked, defaced, and destroyed… leaking over 600MB of private information”: 1
4. “defacing their website and giving out live backdoors… dumped a few of their mail spools and forum databases… passed around [and dumped] their private password list”: 1
5. “BACKDOORED [antivirus software]”: 1
6. “leak of Norton source code”: 1
7. “downed… conducted an easily reproducible D0s… launched multiple instances of pyloris”: 1
8. “servers were rooted and rm’d… .bash_history and mail spools spilled… doxed… live passwords [stolen]… used company credit cards to make donations to dozens of charities and revolutionary organizations… transferred to ourselves… anonymous currency… sold or traded… cc dumps and password lists… making off quick with their private documents which we then published on tor hidden services and BitTorrent”: 1
9. “dumping their mysql databases, stealing their private ssh keys, and copying hundreds of employee mail spools… used and abused their customer credit card information… dumping all 75,000 credit cards and 860,000 md5-hashed passwords of their ‘private client list’”: 1

**Total # of references in attack communiqués to this tactic: 15**

**Tactics unclear or vague**

1. “sabotaging”, “were sabotaged”, “sabotaged” (2): 4
2. “attacked” (3), “was attacked” [link included to news article with headline “vandals break out windows of olympia”]: 4
3. “[vehicles] were disabled”, “[ATMs] were disabled” (2): 3
4. “struck”: 1
5. “attacked… with rocks”: 1
6. “Rocks and bottles were thrown”: 1
7. “vandalism”: 1
8. “[vehicles] detourned. beautiful, inoperative art installations.”: 1

Total # of references in attack communiqués to this tactic: 16

Tactics involving sabotage specific to animal oppression
1. “wire cutters were used to successfully remove a large section of fencing from one of the pens”, “dismantled a huge section of an aviary that held between 75-150 pheasants”, “cutting holes in their fences”: 3
2. “opening cages… approximately 300 mink were released from cages”, “opened approximately 3/4 of the cages, many of which had more than one animal”: 2
3. “the breeding records we took from your sheds and throw into our fire”, “took down every breeder card in one of the two large, main sheds”: 2
4. “took 3 individuals and released them at different locations”: 1

Total # of references in attack communiqués to this tactic: 8

Tactics involving vehicle sabotage (not window- or paint-specific)
1. “Their tires were slashed”, “slashed their tires… defaced [their vehicle]”, “slashing all the tires”, “tires were slashed”, “slashed several tires”: 5
2. “used 4AWG copper wire with the ends stripped of insulation and wrapped around the two sides of the track with the rest of it buried in the middle, which falsely indicated to a sensor that there was a train stopped on the railway”, “Copper wire was wrapped around railroad lines which caused a false signal, blocking the line”: 2
3. “poured a mixture of sand and water into the fuel tanks”: 1
4. “dismantled” [vehicles]: 1

Total # of references in attack communiqués to this tactic: 9

Tactics involving information distribution (separate from noise disturbances/paint)
1. “Leaflets were thrown”, “Fliers were thrown”, “Flyers were strewn”, “fliers were left”, “hundreds of fliers were thrown into the air”: 5
2. “a banner was dropped”, “dropped a banner… reading, ‘Fare Strike for Kenneth Harding/ Fuck the Police.’”: 2
3. “dozens more leaflets were distributed to motorists and passersby”: 1
4. “Posters… were simultaneously wheat-pasted on walls throughout the area”: 1

_Total # of references in attack communiqués to this tactic: 9_

**Tactics involving fire**
1. “molotovs were thrown [into the parking lot]”, “a Molotov cocktail has been tossed through a large window”: 2
2. “A large rock and subsequent molotov cocktail were tossed [at a window]”, “another window has been shattered along with a molotov cocktail tossed inside”: 2
3. “containers of accelerant were placed beneath a row of 14 trucks with 4 digital timers used to light 4 of the containers and kerosene-soaked rope carrying the fire to the other 10”: 1

_Total # of references in attack communiqués to this tactic: 5_

**Tactics involving gluing or sealing**
1. “The locks to several doors were glued shut”, “gluing the locks”, “glued the locks on ten doors”, “their locks were glued”, “glued the locks”: 5
2. “had an ATM card slot glued”, “glued the ATMs”, “[the ATMS] were glued shut”, “sabotaged… had their credit card slots sealed shut”: 4
3. “had all of its locks and ATMs glued shut”, “had all of their locks and ATMs glued shut”: 2

_Total # of references in attack communiqués to this tactic: 11_

**Tactics involving sabotage of ATMs or fare machines (beyond simply gluing/sealing)**
1. “sabotaged the fare machines, turnstiles and facade… Our spray cans dispensed slogans and our hammers shattered screens and ticket readers”, “employed a variety of tactics to sabotage the machines… used hammers to smash their display screens and keyboards… Spray paint was used to obscure their hidden cameras… Expanding spray foam was sprayed into the card readers and cash dispensers.”, “destroyed… by filling all of the slots with expandable foam and spray painting the screen and hidden cameras”, “were made inoperable with glue, paint and hammers”, “used industrial adhesives and a hammer to dismantle”: 5
2. “The ATM got smashed”, “[2 ATMS] smashed and few windows [sic]”, “smashed out its windows and ATMs”: 3
3. “the banks [sic] ATM machine was destroyed”, “[ATM] was destroyed”, “destroyed the windows and doors and ATM”: 3

Total # of references in attack communiqués to this tactic: 11

Tactics involving public disruption: noise disruption
1. “chanting at the top of our lungs”: 1
2. “yelled at”: 1
3. “fireworks were set off… anti-police chants were screamed into the night”: 1

Total # of references in attack communiqués to this tactic: 3

Tactics involving public disruption: street blockades
1. “dumpsters were being turned over every hundred feet, blocking both directions”: 1
2. “[The intersection] was blocked and held for 15 minutes… trash cans and other debris were thrown into the street”: 1

Total # of references in attack communiqués to this tactic: 2

Tactics involving theft (non-cyber)
1. “relieve KATU of a 25,000$ news camera… figured they were no worse off filming their story from the muddy bottom of the Willamette”: 1

Total # of references in attack communiqués to this tactic: 1

Tactics involving explosives (not incendiaries)
1. “bombing”, “bomb”, “bombed”: 1

Total # of references in attack communiqués to this tactic: 1

Target Analysis

Target: Corporate
1. “Starbucks”, “a Starbucks” (2), “the Starbucks”, “that ugly beige Starbucks on Federal”: 5
2. “the Street of Dreams Corporate Office”: 1
3. “an American Apparel”: 1
4. “a Wal-Mart”: 1
5. “three Upper Crust Pizzerias”: 1
6. “a Modesto Property Management company and landlord’s office”: 1
7. “the development company Triway Enterprises”: 1
8. “architecture office… development office”: 1
9. “Duke Energy… four of their meter-reader trucks”: 1
10. “Bloomingfoods, an eco-capitalist cooperative”: 1
11. “The Human Rights Campaign (HRC) gift shop in Dupont Circle… that tacky
testament to the transformation of radical queer liberation into consumer junk”: 1
12. “[5 websites associated with] prison for profit scumbags GEO group… GEO GROUP
PRISON INDUSTRY”: 1
13. “Panda Labs… pandasecurity.com”: 1
14. “The Little Tattoo Shoppe owned by Matthew Mattison” [“recently outed as a rapist
and a sexual predator”]: 1
15. “the NYPD (pizza shop)” [is actually a pizza shop, but tactic used changed signs to
say “suicide our cops”]: 1

Target: Capital/banking
1. “bank”, “a bank” (4), “a bank and an attached ATM”, “a bank and ATM”, “16
ATM’s… Also 3 banks”, “four ATM’s [sic]”, “two banks”, “two ATMs”, “3 Bank
atms”: 12
2. “Wells Fargo” (3), “a Wells Fargo… ATMS [sic]”, “two Wells Fargo banks”, “a
wells fargo”, “a Wells Fargo bank ATM”, “a Wells Fargo branch”, “a Wells Fargo
bank”, “A Wells Fargo” (3): 12
5. “the Hollywood district Key Bank”, “Key Bank”, “a Key Bank”: 3
6. “24 ATMs… in addition to other surveillance cameras”: 1
7. “Marathon bank”: 1
8. “West Coast Bank”: 1
9. “Columbia Bank”: 1
10. “the Chase Bank and Wells Fargo Bank”: 1
11. “the Umpqua Bank”, “The Ravenna branch of the eco-insidious Umpqua Bank”: 2
12. “three banks on capital [sic] hill… The banks Chase, Key bank and an U.S. Bank
[sic]”: 1
13. “the US Bank”: 1
14. “the downtown M&I bank”: 1
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Target: Government
1. “BART” [Bay Area Rapid Transit], “the Glen Park BART station”, “an outbound T train… the train”, “MUNI transit construction… the construction happening on the N Judah”: 4
2. “160 city parking meters” [Denver, CO], “more than 50 parking meters in a bar district and an up-and-coming artist district” [against gentrification and environmental destruction as well as state control], “every parking meter on Edgewood Avenue… (45 parking meters total)”: 3
3. “a municipal court building in Seattle’s bedroom community-Kirkland”, “The Madison County courthouse”: 2
4. “the Greek Consulate General”, “the facade and crest of the Greek consulate”: 2
5. “Greek embassy” [Washington, DC]: 1
6. “the building housing the Chilean consulate in San Francisco”: 1
7. “the new city hall” [Olympia, WA]: 1
8. “two tractors used in the construction of a new Atlanta streetcar” [“one of many major development projects the city has initiated in the past few years as a part of a general plan to revitalize downtown. We know that this plan only means more police and unaffordable housing”]: 1
9. “the City of Seattle website” [also described as “the Seattle government website”]: 1
10. “the obama campaign center [sic]”: 1

Target: Law enforcement, security, military
1. “the lead cop car”, “two police vehicles”, “a police car”, “Two Santa Cruz County Sheriff Department vehicles”, “a truck belonging to the Santa Cruz County Sheriff’s Department”, “their vehicle” [title describes as “undercover police vehicle”], “three police vehicles”, “two CPD squad cars”, “a police patrol car”, “cop car… a police car parked outside a private residence”, “the St Louis City Police Department Probation van” [one of many “vehicles of pig mobility” or “pig cars”], “2 unmarked Oakland Police Department vehicles”, “eight San Francisco Police Department cruisers and one San Francisco Sheriff’s van”, “3 police cruisers and 1 paddy wagon”, “several police cars”: 15
2. “police station”, “the ‘community’ police station”, “a Tacoma Police Department building”, “the Portland Police contact office” (“police substation”), “the station itself”, “the FPOA”, “the ‘community police’ contact office”, “a cop shop (snitch station)”, “the police substation”, “district 4 denver cop shop”, “the Portland Police Bureau’s offices”, “a police station”, “the Little 5 Points police precinct”, “an Oakland police substation”: 14
3. “several dozen law enforcement websites… over 70 US law enforcement institutions”, “International Association of Chiefs of Police… several law enforcement targets… the police, military and other government websites hosted by [MatrixGroup.net]… the Boston Police Patrolmens’ Association (wwwbppa.org)… Alabama law enforcement systems”, “the California State Law Enforcement Association (CSLEA.COM)”, “multiple law enforcement targets in the state of New York” [claim makes clear that the attack targeted websites], “DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INTEREST COMPUTER SYSTEM (DODICS)”, “a Dell Vostro notebook, used by Supervisor Special Agent Christopher K. Stangl from FBI Regional Cyber Action Team and New York FBI Office Evidence Response Team”, “servers… sysadmins… cops… police departments”: 7
4. “a Department of Corrections office”, “the Department of Corrections Office”, “the Downtown Brooklyn Parole Office”, “your probation center”, “the west seattle community building” [identified in title as “Department of Corrections building”]: 5
5. “the line of police waiting there for us”, “a ‘Special Agent Cybercrime Supervisor’ of the CA Department of Justice… Fred Baclagan”: 2
6. “the online piggie supply store SpecialForces.com” [“customer base is comprised primarily of military and law enforcement affiliated individuals”], “security firm Stratfor… IT MANAGER FRANK GINAC” [described in summary release as “Stratfor.com… A MULTI-MILLION DOLLAR INTELLIGENCE CORPORATION”]: 2
7. “the parking lot of the Fresno SW substation where police cars and pig’s personal vehicles are parked”: 1
8. “the nearby OPD recruitment center” [nearby to targeted police vehicles]: 1
9. “the pig memorial in front of FPD HQ”: 1

Target: Public spaces
1. “Burnside Avenue”: 1
2. “the intersection of Bowery and Houston street in Manhattan… Bowery… the entire street”: 1
3. “7th and Market”: 1
4. “a bridge over the I-90/94 in Chicago”: 1
5. “several walls and surfaces”: 1
6. “a large wall”: 1
7. “a nearby building”: 1
8. “throughout downtown”: 1

Target: Animal industry
1. “Damascus Elk Farm” [Clackamas, OR]: 1
2. “the mink farm on Savola Road…the Western Star Fur Farm” [Astoria, OR]: 1
3. “Miller’s Mink Ranch” [Washington]: 1
4. “14 cattle trucks…at the harris feeding company in coalinga, ca”: 1
5. “Queener Ridge Pheasant Company”: 1
6. “company vans at Sunshine Dairy Foods” [“To continue the momentum of direct action targeting speciesist companies”]: 1

**Target: Surveillance technology**
1. “ID-card scanners at the Hunter College campus”: 1
2. “red light cameras…traffic cameras”: 1
3. “5 surveillance cameras”: 1

**Target: Fascism**
1. “MCL Cafeteria” (for hosting a speaking event by “holocaust denier and nazi sympathizer David Irving”): 1
2. “a rash of Nazi graffiti in East Arvada [at] the Lutz soccer field, Vanderhoof elementary school, a park adjacent to Vanderhoof, a wall dividing the nearby neighborhood from 58th Avenue, and the Arvada Plaza…several fascist stickers in the area…including Combat 18 and for an Arvada-based Neo-Nazi merchandise distributor DRP Industries”: 1
3. “the nazi publishers at counter currents”: 1

**Target: Railways**
1. “a rail line in Southern Oregon”: 1
2. “a railroad line in occupied Samish and Lummi territory, also known as northern Washington state”: 1

**Target: Media**
1. “the media parasites standing by with their cameras”: 1
2. “KATU” [Portland news station]: 1

**Target: Religion**
1. “Vatican…Vatican.va…the corrupt Roman Apostolic Church and all its emanations”: 1
2. “Mars Hill Church” [because “notoriously anti-gay and anti-woman”]: 1

**Target: Environmental**
1. “the Washington State Loggers’ Association building”: 1
2. “the Department of Natural Resources (DNR)” : 1

**Target: Consumer/luxury goods**
1. “a luxury SUV”: 1

**Target: Education**
1. “Brooklyn College’s administrative building”: 1

**Target: Healthcare**
1. “the University Health Services at the Tang Center”: 1

**Target: Residential**
1. “a residential neighborhood”: 1

**Target: Scientific research (not specifically targeted for animal oppression)**
1. “Emory’s Department of Human Genetics”: 1

**Target: Other social institutions**
1. “the Chi Psi frat house” [because “All fraternities are sites of conscious self-organization for patriarchal power and the homophobia that supports it.”]: 1

**Country where the attack occurred**

1. [USA]: 130
2. “U$A”: 2
3. “US”: 1
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