Glossary:
Alienation, Division of Labour, Patriarchy, Speciesism

Scattering Seeds... [editorial]

...Under a Changing Sky
(facing ecological collapse without delusion or despair)

'I Didn’t Want to be a Proud Worker'
& exploiters smashed or expropriated

...and more!
There is a permanent conflict being carried out in the guts of this society. Open hostilities that we see when the mask slips, are only one side of the continual warfare. Behind the police murders, the ruined forests, the domestic battery, the workplace casualties, the factory farms, a mosaic of hidden violence is taking place. It's hidden in the conventions, the regulations and hierarchies. It's in the possibility of a bailiff at the door, the certainty of a preacher's moralistic hate, the inevitability of the fumes and carcinogens, and the predictability of venom for the rebels which is carried by reporters. Until you've trained your eye to see, also hidden are the many contrary relations; rebellious smiles that are exchanged, the moments of solidarity, the communities and individuals in struggle: behind the years of captivity, the corresponding seizures of freedom. The times when the hand of who wishes to domesticate us, gets bitten. To awake to the nature of the war pressing against you, is to glimpse something of what this world denies to us. It's only a step further to feel the presence of a wildness barely suppressed; coursing like lava beneath the factories, suburbs and prisons, waiting to sweep them away. From the foundations up, warming our friends and burning terror into the hearts of the enemy. Anarchy is the stance we freely choose to fight for the destabilisation of an existence unworthy of us.
Alienation – The result of individuals and, through them, societies ‘becoming alien’ (i.e distant, disengaged, even uncomprehending) to the results of their own activity, the environment in which that activity occurs, from the people who share that environment and activity, and from themselves. Alienation is marked in those of us living out systems of social relationships which thus redirect our energy from living on our own terms in a manner we ourselves can choose and assert, and into simply reproducing and reinforcing that social system in order to attain the means for survival. Individuals with the means (intellectual, ecological, social) to create lives they freely desire are difficult to base top-down authoritarian systems upon without the draining use of constant force. Alienation makes it possible to relatively smoothly maintain the centralisation of wealth, knowledge and power, separated from us yet raised by ourselves and many like us.

A well-used example of alienation was deployed to describe private property and the economic exploitation of capitalism, by which the worker is separated from what they produce: their ‘power to’ do whatever it might be is sold as labour power, transforming it into an owner’s ‘power over’ them and thereby alienating human beings from their capacity to create. However it would be a mistake to simply stop there, as Marxists mostly do for instance. (In the 20th century what became known as ‘the Fordist compromise’ began to allow producers a limited amount of access to the commodities they produce; without however changing the course of alienation, now even more marked in the ‘post-industrial’ consumer classes.)

We believe that the problem runs much deeper and older than wage relations, in both the ‘external’ world of habitual interactions and their ramifications and in the psyche. While alienation can be and is implemented through many institutions (religion, for one) with a far longer history, a more holistic example of how alienation begins to sink its deeper roots would be the dispiriting result on untold numbers of land-based cultures from assimilation into conquering empires, and the industrial revolution that forced a mechanical division between individuals and their livelihoods, their tools, their communities, their lands; the separation between production and knowledge itself. Let’s take a step back to a more fundamental appraisal of what it might mean to be a potentially-free being on a living planet.

What do you know about the trees outside the window? What keeps them healthy? What about the other animals that live close to you; do you recognise their calls or tracks? What do they know about you? How do you know about the lives of human animals that go on over the other side of the wall next-door, or the masses you pass on the street? What do they know about you? How does that make you feel?

What do you really know about where the food you eat comes from? Or about what has to happen for our homes to be lit, heated, or built? How many of your survival necessities or subsistence skills are truly in your own hands or those of your relations?

What proportion of your conversations still enjoy the depth of face to face interaction? How much of your daily environment can you navigate on foot, walking, climbing, swimming, being helped by a companion, or how much of it is it necessary to depend on regulated means of transportation through? How much of your immediate surrounding area are you physically, socially or legally barred from exploring? Why?

How much of your daily activity is to suit your own needs? Aside from within the

---

“Alienation defines all social relationships in a world of work and money, politics and economy, where wealth and power are concentrated in a few hands. Under such circumstances, there is no direct relationship between an individual’s thoughts, her desires, his activities and their outcome. “Life” is something that happens to her, not something she creates. It is an alien imposition upon the nothing that he has become. If she still desires greatly with a creative energy that demands to be expressed, this condition is intolerable. But to fight it he needs some understanding of how it functions.”

- Strangers in an Alien World
symbolic order of the wage economy, that is. How much of it do you even really see or understand the repercussions of? Would we live in this manner if we could directly see and touch the impacts that are hidden from most, in ghettos, toxic dumps, slaughter-houses, hospitals, cemeteries, refugee camps, battlefields and felled rainforest in distant lands, youth jails, oceanic garbage-gyres? Or have we become so distanced from other lives by the allotment of everything into categories of utility, so justifying their and our exploitation, that we cannot empathise with parallel lives that become mere resources for our own, as rulers living off us cannot empathise with ours?

Does the concept of diversity have much relation to your life beyond the array of brands at the supermarket, or interrelatedness have a meaning beyond message boards? We are tricked and trick ourselves into believing that the damming of a river or disappearance of wildlife doesn’t really affect us, burying ourselves in air-conditioned coffins as a society to separate ourselves from the world we were born in.

Do you even remember how to enact and express your joy as you may have in your early years? What actually gives you deep satisfaction; or fails to, even though it may be what advertising and marketing, your parents, school, politicians or your peers tell you should do? How in touch are you with your own desires, multisensuousness, thoughts and feelings? Might they be directed by social constructions of gender roles, ‘human nature’, class positions, urban desensitisation...? Might any tendencies which don’t fit those constructions be smothered daily, in this world we endure?

Do you ever feel like something is missing?

What about your own body; are you familiar with its cycles and drives, or are they an abstraction in a textbook or something that simply comes upon us from the blue? Is health just something that simply comes upon us familiar with its cycles and drives, or are you with your own desires, peers tell you should do? How in touch are you with your own thoughts and wishes. A while ago, Michele Vignodelli characterised the deeply meaningful interactions with a living Earth, as the cornerstone of existence, as having been replaced by “over-stimulation by artificial, coarse, mechanical inputs, through fashions, revivals, disco music, roaring toys, cult actors, events... a whole flamboyant, uproarious and desperately hollow world. A rising wave of fleeting inputs, a multitude of fake interests and fake needs where our emotional energies are swept away, drowning us in nothingness...[...].” This sumptuous parade seems to consist substantially in the stream of toxic, hidden grudges that flows beneath the surface of politeness, in the corridors of industrial hives; it consists in the snarling defence of one’s own niche, to protect ‘freedoms’ and ‘rights’ that are sanctioned by law, in a deep loneliness which is increasingly hidden in mass rituals, in a universal inauthenticity of relationships and experiences.”

We’re awash with communication technologies, and yet more often living alone, with fewer off-screen friends and little real-world social solidarity. In replacement we are given the imagined community of the market, the nation, or the virtual. What was once lived directly, becomes mere representation.

Alienation results in sensations including (but not limited to) powerlessness, shame, despair, delusions, hostility, social withdrawal, feeling constantly threatened or self-destructive, which are all endemic within industrial civilisation. Its outward manifestations are on the rise everywhere that industry and ‘development’ have become the social norm, not just in the capitalist ‘Old World’ but now China, India, Africa. Alienation is needed for how our bodies are currently regulated in ways both great and small by being enmeshed within norms and expectations that “determine what kinds of lives are deemed livable or useful and by shutting down the space of possibility and imaginative transformation where peoples’ lives begin to exceed and escape [the system’s] use for them” (Susan Stryker). It forms a society of individuals largely isolated and dissociated from each other and themselves, despite the crowded cities, depressed, apathetic or filled with violent and directionless anger; and we identify it in how the dominant social mode pushes us further into this estrangement. It’s the anguish of the living subjected to a deathly regime, and a condition that must be struggled against to overturn the whole social order – which we are demanded to adapt ourselves to. To adapt ourselves to ever-more limited and virtually superfluous roles, at any time liable to be replaced like a faulty cog. Beneath the surface of modern life, we live in what can only be described as a state of captivity, and the neurotic way we internalise this reality to cope with it seeps out and permeates our every interaction. The loss of perspective that the overwhelming totality of the current system engenders, casting a shadow over all past ways of life, makes it easier to be fooled when we’re told that it is us who are maladjusted, malfunctioning, and when the system’s guards tell us they have just the cure for the mysterious undermining of life.

Yet in spite of generations of ‘naturalisation’, psychological immiseration tells us we are not at home in the world of social media, council
Choice, no escape. Impression of there being no outside, no system, leaving the occupation by the capitalist-industrial out. The chatter of the crowd won't drown it doesn't cut it. Reality TV can't mask it. Dependence, the interpersonal violence, unarticulated precarity of our helpless existence itself is jeopardised by our own alienated activity. The blackmail of the market keeps our habits and relationships, more often than not, not just delaying but actually antagonistic to the fullness of autonomous creativity. Mass social organisation is the separate power that stands apart from us as individuals, regulating and imposing on us, as the truly human-scale in life is dwarfed by an unending cycle of representations, bureaucracy, requirements, regurgitating what is; and what cannot fail to oppress us. The conditions of life forced upon us by the economy, the State and technological society have become powers that rule over and direct us, not tools to use as we see fit. The segregation from a multitude of lifeforms displaced by the city not just unfamiliarises us with our planet, but makes it much easier to participate in the industrial structure devouring everything.

Ignore these facts we may, they continue to come back to haunt us in the unarticulated precarity of our helpless dependence, the interpersonal violence, the deadly sadness. Self-medication doesn’t cut it. Reality TV can’t mask it. The chatter of the crowd won’t drown it out. We are under mental and physical occupation by the capitalist-industrial system, leaving the firm but false impression of there being no outside, no choice, no escape. Is this really what we could call living?

Division of Labour – For us as anarchists, a key question should be – what modern institutional foundations prevent non-hierarchical relations flourishing? One of the processes that contribute to the social order as we know it is a highly institutionalised division of labour (or rather many forms of the above). In its narrow definition, division of labour is simply when tasks or responsibilities are separated out into social roles (even temporarily), but for our purposes we mean something far beyond different people having different capacities, interests or talents which they could or do apply in a non-hierarchical manner. Rather, the problem becomes when social systems are constructed in which individuals are forced to live according to pre-determined divisions of activity, and the power relationships that are the result. The deeper the division of labour becomes as the basis for social life, the more abstract and alienated the forms of interactions that go towards daily existence, and more static systems replace free or spontaneous exchange between people as and when chosen. While we’re not interested in flattening all of our social life into a cycle of duties all must participate in, it seems clear that the more people know how to maintain themselves and the more readily-understandable the processes by which their culture navigates the world, the less potential for coercion and alienation there is. So although we don’t imagine that, for example, an individual within a group having a particular flair for herbalism, interest in fishing techniques or love for music-making constitutes a division of labour in the sense we oppose, the problem seems to become when there is no possibility for knowledge to be generalised if desired, and people are instead locked into their designated stations. And while it seems there can be certain divisions of labour without civilisation, there can be no civilisation without an enforced division of labour.

We identify civilisation as completely antagonistic to our desires for freedom. By civilisation, we could briefly and incompletely summarise: urbanised societies which imply large-scale demographic growth and the constant need for expansion and conquest, complex social structures which coercively administer political, economic and military power, and which are served by mining, deforestation, agricultural domestication and the like. In short, mass systematic domination and structuring of human and non-human lives, oppression and alienation of the individual and hence the truly communal. This has been the common structure of civilisations, whether Western, Eastern, Mesoamerican, Asiatic, etc.

In essence civilisation depends on individuals being stripped of their capacity to live in communities that, through the connection of that community to (and understanding of) their habitat, are fairly autonomous of other human social groups. One of the key ways this autonomy is prohibited is by making people dependent on systems of production where tasks are divided out into set roles, which become so consuming that they close the role-player off from the whole until they can see little past the one fragment they’re engaged with. Obviously we’re talking here about large-scale social organisation where it’s impractical to skill-share or generalise knowledge from close contact with people who might have a particular passion for a subject; under mass social organisation it’s more likely that you’ll be too busy toiling away at some other niche yourself to have chance. This masks the reality of a subtly violent system where the knowledge or expertise required to transcend the divisions of labour (and thus the set social structure) is withheld. Life is increasingly compartmentalised and alienated from us.

A classic instance of this division of labour is the existence of politics; one of the more explicit alienations from our own power to act. This is instituted in the form of the State, and maintained by politics of all kinds, apportioning alienated power to those who claim to represent others, often through permanent organised structures. Anti-politics means self-organisation, against all delegation, reclaiming the force of our desires.

While certainly effective (in a strictly utilitarian sense) for creating complex productive systems of specialisation that enable greater control over the surroundings by the greater social order (at the expense of intimacy with those surroundings for individuals), the social reality that complex division of labour tends towards is one of centralisation of knowledge and so of power over others. Some roles are given more social value than others, developing and reinforcing a dominant owner-class. Privilege to
perform some tasks in isolation, for instance intellectual exercises or politicking, belongs to those who are relieved of other tasks by the labour required of others. Meanwhile institutions crystallise around separated roles, institutions such as the State, the Justice System, Religion, the Nuclear Family, the Military, the Economy. This actually entails generalised de-skilling and reduction of opportunities from a wider and potentially more fulfilling experience and understanding of the world, and reinforces and extends hierarchies and class distinctions based on who performs what, when, for whom, and who consumes what, when, and from whom.

In civilisations, some forms of specialisation have led to more, until tasks or technologies emerge that are simply incomprehensible to the vast majority of people who are affected by them. Since no single person has the ability to conceptualise and create these overall processes on an informal level even as they contribute to running them, an institutional division of labour is necessary for complex productive and disciplinary systems. In the current world the division of labour is extremely pronounced, with specialisation running right through almost all facets of civilised life; from how we entertain ourselves to how we entertain ourselves from how we entertain ourselves (reduced from understanding to ‘facts’), so much is relegated to the experts, and we barely have time to notice (much less question) what gets taken away at the same time, while our lives fly by through our fingers. The individual is lost in the mass as an interchangeable cog, benefiting an overall system impervious to desire.

In ‘Some Notes on Industrial Society and its Ecology’, someone noted: “One of the essential characteristics of present-day society is that within it we are witness to a growing gap between the activity that we carry out and our capacity to depict its consequences. Due to the extreme division and specialization of labor, due to a gigantic technological apparatus that makes us more ignorant every day about the tools that we use (incapable as we are, individually, of understanding their nature, of mastering their production, of repairing their breakdowns), we aren’t aware of the significance of our activities. This is why the product of our activities can be calmly falsified and artificially reconstructed for us. To give an example, someone noted that it is easier – in terms of the real repercussion of the action on the awareness – to bomb an entire population than to kill an individual person. A bombed population is only whatever flash of light on a screen, whereas a murdered person is a reality whose complete weight the consciousness bears. This is why the current society is able to make us tolerate a daily scientifically-organised butchering: because it renders the relationship between actions and their consequences increasingly obscure. [From financial speculation] to the nuclear industry, everyone can find examples for themselves.”

The alienation that stems from such divided thought could be said to account for many of the largest atrocities in history (as well as an infinite number of daily ones); certainly those we have witnessed since industrialism began and propelled us into whole new quantitative fields of misery. Jacques Ellul tells of the results: “In a society such as ours, it is almost impossible for a person to be responsible. A simple example – a dam somewhere has been built somewhere, and it bursts. Who is responsible for that? Geologists worked on it. They examined the terrain. Engineers drew up the construction plans. Workmen constructed it. And politicians decided that the dam had to be in that spot. Who is responsible? [...] In the whole of our technological society, the work is so fragmented and broken up into small pieces that no-one is responsible. But no-one is free either. [...] Just consider, for example, that atrocious excuse... It was one of the most horrible things I have ever heard. The person in charge of the concentration camp Bergen-Belsen was asked, during the Auschwitz trial, the Nuremberg trials regarding Auschwitz and Bergen-Belsen: “But didn’t you find it horrible? All those corpses?” He replied: “What could I do? The capacity of the ovens was too small. I couldn’t process all those corpses. It caused me many problems. I had no time to think about those people. I was too busy with that technical problem of my ovens.” That was the classic example of a totally irresponsible person. He carries out his technical task and he’s not interested in anything else.”

Key ideologues in Western history have put great emphasis on praising this narrowing of experience and ability. (Although interestingly, apparently the Ancient Greeks had great mistrust for specialists and experts; believing that anyone misguided enough to unbalance their life in that way might be useful in limited situations, but showed signals that they clearly had bad judgement in general as a result. We’re reminded of George Orwell, speaking at the birth of the intensive bureaucratised era of the 20th Century, who commented: “Where I feel that people like us understand the situation better than so-called experts is not in any power to foretell specific events, but in the power to grasp what kind of world we are living in.” But, however, Ancient Greek society was largely run on the back of chattel slaves – a pretty clear division of labour – and also spawned various cults of science and number, so in a way the example is redundant, if intriguing to note.) Indeed it’s hard to imagine how anything like current systems of domination could have even got a foothold without certain divisions of labour. How else could the orders run on time, the factories keep on producing, newspapers be printed everyday or the scientists focus on their theorising, if it wasn’t for a whole plethora of well-managed positions, each taking care of a specific item of modernity and so enabling the overall structure to function? And in the epoch of the computer, the business-people and administrators are more certain than ever that in the future we will all “learn less and achieve more”; that is, surrender all the more efficiently our vision of ourselves as free agents, rather than predetermined machines.

We must exit this labyrinth if we are to stand any chance of experiencing a life dis-alienated, de-civilised and accountable; one in which our actions can be plainly understood and considered, one which we can choose and shape ourselves. We could start by rejecting the hierarchy of roles in our friendships and struggles, the latter of which too often follow the formalised patterns of the dominant society they claim to oppose. We can develop our skills, individually and communally, and begin to demolish the absurdity that modern life has become by focusing on the forms of relating and subsisting that allow for minimal technical complexity and a healthy scepticism towards expertise. This is at the core of the struggle of the exploited, the dispossessed and the dis-empowered against their condition as such.
Patriarchy – To speak with accuracy about patriarchy, we must first understand about the often misidentified construct of gender. Gender (as opposed to sex, which is a tiny part of the bodily make-up of individuals) is a purely cultural role that is attributed to individuals because of their (perceived) sex by the society they live under. Gender defines what behaviour, relationships and access to different forms of power are ‘appropriate’. It is a performance that we are all expected to act out in daily life. The differentiation between anatomy of the body and gender is important; it is anatomy that for example determines that some women could bear children, whereas it is would be a gender role (also known as the sex/gender system) to dictate that women should raise children.

Patriarchy is one specific direction of socially-constructed gender roles, that has developed alongside civilisation. In the strictest sense patriarchy means the absolute legal and economical power of a male head of the house-hold over dependant female and male family members. More usefully, this specific mode of gender norms has evolved into a system that is sometimes and in some places more subtle but still bars the self-determination of the individuals affected, following some basic structural assumptions which led us to still describe them as patriarchal ideology.

The content of gender roles within patriarchy have varied according to the time and place. The common elements are a duality of gender based on sex, with some kind of privileging of the ‘male half’, along with a means of enforcement (social, political, economical) over and between the divided population. These are extremely deeply rooted in various forms in the histories and mythologies of civilisations. It’s been arguably key to initiating and maintaining complex and class-stratified societies, the basis for the State, that extended across the world.

The patriarchy we are most familiar with ourselves, and which is seeking global hegemony under this standardising industrial society, is the one which was explicitly formalised during Western history. It consists of paternal dominance in the family, gendered reproductive ‘work’, institutionalised rape and objectification, regulation of women’s sexuality, and theories of female insuperiority. On an ideological level Western patriarchy hinges around the ‘male’ as strong, rational, endowed with procreative means and the ‘natural’ authority, while ‘female’ signifies fragility, impulsiveness, provision of the ‘less’ material needed for procreation, and practically designed to be ruled over.

While studying historical creations of women’s subordination in the Judeo-Christian world (and pointing out that “the key texts of Western civilization – principally the Old Testament and the works of Aristotle – enable and validate [that] patriarchy by constructing the matrix of symbols that give it power”), Gerda Lerner noted that “patriarchal dominance moved from private practice into public law. The control of female sexuality, previously left to individual husbands or to family heads, had now become a matter of state regulation. In this, it follows of course, a general trend toward increasing state power[...].” From the second millennium B.C., forward control over the sexual behavior of citizens has been a major means of social control in every state society. Conversely, class hierarchy is constantly reconstituted in the family through sexual dominance. Regardless of the political or economic system, the kind of personality which can function in a hierarchical system is created and nurtured within the patriarchal family. [T]he archaic state, from its inception, recognized its dependence on the patriarchal family and equated the family’s orderly functioning with order in the public domain. The metaphor of the patriarchal family as the cell, the basic building block, of the healthy organism of the public community was first expressed [ed. - in Western heritage] in Mesopotamian law. It has been constantly reinforced both in ideology and practice over three millennia.”

Whereas men’s class positions became consolidated and defined by their relationship to property and the means of production, the class position of women became defined by their sexual ties to men. Marriage became the central institution at the convergence of the State, religion and women’s economic and sexual subordination. It’s also been posited that patriarchal cultures, living in monogamous households, would have been more likely to develop or internalise notions of private property.

The development of capitalism in Europe following the Middle Ages necessitated another shift and enforcement of patriarchy. At the same time as enclosure of what used to be communally-accessed lands for the peasant population began forcing people into burgeoning cities to labour in factories as landless workers, a new sense of gender roles solidified into public = male (defined by wage-labour and participation in politics, valued highly) and private = female (defined by the family and the home, valued lowly). Women’s autonomous health-care, birth control and culture in general was under genocidal attack from the Witch Hunts onwards and their knowledge expropriated and then regulated by a male-dominated medical profession. So increasingly reproduction became a duty, yet an alienated one. The focus and rationale of this new drive was so greater efficiency and productivity for the new industrial order and its bosses could be gained. (It’s worth noting though that attempted control over women’s procreation was certainly nothing new, and evidence from around the world allegedly points to formal and ritual control over this capacity being immediately increased while women’s independence decreased as societies elevated agriculture to their primary subsistence method.) In effect this patriarchal order was also a tactic to break class solidarity, by offering exploited workers the promise of more docile and obedient wives who had been terrorised by violent imposition of their new status. Women’s role as the productive force that sustains workers as wives and the reproductive force that ‘mothers’ men to go out into the world of waged work became a key aspect of the dominant patriarchy – and remains so to this day.

Additionally, millennia of objectification and exploitation find expression today in consumer culture where commodified
parts of female bodies fill the media and advertising which we spend most of our lives immersed in, and so fill the culture in general, contributing to a very high level of sexual violence and male entitlement. **There are certainly differences since the era when patriarchy was still founded on the assumption that people can and will fit properly into their gender boxes.**

Gender has been enacted in quite radically different ways in different societies (which in itself mocks the idea that people can be ‘essentially’ characterised from their anatomy). It has not always taken the route which we can call patriarchy. Although some pre-/un-civilised social groups displayed or display similar codes, by and large in these instances it’s much more common that traditional engagements of ‘men’ and ‘women’ in social life are more evenly valued than under patriarchal systems, although still usually separated into prescribed roles. There’s also examples of cultures (such as in ‘North America’ and India) which honoured a degree of fluidity between the polarities of gender constructs, something like what would be called “trans-gender” (and often heavily penalized) in contemporary capitalist society. **But we see no reason to believe that there is anything necessary or desirable about a gendered division, instead feeling that it constitutes an unmistakable potential root for many oppressions.**

In fact various theorists have made cases that normalising the subjugation of ‘women’ by accentuating (a tiny fraction of the many) biological features of some humans and not of others, and creating a hierarchy of these differentiations, set a precedent for ideologically justifying slaveries which followed, through the ability to see some people as ‘not-quite-people’ for systematic exploitation due to their religion, race, or species. Others infer that domestication of non-human animals first institutionalised this worldview in other places, but whichever way the links seem relevant. One of the insidious constructions of patriarchal thought is that ‘women’ are considered the life-givers, ‘Mother Earth’ (always attributed as being closer to ‘nature’ than to ‘culture’ – as these cultures strive to rise above ‘nature’ through bending it to their will), healers, and so justifying the gender roles which expect reproductive and nurturing services of women. The ‘nature’/‘culture’ dichotomy serves to enable greater exploitation of the Earth, the supposedly ‘feminine’ aspects of any sensible way of life (intuition rather than solely reason, compassion rather than solely calculation) having been devalued by the patriarchy.

Regardless of the roots, it seems clear that patriarchy remains a major underlying force of domination and a heavy burden on all of our lives, without exception. Subversion and attack on the institutions of patriarchy will be part of any authentic liberatory project. Any
argument we have heard which aims to counter that appears massively flawed to us; from the heritage of class-struggle where you can (still) hear claims that gender oppression is essentially a secondary issue, to the curious ‘radicals’ who insist that eliminating gender distinctions would actually be in the interest of the dominant order and thus recuperated. In both these divergent opinions (although neither are the exclusive view-points within their tendencies we should add) we can see a common pitfall, dictated in both cases by the dominant patriarchal ideology. In the first case, the narrative of resistance is structured around the experiences of male-sexed workers at the expense of considering the very unpaid labour of roughly the other half of their very class which has been gendered ‘female’ and which usually makes their wage-exploitation possible (through care work, emotional support, maintaining the private home and so on). In the second, the line is usually that integrating oppressed ‘minorities’ (as women are still bizarrely categorised) as obedient cogs would remove antagonisms that come up around discrimination, and so make the system run smoother; completely overlooking that gender roles are already cogs of civilisation’s and so also the industrial-technological system’s workings (as well as racial roles, roles of ‘ability/disability’, etc.), and to lose them would remove a pivotal form of control, disciplining and reproduction of that society. Even the increasing numbers of humans becoming essential superfluous to the economy due to technological advances need pacifying in many forms to prevent them from disturbing the elites, and we see no reason that gender divisions and norms would cease to be a part of that even in a more subtle or insidious manner, useful as they are to those in power. Obscuring the issue by pretending that any focus on patriarchy is the same as liberal feminist appeals for (more) female cops, scientists, politicians etc. is nothing but wilful ignorance to the depth of radical critique that exists. We can’t compose a radical struggle against this system while blind to gender oppression as an integral dynamic in it.

As we take the view that those gender-assigned as women are obviously not in fact inherently lesser in intellect, ability or agency, then we confront the fact that the roles of patriarchy have evolved from and are daily reinforced by the joint activity of ‘men’ and ‘women’ together. This isn’t to say that the results of social norms once they became established would be clear to people at the time that they were contracted. Some could not have been (although the counter-intuitive feel of the imposition of gender roles on individuals from childhood should be a warning sign for those who value self-determination). But the history of patriarchy is also the history of class divisions and power struggles among the sexes as well as between them, the prize of one’s freedom often taking second place to status privileges or familial advancement, and today is no different. In many cases the dynamics of patriarchy even between friends, families and lovers works like an addiction to the mutually-reducing yet complementary gender scripts that are construed by the dominant culture as fulfilling an incompleteness in one another, however abusive or degrading those might be. Another mechanism for subduing women has been instituting categories of ‘respectable’ and ‘non-respectable’ women that has led to further divisions and secured a level of cooperation with the sex-gender system for its perceived privileges. Women’s social situation cannot be described as equivalent to men’s concerning the influence and options that were available to them once patriarchy took hold, but patriarchy also cannot be reduced currently or historically to despotic rule of ‘Man’ over ‘Woman’, as some feminists implicitly or explicitly paint it, by minimising women’s agency and intelligence. Realities of domination and collaboration are always more tangled.

Finally another mechanism used to raise another barrier between us and the demolition of women’s subordination is the enforced lack of knowledge of women’s long and proud history (among others) of struggle and defiance to patriarchy. For many, discovering the level of disdain for gender roles and the possibility to step outside them in some moments is key to overcoming self-victimisation. Another very large barrier is that fact that even many male-conditioned individuals who are aware of the problem of patriarchy don’t consider it as something that actively deforms and represses themselves as well as the female-assigned. People deigned ‘women’ of course are subject to physical restrictions and are objectified as a sexual resource, but people assigned as men bear also a heavy price on the level of emotional repression and brutalisation (often then taken out on women, children and those who don’t conform to gender norms). The ‘male experience’ may be what gets considered the default within this culture, but it is not in the interests or the design of those ‘men’ who are forced within it if what they value is liberation on any level. Therefore, struggle against every vestige of this civilisation, certainly including its gender roles!

Speciesism — As we’ve described above, the dominant system attempts to justify itself through various predetermined categories of superiority which we, its subjects, are trained to internalise and reproduce among ourselves. Human supremacy over any other species (or, more-so, over the planet as a whole) is another example. While ‘women’ are socially constructed as the resource of ‘men’, a whole host of non-human lives are socially constructed as the exclusive resource of ‘humanity’ in its’ abstract conception. The worldview we inherit within civilisation is permeated with the legacies of segregation that follows; land is there to be farmed, minerals are there to be mined, horses are there to be worked, women are there to raise children, people of colour are there to labour in plantations or modern factories/prisons for the coloniser... Again, ancient philosophers like Aristotle
and Cicero cemented the opinion that other creatures exist for human use that is the heritage of our culture in particular, even before the infamous directives of the Judeo-Christian heritage. This type of outlook spawns a death-dance of hyper-domestication, as the lifeforms that are considered to be less useful or pleasing to a particular civilised culture are systematically exterminated and the rest tamed and made dependant. Civilisations have been universally raised on the back of enslaved animals, non-human as well as human, and with the non-human often subjected to some of the worst and most degrading domestication.

We believe that speciesism is both largely a product of (and systematically reinforced by) living in a way that denies us the time and intimacy with, and first-hand observation of, wild beings who have great differences to our own. We lose sight of our own animality, our inter-dependence, and place ourselves at the centre of the universe as a species. Only considering human (or rather civilised) social values and goals is what’s called anthropocentric thought. We should be clear though that we think this prejudice comes at the expense of the actual individual humans involved, eclipsing the diversity of life with a homogenised common ‘human worth’ above all and so devaluing the experiences and connections that may otherwise flourish between us and our non-human neighbours. Many people go through their day (week, month, year) without encountering a single other mammal who isn’t (physically or for all intents and purposes) on a leash.

The proportion of wildlife to farmed creatures has swung rapidly with the ongoing war that industrialism has waged on the planet, and the expansion of the control ethos which underlies civilisation.

The psychological barrier raised between ‘us’ and ‘them’ of course smooths the way for mass exploitation, most obviously by the meat and dairy, fur, pet and vivisection industries, among others, but also allows the devastation of other species’ homes or ways of life in the name of ‘progress’. As recounted in an anonymous environmentalist article (leaving aside our problem with the mechanistic term ‘ecosystems’ when what is described are in fact communities of life), “As a species, we’ve gained an impressive degree of influence over our environment by deliberately simplifying ecosystems so they will support more humans, but fewer other species. Our principle strategy in this project has been agriculture -- primarily a form of agriculture that focuses on a few annual grain crops. We’ve commandeered up to 50 percent of the primary biological productivity of our planet, mostly through farming and forestry. Doing this has had overwhelmingly negative impacts on non-domesticated plants and animals. The subsequent loss of biodiversity is increasingly compromising humanity’s prospects, because we depend upon countless ecosystem services (such as pollination and oxygen regeneration) -- services we do not organise or control, and for which we do not pay.” Self-willed beings are confined and contorted into shapes that serve civilised human ways of life, or bred to require the social organisation which we need so badly to overthrow – from modern corn, for example, which couldn’t even exist in most regions without intensive attention, monoculture and irrigation along with all that entails, to domestic turkey breeds that are so mutated by their engineering for industry preferences that they can no longer mate; each female is artificially inseminated (i.e. raped).

It’s important to understand that, as it’s been shown that violent cycles of abuse among humans both reflects and informs how we treat the Earth and each other, how we relate to other animals is also absolutely cardinal. With this in mind, we can see how the basis for civilisation really is rape: control of reproduction through selective breeding and regulation of female sexuality. When we look at life with a perspective of wildness, that rejects any notion of ownership of one life over another, the fundamental basis of all animal farming becomes clear. We see it as unsurprising how the disgusting institutions of patriarchy, and slavery of creatures in general, interlock. This co-development of power has been elaborated on by Layla AbdelRahim, as we can hear; “[patriarchy decided] who marries whom, how the wealth goes down, and it’s the same with the animals. You the farmer, the engineer, the genetic engineer [decide] who you’re going to mate, how you’re going to mate, and then you are going to use all the unwanted males for meat or labour and the females [are used] for reproduction and milk, and how do you go about insemination? That’s rape. And so this is to-your-face, but in symbolic culture you can call it something else, insemination, husbandry, so it doesn’t appear violent. You are going to identify only human animals as capable of experiencing rape (and still in specific circumstances because not every rape is equal in civilisation [ed. - discussion on judicial handling of rape in class society followed]). If it is seen as improving the reproduction, then “it’s not rape”...

We should make clear at this point that we aren’t suggesting that humans or any other animal exist in isolation and should have no affect on our wild kin. Co-dependence and co-development are facts of life, and constant within all ecological communities of inter-species interaction. There is also a blurred line around what constitutes the threshold of domestication at which we could reasonably hope to remain: for example not confining any otherwise mobile creature is a necessity to us, but we don’t have a problem per-Se with interventions to encourage beings of whatever shape and form who we want to mutually interact with into an area, or an amount of plant cultivation within certain parameters. We are more concerned with the dynamic that comes about when all a particular species becomes to us is a resource, and any mutual co-development is excluded. When we foolishly believe that we can choose to mould all of life around an inflexible civilised culture, without any possibility of a symbiotic exchange in freedom. When we can consider lives in terms of ownership, lives that live life for others.

There are many ways, subtle or blatant, which we could mention in which this view of superiority has been constructed and upheld. One for instance is the overemphasis on the food cycle, which reduces relations between different species to one particular economic feature of them (perhaps because heavily-domesticating cultures are obsessed with consumption, eat or be eaten, dominate or be dominated, rather than it playing one part of a richer and
more diverse life) and raises ideological 'justification' for top-down hierarchies. We can see that it’s not every day that the fox eats the rabbit, for example, but a certain moment of their relationship to each other; a relationship which at other times might even look so much as co-operative within a broader cycle.

Focus on the predatory aspects of life above all others, and then raising that into a principle that sought to justify all sorts of not only speciesist but also racist and colonialisist behaviours, is what was recommended by influential scientist Charles Darwin, lauded during the British Empire. (We don't seek to overly sanctify the theory of his critic at the time, the anarchist biologist Peter Kropotkin, which posited that co-operation a.k.a. 'mutual aid' was in fact the main driving force in the biosphere, as convenient as that would be for our ethics and desires. We don't believe that there is any one principle within our comprehension which could account for the innumerable processes and communities of life that make up our world, but so neither can we accept the dominant narrative that all existence is a bloody struggle for power and survival.)

Another example of speciesist ideology is the criteria by which we are taught to measure intelligence, and that higher 'intelligence' (let's remember this is the culture that has polluted and proletarianised its own world talking...) entails the right to dominate. That we could ever quantify and order the intelligences of creatures so diverse as human capacity to think abstractly, a steelhead trout who navigates using the Earth’s magnetic field to find the river mouth to return to for spawning, or the wolf's ability to smell the age or health of the deer from a hoof-print, is mind-bogglingly arrogant.

This way of viewing species has grown markedly within the last few thousand years of civilisations. While fairly overt domestication of non-human lives was and is practised by many indigenous cultures (though certainly not all, even to this day with all the civilising influences), none seem to have seen the same vitriolic contempt for the rest of the living world as have developed within those civilisations. Instead most place social and spiritual value on the uses but also contributions, needs, and wild purposes of other species. The example has been made of the Innu culture of Arctic regions, which like many others traditionally lacked even a separate concept of 'humanity' compared to other life. (This isn’t to suggest that there’s a particular culture we would appropriate as our ideal; simply that this counters the 'biological determinism' that wants us to believe civilised attitudes are somehow 'natural' and unavoidable.) Enlightenment philosophers of the West went a long way in construing 'the animal' as incapable of reason, sentence, empathy or the ability to suffer, with the result of institutionalising apathy and cruelty. This robs us of a crucial means to understand our animate environment, when it is healthy, when it is ill, how to live well in this world, to contribute to wildness, diversity, life.

Beyond its obvious use in justifying industrial-scale habitat-eradication or factory-farming for slaughter, colonialists used the same framework to reinvent other human races as 'animalistic', to them meaning inferior in the same ways mentioned above. To this day, the paradigm of certain people being dangerous, devalued 'animals' is used by some as the justification for all sorts of horrors. Like many oppressions, speciesism reinforces and intersects with others as well as gender and race – for example also along class lines, with the poor able to at least exert physical or theoretical power over the non-humans lower than them on the hierarchical ladder to alleviate the frustration at being dominated by the wealthier (or 'whiter', more 'masculine', and so on). It’s worth pointing out though that in the global drive to commodification of a being’s body, not all non-human species are devalued evenly. For example the paper-thin pretence of ‘conservation’ (especially of iconic, 'cute' creatures); where you can see such wonders as legislation against indigenous peoples gathering, hunting or fishing on their traditional territories, with all scale having been lost while trying to fight the blight actually caused almost entirely by civilisation, not by ancestral subsistence. Or for instance the rhetoric against poachers (i.e. depicted as aberrant individuals rather than another part of the imposed status quo of who gets to consume what, who, when) when not a word is whispered about the more major threats to, for example, the Chinese tiger or African elephants (i.e. destruction of habitat and food sources or urban encroachment) nor the poverty or alienation of humans in these areas which drives the poaching itself.

Strangely, the same separation and reification within speciesism occurs even in some circles which pay lip service to a critique of civilisation itself, such as deep ecology – where humans are often actually viewed as somehow inherently lower forms of life than others, replacing anthropocentric thought with 'biocentric' in a misanthropic form and so perpetuating the estrangement of the human animal from the world with a mythical 'nature/culture' split. Even when not demonising 'humanity', deep ecology and some other strains of radical environmentalism or 'animal rights' try to confer an abstract 'equal right to live and blossom' onto all things in the biosphere. Really this is just the same anthropocentric projection of civilised social-political categories onto the living world, in this case in a formalised, legalistic and bourgeois-humanist vein. What we prefer, what we seek, is not 'equality' in some abstracted humanitarian ideology but the uniqueness of every species and also every individual within each species, blowing apart the foundation for viewing the population of any entire lifeform community as ranked against another, but instead flexibly valuing things based on our own personal desires, connections and experiences of the world.

“If you talk to the animals, they will talk to you, and you will know each other... If you do not talk to them, you will not know them, and what you don't know you will fear... what one fears, one destroys.” - C.F. George
Daybreak!
A tentative text not meant for solace,
The cacophonous (Non)life that runs
In each daybreak its obligatory course.
Another daybreak!
*(Phoenix Project #9)*

What’s presented here is a combination of written pieces that explore the collision between our whirling desires and the world as it stands today. We’re continuing our publishing project, although without any promise of regularity, because of a lack we see in our corner of the world when in comes to more diverse printed material (and the different potential connections it can make) compared to online spaces. Our purpose is to propagate news about and analysis from an international evolving tendency towards a life away from domination of the Earth and all creatures; and some ‘classic’ writings that we think have new applications and usefulness to whoever takes them up today. Once again this volume is something of a scrapbook of thoughts, reports, personal accounts and investigations, with no overall theme in how they were chosen beyond common ground of the struggle we hold dear – to be rid of the scourges of authority and alienation, to live wildly.

We thought long and hard about whether another publication is really a suitable intervention in the mire of civilised life at this point in time. We’re happy that across the world our comrades in this struggle are already active with many decent zines, newsletters, posters, and graffiti, along with the radicalisation of their personal relationships and with that sweetest propaganda, *direct action that speaks and seeks accomplices*. We never want to give up our voices that shout aloud across the social quietening that freedom is still undefeated, that we can and must arm ourselves and find each other.

Within the social war, as much psychological as martial, we have experienced certain words and deeds as rafts that kept us afloat on waves threatening to drown us. Before the swelling tide of cloying social norms, and the State and technological-industrial system’s advances, these rafts became our pirate vessels in rebellion against the prison-world of masters and slaves. Ideas have always been our most potent weapons to sharpen, they are the yeast we add to the wider cauldron in hope to contribute to the fomentation of the necessary courage and determination for autonomous action, they are the finger we point at the entrenchments of many enemies we have so far identified. We strongly feel that as well as the general fighting spirit to be developed, we want to constantly put forward an unbridled expression of what we at least think constitutes the minimum state of being to be demolished in that fight (i.e. civilisation itself), along with shared interpretations of how this civilisation constricts and corrupts any chance of a free life. The cobblestone, explosive or barricade alone cannot sufficiently express the vast destruction of not just infrastructures and representatives but also of dominant cultural values that de-civilisation requires in such a way as to hinder their reappearance. Although attack cannot be absent and the task of destruction is great, discussing, healing, listening, learning, connecting, deconstructing, loving and experimenting all have their own parts to play too and their own available tools.

We think that a variety of subjects addressed in this issue can be practical to these ends as well as to the insurrectional ruptures that would allow us to consolidate our projects outside of the space-time of capitalist economic and social relations, invigorating us with a love for the land beneath the paving slabs and behind tamed environments. Ultimately, each critique contained within lends itself to the attack as well, to diversify its targeting and refine its aim. When combined with these other practices, no corner of our domestication within reach need be left untouched. And so in the end, we decided – despite our limited means and hence limited scope – that the pleasure and inspiration we ourselves have felt when writings that reflected our own anger came into our hands, reminding us that we are not alone, was sufficient reason to continue releasing some seeds into the wind, our own message in a bottle... However, we shouldn’t forget that the most vitalising part in our undertaking (most broadly conceivable as individuality seeking a collective fulfilment entwined with a vibrant habitat, in contrast with mass...
Return Fire is constructed from pre-existing texts or their segments (sometimes with our own notes) and the occasional hitherto-unpublished pieces that we’ve either written ourselves or that were passed on to us, as well as information we’ve collated and reassembled from the international counter-information network, on developments in the struggle whose front-line is everywhere and everyone. We feature more new translations this time (whole or in fragments), to contribute back in the way we can. We’d also like to sincerely thank the comrades of the Parabellum counter-information project who took the time to translate our previous editorial into Greek[1].

As well as the chronology of some excerpts being rearranged for the sake of clarity, emphasis has been added by us in places throughout in the presentation; after all we’re not and don’t pretend to be ‘objective reporters’ or something like that... Sources are either listed beneath the titles or in the section specifically for them at the end. Since we put our own pen to paper for the previous volume we’ve reflected a lot – but nothing we add to this project can ever be ‘definitive’ and writing is in itself a reflection of an ongoing thought process. If anyone should note contradictions or disagreements between different authors we’ve included, this is simply the nature of the open and provisional dialogue which we want to play host to, without a ‘party line’ or respect for dogma.

This time the articles address practical rejection of wage labour, confronting industrial energy infrastructure, conditions of clandestinity, coupled and motherhood within patriarchal civilisation in its present incarnation, dynamic considerations for individuals or groups taking the offensive, realities of climate change and the footholds we can imagine within, the Turkish uprising of 2013, what constitutes the modern “educational” project, information for foraging, queer negation of the socially-constructed subject, occupation or de-civilising encampments as well as other moments of struggle in more or less recent history; and more.

Because to our minds theory should always be coherent with practise, and vice versa, in some cases we’ve again added listings to give a snapshot of actual resistance to the oppressive structures in question; to ‘connect the dots’, as it were. These lists are random and non-exhaustive. Much more is always happening than we can sense in the air from here, and we simply wanted to share our inspiration to get out there and add much more to these open and largely-unwritten stories of insurgency.

Every day we’re told in a million subtle and blatant ways by the dominant culture that “our type” can’t and don’t exist. And yet we do. Tearing up the billboards, breaking down the conditioning, deserting or undermining the battalions of work, burning out the occupying forces, claiming a stake within the wildness pulsing through the cosmos: raising the torch which illuminates these pages, from far-flung corners of the Earth. These antagonists generously shared their strength with this project as we feed our own tributary back into the churning waters that beat inexorably against a vast dam preventing our self-willed passage. This zine is for them, and for us. Not because we believe we’ll all meet one day on the barricades, but for a whole constellation of barricades thrown up autonomously and unpredictably by irreducible individuals as they grow firm by making war uniquely on everything constraining them.

This publishing project is harbour to all such desires and more. Take what excites and incites you, compost the rest, and etch your own stories into the fabric of daily life by tooth and nail. Don’t wait to be further provoked:

Return Fire.


“We always do what we say because we feel the need to carry out the acts we think about. Theory is all the ideas that exist inside of our heads, practice is everything that comes out of our bodies including words. At the same time we do one we also do the other, we are unable to separate them; there will be moments when one imposes itself on the other, but we never want to separate them, it is our spirit, our projectuality.”

– F.A.I. ‘Friends of the Earth’
Who can avoid — despite authoritative popular media discourses which often conceal as much as they expose — the fact that our world is becoming increasingly unthinkable? Lurking pandemics, oil-drenched seascapes, the drifts of people fleeing an implosion of social and economic configurations, the smoke everywhere from ethnic strife, war, or dispossession, the removal of tenuous previous barriers to exploitation. Instability seems the one sure promise for what will come, for those of us who were sold any certainties by the global system in the first place. On top of the deepening misery caused by our varied but universal subjugation, and alongside the crash in biodiversity, we must contend with dramatic climate shifts probably on a scale rarely seen in the Earth's existence.

Parts of the world glimpsed a sign of their future on a planet overheated by ravages of the industrial system, raindrops before the coming deluge, when the super-storm with a centre 300 miles across (the most powerful to make landfall in recorded history) tore through more than fifty cities in the Philippines last November, killing thousands of people and displacing millions. In the aftermath the army swiftly moved in on the mass of people fleeing an implosion of social and economic configurations, the smoke everywhere from ethnic strife, war, or dispossession, the removal of tenuous previous barriers to exploitation. Instability seems the one sure promise for what will come, for those of us who were sold any certainties by the global system in the first place. On top of the deepening misery caused by our varied but universal subjugation, and alongside the crash in biodiversity, we must contend with dramatic climate shifts probably on a scale rarely seen in the Earth's existence.

Closer to home, we tasted the climatic furies of winter storms across Britain, with the lasting flooding (most notably of the Thames Valley and Somerset Levels) being the worst nationally in the 250 years since industrialism’s onset, if not longer. Scotland underwent an almost complete shut-down of schools and transport networks during the widespread chaos of early December. A passenger jet was hit by lightening. The media relayed images of whole streets with waist-high waters as thousands across the island were forced from their homes. The military intervened to deal with some badly affected areas, and some quick-minded entrepreneurs made a handsome profit from private sales of sandbags to terrified middle England. Unprecedented waves dashed the Cornish coast, while across the nation flood defences, cliff-faces and in one case a trainline were eroded or lost to sea. As the waters now recede from submerged villages, town centres and farmland, both livestock and wild animals at all stages of the food cycle that didn’t drown are being poisoned by redistributed pesticides and toxic chemicals washed out of industrial sites across the countryside.

At the same time and in direct relation the severe drought gripping the western United States entered its second year, causing a state of emergency in California with havoc wrecked on crops and water supplies. Growing instability of the polar vortex and jet stream weather patterns brings these effects of historic proportions to bear. Here, the government has described the rising flood risk as one of the biggest probable impacts of climate change in the U.K. (corresponding to our lived experience of the last few years), but the truth is that the climate is increasing volatile and the ‘experts’ have an extremely fragile hold on what to expect. Temperature records being broken all over the planet (in both peaks and troughs) herald the ecological meltdown underway.

It’s well known that it’s broadly the populations of the Global South who are first in line for many of the impacts of global warming, which are already hitting hard in some regions. Floods and landslides had become common in the Philippines even before the recent spectacularised barrage, and the changing weather pattern had already reportedly begun claiming 300,000 lives annually in a nation where 60% of the people now live in flood-adverse areas. The archipelago is in the front-line of calamity brought by storms, with crop failure, water shortages and the spread of disease looming. Ironcally, once again the regions that are already colonised resource-extraction ‘sacrifice zones’ for largely the capitalist core economies are struck quickest by consequences of the latter’s hyper-consumption. But even within Europe there’s examples like the port-city of Rotterdam, the economic heart of the Netherlands that sits several feet below sea-level in places and is subject to constant technological intervention, as it and significant parts of Holland have been for generations to prevent disaster. System failure would submerge its inhabitants.

Across the world many of the most densely populated and fastest growing mega-cities are coastal and vulnerable to the inexorably rising seas. Yesterday’s New Orleans could become tomorrow’s Bangkok, Lagos, Mumbai or Melbourne.
The callousness of industrial development and civilisation’s permanent need for expansion sows the human death and misery of millions. An unimaginable population expansion has been implemented (usually by undermining the bodily autonomy of women) by the world economy of past centuries to feed the capitalist-industrial colossus with workers. Now we find ourselves often dangerously settled on inherently unsuitable terrain; terrain that is denuded of ecological defences from disaster, whether by deforestation, loss of coastal wetland, spreading a new impermeable concrete skin over the earth or by agricultural degradation of the soil. When the harsh weather events hit mass society, the effects are already amplified[1].

This vulnerability is compounded by the overwhelmingly shoddy construction of most cities, due to the cost-cutting and maximisation of profits inherent in capitalist development and the surrounding easily-dislodged industrial detritus[2]. After the intensification of extreme wildfires, landslides, hurricanes, earthquakes, flooding, blizzards and more of recent years, the wreckage is just one more source of income for the bosses – continual disaster is a way of continuing to profit even after production has reached other limits on a commodity-colonised globe. Similarly to the multinational consortium which moved in to capitalise on the bloodshed in Iraq after the Allied bombing had razed much of the civil infrastructure, corporations bid for contracts to re-build damaged areas before the next wave, and whole new markets explode in technological fields claiming to alleviate the certain future turmoil. The next round of failures from the technology provides, as always, the next opportunity for new business, then in turn bringing a new problem for the next generation: except now the cycle comes back around on almost a weekly basis. The State utilises the catastrophic alarms to usher in all kinds of social controls at the micro- and macro-levels and enforce the rule of (those-they-ordain-to-be) experts. These institutions claim to be the only ones who could save us, in spite of their embedded position within the ruling bureaucracy attending to the entire ensemble as it drags us over the cliff of total annihilation.

In the capitalist core countries the temporary respite is over from a percentage of the more blatant devastation of the land that moving intensive energy extraction to the Global South had afforded us in the last era. ‘Fracking’ for shale gas is now poised to begin in earnest and despoil the backyards of European consumers, extending the life of the petrochemical machine beyond the predictions of ‘peak oil’ theorists. The U.S.A. and Canada are even setting up to begin exporting tankers of the liquefied gas, so great is its current (if temporary) abundance. Really, rather than holding back, industrialism is only speeding up in every corner of the world that its manacles take hold. Within the ingrained grow-or-bust capitalist logic, it can be no other way; there is nothing that the experts could do within this framework, as decades of international summits on the climate crisis show from their sole result – more hot air.

At the same time the line we’re supposed to swallow unfolds before our eyes. A new citizenry’s voluntary submission to the machine is cultivated, in the name of the system’s new-found pseudo-environmentalism and mythical sustainability planning. Individual consumer wastage of recyclables or energy is to be ignored; there are other ways; there is nothing other way; there is nothing capitalist logic, it can be no other way; there is nothing that the experts could do within this framework, as decades of international summits on the climate crisis show from their sole result – more hot air.

Philippines: devastation caused by the record-breaking typhoon

“Climate change fueled disasters kill vast numbers but each person dies an individual death: it may be trapped in an attic with water levels climbing the stairs, unable to scratch through the roof to the open air above or it may be in a nursing home without power succumbing to the latest heat wave. Less spectacularly, death may come after working in the mines seeking out the rare earth metals necessary for smart phones and solar panels. Like nonhuman animals going to slaughter, the numbers are at times so vast as to overshadow the fact that each death is its own tragedy. No matter how long the kill line is; it’s a horrifyingly novel experience for each particular individual. Ten thousand deaths in the Philippines boggles the mind not equipped to process such numbers; in many ways the outpouring of grief after the Boston Marathon bombing seemed greater, perhaps simply because the numbers were smaller and more readily understandable. It is difficult to meaningfully grieve for 10,000.”

– Instead of Learning to Live
We Are Learning to Die

14% of a decade. And that degree of temperature rise is considered a conservative estimate. Crops that are highly sensitive to temperature changes, such as wheat, maize and the Asian rice crop that feeds nearly half the world’s population may fare worst – and have already seen yields fail in the major ‘food basket’ agro-industrial zones internationally. Farming in the tropics and sub-tropics, in places such as the Philippines, will supposedly be hit hardest[3]. In addition, the devastating impacts already underway on fishing in tropical and subtropical zones will accelerate as ocean temperatures increase and the majestic coral reef organisms are irreparably damaged. It’s estimated almost a third of the oceans’ surface (that’s a quarter of the total surface of the planet) is thick with the floating plastic waste of industrial society.

Even mainstream journalists can now openly speak of the crisis of this civilisation, neatly boxed in between the share listings and airline advertisements, in the effort to find some managerial program that could save it from its death-throes. There’s always the conservative rear-guard still clinging to the full-blown denial – such as the British Secretary of State for the Environment, who describes the climatic changes in motion as “really quite modest” – but increasingly they’re viewed as an embarrassment even to the rest of the establishment. Instead more ink, blood and sweat is spilled attempting to construct a working thesis on how to source enough energy to overcome the chronic addiction of this civilisation to fossil fuel while emerging with the technological-industrial order.
It might be said that those invested in the continuation of this civilisation may have their catastrophe averted by much-vaunted possible advances of genetic modification, nanotechnology, geo-engineering, robotics and synthetic biology – ‘the final solution’, the Earth and ourselves mutilated and artificialised to the highest degree. (Perhaps they would like this idea more than the beings who would remain trapped in refineries, slums, or the last remaining ‘nature reserve’.) But of course, we are not talking about the same catastrophe as the State planners, green entrepreneurs and professional environmentalists. For us the catastrophe pre-dates global warming or industrialisation. The heights of toxification, mass extinctions and extreme environmental vulnerability within modern life are simply advanced symptoms of diseased social organisations dating back millennia. These are the same social organisations robbing us of our balance in the world, as well as individual agency and self-creation on terms outside those of civilisation’s reproduction.

Maybe the most dangerous disasters are the gradual ones, the full implications of which aren’t immediately visible but take the shape of a steadily and relentless devaluation of what it could mean to live wild and free. Like the disconnection from the land we endure, that now leaves us comprehending the emergency mainly through news reports, and only minimally through that we personally see, taste or touch as part of our daily reality until the power cuts out and the tap runs dry. Maybe the crisis has always been here, or at least brewing, in the guise of objectification, authority, a long line of warring and hoarding civilised cultures that scorn the idea of both real individuality and real interdependence. The trajectory can only be downwards from there, with loss of respect and wonder at the world turning to the ethos of control and domination, where every creature becomes a gear to be put in the correct place: citizen, slave, administrator, resource, pest. We live within the sixth known planetary mass-extinction event3, the first to be caused by a single way of life (it would be inaccurately distributing the blame to say a single species) and what has become known as the Anthropocene due to the severe impacts that industrial activity is having on the Earth’s very geology. And yet before we got to the stage of frequent and scientifically-unexplained population plummet of species across the world, we first had to once pass through and then systematise the cultural decision that even a single form of life was less important than the profit or control that their demise would bring to ‘us’. Before we reached the stage of helpless confinement within an industrial society we neither direct nor comprehend, we first had to pass through the imposition of complex technological systems in the interests of the earlier social orders, which normalised these processes whose ends we now fully see or understand and which seem to never end. Before it became so run-of-the-mill, so ‘excusable’ to routinely objectify certain body-types for use and abuse, there first had to be a separation and commodification via a sex-gender system to facilitate the reproduction of certain social arrangements. Before it became conceivable to spend most days of your life serving as a worker for ‘superiors’, it first had to be engineered that you did not have the knowledge, space, time or company to sustain your own needs and render these hierarchies superfluous.

All of these phenomena have real histories, and continue to be played out today by real people through real institutions. The problem is not ethereal, undistinguishable, although the power relations born of it become so diffuse in our relationships that we are regularly reproducing the problems ourselves (whether or not intended). The mode we operate under – civilisation – is a death-trap. Symptoms are not hard to find, from the huge markets in armaments and robotic drones, financial blackmail, trafficking in human and non-human animals, computerised social worlds inducing suicide and alienation, mass rape culture and domestic torture, a creeping culture of surveillance, climate refugees across the species, pharmaceutical (self-)lobotomising, slavish cooperation with the imperialist dream of ‘full spectrum domination’. The climate crisis is only another ecological addition to (as well as a product of) the social, psychological, imaginative, existential and all-enveloping crisis our kind are already experiencing every day. The collective result has been a social system so psychotic that it has placed every element that it depends on itself (soil, water, air, forests, metals, fossil fuels) in jeopardy, along with potentially all complex life on the planet; and removed the ability of its each and every hostage to exist separately or reach self-realisation outside
its own paradigm. Our aspirations for freedom are contained, primarily by divorcing livelihood from direct relationship to the landbase we inhabit and then bringing to bear all the controls and manipulations we’re prey to following this dispossession. Each day that passes the crisis may seem more obvious to more people, but each day the laboratories, the media and the public order units refine their methods and the window for revolt grows smaller, along with the portions of modern life that feel worth living. At the ideological forefront of this deformed culture’s trajectory comes academic technocracy, aiming to lay the ‘ethical’ foundations to prop up the murderous corporate and scientific power structure; and it’s not just the giddy futurists, who are more obviously in bed with the multinationals. There’s even the likes of self-described ‘ecologist’ Emma Marris – who insists not just that wildness itself is defunct as a concept, and that we should embrace an environment almost exclusively constructed by technology (couching her rhetoric in so-called pragmatism before climate change, and despite admitting having spent almost no time in actual wilderness); but that this is actually desirable.

If you still don’t believe that this constitutes a state of war on all levels, featuring aggressors only answerable with our violence, perhaps there’s nothing we can say to each other. If you’re resolved to fight, then we arrive at the questions of how, where, and who with.

The global capitalist system is not without its disappointments. Of the many possible triggers for revolt, a few have been recurrent of late. Though all are inter-related, let’s look at one. Within the industrial food system, food prices are closely linked to oil price spikes (due to modern agriculture’s dependence on fossil fuel input). Hence the markets have been increasingly volatile, on top of the capitalist speculation factor and the diminishing returns typical of the impact agriculture has on the soil. This is now coupled with creeping colonisation of farmland to turn over to biofuels. Food price spikes in 2008 coincided with uprisings – Mozambique, India, Tunisia, Haiti, and more. Then again in 2011 – Uganda, Saudi Arabia, Egypt... In 2012 we saw food prices reach the third highest on record, with clashes in China, Argentina, Bangladesh, to name a few. With water, fuel, financial and social crises also pressing, the flame and the powder-keg seem on course to collide.

Social revolts can never (or at least rarely) be reduced to a single reason for every protagonist to come to the streets. And even the most confrontational movements don’t necessarily open up enough space for the liberatory character of transformation we find interesting. Partial struggles (“demanding the bread instead of looting the bakery”) are often opportunities for the State and/or overall social system to increase its hold by adapting and subsuming dissent. But what we see is a world sliding beyond governments’ ability to control and recuperate, more obviously with no convincing answers to their contradictions and little promise for the future. And while nothing is certain, this ground seems at least as fertile for de-civilisation as not.

From South Africa to Bahrain you can smell the fear from the dominant class, that nervous tic unleashing brutal repression at a flicker of incitement. The U.S., U.K., Israel, N.A.T.O. etc. lend their counter-insurgency/ pacification expertise, as well as the proliferating inertia and psychosis of exported ‘Western’ lifestyles, but will it be enough? Even from here in the insulated Global North, with the image of the British riots of 2011 fading into the background of generally-resumed lethargy (though complementary anarchist attacks on State forces, corporations and communications infrastructure which accompanied those August days have anything but abated in some quarters), we count the fires on the horizon as this year begins with rioting in Thailand, Bosnia, Venezuela and Iceland, and we’re thinking – it’s happened here before, it can happen here again.

Times of ‘crisis’ (social, financial or environmental) have previously struck with little or no indication on occasion. In zones where State power is rendered more fragile or perhaps is even withdrawing to leave its former subjects to their fate, we may have yet more opportunities to implement our informal principles in the vortex on a human scale. For instance, by utilising our various experiences in DIY healthcare, breaking into warehouses or squatting buildings, making propaganda, fighting cops, distributing or growing/foraging food and establishing subsistence living skills; not to mention pushing ahead with our offensive while the system is already nursing its wounds. And we may have an initial edge in catalysing situations – others may simply be waiting for some external authority to take charge and normality to resume.

The potential for living outside of the institutions which control us could become clearer if the mirage of stability took some knocks. However, between modern society and where we want to go (diffusion into intimate groups propelled by an experientially-informed perception of their place within a larger host ecology) is the ingrained ‘need’ for those very institutions in the cultural assumptions that are predetermined and implemented under civilisation. That’s why we also take heart from anarchists of the Philippines who toured hurricane-ravaged areas to share solar charging, medicine, a free kitchen, stress debriefing, kids games and other informal relief. The sentiment they carried: “For us this is not a heroic act, we believe that helping is a normal and common relationship in many organisms. Currently, human being is essentially guided by the idea of competition reinforced by capitalism and statism. The idea of supremacy, hierarchy, uniformity and centralized patterns distorted our values. Our relationship with nature, to our self and with others is now characterized by domination and control that eventually resulted in inequality, poverty, ignorance, patriarchy and ecological destructions.”

But, in order to not become recuperated as charity work (‘one-way solidarity’) and so simply become a stabilising appendage to the social machine rather than some of its destroyers, we come to the necessity of the attack. Our deeds as anarchists must also take aim at the logic of delegation itself. The logic that would throw in its lot with (even ‘anarchist’/eco-radical) politicians’ smooth-talking ‘answers’, or trust in redemption by either a god or a vast array of hi-tech ‘solutions’ over building our own capacities and relationships, specific to our individual temperament and locality. The logic that leaves us passively waiting for the news
anchor to announce our salvation once again. That retreats into the last woods until the nuclear winds pick up strength, or that says "tomorrow I may fight, when we will be more..." The supreme alienation of a thousand types of specialists dissecting our lives in the name of efficiency's tyranny.

True as it is that post-catastrophe, spontaneous and mutual relationships are often unexpectedly struck up between formerly cold neighbours in the face of the crisis, as the spell of normality is broken along with all its blinkers and guarantees, just as true is authority's response where it can still bring its will and resources to bear against any desertion. Whilst as we've detailed above, the practices we want to hone in the present could also find incisive application in a destabilised scenario, it would be an illusion to imagine simply disappearing into 'cracks' in the system undisturbed, when the powerful would be well aware of the seditious implication this example could set. See for example the State's response to those who didn't want to be quarantined in militarised "protection" camps in the aftermath of the 2012 earthquake in northern Italy, and instead formed autonomous camps with the aid of nearby anarchists: orders for eviction and forced relocation of survivors into the controlled areas, and a fleet of aerial drones patrolling over the territory, villages and even entering houses. The system will only concede ground when under considerable duress from multiple factors, social ones often being crucial. But, hard though it is to imagine in the world today, seeing as the future seems entirely unpredictable, there's no reason that the offensive we bring to bear with all the strength and consistency we can muster couldn't be a drop in the ocean in that direction, incidentally to our resolve to live with dignity here and now.

Meanwhile we have serious internal and interpersonal development to do within our own circles (usually microcosms of the wider society in more ways than we'd like to admit), such as countering our own convenience-dependency and infantilisation within consumer culture and the atomised relations born of it. How can we disconnect ourselves from the artificial support systems we're hostage to under industrial civilisation – food, transport and financial exchange systems, among others? Should these systems crash, which downfalls could be celebrated and which may we need to expropriate/supplant on our affinity scale (Western medical care, for example) during transition to an unmediated land-based existence, and the battles required to get there? Might we continue to discover or create environments habitable for us and our non-human kin while uninhabitable for our enemies (like pockets of unregulated urban space not currently used by industry or municipal authorities, from which to stage violent forays for sabotage or resources)? Is our focus best elsewhere? These are we questions that we grapple with in our own circles, though obviously we can't speak for others. We hear comrades who assert they only want to see the rotten edifices of this system fall and reserve all their energies for hastening this end, without a will to engage with another way to experience the world; 'warrior or slave', as it were. Our full respect is with all those taking the plunge into combatant opposition to civilisation without delusions, we just don't ourselves find it so easy to separate the "negative" and "positive" as in the nihilist ideal, it doesn't satisfy us. Even if selfishly, we want our days to be fuller.

Our aim is always the breakdown of control (including the so-called "creative" acts that empower us while weakening what we're suppressed by). The breakdown even and especially of the limits and hesitancy we bring with us too often to our struggle in daily life: not to romanticise the pain we go through in the process or minimise the dangers of any real disintegration on a social level. We won't pretend to have some viable solution for the billions of people on this wounded planet, and we're hostile to whoever falsely claims in their hubris that they have one: usually some form of 'Great White Saviour' redemption trip, and always the seeds of a new managerial apparatus to ensnare us. As there could never be a single formula or approach that would be adequate or freely-desired by a bulk of any population anyway, we'll continue to follow what we simply feel to be right for our ethics, and for the needs of our desired habitat and hence also ourselves and close affinities. It's open for rest to do likewise to find their own paths. We're always open to the insights of others we touch but ready to collide with what impedes us without first searching for consensus – living anarchically delegation); that their "response amid so much misery is the anti-authoritarian offensive in its multiple facets and forms. It is the incitement to arson by any means. It is the arson itself, the idea that motivates it, and also the hands that concretise it, the unwavering will of those who fight to the last breath, with the means they have at hand. [...] We are considering conflict in these parameters; those who expect revolutionary armies or popular militias do not even understand the nature of the current war. If conflict is asymmetric, then let's bite and disappear (hit and run), let's engage in hostilities against the enemy wherever they are, in every place, even within every single one of us. Far from any militaristic drift, let's fight Power in a multiform manner, with autonomous action, and organized from informality. The attack
is not only possible, it is also necessary. Let’s generate situations and means to continue experiencing the conflict, and let’s practice our advances wherever they arise.”

The misery of these times has whetted our appetite for a great refusal. One which is germinated in the soil of individual will, then to seek achievement in company as desired. A refusal described by Michel Foucault as “a plurality of resistances, each of them a special case: resistances that are possible, necessary, improbable, others that are spontaneous, savage, solitary, concerted, rampant, or violent.” In northwest France, rage against a transport network mega-project and also its world has spiralled into an ongoing and partially self-subsuming occupation across hectares of woodland and woods, attempting collective subversion of urban capitalist life and its relations4. Some use the space to launch rioting into the nearby city, to raid the supermarket within range en masse while fending the cops off with fireworks, or damage power lines crossing the territory. Links among the squatters and discontented farmers threatened by the mega-project are strong, and a militarised police incursion of some months failed to pacify the surroundings. In Mexico, across various municipalities, anti-industrial groups are targeting nanotechnology and bioscience pioneers, harassing, wounding or killing them, attacking their institutions, vehicles and development centres.

The nascent expansion of techno-dystopia has its studious technician-disciples who are the product of years in intensive education and research experience – investments that it tangibly harms the technological establishment to lose.

Not to mention the implications of possible infrastructure sabotage for our environment in the here and now – let’s remember that when a 2003 blackout caused by overgrown trees coming into contact with power lines shut down electricity to the fossil-fuelled turbo-generators throughout the Ohio Valley 500 power plants shut down in total in Canada and the north-eastern U.S.A., after just 24 hours visibility increased by twenty miles as the ozone dropped by half, and airborne sulfur dioxide fell by 90%. Across the world, indigenous people and peasants still with (at least links to) land-based cultures attempt to slow the boom of mines, dams and motorway expansion – they may often end up overwhelmed but how much worse would current contamination be if they were already confined to urban exile rather than protecting the Earth with their bodies and sometimes their weapons? Even in the ‘European Capital’ of Brussels, antagonists disturb the spectacle of placid consumption and obedience. Officials are assaulted while going about their duties restructuring the urban environment for those in power, internet relay cables and power supplies are mysteriously cut, ‘Eurocrats’ personal cars burn in the night. In Greece, ravaged by the economic policies of the new junta (European Union, International Monetary Fund and European Central Bank), anarchists bitterly contest the rising far-right on the streets and defend semi-autonomous spaces from their and the State’s aggression, while anti-capitalist and insurrectional groups carry out bombings of cleared economic centres, rob banks to collectively resist wage-slavery, block mass transit in the city and have engaged in more than one armed exchange with the law-keepers.

“...The forms of domination we face in impending years are without precedent, as are the alienated social relationships in which we exist now. Economic restructuring, the decline of material resources, growth of the far-right, the crisis of current lifestyles and political forms – nothing can quite prepare us for how these forces will influence our lives. And yet, this has always been the case. The illusion of easy unity in past times, centered around work, based itself on a massive erasure of history, of gender, race and subjectivity. If the uncertainty, the crises and shortages that confront us now appear new, it is only because we have been blinded by the promises of progress and development. The evidences of resource depletion, extinctions and annihilated cultures reach back millennia. It is only that now these reach such an intensity that it is difficult to see anything else. [...] A hands-off approach to social control has largely been adequate in expanding economies, but their contraction may be accompanied by regimes of more explicit control. Cuts to social services alongside prison expansion, with a growing economy in prison labor, is only one angle by which to see the seeds of a repressive future in the present. Civil war in resource-rich areas is another. Urban insurrection without hope or demands is another, as the promises of industrial society become visibly hollow. The uprisings in ’05 France, ’08 Greece, and ’11 London, so often cited, give us a picture of revolt on the part of youth with no hope in the future (not to say that only youth participated). Yet while moments that break with the normalized social order create the opportunity for new explorations, clearly these events do not shatter the structures of domination that compose our societies. Natural disasters, recessions and countless other events may also change the shape of our cities, regions and societies. Yet often, society-altering events in themselves may be less significant than what we create within the cracks they open. There is little point to speculating on how our society will evolve in coming decades, on the future fallout of current trends or the unexpected events we can anticipate in years to come. If there is one thing we can use, it is bases of struggle that can adapt to a changing context, relationships and forms of organizing that can respond quickly to changing conditions, calamity and surprises. While we may not often be able to predict new social tensions and eruptions, we can ready ourselves to act quickly, to leap on new opportunities as they present themselves.”

– invitation to a 24/05/13 informal anarchist meeting in Montréal
Nevertheless, the achievement is still principally individual, and cannot solely be measured by external factors nor reduced to geographical points of ‘counter-power’. The subject of a queer-bashing who bashes back (or bashes first…), the worker who downs tools and abandons their post with the workplace in ruins, the migrant who stabs the cop to stay free, the one who breaks open a single creature’s cage – the rebellion starts here, and who knows where the fire spreads next, or when it might ignite in minds the dream of total liberation.

So we find ourselves elsewhere than all beaten ‘revolutionary’ tracks, teetering on the brink of ecological endtimes, without anything certain we can read in the changing skies. Some situations seem familiar, the majority are unchartered territory. Some enemies are found in new fields, many more in the same as always. Omnipotent as their ranks may seem, we’ll find out what’s really possible in the years to come. Who will keep believing in or defending a decomposing order, stay bought off with its circuses and concessions. Where else the signs of fragility will start to show, and what can be done to put a brick through them. Which will gain traction – the deadening call of duty to whatever cause, or the innate passion for the adventure of living beyond moral obligation. Despite all terrible signals that the source of all life and sustenance, the land we exist upon, is fading into critical condition as the machine-world responsible for the poisoning moves to supplant it – there is still solace to be found, whispers of the wind through the branches, the feel of the sun against your face or the surf lapping around your feet, the reflected gleam of an owl’s eyes on a fire-lit night, whatever nurturing we need to light us up and keep us going through the heartbreak must be found. Along with the necessary ammunition. Put another way, as the message accompanying the anarchists’ bomb in the BBVA bank branch on Paseo de Husares in Madrid read; “Our hate is stronger than theirs.”

Self-creation, de-civilisation, renewal of ecology and an effort to extend that “harmony of opposing tensions” in eternal motion which we call our anarchy. The quality of our lives defined not by social accommodation or by material wealth, but directly proportionally to the harm we together manage to inflict on what harms us. What better challenge for those unafraid to die trying?

1. Compare this to the ancient Jarawa band society who astonished the world by entirely surviving the 2004 tsunami and earthquake which rocked the Andaman and Nicobar Islands in the Indian Ocean, despite being so close to the epicentre of the massive Asian earthquake that the tsunami hit them most immediately. It was assumed that they would have perished along with many of the islands’ settlers, until Indian military helicopters came under arrow fire from the indigenous when flying over the forest. Government officials and anthropologists believe that generations-old knowledge of the land, and the movement of wind, sea and animals accumulated over 60,000 years of inhabiting the islands as foragers may have warned the tribes of the tsunami in time to prepare. By comparison, the State resettled people of the islands who have adopted cultivation, pig-herding and Christianity were badly hit. Still, progress leaves no respite for the surviving forest-dwellers, with civilizational encroachment through roads, logging, Western foods and diseases already steadily killing them.

2. For example when the sixth largest earthquake to be measured shook Chile in February 2010, most of the dead had been crushed while at offices, on transport arteries or in apartment blocks, and evacuations were caused by incidents such as the flaming chemical plant outside Santiago and not just by the structural damage. As for the dangerous materials used in construction, the casualties of various industrial diseases stemming from the wreckage of New York’s World Trade Centre ‘Ground Zero’ (both long-term and from the instant dust-cloud of wildly toxic carcinogens, diacins, lead, P.A.H.s etc.) exceed those immediately killed by the Al Qaeda attack.

3. Philippine farmers affected by an even more recent storm ‘Agaton’ have complained that the non-traditional seeds now in use, while higher-yielding, are weaker and less resilient to the floods and storms compared to those still grown in the Jabonga highlands, as well as more expensive to grow and dependent on synthetic chemicals. Now after the storm, the communities are dependent on handouts to eat.

4. Still others welcome the ‘necessity’ of casting aside our biological forms as individuals altogether to overcome the rising challenges to sheer organic existence, and herald the ‘Singularity’ cyborg adaptation of (wealthy enough) humans via implants, brain or organ ‘upgrades’, even extracting one’s ‘memory’ into a computer simulation. And others seriously bank on the colonisation of other planets as this one degrades. This is the extent of the cultural psychosis.

5. As the near-universal plunge of biodiversity is being named, due almost exclusively to habitat loss/frAGMENTATION, hunting or culling, pollutants, auto-competition by introduced species, and climate change.

6. See Return Fire vol.1 pg81

---

**INDUSTRIAL POISON SPREADS ACROSS BRITAIN**

European pollution spikes have so far marked the early spring of 2014, with a heavy smog falling across Paris to rival the world’s most noxious metropolis. The French government’s response? An alternating driving ban and free public transport until it abated. Anything to keep the machine running. Now a couple of weeks later record-breaking levels are being reported across Britain. Of asthmatics, around 30% (that is, 1.6 million) have suffered an asthma attack as a direct result, alongside a wider spike in breathing difficulties and heart problems bombarding emergency services in the Midlands. In some parts of London children were banned from outside play-areas. Scientists admit that the air many of us breathe when we step outside now causes cancer anyway (with 3.2 million premature deaths worldwide in 2010 alone: motor vehicles, power plants and other industrial processes being the primary sources of toxification). During the ‘Green Games’ fervour of the 2012 London Olympics[1], someone in the periphery mentioned nitrogen dioxide levels in the air as bad as the Olympic precursor of notoriously-toxic Beijing, and that the city has the worst air quality of any European capital (29,000 premature deaths attributed to it annually – enough to reduce the average lifespan in the whole country by six months, and nationally air quality is designated the biggest public health hazard after smoking). Counter-pollution technologies are so far laughable, such as smoke-stack cleaners that just move the air contamination into the soil and water or London’s gimmicky ‘spray-glue’ capture vehicles, and it’s only a matter of time before face-masks and indoor air filtration systems are as common (and futile) as in much-maligned China. How long must we be violated, and who what depth, before we locate the bombardment’s source; and do away once and for all with the totality that binds us to self-destruction.

---

1. ed. - see Return Fire vol.1 pg26

---

Some of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police vehicles that were torched during clashes against fracking exploration in Mi’kmaq territory (ed. - see Global Flash-Points)
I like to sit down in front of the typewriter just as I'm waking up, when I still don’t know who am I, where am I come from, or where I'm going. My head in is the clouds, hazy and chaotic, beyond Space-Time or any Dialectic.

While I write, my sense of self (whatever that may be) gradually “returns.” I open “my” cell window, take a deep breath of the cold morning air, and feel my lungs expand. I make coffee, and its aroma relaxes me, reminding me of “another time” – my childhood – as well as my mother.

My mother woke up every day at 5 a.m. to go to work. She would put the coffeepot on the kitchen stove, and in a few minutes that familiar aroma I found so appealing was wafting through the air. When I was little, I was convinced that one of the reasons my mother was so “dark” was because of all the coffee she drank. Who knows why? Kids have crazy ideas.

On weekends, “class” wasn’t in session, so I was usually able to go to work with my mother. I enjoyed helping her.

My mother was (and is) a “cleaning worker,” and to earn a living she had to clean other people’s shops and offices. She always took pride in her work. Or perhaps it just was pride in having a job. I never knew exactly which.

My father (now dead) was a construction worker, and he built houses for other people while we lived in a rented shithole. He also took pride in his work. Or perhaps it was also just pride in having a job. Again, I didn’t know which.

Even as a child, a deep feeling of hostility was beginning to grow within me toward what we now call “wage-labour,” but what was simply called “work” back then. Somehow, my daily reality was teaching me that those who had nothing were being forced to sell their time as well as their energy to those who had everything.

When I asked my parents why there were poor people and rich people, they told me it had always been that way since the beginning of time. My parents’ “mentality” always shocked me: beggars were beggars because they were lazy, whores were whores because they were depraved, thieves were thieves because they were evil.

You had to work, obey, be honest, and be a “good Christian,” always willing to suffer and turn the other cheek. Someday, in the “great beyond,” we would find our reward.

When I was a child, I was embarrassed to say that my mother was a “cleaning worker.” Now, I feel embarrassed for having been ashamed of my mother, for having been ashamed of being poor (I mean “proletarian,” since we never had to go begging) – as if having been born poor, in the heart of a proletarian family, was a “sin” or something you chose.

No, I couldn’t get used to that “order of things.” I didn’t want to accept such an order. I didn’t want to be a proud worker who worked for “other people” and sold his time, his strength, all his energy, and sometimes even his Soul for money...

To me, prison wasn’t anything distant or mysterious. Half the people in my neighbourhood had been or were currently locked up in some cell.

Very early in the morning on (prison) visiting days, I would watch mothers, sisters, and wives (who are women always the ones who unconditionally make trips to prison year after year, while it’s the “men” who disappear into thin air after no time at all?) set off with their little plastic bags full of food and clothing to wait for the bus that would drop them off near the prison.

Off those women went, with clean clothes and food that were often bought on “account” (credit), because in those days money and well-paid work were in short supply in my neighbourhood.
That’s exactly why so many people were in prison. It had nothing to do with being “lazy,” “depraved,” or “evil.” Not everyone wanted to join the diaspora of immigration (like my parents did) or exile, so instead of accepting the exploitation of wage-labour or the dictatorship of the post-Franco [ed. - Spain’s military dictator, General Franco] market, they decided to “steal” or “take up arms” against that entire order of things.

Those women who bought on “credit” and marched with their little plastic bags like a silent army toward prison, often depriving themselves of food so that their sons, brothers, and husbands would never have to do without their little package of food and clean clothes, were the very embodiment of love and solidarity. I felt tremendous love and respect for them.

One of those women (she was both a mother and a grandmother) was called, or rather we called her, Doña Cristina. She was a little old wrinkled lady with a kind, cheerful personality, but so tiny that the plastic bags she carried almost touched the ground, making each step she took seem like a superhuman effort. On more than one occasion I helped carry her bags to the bus stop.

Doña Cristina’s son had been in prison for 12 years. He had stolen several cars (during the Franco era) that he later sold for parts to scrap yards and repair shops in order to make some money. He was one of those (thousands of) prisoners who didn’t benefit from the “political amnesty” at the end of the 1970s [ed. - transition to democracy]. He was also one of the rebels who organized the Committee of Prisoners in Struggle (COPEL, which was already in decline by then), and no one wanted anything to do with them.

If my family was “poor,” then Doña Cristina’s family lived in the most abject destitution. The subhuman conditions in which that woman survived (together with her daughter and her children’s children, and without a “husband” or any kind of economic support) infuriated me so much that I decided to help her out...

It was the summer of 1982.

Like every morning, a swarm of human beings was set in motion. They spread out in all directions like tiny worker ants – little rows and groups of men, women, and children on the way to their workplaces and schools. From their outfits and uniforms, it was easy to figure out their job, schooling, and even the “social class” they belonged to.

Few workers went to work in their own cars. Most of them used public transportation or woke up a little earlier and went on foot.

I was sitting at the wheel of a Seat 131 I’d stolen that very night from another part of the city. My friends’ faces were tense, observing every movement on the streets adjacent to the Bank – every car, every person, everything.

Toni tapped my shoulder and told me to move the car. Here, parked right in front of the Bank, we were drawing too much attention to ourselves.

Toni was known as “Lefty.” Years later he was found murdered alongside his girlfriend Margot. Both of them had been shot in the head. Word on the street was that it was the work of the Vigo police department’s Robbery Squad.

Toni was 15 years older than me, so he must have been around 30 at the time. He had just recently been released from prison and was part of a group that was responsible for supporting and disseminating the struggle of prisoners.

I always liked his demeanor. He didn’t talk too much, and when he did speak, he was usually very specific.

Moure (who committed suicide years later) was sitting next to me in the passenger’s seat. He winked at me, smiling while he cleaned the oil off the weapons he had in his lap.

Moure also belonged to the prisoner solidarity group. Like Toni, he was older than me and had been in prison.

“Rachel said she had told her partner not to bring the kids when coming to visit her. “They were just too young. They would only be confused by the Plexiglas in the visitor’s cubicle. Being able to see their mother, but not reach out and touch her.” I thought of an article I’d read once, about animal testing laboratories. One method used by lab technicians to create symptoms of stress and depression in mammals involved removing newborn babies from their mother, then placing the mother in isolation. I looked up at the florescent ceiling lights within their shatter-proof wire cages. Soon the nurse came and people lined up to receive their daily doses of sedatives and anti-psychotics – a precautionary measure, prescribed to virtually everyone, like cutting off the beaks of factory farmed chickens to prevent them from pecking themselves, or each other, to death from the stress of confinement and isolation. My views of the prison system solidified: prisons are little more than warehouses for concentrating the poor. Rather than being populated by the people most harmful to society, they are crowded with those who have been the most harmed by society. Rather than being “correctional” facilities, they are a method of ridding the streets of those who act as living reminders of the crisis of poverty, the widening income gap, the future of hardship which may very well await many more in the coming years if something does not change. Prisons are a way of pretending that nothing is wrong.”

- These Burning Streets
We drove to the outskirts of the city since there usually wasn’t any police presence there. After all, the poor didn’t need to be “protected” from their misery. The money was downtown, in the Banks.

Once we were out in the sticks, we got out of the car to stretch our legs a bit. We’d spent the whole night driving around, and we were tired and needed sleep.

Toni picked up a twig. In the dirt, he began to sketch out the positions we would take up and the steps we would follow during the robbery. We also discussed the roads and routes we would use for our escape after the robbery.

During this first action, I would have to remain in the car and “cover our withdrawal” in case the pigs showed up. For the task, Moure handed me a Winchester repeating rifle that very much reminded me of the ones “cowboys” carried in Hollywood movies.

Once everything was sorted out, we got back in the car and headed for our target. Each one of us was immersed in himself. At such moments, there is nothing left to say. Everything has already been said. All that remains is total silence, complete concentration, and indescribable tension.

We arrived. When we were a few meters from the Bank, Toni told me to stop the car, but we hadn’t yet come to a full stop when I saw him leap out as if propelled from a slingshot. With a ski mask covering his face and a pistol in his left hand, he shouted: “Come on, let’s go, let’s go!”

Moure followed a few steps behind, also masked and armed with a revolver. I saw them disappear into the Bank. Some pedestrians were dumbstruck by the whole scene. They were staring at the Bank, and then they looked in my direction.

I didn’t know exactly what I was supposed to do with these “spectators,” but to calm my nerves I decided to get out of the car and do something. I grabbed the rifle and approached them, saying something like: “Move along assholes! Get out of here before I start shooting!”

I wasn’t wearing a ski mask, and the only thing partially covering my face was a pair of sunglasses. Luckily, it wasn’t necessary to repeat my threats. The spectators left the scene. I remained outside the car, watching the Bank with my rifle pointed down the street in case the pigs showed up. My heart was beating furiously in my chest. I reached for my asthma inhaler, then remembered that I had left it at home.

My hands were sweating. Each minute became an eternity. If the pigs appeared, I was prepared to shoot. That’s what we had agreed to. I told myself that next time I wasn’t going to stay in the car. It was better to be inside the Bank. Finally, I saw my friends exit the Bank and come running in the direction of the car. I jumped in, threw the rifle in the back seat, and picked them up.

In the car, all the tension and energy that had built up during the robbery was released. My friends were all smiles, and so was I. They joked about how I looked with the rifle and sunglasses. We took the prearranged route at top speed, and I left them at a spot we had chosen in advance, where they hid themselves, the weapons, and the money. I had to get rid of the car far away from our “base,” and I usually torched the cars we used.

A few days later, Doña Cristina found a bag full of 150,000 pesetas on her doorstep. Around the neighbourhood, graffiti appeared in red paint: Total amnesty! All prisoners to the streets!

The neighbourhood leftists talked about “political prisoners,” but people in the neighbourhood didn’t understand them. After all, the “political prisoners” had already been released thanks to two partial amnesties. They talked about “solidarity,” about “freedom,” but only for prisoners from their organizations. What about the prisoners from the neighbourhood?

I didn’t attend “political” meetings. I was 15 years old and didn’t understand what the people there were saying. Also, it was always the same ones who spoke. They talked like “television personalities.”

“I said goodbye to my friends with an embrace. They had a meeting to go to. I was planning to rob a food warehouse in Revilla and then distribute the food throughout the neighbourhood. It was an action I managed to pull off successfully.

“Call me when you’re planning another action. I’m just not interested in politics.”

Over the course of two years, we managed to successfully expropriate over 20 bank branches and a dozen gas stations, along with other actions of that type...

Almost 30 years have now gone by since those events, those times, those “speeches,” yet differentiating between prisoners still seems to be “topical.”

It’s absurd to think that only prisoners with political consciousness are worthy of our “solidarity.” As if Doña Cristina’s son wasn’t also a result of the system’s contempt. As if the “lumpen” were incapable of drawing conclusions from their own experiences and circumstances. As if their lack of “education” and “culture,” of money and support, wasn’t punishing and ostracizing enough in itself.

In prison, those differences are meaningless and irrelevant, because the
architecture of prison doesn’t “mix” prisoners according to their “political ideology.” It’s quite the opposite. Time, architecture, “employees,” conditions, attitudes, and individualities are all artificially constructed in such a way that the “day-to-day operations” produce relationships of power and coercion — in other words, alienation, contempt, etc.

One defense mechanism (or even better, self-defense) against these false “dichotomies” (compartmentalizations), inside as well as outside (the System is the same on both sides of the walls), is informal organisation based not only on action, but on any activity in accordance with a “distribution of tasks” that pursues two simultaneous ends: “living our lives in the here and now,” but also defining more “ambitious” goals that “transcend” our own “individuality” without dehumanising or alienating anyone in the name of some hypothetical “community” or “communism.”

What we want, or at least what I want, is the disappearance of power relations based on coercion: to live and act according to the principles of our hearts, to see “others” not as “objects” and/or “subjects” but as individuals.

Freedom doesn’t mean “alienating” ourselves. It means understanding our common “interests” and desires in pursuit of a shared liberty, and in that sense living/organizing and acting/thinking in concert without having to “sacrifice” oneself to delegation, participation, dirtying one’s hands, getting involved, accepting “responsibilities,” etc.

No single organization takes precedence over my individual liberty, and I don’t want to be part of any revolution that doesn’t let me dance.

EXPLOITERS SMASHED & EXPROPRIATED

30.06.13, Jakarta, Indonesia: Three-floor clothing warehouse burnt down “to show to the unionists that the workers goals are not to be workers anymore, and not for eight-hours, democracy inside the factory, freedom of association or other reformist demands.” A contribution to the Informal Anarchist Federation / International Revolutionary Front (F.A.I./F.R.I.) by ‘Anger Unit’ of the International Conspiracy for Revenge.

04.03.13, Athens, Greece: F.A.I. ‘Lone Wolf’ cell claims the attempted expropriation of Emporiki Bank. “The blowing up of the ATM was by the method of Plofkraak (using an LPG cylinder that drains the gas inside the safe and ignites/explodes by the use of a battery that activates the ignition lamp). But this time luck was on the side of the enemy[...] this ATM had a special protection system (insulating material lining the inside of the safe which absorbs an amount of the explosion). So the ATM blew up, but we didn’t manage to break into the safe. Then we poured gasoline onto whatever was left and we delivered it to the fire of destruction. From now on, whatever can’t be robbed, will be burnt[...] We hate money and its power. We expropriate it only to ignite, through the new anarchist urban guerilla, the destruction of the false idols of economy and the morality of the civilised...”

23.04.12, Barcelona, Spain: “At 11:30 PM an employment office was attacked with stones from the ground and once the windows were broken, paint bombs were thrown on the exterior. Then, the street was blocked off.”

30.04.12, Hamburg, Germany: Work agency windows smashed. “Work takes away any passion from your life, it reduces it to producing and consuming, steals any time from you for dreaming and to live.” They mention Christy Schwundek, “shot dead by the cops at the jobcenter in Frankfurt, just because she did not want to submit to the usual intimidations”, and Holger Wiemann, “who has been sentenced to 3.5 years of prison because he set the jobcenter on fire in Wuppertal, since he was in a rage against it.”

17.04.12, Cambridge, U.K.: A promotional employment van is set on fire outside the Jobcentre by F.A.I. ‘Fire Cell’.

29.03.12, Barcelona, Spain: The general strike that paralyzed much of Spain begins in Barcelona at midnight with pickets closing down bars (later in the day it escalated into the largest rioting seen for 30-odd years). In the centre, one group of hooded picketers enters a casino, presumably to shut it down, but once inside carries out a quick robbery and made off with 2,300 euros in cash.

03.10.10, Athens, Greece: Dozens of anarchists storm a supermarket. “Some of the comrades were blocking the street outside the supermarket holding a banner, distributing flyers and shouting slogans, while the rest of the group was expropriating the products from within. The products were distributed afterwards at the local public market[...] Police arrived within a few minutes and did not manage to locate any of the people involved in the action. [...] There is always room for patience, tolerance and submission. There is always the chance for each and every one to mind his [sic] own business, to look out for his survival, to try to move through the choking reality of our everyday living and to end up at his little nest in the conformance of the drug of his choice. But there is another way[...] against this monstrous system that is controlling our lives[...] for the total overthrow of it and not just demanding better terms of slavery.”

08.09.10, Buenos Aires, Argentina: A part of the Luciano Arruga Brigade (named after one of the many youths “disappeared” by the Argentinian police during the post-fascist democracy) “attacked the offices of exploitative French company Carrefour, stealing a significant sum of ill-gotten money[...] Additionally, we stole a weapon and ammunition from a member of the Argentine Naval Command, which carried out repressive assignments for the exploitative business. [...] Apart from recovering resources, this action was carried out as a protest measure against the French state’s xenophobic treatment of the Roma[...] Also, against the downsizing policy directed at the Carrefour workers.”
08.07.10, Buenos Aires, Argentina: Various cells of the Luciano Arruga Brigade claim two bank robberies (“On both occasions, we took money from the tellers and — after a hasty retreat — left behind fake bombs in order to delay the pigs.”), seizing weapons from two private security firms’ employees, and unspecified attacks on collaborationist unions “against the bourgeoisie and the union bureaucracy”.

26.03.10, Buenos Aires, Argentina: Anarchists announced they “reclaimed money and a handgun from corrupt union leader Amadeo Genta and his goon when we assaulted them…”

01.01.10, Tijuana, Mexico: ‘Anonymous Anarchist Action’ claims seven successful hold-ups of OXXO stores. One cop dies during the robberies: “It was him or us[...].” All capitalist businesses are our objective: banks, stock exchange, currency exchanges, insurance companies, department stores, OXXO, Super 7, Seven Eleven, supermarkets.” During the night they also machine-gunned 3 police vehicles and a private cop car in different parts of the city, without causing injuries. “We did this as a gesture of solidarity with the international hunger strike of anarchist prisoners called for by Gabriel Pombo Da Silva… from the 20th of December until January 1st…” Gabriel’s hunger-strike (he was then held in Germany) was joined by anarchists in Chilean, Swiss, Swedish, Spanish, Argentinian and Italian prisons. The month beforehand, ‘Anonymous Anarchist Action’ burned 28 pick-up trucks of the Tijuana cops’ brand-new fleet in solidarity with the upcoming hunger-strike, and two days into the strike anonymous comrades announced robbing a jeweller’s shop in Rome.

‘FACE TO FACE WITH THE ENEMY’

[ed. - This passage relates to the late 2013 death of Chilean anarchist, insurgent, hip-hop artist and bandit Sebastián Oversluj: gunned down in Santiago by a security guard of the state-run bank Banco Estado as his group prepared to execute a hold-up. Some managed to escape but two of his comrades (Alfonso Alvial and Hernandez Gomez) were arrested nearby, both with a history of street-level rebel activities and who the prosecutors want to connect to other robberies and attacks, and another is now a fugitive. Little over a month later a woman in black entered another Santiago branch of Banco Estado and badly wounded the security guard present with four shots, shouting “This is for revenge!” She collected his weapon and left her own, fleeing on a bike. Moments later the comrade Tamara Sol Vergara was captured after she drew the guard’s loaded pistol in a nearby police station. Despite the patriarchal insinuations of the media – that there must be “romantic ties” or “emotional instability” to explain a woman’s armed decision – motives for an attempt on the life of a capitalist lackey seem clear. Tamara Sol refused to identify herself or collaborate with the cops. She was brought to court the next day, where her grandmother shouted out to her “Strength, Sol, we love you. We are proud of you.” (The family has had members assassinated by agents of the powerful in the past during the Pinochet regime.) Outside clashes broke out between cops and the solidarity gathering, one briefly detained for aggravating a journalist. Respect and complicity with Sol, Alfonso, Hermes and the fugitive in these tragic days. In honour of Sebastián, his life of propaganda by the deed in many forms, we present an excerpt below from the statement by ten anarchist and libertarian Mapuche indigenous action groups of Chile, who are named in the full text available online as ‘With Tears in Our Eyes, With Closed Fists’.

“The silent one walks insurgent, with meticulously thought-out, detailed steps, it is the voice of consistency, of confronting the world of daily and systematised violence, and hurling ourselves into the exquisite idea of freedom. Clandestine conversations that culminate in the preparation of actions. There is no time to pause, it is the urgency of being free that pushes us to take little and risk everything. It only takes a few minutes to let them know that we are always here, under their noses, my hands sweat, the cold of the metal that will spit out our hatred is ready, well prepared, hidden, always hidden. Everything has to surprise them, the eternal defenders of the bourgeois order, for our part everything is agreement and organisation. Our clothes are adapted to the place and time, nothing is left to chance, the nervousness of placing oneself face to face with the enemy and not knowing if this time we will leave successfully.

It is the path we chose to take years ago now, crudely built by hand. Time seems dead, everything looks disturbingly calm. Go over the agreement, you there, me here, our bags empty, ready to be filled with money, none of what we come to steal of the commercial flow of a dead life will be our property, we live for an idea of freedom that doesn’t give up. Once again we will let them know that we are always here, “It’s time to go in!”

“An olive-green tarp blocks the view of the interior of the Banco Estado branch located on Avenida La Estrella in Pudahuel [ed. - Santiago]. The impacts of bullets that passed through the partitions’ windows and a firearm resting on the floor portray the violent robbery that affected the banking establishment yesterday.”

This was how some of us were informed of the painful details of the action you carried out on Wednesday December 11th, 2013, when along with others you prepared to take back part of the wealth stolen by the rich and powerful of this country. And so it is that the vortex of the war brought you to more than a project. You understood the consistency between saying and doing, and you knew to fight the extremely poor conditions with those who raise up those dreams. Robbery, expropriation, not only of money, but also of the time of waged labour that we recover is what calls us to utilise one of the tools most used by the rebels of history.

We share your decision: You have to contribute in the struggle and deliver your best.

They think that the dreams you hoped for were buried along with your body, riddled by the mercenary bullets of a miserable peon of the State/Capital, but they are wrong on just one point: Our idea of Freedom does not die. We unite ourselves with every form of propaganda you used, we value your total and complete integrity, and that is what we vindicate today. Sebastián Oversluj Seguel died standing, fighting, happy, combating the miseries of this world, assaulting a centre for the accumulation of wealth, and we, despite the deep pain we feel with his passing, we are happy to have had the fortune of knowing you in life, of having crossed paths and shared smiles.
Plan for Europe's Biggest Children's Prison
– from In the Belly of the Beast
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Her feet scarcely moved, but her body so swayed and her dress spread so gloriously around her that we were transported with joy. She danced to the song of a bird that sang passionately in Other Kingdom, and the river held back its waves to watch her (one might have supposed), and the winds lay spell-bound in their cavern, and the great clouds spell-bound in the sky. She danced away from our society and our life, back, back through the centuries till houses and fences fell and the earth lay wild to the sun. Her garment was as foliage upon her, the strength of her limbs as boughs, her throat the smooth upper branch that salutes the morning or glistens to the rain. Leaves move, leaves hide it as hers was hidden by the motion of her hair. Leaves move again and it is ours, as her throat was ours again when, parting the tangle, she faced us crying, ‘Oh!,’ crying, ‘Oh, Harcourt! I never was so happy. I have all that there is in the world.’

- Other Kingdom
Glossary:
Alienation, Division of Labour, Patriarchy, Speciesism

Scattering Seeds... [editorial]
...Under a Changing Sky
(facing ecological collapse without delusion or despair)

'I Didn't Want to be a Proud Worker'
& exploiters smashed or expropriated
and more!
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