

The critiques of the summit protest from the early '00s are halfway digested. We view the summit-model not as a result of choices made by many individuals to protest global trade but rather as a site of conflict in our time, similar to the “strike” as a site of conflict during the time of the workers movement. Thus, just as the workers movement had to go through the strike in order to develop the force of interruption of the general strike and proletarian community, we must go through the summit-model convergence to find out what is on the other side. The total *aufheben* of summits is yet to be realized, but a clear line of flight is being constructed, and its North American rudiments can be observed in last summer's RNC limited rioting, The New School occupations, various street parties that become wild, the Oscar Grant Riot riots, Mayday actions, the occupations on the west coast, and the G20 rioting.

”

from the Inside

the
enemy
of
mankind
speaks
power

**As predicted, the
events of Sept 24th
in Pittsburgh did
not end history.**

However the
experiment which
we in the US have
been tinkering
with for quite
some time was
finally realized:

VI.

What has already begun, and what we are already becoming taken by, is such a force. If it will reconstitute proletarianized life as "the class who abolishes class society only through its own self-abolition," or if the practices which take us will diffuse at the level of symbolic production to constitute an incoherent war-machine, is yet to be known. However, what's beginning to be audible across geographic and ideological boundaries is that we are coming out the other side of the war which biopower first set out, and we are beyond despair. We have endured all the horrors of late capitalism, the misery of being superfluous labor, and we have consumed everything. Through our common practice of endurance, we can begin to really understand each other. Through our common practice of reclaiming violence we can begin to really care for each other. We are abandoning what is drained of life. We have begun to shut up about the truth all the time, and speak power. It feels delightful.

its rocks off at a trade-summit once or twice a year. We can be intelligent. We can be sadistic and masochistic with a deeper endurance than the forces of policing can calculate, but only if we become sensitized to the contingencies and possibilities within biopolitical combat.

IV.

There are no right choices to make. There are possibilities, of which choice conceals. We collectively encounter possibilities and act decisively. There were no choices made by individuals or groups in Pittsburgh. There were decisions imposed by the use of collective sentimental intelligence. Conditions pose problems that consciousness then solves.

V.

Plan B has the potential to interrupt not only the subjectivity of "the protester," (and by extension, the liberal individual) but also the production of the security industry. If a certain intimacy and solidarity is developed between groups of friends, then something as simple as a text message, a phone call, or an email (or the use of *whatever* appropriate system of communication) inviting friends to an event can be enough to ensure the formation of a material force who can take its objectives and connections very seriously. If there were simply a few groups of friends and their friends who had such an intimacy which each numbered fifty, then it would only be a matter of time before such groups would find each other and be able to do whatever they want together in this or that node of the metropolitan network. With a different level of intelligence and organization, it wouldn't be difficult to direct such a force at other gatherings where capital is being generated and exchanged, nor would it be difficult to choose terrains which are not already inhabited by a militarized police force or the national guard. Moreover, perhaps through a less predictable mobilization and demobilization of forces, the state would have fewer consolidated events to justify its practice at control and neutralization. On the other hand, the intelligence of such a practice may even open up new possibilities for ways to immediately change our material conditions (i.e., we run up in a store and take what we want), and open up portals between the worlds of other forms-of-life, who are already experimenting with aggressive collective survival. If such actions proliferated and generated nothing less than one of the most visible expressions of an autonomous material force, then perhaps the state would have to spread its policing forces across multiple geographies; but even if so, this would only favor insurrection because it would reveal the state of exception, in which we now live, and impose a completely different framework of what life could be in the permanent moment of this society's last breath.

we ignored the
photo-op of the
world's most
wealthy leaders
in favor of using
the opportunity
to find each other,
and lose ourselves,
in collectively
remapping the
city with our own
topography of
destruction.

between citizen- subject & potential terrorist

It is only an apparent paradox that the harmless citizen of post industrial democracies (the bloom, as it has effectively been suggested he be called) who readily does everything that he is asked to do, inasmuch as he leaves his everyday gestures and his health, his amusements and his occupations, his diet and his desires, to be commanded and controlled in the smallest detail by apparatuses, is also considered by power—perhaps precisely because of this—as a potential terrorist.

While a new European norm impose biometric apparatuses on all its citizens,...surveillance by means of video cameras transforms the public space of the city into the interior of an immense prison. In the eyes of authority—and maybe rightly so—nothing looks more like a terrorist than the ordinary man.

”

G. Agamben
What is an
Apparatus

I.

“If we are abandoning the vapid discourse of protest in search of a concrete offensive of social war, then the G20 summit can be put to use only as a convergence of antagonistic subjectivities and as an experiment at interrupting their function in capitalism—how to become non-functional in the metropolis; how to become a contagious error.”

II.

Plan B—or whatever you want to call the imposition of new terms of engagement and tactical thought which has digested the critiques of summit-models, protests, and night-time affinity group actions—is coming, because it is already in practice. The *aufheben* of the summit model is the congealing of the excess practices which are already present in its content. These are tactical practices which we have become sensitized to: *how to mobilize a large number of people for attack quickly; how to gain materials for attack without traces, how and when to disperse and disappear*. These are the emotional histories which we have begun to write: the care we take in having each other's backs, the love and erotic practices which we experiment with well beyond the bedroom. These are the cartographic practices which we already impose: the way any place, business, or home can become a center of convergence whose vitality is only contingent on how it is populated. And these are the theoretical practices which we already are taken by: the need to experiment with pure ideas (yet-to-be-realized thought), with the threshold between the practice of thought and inclination (disposition), the need for critical engagements with our experiments, and the collective intelligence which these experiments generate. More than anything, we have already begun to experiment with communication which leaves no fingerprints but which leave remnants, tastes, worlds.

III.

The experiments and events in Pittsburgh during the G20 summit reveal that leaving the summit protest model is neither fantasy nor false urgency. If the state uses these events as *practice*, in the same way we do, then even if we become increasingly ungovernable and cruel, the state will sooner or later have to include even *so-called predominately white, middle-class protesters* in their libidinal economy of death (and has, see: Genoa '01). On the other hand, even if we are able to restrain the policing forces use of the extremes of biopower, tazers and sound rays are just the beginning. We understand very clearly: the state will kill us in order to be the sole authorizer in the use of violence. It will torture us in order to be the authorizer of the use of the word. This does not have to be the result of becoming a small isolated armed group, nor of turning anarchists into a strange predictable violence-unleashing subculture which gets

plan b, elaborated

We would submit that a 'host' group chooses an objective(s) and then has face to face communication with those they trust about the idea to gage interest.

This will likely have to be done by touring different regions. A more intimate relationship between groups can flourish and a more healthy understanding of needs and differences between groups can become illuminated. The host group will create some mode of communication between themselves and the other trusted groups in order to receive affirmations of interest. The trusted groups, who may not know all of each other, are networked through a series of vouching; facilitated in part by the 'host' group and can then begin to find secure modes for their own inter-communication about "how" the objective(s) is achieved. With so much attention to detail and intention, our imaginations are free to experiment with conditions. We can ask

questions of our resources, our own intelligence gathering—perhaps, there will be a place where many wealthy people's cars are kept? Perhaps there can be a way for us to destabilize communication networks of the security forces? Once the host group receives the affirmation for capacity they communicate with the trusted groups who can then choose to make the action public or build their own post-capacity with other trusted people or other modes of communicating to people who may wish to rebel in a similar style.

In the case of the summit protest, we can assume this. Our structure is then something that can appropriate that desire or be appropriated as well. If we provide hundreds of rock-hammers to make projectiles out of concrete, then our one hundred or so can be of use to a thousand more people who wish to riot. Likewise, if we have access to a sound system that can be lost then we have the ability to emerge a street party. Our structure, by its nature, becomes both robust and diffuse. We have the freedom of imagination to call it off if we must and also the power and capacity to do more tomorrow if we wish. It is through a intimate knowledge of our power that we can refuse to simply "do something" and instead do what will benefit us.

”

Plan B
Politics is
Not a Banana

Ten years of rioting in far off places and places closer to home has it affects. I endure violence I had only dreamed of and experience gestures of care which feel like double-dog dares. I am molded into whatever. My black bloc is sloppier, and yet more refined, through its naughtiness. Chants lose their significance against the backdrop of clamor and shouts. Signs and flags are not even camouflage for long sticks. Speed and cruelty, robust friendships and carnal knowledge, take on terrible new forms, and I am taken by them.

I resist the seduction of the militant with his bulging biceps and dark helmet—his calls for us to form a impenetrable front. Perhaps I penetrate his backside or perhaps it is he who penetrates my front. I feel myself—constituted as a good-for-nothing outsider who just wants to wreck shit—fall apart as I hurl chunks of concrete at the ducking police force in military fatigue. My masochism leaves me, and it enters another comrade, who becomes composed as the militant. His heroism is signed by a baton round colliding with his chest. I am sadistic again, and we fuck them. A business at which I have eaten as a child feels the wrath of my long memory of disgust. The mediocre shit-pile of the classless class society is momentarily present in its gleaming windows—so much that perhaps we forget there are customers, or perhaps our sadism takes me in such a way that we could give a fuck. Running, the crashing plate glass all around me; the bitchiness of our gestures, the toughness of our camaraderie: I am so fucking anxious.

I. This is not a critique of the “critiques.” It’s the process which reveals the elaboration of a position—a position which is occupied collectively, and across ideological and geographic borders. If this little text contributes a disquieting affect to theoretical analysis from within anarchist discourse, all the better. If certain phrases and terms are not contemporaneous with the anarchist-activist discourse, this is not because of any shortcoming on the part of our lexicon. On the contrary, it is because we pose different terms of engagement. The division between creation and destruction is fictitious. However, the division between social justice and social war is quite real. We recognize that in the discourse of social justice “rioting” is only one tactic within a “diversity of tactics.” What we intend to oppose to this discourse is the fact that wrecking shit and fighting the police are only two tactics within a diversity of insurrection. Insurrection is limited because it is captured by the discourse of social justice as “property destruction.” The terms, questions, and aphorisms within this text reflect an effort to reveal that insurrection is not merely a tactic, but a maneuver in social war.

II. War is a vortex. What occurred on September twenty-four was a vacuum, which reflects the vacuum that all contemporary concepts of war seek to open up. The categories of combat of which we are speaking form two histories (metaphysics and materialism) which parallel and weave in and out of each other.

III. On the one hand, the history of the state in global civil war, currently named “permanent counter-insurgency,” whose protagonists could be called the “policing” forces. On the other hand, the history of class struggle currently developing beyond itself to become “social war,” whose protagonists could be called “rioters.” From the position of the police, “society must be defended” through the method of counter-insurgency. The robot soldiers’ gestures of intensive repression against anyone who occupied spaces in-between “citizen-subject” and “potential-terrorist” follow logically. With their method, the terrain of Pittsburgh had to be remapped militarily; space, bodies, objects had to be viewed through the lens of their potential to become insurgent.

IV. From the position of the rioters, society cannot be made separate from its policing and discipline—the pure governmentality



the enemy of mankind was
pissed that they took away the copy scam

and reflecting the image of normality going straight to hell. From this position, we can claim a clear victory. The riotous practices that were earlier limited to a tiny subset of anarchist discourse spread across political, racialized, gendered, and sexual categories, even taking hold of a portion of the student population—momentarily revealing a threshold between each of these categories. Just because black-clad whatevers were not literally fighting alongside “the students” or “the workers” does not change the fact that entire territories of the metropolitan network were altered topographically and affectively. The text messages from comrades about the occupations in the west coast and rumors about shit blowing up on the campus in Pittsburgh cannot be discounted.

VI.

We may imagine looking behind us and seeing so many different bodies which make up a “we” whose collective force is directed towards a confrontation with the police, but this may not be the only way material solidarities and practices are really shared. Certainly, it feels promising when one can no longer speak of oneself as *one*, but the spectacular reality we occupy does not *only* function in the most densely populated territories. The force of interruption, the micro-singular ruptures which take a city or a territory or impose a momentary communion between different forms of life, must be understood at a different level. What is affective is what resonates and mutates. Capital is a *global* relation which structures everything. Thus, the repetition of certain gestures—the occupation of avenues, the t-shirt-cum-mask, the blockading of intersections with objects not intended for that purpose, and the destruction of property—and the way we become sensitized to how we contribute to such situations—must be understood in how these practices resonate *globally*; how these operations make common spaces, objects, bodies and time. It is by no small coincidence that we see ourselves in the events which tear open capitalist time. Each of these events maps the convergence of non-functional practices whose history is the history of social war.

V.

of liberal society—and so what is at stake is becoming ungovernable. Similarly, Pittsburgh had to be remapped in regards to its potential—a cartography of insurrectional devices: dumpsters, newsbins, rocks, bottles, roadsigns. All take on new life from the position of the rioter. Thus the trashing of store fronts, the fighting with police, and the gestures of cruelty lovingly splayed on the faces of the partisans of heteronormativity; these affective gestures of oh-so-many black-clad whatevers form the techniques of their method: insurrection.

Neither forces achieved their ultimate goal, and most bodies were probably *unconsciously* making their moves on the Go-board of Pittsburgh. However, it can be said from the position of the rioters that their objective of becoming ungovernable was far easier to achieve than the objectives of the policing forces. How was this done?

VI.

If the policing forces estimated their capacity and concluded that a broad show of force would be best to subdue rioting, then we can conclude that they made one of two possible assumptions. Either they began in riot gear and with *distance* because they knew they would have to deal with a higher threshold of ungovernability than usual, or the policing forces thought that a broad show of force would neutralize any potential desire to rebel. If the apparatus of repression failed Thursday to subdue rioting despite its heavy hand, this suggests three things. One, rioters effectively oscillated between “citizen-subject” and “potential terrorist” with the appropriate haste. Two, the speed and frequency of attack may have taught policing forces—who shared less affinity and intimacy than the rioters—a valuable lesson. Which is to say, the cruelty and initiative of rioters earlier in the day communicated to policing forces that its best to *keep their distance* (even if this was a bluff). And three, rioters were better organized materially than usual and better practiced in chaotic situations than the policing forces. Information about reconvergence points spread quickly, and rioters made use of distractions and weapons with care and guile. One simply could not stop the chaos, as it were.

my preferred gender pronoun is negation

Where, then, is a real possibility
for liberation ~~in Germany~~?

In the formation of a class with radical chains, a class of civil society that is not a class of civil society, a class that is the dissolution of all classes; a sector of society that has a general character because its sufferings are general, a sector that does not claim any particular right because the wrong it suffers is not any particular wrong but a general wrong; a sector that no longer claims a historical status, but only a human one; that is not narrowly opposed to particular consequences, but is fundamentally opposed to the very foundations of the German political system; a sector, finally, that cannot liberate itself without liberating itself from all the other sectors of society, thereby liberating all those other sectors at the same time; a class, in short, that embodies the total loss of humanity and that can therefore redeem itself only through the total redemption of humanity. This dissolution of society as a particular class is the proletariat

K. Marx
Critique of Hegel's
Philosophy of Right

IV.

work, i.e., the form of activity ideally suited to capital's needs. The opposite of work is not pleasure. The best employees take pleasure in their jobs. "Community organizing" might be boring, or not; our objection is that it institutes a community whose internal structure precludes any serious threat to capital. Even with guns, the cultivation of "sustainable autonomous communities" would fail, because it conceives of its territory as a fixed and durable location. Spatially, it locates itself in the land project, the social center, the collective house, the weekly or monthly community event. Socially, it locates itself in the political identity of "anarchist" or "anti-authoritarian"—affinity on the basis of shared ideas (which so easily translates to shared social position). Ethically, it creates an absolute division between interior and exterior; antagonisms not mediated by consensus are banned from the community, often enough by expulsion of the weaker party. "Community organizing" generates something to hold on to, but it could easily be shared self-destruction as well. What matters is not what is done, but rather that there are practices which generate affective circulation, power, and happiness which we share. This means that we meet people based on shared conditions, and we collectively make it our object to survive and change these conditions.

"Effective direct action" may be the wrong lens through which we can read the taking place of a strategy in a war against everything. If we know that the trade summit is an image of itself, and we know that the protester is also an image of itself, then both must be practically confronted if we aim to destroy spectacular society. The march route which makes its way to a militarized photo op confronts nothing. We became increasingly sensitized to this throughout the early part of Thursday, culminating in the collectively improvised strategy deployed *elsewhere*. Objectively, even the most ideological of anarchist-activists became complicit in the collective becoming-ungovernable. It was through this becoming—this *losing my self*—that both the terms set by the impoverished discourse of activism and the terms set by the state were practically defeated and new terms of engagement imposed.

V.

What was imposed took on new senses and appropriated strange groupings of people into complicities. Perhaps it's difficult to see the causal relation; from a glance, there were the students and the rioters. But we are not fighting for the hearts and minds of anyone. We have no illusions of "consciousness-raising" or "building the movement," the two modern residues of leaderless Leninism within the anarchist left. The production of anarchist-militants with a proper ideology is not our objective. Instead our objective is spreading the practices of insurrection

I.

The critiques of the summit protest from the early '00s are halfway digested. We view the summit-model not as a result of choices made by many individuals to protest global trade but rather as a site of conflict in our time, similar to the "strike" as a site of conflict during the time of the workers movement. Thus, just as the workers movement had to go through the strike in order to develop the force of interruption of the general strike and proletarian community, we must go through the summit-model convergence to find out what is on the other side. The total *aufheben* of summits is yet to be realized, but a clear line of flight is being constructed, and its North American rudiments can be observed in last summer's RNC limited rioting, The New School occupations, various street parties that become wild, the Oscar Grant Riot riots, Mayday actions, the occupations on the west coast, and the G20 rioting.

II.

Some bewail the absence of anarchist strategy and the lack of effective direct action. Such people fail to understand that the G20 rioting does not occur in a vacuum, rather it attempts to generate one: a vortex that draws everything into it. In a political climate lacking any real Left, adopting a strategy with specific demands and tactics to achieve our objectives would only solidify anarchists as the loyal opposition. Whereas some may fantasize about these very conditions and others may claim this is unavoidable, we cling to a different discourse altogether, with a different concept of history. From our vantage point, the so-called lack of an anarchist strategy to achieve "economic or social justice" is merely the concealment of a longer-term strategy of spreading insurrection. The Left within anarchism is sincerely depressed that no one is interested in reanimating the husk of society; rather, everything points to its dissolution. What gives rioters who become the partisans of insurrection a certain consistency of inclinations is not actually the product of our hard community organizing work. Rather, what generates the certain robustness is the way we collectively share our means of survival within the horrifying conditions of late-capitalism. Some anarchists are too busy with their reenactivist societies to understand this.

III.

Temptation arises when we fall in love with the stasis of autonomy. Autonomy, as a precisely measurable degree of independence from institutional power, is cultivated by: planting gardens, building bikes, claiming space for communal use and developing the infrastructure to sustain it. Sustain it. Sustain it. An endless refrain. It's also known as "the really hard work"—which is doubly true: it is really hard, and it is



the enemy of mankind
attacks big ones and small ones

Thursday night, following a radical-queer motivational speech about rioting, a black bloc emerged as the fourth round of the day's street fighting. This particularly vicious bloc (later named the Bash Back! black bloc) moved through Oakland smashing countless windows, overturning dumpsters and setting them on fire.

A friend remarks: What is so queer about that? People just wore black and burned things in the street.

We counter: the practice of wearing black and destroying everything may very well be the queerest gesture of all.

In fact, it cuts to the heart of the matter: to queer is to negate. At this intersection of our deviant bodies we experimented in becoming-mob, problematizing our very bodily boundaries. Fairy wands, tiaras, hammers and masks were annexed into our limbs as dangerous prosthetics. Rocks, dumpsters and black-sequined-dresses were profaned and put into use - thrown through windows, set on fire, and draped over our shoulders as a more fabulous take on riot-attire. Our thresholds-of-self dissolved further into a flood of shattered glass and smoldering garbage across the field of play.

Without hesitation, queers shed the constraints of identity in becoming autonomous, mobile and multiple with varying difference. We interchanged desires, gratifications, ecstasies and tender emotions without reference to the tables of surplus value or power structures. Muscled arms built barricades and broke

shit to the imagined anthems of riot grrl (or was it La Roux?).

If the thesis is correct that gender is always performative, then our performed selves resonated with the queerest gender of all: that of total destroy. Henceforth our preferred gender pronouns are the sound of shattering glass, the weight of hammers in our hands and the sickly-sweet aroma of shit on fire. Address us accordingly.

The march continued its rampage down Forbes, encountering some two-bit would-be queerbasher calling us faggots. Before he could realize his mistake, we enacted a particularly cold-blooded sadism on the fool. He was shown his error in a shower of kicks, punches and a copious dousing of pepper-spray. Before he even hit the floor, the immunitary logic of biopower was turned inside-out. His power to shape our bodies and to expose them to death was collapsed into itself. Yes, our bodies have been shaped, but into monstrous vessels of potential and revolt. He was instead made our object and was exposed to our violence.

An amalgamation of our crude delinquency and nasty desires unapologetically saturated the streets (and bathrooms and hotels and alleys) of Pittsburgh this past week. With ribald irresponsibility we wrecked, fucked, fought, and came all over politics' symbolic terrain, synchronized only in our lust for disorder. Using our bucking bodies against restraint itself, we had no message - choosing instead to leave behind ruins of boundaries and a tangible path of demolition. Our unleashing of violent aspirations upon homophobic frat boys and lifeless-daily-addictions spilled over as we pursued further stimulation onto each other. We got wet and came hard in a pile of dirty money, corrupting every inch of sterility with the funk of our perspiring bodies - aching with impure satisfaction. Our scheming, pleasure-seeking bodies came into conflict with lesser realities and emerged victorious. We left stains of the queerest kind all-over the broken bits of capitalism graced by our presence.

Two questions were raised this summer. In Chicago: "to barricade or not to barricade?" And in New York: "does she give a fuck about the insurrection?" Thursday answered both definitively in the affirmative. To the question of barricades we answer that we only correctly concern ourselves with how to make them taller, stronger, more terrible. To the latter, we offer a form-of-life that could be read as a reuniting of barricades and unshaven legs. But what's more, a synthesis of strap-on-cocks, hammers, outlandish wigs, bricks, fire, pepper-spray, licking, fisting and always ultra-violence.