Beyond Property Destruction
Beyond Property Destruction is the fourth installment in the Tactical Analysis Series. This and other installments can be found at introtoanarchy.blogspot.com. This text was written by Tom Nom(ad) with the help of many others.
“All politics is against the police”
- Jacques Ranciere

There have been some remarkably disruptive concentrations of property destruction in the last series of years. This is a welcome shift away from the aimless black blocs marching in circles with no obvious direction, away from blocs that rely on numerical concentration in a specific space, away from the island effect (where a group at the front becomes isolated and boxed in because the rest of the bloc has dispersed due to some minor police threat). The streets of Athens, London, Pittsburgh, Santa Cruz, Asheville, Oakland, Los Angeles, Vancouver and Toronto (among others and the list grows daily) have been littered with broken glass and barricaded off with burning dumpsters (or cop cars). But beyond the ability to become immediately appropriated by the media spectacle and the post-action pay-day for plate glass companies, something seems lacking. From the obsession with “riot porn” to the images on the materials that are produced to “explain” or call for actions, this reliance on property destruction, both as a tactic and indicator of “success”, has moved from being a tactic, conceived of in a tactical sense, to a fetishized necessity, a trap that we do not seem to be able to move away from. Maybe it is the militant rejection of nonviolence coupled with overwhelming police force, leaving property destruction as a direct, yet low risk alternative to actual conflict; but regardless of the reasons we need to move away from this tactical definition, this concept of a certain tactical necessity, and move beyond property destruction.

Property destruction can be remarkably disruptive, especially in high concentrations, but it has come to exist as some sort of abstract anarchist threat in a reactionary politics of
and make politics itself possible. Political definitions that can amplify the crisis in the logistical operations of the state and make politics itself possible.

make the definition inoperable. In other words, we need to really get over this idea of the anarchist revolution, or of insurrection as a categorical goal, and realize that insurrection is constant to more or less of a magnitude. To say that insurrection if constant is to say nothing but to rename the constancy of crisis that is always present in every moment. We need to become aware of this in the very moment, and make it possible to define the moment, to redefine the concept of crisis itself.

The term “anarchist movement” needs to sever itself from the notion that we are politics, that we exist to define moments by transferring politics across time and space. We need to stop pretending that we are gods predicting situations and determining moments from some transcendental point of view and realize the possibilities inherent in the very reality of it being an action in a particular moment, it generates effects/affects and generates possibility. We need to understand “the movement” for its potential. In the very absence of being able to define the anarchic we always exist within our own impossibility, and we should embrace this. Instead of existing as a political movement in the traditional sense we need to realize our very “power”, that as the undefinable we can amplify the crisis in the attempt to operate definition.

It is only through becoming a tactical movement that we can amplify the crisis in the logistical operations of the state and make politics itself possible. The crisis has played itself out, and seemingly without end or even acknowledgement that we have been down this path before. Yet, this discussion of where to go from here tends to fall into a series of ridiculous dichotomies; direct action or community organizing (as if there is a separation) or the endless violence or nonviolence debate (as if concepts can ever speak of particular tactical terrains). In this collapse into dichotomy we have lost the fundamental purpose of the discussion, what we are doing and how it is, or is not, effective. In other words, in the swirling conversations about concepts and definitions one thing gets lost, tactics, action, material tactical situations. It is not as simple as saying that property destruction is the logical surpassing of nonviolence, we need to look at tactics themselves, and remove them from the conceptualizations of politics that we have all become so “fond” of.

This is not a call for a return to the days of mass movements of the late-20th century or more. It is not a return to the days of mass movements of the late-20th century or more. It is about seeing beyond this dead end of mass actions and the shattered windows that sometimes result. It is about seeing beyond this dead end of mass actions and the shattered windows that sometimes result. It is about seeing beyond this dead end of mass actions and the shattered windows that sometimes result. It is about seeing beyond this dead end of mass actions and the shattered windows that sometimes result. It is about seeing beyond this dead end of mass actions and the shattered windows that sometimes result. It is about seeing beyond this dead end of mass actions and the shattered windows that sometimes result.

Instead of existing as a mass movement, we need to become a tactical movement. It is only through becoming a tactical movement that we can amplify the crisis in the logistical operations of the state and make politics itself possible.
As we mentioned earlier, we must get beyond the notions of “victory” and “defeat”, but this requires us to challenge another categorical mythology handed down to us from the trajectory of traditional politics; the myth that movements in themselves accomplish anything directly. We have to dispel the notion that anarchists are the “movement”, that we directly construct “the new world”. This trap has led us down the road of traditional politics often, into the trap of attempting to define moments and enact theory. If we can learn anything from the gulags, the massacres and the numerous other failures of the radical project it is that once we go down this road of defining moments, the moment we go beyond understanding “our role” as anything but being another disruption to the functioning of the state, we come to replicate the very impossibilities that have plagued all politics, the arrogance of disregarding the very basic fact that theory exists at a divide from the material. Once we forget that we come to replicate the very possibility of the police. It is not that we ourselves cannot have “politics”, it is not that we cannot take positions, on a certain level we are attempting to encourage the assertion of positions and possibilities that can enter into conflict. Rather it is that we should not be so arrogant as to assume that those are something other than vain attempts to make sense of the world. It is not about the operation of theory, which is really nothing but an opinion from a particular point of view, but rather it is about generating the possibility of possibility; of generating the possibility of politics itself through the disorganization of the police.

The police exist to prevent conflict, but do so by employing conflict. However the goal of the logistics of police is to define situations and to operate that definition to the point of eliminating conflict itself. If we are to avoid our downfall, if we are to make politics itself possible, the operations of action must exist to amplify conflict, to increase

The focus or fetishization of property destruction has tended to come from two perspectives, perspectives that are not only not mutually exclusive but mutually reinforcing. On the one hand property destruction is spoken of affectively, as something that has an affective resonance with those that carry out the actions. On the other property destruction and its fetishization tend to focus attention on the act itself, as if any action has some inherent meaning outside of the terrain and medium that it exists within.

This focus on affectivity, the idea that an action is carried out for the affective results, exists as an attempt to isolate actions while marginalizing the action in some attempt to “proliferate subjectivities”. In order for this sort of analysis to carry through the action needs to be isolated as a site of generation, as some space that will generate results, and then be analyzed in relation to this affective result. In other words, what occurs, at the point of treating actions as something with a specified, legible, result, is that the action becomes isolated from history, from the dynamics of conflict that construct its possibility, and then judged through some “transcendental” lens, in this case the transcendental lens of abstracted affective profit. But this isolation, in order to obtain some “profit” or gain in the amount of possible subjective manifestations, is just another form of isolating action from the context that it is a result of and produces. It seems odd to how much some of this rhetoric surrounding affectivity, especially among the more hipster among us, begins to resemble early capitalist arguments about the importance of material profit. We have noticed the same focus on the isolation of “individuals” from the shifting totality that we exist within, that constructs our possibilities, combined with a discourse of profit. It is not that we should reject affectivity or something like that. Rather it is that we need to understand the coimmance, the necessary relation, between the affective and the effective. In other words, there are no actions that in themselves exist purely affectively,
The movement of time is guaranteed by the birth of generation after generation, a never-ending succession that fills the gods with fear.

-Mikhail Bakhtin

The fetishization of property destruction makes a series of fatal errors, but two of these errors are primary. On the one hand, if property destruction is isolated to isolated points in a vacuum, separated from the tactical terrain, it is not some goal, but a singular moment that makes police work impossible and stencil the space of property destruction itself. On the other hand, the fetishization of property destruction makes police work impossible and stencil the space of property destruction itself. Again, we are not here to reject property destruction, just its fetishization. We need to understand that property destruction has space, but it is not in "riot porn" videos on Youtube. The place of property destruction is that it exists as one of many means to amplify the crisis in policing, to generate space for more actions to occur, which further amplify this crisis in policing to greater space for more action to occur, which further

Conclusion

There is always an effect, and with that effect a consequent construction of other particular moments. Action itself exists as a manifestation of one of a series of possibilities presented in any moment, and the very act of production is one that is necessarily also an effect. But there is a moment, sometimes called the aesthetic or the aesthetic effect, that produces subjectivities (especially because they are all moments when new events occur, where and when they are.

- Mikhail Bakhtin

The movement of time is guaranteed by the birth of generation after generation, a never-ending succession that fills the gods with fear.

"Conclusion"
proliferate, crisis amplifies, and, if not reinscribed, the logistics of the police becomes disorganized to more or less magnitude. In a story about the Greek insurrection an anarchist said that they knew the insurrectionary events had resonance when they realized that old ladies were smoking cigarettes on the train and telling the cops who came to stop them to “fuck off!” In other words, the insurrection had resonance because, long after the windows were replaced, long after the streets were cleared of the burned out carcasses of cars, the ability of the police to project themselves through space, the ability of the state to operate logistically, was still disrupted; and in this disruption the space to realize new possibilities was present, even if that only meant that people smoked on the subway with impunity.

necessarily means that not only does all action exist as one trajectory of affect/effect within a innumerable series of actions (or everything that has ever occurred) and trajectories that come into conflict in the tactical medium but that this very conflict, this very collision of trajectories means that not only is the future indeterminable but that the conflict itself, the unfulfilled trajectory of affect/effect is what constructs what we call the world. To go back to something Patton said, following Clausewitz, “no battle plan survives first contact with the enemy”. In other words, this theoretical attempt to isolate affectivity, to predict affective consequences, is not wrong in the absolute conceptual sense, but it is plainly impossible. We project the theoretical within this smooth context devoid of actions and affect/effect, devoid of conflict, devoid of the unfulfilled; but the moment any action occurs the very context that was theorized is already obsolete, the theoretical and the material necessarily exist at a division across a wide gap.

Now I do not want to reject the affective consequences of direct action. Going on “missions”, smashing bank windows, taking out cameras, building barricades, running through streets has a large affective result for a lot of people. For some of us that grew up in places that elevated property to the status of the sacred destroying property was a way to “break free” from that particular limit that we had placed on ourselves. For those of us that grew up in places where there was very little property to fetishize destroying banks and fighting cops exists as a way to find an outlet for the rage that we had always felt about the positions that we had been relegated to from birth. It was a way to get over the fear that the police had instilled in us from a very young age when they rolled up on us, searched us, walked into our classrooms to pull people out for “questioning”, beat us for minor infractions and then dropped us off without being arrested (because arrest would entail explanation), the killings in cold blood, the criminalization of our youth, the
operates with a certain gap. The information gathered still needs to be fit within notions of sense. Namely it needs to be sent from the field, interpreted and categorized and then orders for movement, new strategic projections, need to be transferred back to the field. In other words, even though the logistics of policing has increased in speed it can never overcome its very impossibilities, its constant crisis.

Because policing operates as a logistical attempt to define space, even fluidly define space, it is always locked in the impossibility of being undermined through its own operation in a resistant medium. Each and every thing that occurs, each breathe, each step, each person leaving a building or crossing a street, each conversation, generates a new contingency and a series of possibilities that strategic models could not project.

When we think of strategic models, even fluid ones, we need to see their narrowness in time and space. They fundamentally are conceived of in a theoretical vacuum in a certain time and place, from a certain perspective with a certain amount of information and a certain problem with a certain amount of information and a certain space. They fundamentally are conceived of in a theoretical vacuum in a certain time and space. When we think of strategic models, even fluid ones, we need to see their narrowness in new contingencies and a series of possibilities that strategic models could not project. Deep within the process forming a building of cleansing a street, each conversation, each operation is a possible locus in the impossibility of being undermined through the space. It is always located in the impossibility of being undermined through the space. Because policing operates as a logistical attempt to define space, even fluidly define space.

But in the gaps that are always community forming and dissipating possibilities, in the gaps that are always community forming and dissipating possibilities of our existence. We only get the same move replaced in all capitalist discourse of property which implies exclusion, as well as some form of the “individual”, to solve, “selves”, from the very condition and constraint of effect, of the external and actual. It is still our existence and the production of possibility of strategy or efficiency, but back to the point, to focus on the strategic to the exclusion of property, the “individuated” from the condition of one existence, the “self” from history, need to focus, the base form of the stratification, the separation of the subject from the object, the “subject” from the “object”. In other words, we need to focus on the existence of certain forms of “subjectivity”, or rather “selves”, in order to reach the space.

Now we all love the situationists but they made this same error. While recognizing that our actions can cause wider destabilizations, the purpose of these destabilizations became about the manifestation of some “subjective” desires. Now we are not rejecting the existence of a certain sense of “subjectivity”, rather what we need to reject is the separation of this “subjectivity” from some form of “objectivity”. In other words, we need to reject the basic error of the Enlightenment, the separation of the subjective from the objective, the “individual” from the totality of our existences, the “self” from history. It is an error that permeates Kant and Hegel and one that has again crept into this discourse of affectivity. But back to the point, to focus on the subjective to the exclusion of effects, or the external and tactical, is to isolate our existence into the perpetuation of some form of the “individual”, to isolate “selves” from the very conditions and possibilities of our existences. Not only is that the same move replaced in all capitalist discourse but it is also a way to isolate in a world that constantly affects us, a way to reify, a way to reify in a world that constantly affects us.

Friends locked in the dungeons of America; for us it was about finding a catharsis, a way to fight, a way to feel powerful in a world that constantly beat us down. But often this discourse of affectivity tends to focus on only the “positive” or “empowering” aspects of property destruction and fails to deal with the trauma, the mental affects that this has had on us. We feel that this has a lot to do with the inattention that trauma gets in our community, but that is a topic for another essay.

Now we all love the situationists but they made this same error. While recognizing that our actions can cause wider destabilizations, the purpose of these destabilizations became about the manifestation of some “subjective” desires. Now we are not rejecting the existence of a certain sense of “subjectivity”, rather what we need to reject is the separation of this “subjectivity” from some form of “objectivity”. In other words, we need to reject the basic error of the Enlightenment, the separation of the subjective from the objective, the “individual” from the totality of our existences, the “self” from history. It is an error that permeates Kant and Hegel and one that has again crept into this discourse of affectivity. But back to the point, to focus on the subjective to the exclusion of effects, or the external and tactical, is to isolate our existence into the perpetuation of some form of the “individual”, to isolate “selves” from the very conditions and possibilities of our existences. Not only is that the same move replaced in all capitalist discourse but it is also a way to isolate in a world that constantly affects us, a way to reify, a way to reify in a world that constantly affects us.
sections of the city. The very magnitude of the force of the occupation, and the sheer number of arrests through arbitrary searches and road checkpoints, is meant to reverberate in times of non-concentration by defining territory so thoroughly, including through the elimination of “problem elements”, that the very space becomes defined almost totally. She also began the use of “Predictive Policing” in DC which uses “crime stats” to “predict” where “crime” will occur. In other words, the attempt is to take trends that are categorized by the police as “criminal” and use that very categorical analysis to gather data, analyze this data and from that determine coverage. This approach found its logical absurdity in New York City under Giuliani. The staffing of the NYPD was based on “criminal statistics” at a time when they instituted the concept of “zero-tolerance” policing. Instead of being fluid with enforcement every situation that was defined as criminal, even for minor infractions, resulted in the arrest of not only the “perpetrator” but usually anyone else that may have information on what occurred. The police are the ones that create “crime”. It is not just that they are an organized “criminal” apparatus but that it is in the arrest that a situation is defined as a “criminal” situation. So when they redefined the threshold for the definition of the criminal they of course found that “crime” went up, which justified the hiring of more police, which resulted in more arrests, which caused more cops to be hired, and so on. The size of the NYPD exponentially increased, along with the prison population, under this absurd logic which does nothing but generate total police state conditions; and this has only amplified even more since 2001 with the construction of New York as a zone of total warfare.

All of these approaches take into account that terrain is both resistant and fluid, that the very reality of existence is that it occurs within a resistant medium that shifts through its very actions. But this attempt, though it affords a certain amplification in fluidity, still use) it is also the generation of a “subject” that cannot speak, that would have no context for words, no way to make sense of things, no way to actually experience phenomenon. But in this isolation of agents there is a coimmanent isolation of actions. We tend to see single smashed windows, or even instances of large scale property destruction, as actions in themselves, as if they have meaning in themselves. Theory only exists as a way to make sense of the world, but it cannot actually describe moments which always exist as singular, unrepeatable, unreplanted in history. In other words, all actions are possible due to the dynamics of everything that has ever occurred, yet that totality of actions is something inaccessible in a moment. Theory is the impossible attempt to chain moments together, to generate concepts from some notion of a constancy of actions; what it forgets is that the ability to ever describe a moment, all the dynamics that led to the manifestation of a certain possibility, all the possible meanings, all the moments that have ever occurred, is impossible from the positionality of theory as something that occurs at a specific time and place; the theoretical requires transcendence that in itself is an impossibility. To put it another way, property destruction actions in themselves are meaningless, all actions are materially meaningless. Not that they do not have effects, but rather that there is no way to theorize about the affect/effect of an action or moment isolated from the totality of history that led to that moment and there is no way to make sense of history in any way that is not just more or less persuasive speculation.

Yet, this fetishization of property destruction as an action-in-itself is the attempt to do just that. When we isolate actions from the totality of history that led to the possibility of that action itself in order to make sense of the action itself we are consequently rejecting another view, the view of the context that the action exists within, the terrain of conflict that constructs possibility, the effects that action has in the construction of history, or the
should not understand rupture as some privileged historical moment, yet another metaphor for Revolution. Rather this rupture exists fluidly and alongside spaces where projection can operate. But it is these spaces of rupture, these gaps in coverage, where we can expand and amplify projection. Rather than trying to fill these gaps in coverage, where projection can operate, we need to create these gaps. The rupture exists fluidly and alongside these spaces where projection can operate. Rather than trying to fill these gaps in coverage, where projection can operate, we need to create these gaps. The rupture exists fluidly and alongside these spaces where projection can operate. Rather than trying to fill these gaps in coverage, where projection can operate, we need to create these gaps.
operate this projection into the future by constructing terrain to fit the plan. Like the
often cited Borges story, the map attempts to become the territory, but this is a
fundamental impossibility. The failure is not in poor military planning but rather in the
very concept of the plan; the idea that plans developed in a space with no resistance will
ever survive even a single action. As action multiplies the crisis in the logistical attempt
to operate the plan becomes amplified until it reaches the point of disorganization, the
point where strategy is abandoned and conflict amplifies this impossibility of
“coherence” to the point of operational rupture. The operation of the plan is not only a
projection of a plan temporally but sets the stage for policing as a spatial projection, one
that is always attempting to compensate for the impossibility of definition or the
impossibility of philosophy applied.

The logistics of policing therefore, again, cannot be understood as something to be
defeated but rather as a projection that can be disrupted and disorganized, a crisis that can
be amplified. We cannot understand strategy as something to be destroyed but rather we
need to understand projection for what it is, a capacity to operate a strategic projection in
time and space. When we talk about capacity we are not just talking about material
capacity or the amount of vehicles and personnel that can be mobilized but, rather, the
ability to mediate contingency, the ability to operate logistically to define territory
according to strategy. That capacity, as the ability to logistically project across time and
space, is a capacity to deal with the crisis that the very operation of policing implies.
When that capacity is exceeded the police are reduced to nothing but a physical force that
operates in direct physical contact, responding to situations without being able to either
define the limits of movement or space. This is what we call rupture, it is the
disorganization of the logistics of policing and the policing of logistics itself. But we
conflict and destabilization amplify and instead take actions that in themselves exist as
isolated opportunities taken rather than an amplification of the crisis in the functioning of
the state itself. This attempt at systematization is largely known by the term “Plan B” and
exists as both a strategy based in defeat and one that does nothing but amplify this defeat.

The concept underlying Plan B, that attacks an actions occur outside of concentrations of
conflict, is sound, it is based in the necessity of the crisis in policing, the impossibility of
a totality of policing. But, rather than seeing the gaps in police coverage, the
impossibility of total policing, as something that can be amplified Plan B takes these gaps
as “the best we can do”, as something to be exploited by single actions that can be easily
mediated and repaired. It begins from the assumption that we are already defeated, that
all scenarios necessarily lead to our defeat tactically, that no new possibilities are able to
be generated, that the situation is totally defined and then goes to entrench this notion of
defeat in our very actions and the way we imagine our tactical possibilities; this same
mistake is being repeated by a similar group of people now with the notion of only being
able to be pro-revolutionary, that the historical conditions are not “correct” for us to fight,
as if they have all of a sudden become the sages of history. It is not that they are wrong,
it is only that the ability to access this perspective necessitates one becoming able to
transcend the particular moment of theory, but again this is the group of people that
demands that we need a “new theology”, a new ideal or concept, and this is why they
tend to separate insurrection from actual actions. Because, really, what is the importance
of broken glass, how much existential weight is carried by a smashed ATM screen. What
we need to begin to see is that even isolated attacks, if carried out with frequency, are
important to the degree that they stretch the police apparatus to the breaking point, to the
point of rupture. The word rupture is thrown around a lot in contemporary
To operate strategically the apparatus is not so much to move according to a plan but to
operate through both casualties (the shifting of numeric balance) and in the very
shifting of the medium of combat itself. At the end of the day there would be time to
regroup, count the dead, and reorganize. This period of reorganization was necessary in
order to continue fighting to prevent the local failure of the operation of the
operations of the military apparatus to prevent the local failure of the operation of the
apparatus. Within any models combining them into operation without strategy,
although unsurprising in Vietnam and now Iraq and Afghanistan, the apparatus to
defeat the enemy, the enemy is the Russian or the French or the Chinese. The
operation of the military apparatus to prevent the local failure of the operation of the
apparatus was necessary in the period of the operations of the military, the period of the
operations of the military apparatus. The brilliance of Mongolian military strategy was not
the brutal force employed but rather the inability to fall into this form of definition. From
the outset Mongolian units would begin dispersed across a vast territory and then
converge to fight, dispersing and reforming when the situation suited. This fluidity
whole militaries, legendarily powerful militaries, fell almost instantaneously. This
dynamic also formed the core of Napoleonic military strategy in the tactic of constant
pursuit and the use of advanced skirmish lines. After battles Mongolian military
would disappear into the crowd of Mongolian military, their role being to
overwhelm, divide, and make it impossible to fight in the place they were called to fight. In
this fluidity, combat is to fight, dispersing and reforming when the situation suited. The
ability to fight, dispersing and reforming when the situation suited, is the key to
understanding the insurrectionary anarchist theory but what we are speaking of here is the
very material situation where the police are prevented from operating in and as a tactical
terrain of action. This occurred in Pittsburgh, and many have spoken about this.
Rather quickly into the actions on September 24, 2009 the cops were unable to actually
carry out their duties and began reacting in a frantic attempt to contain the rioting and
respond to actions that had already occurred. This led to the hilarious scenario of a group of
anarchists pulling an action, dispersing and blocking down, and going back onto the street
only to see the cops respond to the last place they were called to almost 15 minutes after people had left.
We need to look beyond the isolation of moments imposed by the theories that
underlie Plan B. Again, we are not rejecting property destruction...but we are here to reject Plan
B, not in favor of some "Plan A", but in an attempt to take the thing that Plan B
recognizes, that there is always a necessary gap in police coverage, that police exists as
a dynamic in crisis, and amplify this crisis rather than understand it as a static reality
that we cannot manipulate, much less control. This makes us reject the framework of
understanding the police as a means to police, the police as a means to define the
situation where the cops are operating as operators in and as a tactical terrain of action.

absolutely of defeatism. This occurs in Philadelphia and many have spoken about this. Rather quickly, the
and begin reacting to a proliferation of actions on the street.
We can see this operation in the attempts of the military and police apparatus to compensate for their impossibility by constructing more and more fluid conceptual structures. But before we get to this we need to understand that at its base the logistics of policing is a projection forward in time. In order to allocate resources the police project from a fixed moment in time into the future. For example, the use of “crime statistics” to develop patrol patterns or the use of the study of past demonstrations to determine coverage patterns to prevent “civil disturbance”. But as has been shown through numerous experiences, this strategic perspective fails at the very outset, at the moment of enactment; “no battle plan survives initial contact” (Patton). As was spoken about at length earlier, the police rely on action that necessarily shifts the medium of operation, making the projection of the strategic an impossibility. This approach, of developing static strategic models, has failed dramatically in circumstances ranging from the fall of empires under Mongolian fluidity to the failure of force to quell guerilla conflicts. As Che said, if you can attack from anywhere, the battlefield becomes everything. In other words, at the moment that the strategic fails; at the moments where it fails to be able to be enacted, and it always must, there becomes no way to define terrain conceptually. It is a problem of the necessary gap between theoretical projection across time and space and material fluidity. But at its core, the strategic is an attempt to make sense of a fluid terrain of operation that attempts to apply itself.

In traditional military engagement between state forces battle lines were drawn and rules of engagement were agreed upon, the basic limits were set and adhered to. Primary among these, especially in the European context, was the temporality of battle. During battle individual combats would shift the terrain of the battle, disorganizing the military.
But these types of actions only operate due to a certain impossibility of definition amplified. The impossibility of defining material moments is always present, and that is why the very operations of the state are always in constant crisis. But we cannot just look at crisis as something that can occur, or consequently goes through periods where it does not occur. The mistake that works like Nihilist Communism make is assuming that because a situation does not give off the appearance of being in crisis that it is somehow stabilized. But to assume this is to assume that theory crosses this divide and becomes actualized in some immediate way. In other words, and to use an argument from Capital (Volume 1), it is not that abstract value actually functions, rather it must be inscribed over moments on a momentary basis, constantly, but in itself it is an impossibility. To say that crisis is ever eliminated, that there are periods of crisis and periods of non-crisis, is to make the assumption that sometimes, on some level, concepts actually come to be joined with and define moments and objects. To mirror Adorno, the philosophical always maintains a separation between the conceptual and the object of contemplation, but a resistant separation, one that necessarily frames the conceptual without defining it while the conceptual frames the understanding of the object without ever being able to be inscribed. The moment where inscription is attempted is the very moment where defining the conceptual becomes the impossibility of the philosophical. And the conceptual is always separated from the momentary basis. To put it another way, the state is a constant operation, a constant attempt to actualize the conceptual. To cross this gap, to make the theoretical operate, requires an actual logistical form of existence itself.

In the moment of disagreement, we can sometimes actually hear form of agreement through a particular series of circumstances and experiences. In a lot of fascist theory books written, there have been a lot of attempts to generate some all-knowing theoretical principle that defines life itself, and that is problematic enough. But what we need to understand is that the state, though guided by certain notions of making sense of the world, do not exist in some abstract, theoretical form of agreement. Instead, the state is the moment where inscription is attempted. To mirror Adorno, the philosopher always maintains a separation between the conceptual and the object of contemplation, but a resistant separation, one that necessarily frames the conceptual without defining it while the conceptual frames the understanding of the object without ever being able to be inscribed. The moment where inscription is attempted is the very moment where defining the conceptual becomes the impossibility of the philosophical. And the conceptual is always separated from the momentary basis. To cross this gap, to make the theoretical operate, requires an actual logistical form of existence itself.

To actually make the state exists, we need to understand that the state is a constant operation, a constant attempt to actualize the conceptual. To cross this gap, to make the theoretical operate, requires an actual logistical form of existence itself.
Constant Crisis and Capacity

“Uncertainty is the only certainty there is, and knowing how to live with insecurity is the only security”
-John Allen Paulos

As was mentioned earlier, due to the very impossibility of policing numerically and tactically, the police must operate through a certain sense of projection. What this means is not just that they need to operate and move with a speed, both communicative and logistical, but also that, as a movement, it requires an absence of interference in order to function. Every person on the street that calls the cops, everyone that gives them information, all the snitches and informants, all the cameras, are minor in comparison to the overall effect of fostering a space organized through a certain notion of “self-control”.

Now we do not want to get into the particular manifestations of self control, I think that these are obvious. But what this means is that not only do police project themselves spatially in a material way but that the crux of their ability to construct space, their ability to operate in non-resistant spaces, is a product of their potential projection. In the most concrete terms possible, it is not that people do not shoplift because there is a cop in every store but that the notion of being able to shoplift is made difficult by the possibility of arrest, by the possible projection of police into a space that they are not immediately within and as. For those that have marched in bloc marches or been in militant actions, the anonymity of the group and the mask gives space for action not just out of direct resistance to this projection but because in the organization to resist directly it prevents projection from operating outside of the physical proximity of the police. In other words, it is in this invisibility combined with movement that generates a profoundly resistant space, generating the possibility of all sorts of actions.

organization, or the police. To put this another way, it is not that the state is not at its basis a certain conceptual reality but just not one that can be grouped into the categories that we have generated to understand political history. It is not that that the United States is a liberal democracy, it is that the United States is a conceptual reality, in that it constructs its own reality, that exists in wildly divergent ways in different spaces and at different times; the United States exists as what it is now, a conceptual coherence which exists at a distance from the attempt at “coherent” operation not as some expression of a certain reality constructed in times gone by by rich white men. Rather, it is that the ideological allegiance claimed by the state itself, though it can serve to set a series of abstract limits to the state's operation (we have elections periodically for example and courts), is in itself largely inconsequential. To put this another way, the question is not the “what”, the attempt to conceptually define the state conceptually (which implies a materially impossible coherence and differentiation); rather, the question is “how”, a question of tactical operation in the impossible attempt to overcome the infinite distance between transcendental concept and materially articular moment. When we think of the state we need to not think of a political operation, an operation borne of conflict, but rather the attempt to operate as a totality in a constantly shifting tactical medium. To say this another way, the state is not, at its most basic, a political reality. Rather it is a logistical policing operation that attempts to avert conflict, that attempts to be the end of politics itself. For many of us this is clear in the post-Cold War age (hell, Francis Fukuyama wrote “The End of History and the Last Man” about this end of politics). But we need to see beyond the historical moment of the manifestation, or increasing “success” of this attempt to end politics and understand that the very possibility of this move lies in the basis of the state itself.
very operation of the police there are always other possibilities open. We need to see beyond these categories of victory and defeat if and see that proliferation of possibilities in front of us all the time. Until we do this we are doomed to recognizing that "the police are stronger than us" and entrenching this defeat in approaches that further construct our position as being "defeated".

This may all seem like so much hot theoretical air, but the point is that when we speak of the state it makes no sense to talk of policies, rather we need to see policies (and politicians) as nothing but certain appropriations of a logistical attempt to operate a conceptual "unity" materially in a constantly shifting tactical medium through constant policing, this is what is meant by social war. A constant operation is waged everyday to operate a coherence of the operations of the State in a moment, a situation that, by the very fact that it is constructed by actions that are constantly generating different possibilities, is in itself necessarily particular in each moment. Social war is the reality of the state, not some fight to choose to engage in. If we choose to fight back, that is all the better, but we do not have a choice as we are caught in an endless loop of possible actions that lead us deeper into a crisis. The attempt to transcribe the theoretical the legal, the ideological onto the physical phenomenon, but there is a logistical operation that exists in a state of constant logistical operation, neither when we want to emphasize these is not only that the same is a logistical operation, rather when we want to emphasize these is not only that the state is a logistical phenomenon there but also that this is a logistical phenomenon that is caught in an endless loop of possible actions that lead us deeper into a crisis.

But we are not just trying to make some fancy theoretical point about the state being a logistical operation, rather what we want to emphasize here is not only that the state is a logistical phenomenon, but that it is a logistical phenomenon that exists in a state of constant logistical operation, neither when we want to emphasize these is not only that the state is a logistical phenomenon, but also that this is a logistical phenomenon that is caught in an endless loop of possible actions that lead us deeper into a crisis.

Yet here it is constrained by actions that are constantly generating different positions. The state is not just a logistical phenomenon that exists in a state of constant logistical operation, but also that this is a logistical phenomenon that is caught in an endless loop of possible actions that lead us deeper into a crisis.

We are not just trying to make some fancy theoretical point about the state being a logistical operation, rather what we want to emphasize here is not only that the state is a logistical phenomenon, but also that this is a logistical phenomenon that is caught in an endless loop of possible actions that lead us deeper into a crisis.

position as being "defeated," they have no authority over you... don't try, we don't have the capacity to support more beyond. But we do not have a choice as we are caught in a crisis that is constantly generating different positions. The state is not just a logistical phenomenon that exists in a state of constant logistical operation, but also that this is a logistical phenomenon that is caught in an endless loop of possible actions that lead us deeper into a crisis.

Yet here it is constrained by actions that are constantly generating different positions. The state is not just a logistical phenomenon that exists in a state of constant logistical operation, but also that this is a logistical phenomenon that is caught in an endless loop of possible actions that lead us deeper into a crisis.

We are not just trying to make some fancy theoretical point about the state being a logistical operation, rather what we want to emphasize here is not only that the state is a logistical phenomenon, but also that this is a logistical phenomenon that is caught in an endless loop of possible actions that lead us deeper into a crisis.
how many hours have been devoted to talking about “what victory looks like”, is an impossibility. To claim victory implies that at some moment all action has ceased, that there is a static situation in place that can be termed victorious. But just as for the police, victory is impossible. Rather than thinking of victory we need to be thinking of movement, of speed, of the multiplication of possibilities. In other words, the logistical organization of the police is not an object to be defeated, rather it is an operation, that in the very constancy of crisis, can be disorganized and rendered increasingly inoperable. Defeat would mean the end of all options, the complete total end of action itself. But as we have mentioned at length, the very operation of the police generates possibilities in its attempt to eliminate possibility; it creates contingency in the constant security operation meant to define situations.

What this means is that there is never a tactical dead end, there are always other options, other possibilities, to the degree that we stop seeing the police as an institution that can control single actions, to the degree that we stop seeing our actions as singular actions, and begin to think of this conflict as a fluid tactical medium. The real fallacy of the dual approaches of Plan B and being “pro-revolutionary” are not even so much that they entrench defeat, although this is the case, but rather that they operate within the categories of victory and defeat but in different ways. Plan B -based tactical thinking entrenches the idea that we are already defeated in our attempts to be “victorious” over police and then comes around to say that our defeat can be mitigated by opening up other planes of conflict, only to the degree that the police are absent. The approach of being “pro-revolutionary” takes this a step further taking our “defeat” to be total, saying the the “historical conditions are not correct” (what Hegelian bullshit!), and then moves into discouraging action at all, literally constructing “defeat” by failing to recognize that in the do, this is the material attempt of the construction of the state in a moment, at once define existence in the theoretical-legal while at the same time encompass and define innumerable constantly shifting particular manifestations of the attempt to logistically operate this definition materially. To the degree that this logistics operates it is always in constant crisis, it is always reinscribing itself but only as a certain static “coherence”, as infinite particular mutations of this definition in its particular manifestations, or supposed manifestations.

But what does this all mean? Above and beyond everything we want to reject this “high theory” abstractness that has come to pervade ad destroy insurrectionist discourse. So we are not just putting all to many words on paper here. What this all points to is a certain impossibility of both the state that manifests in the constant crisis of its logistical operations. When we are looking at policing, at the attempt to make the state material, we are looking at a logistics in constant crisis, a logistics that is dealing with a dual impossibility.

On the one hand the impossibility is very material and numerical. There is no possibility of total policing spatially and mathematically. If we are to assume the totality of policing then the very differentiation of “police” would be an impossibility, the state would always already be an actual material immanence, and our existences would collapse into irrelevancy; to the degree that the police manifest through a separation, between itself and “non-police”, this totality remains always already impossible. So, if we take the many thousands of cops that they brought out in Pittsburgh for the G20, or the 50,000 that they are mobilizing for the G20 in Seoul, South Korea and stick them side by side they cover very little space. If we add all the fancy toys and vehicles that they use, they cover a little
And that is what is really at the heart of the impossibility of policing. The task itself, to end all motion, to cease all particularity, is in itself a task that requires the ability to transcend moments while always expressing itself in particular moments. It is this impossibility that leads to the material impossibilities of policing, the mathematical gaps that always must persist combined with the paradoxical attempt to use action to cease action, that really makes politics possible. This is the spirit behind the quote at the beginning of the pamphlet, that “All politics is against the police.” If politics itself is a conflict, a collision between innumerable desires and the possibilities of action, then the very operation of the logistics of policing stands to operate only cryogenically, in the impossible attempt to cease this motion while at the same time amplifying it through its very operation. The impossibility of pure policing is the very impossibility of the philosophical becoming material, of moments becoming defined. It is not that the attempt is not made to realize the “promises of philosophy,” it is that the very attempt implies a fascist attempt to define life itself. This attempt of the philosophical to materialize found expression in the Terror and the gulag, one organized around concepts of virtue and one around concepts of the definition of the revolutionary; this is the mistake of radical movements that is must always be avoided but always exists on the horizon. We see this ambition in all the great tyrants, from Robespierre to Lenin, from your local police captain to the president, the goal is always the same, to fulfill the intentions of man and the destiny of man, to realize the promises of philosophy.

Victory is an impossibility. The very category of victory, and more space but not much more. And these mobilizations exist at a much higher concentration than in normal days when summits are not in town. If we space that out across a major city their coverage begins to look rather weak. This all means that the police need to operate through a certain projection. They need to project themselves across space in order to amplify the effectiveness of these numbers through communications and vehicular transportation. In other words, the police are a logistical operation in constant movement, in constant motion, and they rely on the ability to move through space in order to attempt a construction of operational coherence.

Machiavelli made it very clear in his manifestos that the streets were a dangerous place, movement and shift of police was the movement of capital in different ways. The police, and the methods of surveillance and control, must not be seen as an isolated operation in a particular moment that is removed from the context of conflict and resistance. This expression, in his political philosophy, of the police need to be understood in the context of not an instrument but a logistical operation in constant motion that is always in movement, and the impression that we are being watched. When we look at it, we begin to see the police as an instrument in “police neighborhoods”, with the flashing lights on top, in order to destroy our ability to trust our space and those around us. They stick cameras up at intersections and in “troubled neighborhoods”, with the flashing lights on top, in order to displace our ability to trust our space, our expectations and intimations. The power is amplified through the use of señales, whose unexpected and impromptu...

Through space in order to amplify a construction of operational coherence.

What we need to realize is that, because the police exist as a logistical organization, their basic attempt is not to catch “perpetrators” but to prevent the very possibility of existence being able to have possibility to begin with. If they were relying on force and physical
Policing must be one that always is in motion and thus an operation that is always causing a crisis in its own mobilization.

But let us be clear, as clear as something like mobility can possibly be on paper, what we are dealing with here is not just the impossibility of police in a vacuum. Rather we are dealing with the very impossibility of the state which attempts to materialize through the logistical organization of the police. The state exists as a total freezing and definition of situations. The modern nation state, but this goes for all formations of the state itself, can only exist conceptually as a definition of space and/or existence necessarily. For example, the concept of the United States does not exist without the definition of territory, and the divisions of territory and "powers", but on the other hand it also exists through the very definition of existence, by defining what it means to be a citizen, an American. We saw this play out in the ridiculous dichotomy of American's versus "terrorists", or Americans versus a completely ubiquitous definition of the term "terrorist" which came to mean in essence "that which is not American". We also see this playing out in the debates around immigration. But what is at the heart of both dichotomies is not policy and enforcement, rather it is the very definition that the state relies on, the definition of existence through conceptual categorization. In other words, all circumstances, all moments, must be posited as the same, as framed through this conceptual system, one that comes to define itself. But this conceptual structure, with all the case law and legislation, is nothing without actualization, an actualization that is impossible at the very moment it attempts to express itself in any particular moment. The police are not an institution in a vacuum, rather they are the vain attempt to actualize the eternal in the momentary; to make the solidity of the conceptual operate.

Presence in itself control would be lost quickly; rather the attempt is to project themselves through space to operate a certain, conceptual, tactical terrain materially as space. What this means however is that, regardless of the fear that cops strike into the hearts of many (particularly in working class neighborhoods), there are always gaps, there is always crisis.

This is the element of Plan B that we do find interesting. In Plan B based tactical thought the point of departure is the gap in coverage itself, the disregard for the more psychological elements of policing in favor of understanding the very impossibility of total coverage. Where it fails is it takes this and systematizes it into a conclusive approach; a rejection of certain possibilities in favor of others, particularly others that we feel is a cop out (no pun intended). But the reality of these gaps is not just a recognition of the impossibility of policing itself but rather the very possibility of the amplification of crisis itself, of politics itself. We are able to fight back to the degree that the logistical operation of policing fails in coverage. And it is these gaps that are amplified to the point of giving time and space for the property destruction actions that anarchists tend to hold in such high esteem. Again, what we need to see is not the end result (the smashed window, the broken ATM, the burning barricade) but how these are the end result of a tactical gap that has opened and as something that makes this gap widen, that makes this crisis amplify.

The second impossibility of policing is all the more glaring in light of the first. It is not that we can just look at the problems with this logistical operation numerically. The police have developed all sorts of ways to amplify their projection through "preparing the ground", so-to-speak. So much time and resources are spent by police departments every
to chain them to other moments to construct some form of coherent and constant discourse of moments that must attempt to function materially. It is not in the theoretical that the issue arises; all theory must take on this transcendent mode. Rather it is in the attempt to cross this gap from the theoretical to the material, from the sense to some impossibility of planning applied. In order for policing to actualize function as some.

year on DARE programs, Neighborhood Watch, and auxiliary programs all to amplify this projection; and this does not even mention the more sublime weapons, the tear gas, helicopters and now sound weapons that are meant to be projections of force over vast areas in the literal sense rather than just possibly and metaphorically.

The second impossibility of policing, rather than being about projection outwards is rather a paradox internally. Namely, the very attempt to operate a conceptual terrain of conflict is operated through an organization of conflict. Again, policing can never be total. The very concept of policing requires there to be something to police. We find this same issue with the state itself; while it needs to claim and organize its application over time and space at its horizon it must always recognize what it is not, the anarchic. Even though the police need to philosophically maintain the projection of the state itself, a projection that must operate in all time and space, it always recognize that there is something to police.

So if things occur, if moments occur, then the tactical medium in which action is carried out is a constantly shifting phenomenon. Yet in order for the police to function in any coherence the attempt of this functioning is to “unify”, operate and define these moments.

One is a constant shifting phenomenon. Yet in order for the police to function in any coherence the attempt of this functioning is to “unify”, operate and define these moments.