

**Elżbieta Posłuszna**

Lotnicza Akademia Wojskowa (Poland)

ORCID: 0000-0001-8652-5729

e-mail: [e.posluszna@law.mil.pl](mailto:e.posluszna@law.mil.pl)

## Insurrectionist Anarchism and Liberational Violence: New Ideas and Trends

**Abstract:** The paper characterises contemporary fighting anarchism from the ideological, tactical, and organisational perspectives. An analysis is carried out that examines the activities of the groups revoking insurrectionism, which today entails three ideological trends, namely social, individualistic (illegalism), and ecological. In the author's intention, the characteristics should serve practical goals, i.e., forming a prognosis regarding the phenomenon's future and drawing possible ways to counteract its proliferation in a further perspective. Contemporary anarchism, due to its intellectual allure (liberationist individualism), broadening the scope of its goals (with the liberation of non-human beings), adopting loose organisational forms, as well as employing the leaderless resistance strategy and swarming, is a phenomenon that has significant development potential. The development of anarchism, due to ongoing socio-political processes (the collapse of the existing mechanisms of social control and political representation, globalisation, informatisation) and the widely spreading ideology of individualism will lead to, as it seems, progressive radicalism, both in ideology and used methods.

**Keywords:** *anarchism, insurrectionist anarchism, Conspiracy of Cells of Fire, leaderless resistance, liberational violence*

### Introduction – The Essence of Anarchism

Anarchism has never been a coherent doctrine. It has always covered various, often even contradictory conceptions of anarchism, including its individualistic, collectivist, pacifist, insurrectionist, communist, syndicalist, or feminist renditions. The number of these interpretations is continuously on the rise. Moreover, some of them constituted a very particular symbiosis with ideologies that they had nothing in common before, e.g., environmentalism, animal rights movements, or alter-globalism. Such a state of affairs makes research-

ing anarchism, both as a doctrine, and a social phenomenon, a challenging, although not impossible, task.

The essence of anarchism<sup>1</sup> can be brought down to two fundamental ideas<sup>2</sup>: the negation of authorities usually embodied in the state's superior authority (Kropotkin, 1910, p. 914) and the affirmation of the individual's freedom<sup>3</sup>. Indeed, these ideas are easy to find in the earlier manifestations of anarchism and its current variations.

The authority anarchists fight against is of a vertical and asymmetric nature. In human relations, it translates into a division into the ones who govern, who enjoy privileges and the capacity to impose their will, and the governed – the ones who do not possess that characteristic. In the political dimension, authority is a system of social relations that consists of the possibility of using institutional coercion to make one of the parties (usually the one subjected to continuous degradation) perform a particular behaviour. Political authority entails certain long-lasting functions, i.e., integrational (that ensures unity in the given area and blocks off decentralist tendencies), distributive (which is related to the way the desired social goods are distributed), protective (which can be brought down to providing security), and structure-forming (which is related to social groups' access to power). Anarchists negate the sense of the existence of political authority in relation to these functions. They counter the integrational function with the principle of self-governing of local communities; the distributive function - with the principle of common decision-making regarding the disposal of resources; the protective function they treat as the only way to secure the realisation of the interests of a tiny elite; and the structure-forming function is by definition unjust because it is a means to cement the division into the governing and the governed (Malendowicz, 2013, p. 45).

In anarchism, freedom is absolute. It is linked to the individual experience of liberties and the sense of control over one's life. Such freedom cannot be taken for granted. Freedom can be secured (and according to illegalist anarchism, it can be simply experienced) by rejecting all enslavement structures. Of course, the strongest of those structures has been the state (authority). However, at a higher and more abstractive level, that rejection should refer to all structures that uniform the human being and limit the individual's freedom (the abstractive idea of the human being, religion, lifestyle and social frameworks). Freedom

---

<sup>1</sup> Even though anarchism is not a coherent, whole doctrine with a precisely defined conceptual extent, it is entirely possible to isolate within it a set of characteristics which give it a core meaning. In addition, those characteristics give researchers an overarching concept of anarchism, with which to define multiple, often quite varied positions.

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that the literature on the subject often mentions two additional ideas that would characterise anarchism, i.e., social justice and equality. However, it should be emphasised that these ideas are not to be found in all "anarchisms". For example, illegality does not refer to them, and in ecological anarchism, the idea of equality has been extended to all natural beings.

<sup>3</sup> The current understanding of the notion "individual" goes beyond the narrow anthropocentric perspective and includes some animals.

can be realised „among other people”, but it does not have to be. Freedom outside of society is not worse. Everybody simply realises their freedom that they understand in their own, individual way. What happens if it does not happen this way? This question generates an intellectual and emotional tension and introduces a very important for every anarchist problem, which can be easiest expressed in the form of the following question: Whether a conscious individual can find themselves in collective life and not lose, at the same time, their exceptionality and liberty?

There were many answers to this question. However, it has to be admitted that many anarchists responded to it affirmatively. For example, Kropotkin believed that the freedom and exceptionality of one’s own „I” could agree with many forms of collectively. People should enter relations with other people (momentary and permanent). However, under the condition that their relations were voluntary and egalitarian, and as such, they would be beneficial to the individual and the collective community. Also, Max Stirner does not negate the possibility of a harmonious relationship between the individual and society. Contrary to Kropotkin, however, he strongly emphasises the priority of individual freedom. Human beings should realise their own unmediated desires; they should negate everything that smothers, humiliates, and reifies them. The negation, Stirner believes, should occur even if these desires conflict with the desires of others. The key here is the desire of the particular individual, which can be anti-collectivist. In such a way, Stirner goes beyond thinking about society as an object of obligation and thus rejects a principle important to many anarchists that the limit to freedom of one human being is freedom of others. The mentioned thinkers (but also many others who indirectly ideologically supported anarchism) contributed to creating two antinomic and, to a certain extent, autonomous traditions in anarchism – the collective anarchism, which states that existing within the society completes individual freedom, and the individualistic anarchism, according to which, existing as part of society constitutes a possibility that can be but does not have to be realised. At the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, within the individualistic tradition, a belief emerged that a conscious individual must be, by definition, in conflict with society as a whole (conceived as a passive and thoughtless mass of conformists).

## **The Attitude Toward Violence**

As a particular political doctrine, anarchism should not be reduced merely to a theoretical dimension. Anarchism emphasises the necessity of carrying out social change – eliminating old, rotten political structures based on violence and building in their place something, from the perspective of a given kind of anarchism, “more perfect” (that enables creating “real” freedom). However, to do that, one has to prioritise actions over words and reject the mediation of political parties that are a part of, according to anarchists, the negating freedom system and galvanise masses, which are unable by themselves to become political. The problem was, of course, how to do it.

Some anarchists supported indirect violence in the form of sabotage. Another group consisted of people who wanted to realise anarchist ideas (usually achieved through evolutionary progress) by carrying out peaceful actions (such as marches, hunger strikes, strikes, protests, and passive resistance). Others believed that the realisation of freedom has to emerge through direct violence, i.e., by attacking people. The differences serve as the basis for distinguishing three main types of anarchism: anarcho-pacifism (Leo Tolstoy), sabotage anarchism (Mikhail Bakunin), and violence anarchism (Errico Malatesta).

Most organisations accepting the use of violence usually do not treat them as a goal in itself but as a tactic that could be abolished under the circumstances favourable for anarchism. Violence was mainly used to efficiently undermine the existing power structures and provoke a global revolution. The latter goal brings closer the organisations that supported it to apocalyptic millennialist groups, like Aum Shinrikyo, which aimed at provoking or prompting an apocalypse that would close up a certain historical phase. In the current anarchist movement, a positive perception of violence can be found in insurrectionist and ecological anarchisms (it is rejected by anarch-sindicalism<sup>4</sup>).

Insurrectionist anarchism does not possess a precise vision of the future. According to anarchists, the future social being will arise only after the state or other state-like structures are overthrown. Insurrectionism consists of three ideological movements: social, individualistic (illegalism), and ecological.

A social movement representing, i.a., the Revolutionary Struggle organisation, wants to trigger a revolution, which would galvanise the majority of the society and abolish the ruling class that protects the state order and would also destroy the very idea of hierarchical order. Today, social anarchists do not aim only at destroying the capitalist system but at something much more important, namely at the definitive elimination from all areas of social life the profit as a motive for action. The result of the revolution should be the emergence of based on the ideas of equality and social justice social self-governance systems. According to one of the theoreticians of insurrectionism – Alfredo Bonanno, the changes within capitalism, which move towards the network of international production, the fall of national states, and related disintegration of the preceding mechanisms of social control and political representation, the society's turning away from ideology transform the current world. New and post-industrial capitalism produces castrated, domesticated individuals for whom the fight and dreams are something entirely foreign – „anything (e.g., ideology, fear) [that] can exist – it is all part of capital's project” (Bonanno, 2000, p. 26). A total fall of the working class has occurred. In practice, it means that this class has lost its identity. That is why the traditional anarchist propaganda loses its *raison d'être*. There is a need for firm action and no place for doubts about whether to use revolutionary violence because it is the only way that will enable solving social problems. Mass struggle is the ideal. However, in Bonanno's

---

<sup>4</sup> Anarcho-sindicalism sees the foundation of the future social system in trade unions and general strike as the main fighting weapon.

opinion, at the current stage, it is truly difficult. It is why the anarchists today should fight for a new postapocalyptic society individually or in small groups. The latter should be built based on kinship (cells united by the community of thoughts and emotions) and act in every situation that manifests a division between the privileged and degraded groups. The activity of the kinship groups should consist in „kindling revolutionary fires”, which in real life boils down to attacking infrastructure that mirrors the contemporary society’s production capabilities and facilities (Malendowicz, 2013, p. 262). The ultimate target of the attacks (plundering shops, arson of police stations and embassies) is to carry the idea from small informal groups overall degraded people (Bonanno, 2000, p. 24).

Bonanno’s views became very popular in southern Europe, especially Italy and Greece. In the 1980s, in Sardinia, an insurrectionist group *Rivolta e Liberta* was established. At the beginning of the 1990s, a Sardinian anarchist journal “Anarkiviu” published the “For an Anti-authoritarian Insurrectionist International” proclamation, where the main goals of the insurrectionist movement were presented (Bonanno, 2010). Soon after, the first attacks took place. In April 1997, the Revolutionary Anarchist Action carried out a bomb attack at Palazzo Marino in Milano. Around 2000, a new anarchist entity emerged called Informal Anarchist Federation (*Federazione Anarchica Informale* – FAI). FAI is a horizontally organised structure of several anarchist-terrorist groups that share the belief in the revolutionary armed struggle, which led them to conduct a campaign of bomb attacks. In 2010, the Federation sent a letter with threats with an enclosed bullet to Silvio Berlusconi. In December of that year, two explosive packages were sent to the Swiss and Chilean embassies in Rome. In an extremely rapid way, insurrectionist anarchism of the social type erupted in Greece. The most important organisation that could be classified as social orientated was the Revolutionary Struggle (*Epanastatikos Agonas*). On December 22, 2005, the group published a manifesto in which it attacked the European Union’s politics that, in their opinion, aimed at reducing public spending and lowering production costs (Revolutionary Struggle, 2009). The group quickly began to act. In May 2006, the organisation tried to murder a former public order Minister, Gregorios Voulgarakis. In January 2007, they carried out a grenade attack at the USA embassy in Athens. In December 2008, the group opened fire on a police car (triggered by youth riots after the police shot down Andreas Grigoropoulos). In January 2007, they shot a police officer guarding the Ministry of Culture. On October 19, 2009, Revolutionary Struggle planted a powerful explosive device containing 60 kilogrammes of ammonium nitrate at Citibank headquarters. The bomb was detonated by the police. On March 28, 2018, a cell of the Informal Anarchist Federation and International Revolutionary Front called Circle of Asymmetric Metropolitan Warfare took responsibility for a bomb attack (on March 24, 2018) at the Evelpidon Courts in Athens.

The individualist trend is exceptional in a broader anarchist movement because it dissociates itself from the simple Marxist division between oppressed minority and oppressing majority. Its ideology is antisocial. According to anarch-individualists, society is partially responsible for the existence of the unjust and enslaving system. It is a reason why it is

not an ally but a foe in the fight against the system it conformistically built. Individualist anarchism, which the most famous propagator is Conspiracy of Fire Nuclei, sometimes also called in English Conspiracy of Cells of Fire (CCF) (*Synomosía ton Pyrínon tis Fotiás* or SPF), solidarises not with the ones who suffer but with those who dare to defy their suffering by engaging in the fight. Entering the path of insurrection is not, in their case, a means to obtain post-revolutionary wellbeing but a goal in itself. The fight is an individualist satisfaction, a way to attain full humanity, and as such, it can be reached only by an aware and equipped with revolutionary consciousness minority (Conspiracy of Cells of Fire, 2011; Conspiracy of Cells of Fire and Mavropoulos, 2012). Therefore, the members of Conspiracy of Fire Nuclei talk in their communications with disdain about class struggle or attempts to create a social utopia. Revolutionary ferment ought not to serve the interests of whatever class but to break down established patterns of behaviour and morality (Kiesling, 2010). Violence should be used for that purpose and in revenge against all manifestations of the ossified system.

Conspiracy of Fire Nuclei started carrying out that plan on January 21, 2008, with a series of setting fire to banks, car dealerships, and the „Public Authority Enterprise” in Athens and Thessaloniki. The perpetrators declared that the reason behind the attacks was to show solidarity with Vangelis Voutsatzis, an anarchist arrested in November 2007. In May 2009, the group partially destroyed two police stations under construction by planting homemade explosives, which they used for the first time. In June of that year, they planted a small time bomb (homemade – it was a pressure cooker with gunpowder sealed in it) at the house stairs of Panagiotis Chinofotis, a former Minister of Internal Affairs. In September, a similar bomb destroyed the flat door of Louka Katseli, a candidate of the PASOK party. On October 10, Conspiracy of Fire Nuclei expressed their objections regarding the educational system by damaging the entrance to an unguarded residence building of the former Education Minister, Marietta Giannakou. On December 27, 2009, the group struck again. They used a much larger bomb that destroyed the entrance to the building of Ethniki Asfalistiki insurance agency that belongs to the National Bank of Greece. In the issued proclamation, the group responsible for the attack signed themselves as Militant Terrorist Group/SPF. In February 2011, the Nuclei, in cooperation with the Consciousness Gangs “honouring our old and timeless friendship, blew up the private car of the female director of Koridallos men’s prisons, Maria Stefi, as a display of genuine solidarity with our ten imprisoned brothers and sister” (325, 2013). In March 2017, the activists sent a parcel bomb to the International Monetary Fund European Office in Paris. One person was slightly injured as the result of the attack.

Ecological anarchism is a separate phenomenon to social and individualist anarchisms, which focus entirely on the human being. It is mainly represented by ecological organisations: the environmental Earth Liberation Front (ELF) and pro-animal rights Animal Liberation Front (ALF). Their activities have been only recently classified as anarchism. Earlier, they were considered mainly in the context of ecological extremism (ecoterrorism) (Połuszna, 2012). It is a fact that nowadays, radical members of the ecological movement no longer fight just for the welfare of non-anthropocentric beings, such as animals, plants, and inanimate

entities like mountains, rivers or glaciers. The spectrum of their goals has significantly expanded. Today, their attacks target only the direct “exploiters” of nature but also the very capitalist system, which is perceived by them similarly as the “classic anarchists” see it, i.e., as a foundation of the enslavement of all oppressed minorities. Therefore, not only the system should be attacked but also everything that the system supports (civilisation). It is difficult to say how this rejection of capitalism should look in practice and whether the goal here is some deep spiritual and moral transformation of the whole society or to remove profit from the area of acceptable social practices. Two proponents of this abolition, Craig Rosebraugh and Leslie James Pickering (both were ELF spokespeople in 1997–2001), are quite restrained in explaining the issue. Other leading ELF activists also have not provided any details that could shed any light in this regard. It should be noted that although this group condemns the pursuit of profit because they see it as a factor leading to the destruction of the environment, they build the efficiency of their sabotage actions exactly on it: “Using real direct action in the form of economic sabotage, the ELF is targeting what the greedy entities care about, their pocketbooks. By inflicting as much economic damage as possible, the ELF can allow a given entity to decide it is in their best economic interests to stop destroying life for the sake of profit” (Pickering, 2007, p. 48). In April 2003, Craig Rosebraugh and Leslie James Pickering formed the Arissa organisation, which aimed at creating intellectual conditions allowing for future overthrowing capitalism, as well as its largest advocate – the government of the United States (accused by ELF activists of imperialism and global terrorism) (Rosebraugh, 2006). The attitude towards violence among ecological anarchists is not unequivocally supportive. Some activists refrain from using it, especially when environmental action takes the form of direct violence targeting people. Still, some are willing to accept it.

## **Structure and Tactics**

The basic units in the anarchist movement are the so-called affinity groups – small collectives, numbering from 5 to 20 people, which gather only to carry out a specific task. Sometimes, when it is necessary to organise a larger action, anarchists create larger units – the so-called clusters (Borum & Tilby, 2005, p. 207). A cluster is a grouping of anarchist affinity groups that come together to work on a certain task or action (a cluster might be responsible for blockading an area, organising one day of a multi-day action or a mass street performance theatre).

Anarchist affinity groups and clusters often enter into more or fewer contingent relationships with other individuals. These relations may be based on close ideological commonality (in which case they are relatively permanent). They can also be „tactical” – when an immediate goal links them, and relations loosen or even dissolve when this goal disappears. The „essence” of this type of relationship is illustrated by a man who has little to do with anarchism, namely Louis Beam: „The New American Patriot will be neither left nor right, just a freeman fighting for liberty. New alliances will form between those who have in the past

thought of themselves as „right-wingers”, conservatives, and patriots with many people who have thought of themselves as „left-wingers”, progressives, or just „liberal” (Beam, 2003). So far, there is no reliable evidence of closer cooperation between anarchists and representatives of extreme ideologies. Less extreme alliances link anarchist, pro-environmental, animalist, pacifist, or anti-war groups.

Affinity groups, clusters, and larger cooperatives do not have any specific form of leadership, usually a unifying element that binds together organisational structures and gives them durability; they operate according to the “leaderless resistance” model. Leaderless resistance is a strategy but also, at the same time, a certain model of organisational functioning. It assumes the abandonment of all hierarchical organisational structures, which are replaced by a loose configuration of small, autonomous cells, units, or small groups, which are not managed by any decision centre. The essence of leaderless resistance is well expressed in the following ALF’s declaration: “The Animal Liberation Front consists of small autonomous groups of people all over the world who carry out direct action according to the ALF guidelines. Any group of people who are vegetarians or vegans and who carry out actions according to ALF guidelines have the right to regard themselves as part of the ALF” (Pallotta, 2005, p. 31).

The actions carried out by anarchist groups are usually pulsating attacks organised by affiliated groups or individuals. This tactic is nothing new. Examples of its use can easily be found in history (Arquilla & Ronfeld, 2000). It was deployed by both regular army troops and small units. However, the 21<sup>st</sup> century has brought forth, due to the rapid development of new communication technologies, the possibility of employing small combat units as an important element of the strategy, both for centrally organised forces and non-affiliated groups or social movements. Military analysts call such pulsing attacks “swarming”, which can generally be defined as “seemingly amorphous”, but essentially structured and, to a certain extent, coordinated way of pulsing from many directions attacks on a specific point or points (Ronfeld & Arquilla, 2001). Anarchists began to use the technique of pulsating actions on a larger scale as part of activities referred to as the “black block”. It is one of the forms of anti-globalisation activity that consists in creating loose combat formations out of people dressed in black. Already during the protest in Seattle in 1999, these formations used the so-called “roving traffic blockades”. They consisted of stopping traffic at road intersections and attracting the police’s attention. However, before the police arrived, the blockade was “dissolved” and formed in another area.

## **Summary – Risk Assessment**

Although the activity of militant anarchists does not seem to generate a threat comparable to that of Islamic fundamentalists, this phenomenon should not be ignored, and there are many reasons why. One of them is the intellectual and emotional appeal of anarchism, which is based on its ability to explain social reality (sometimes with the use of the category of



class struggle, and sometimes with the simple category of exclusion) and provide specific ways to contest it. It should be noted that social reality (which anarchists want to intellectually utilise) is no longer “tamed” (i.e., opened to be grasped using tradition recognised by traditional mental categories). Globalisation and “informationisation” created by networks of wealth and power have completely changed our world. The abstraction of power in a network society has caused the collapse of existing mechanisms of social control and political representation, which has resulted in a widespread sense of the lack of control over one’s life, work, economies, government, and the natural environment. Today, the nation-state (formerly the source of value and meaning) bypassed by global networks of wealth and power is slowly losing the ability to represent its territorially rooted communities and has become an “empty shell”, less and less able to be a reference point. The world is becoming foreign to most people because power sources seem out of reach. Of course, globalisation and “informationisation” generate exclusion. The excluded (individuals, classes, or nations) form the “fourth world” that is composed of “black holes in informational capitalism” (Castells, 1998, pp. 166-170) – the areas inhabited by those who do not matter much (due to their negligible contribution to consumption, work, social life) from the perspective of those who participate in the network of the great, global capital flows. In this way, globalisation creates a new, less-brave new world of poverty and exclusion. Anarchism points the way out of ideological and social chaos by employing simple and intellectually easy-to-understand ideas (social justice, equality, and a non-hierarchical vision of society). Of course, at this point, a question may arise, whether ideological simplicity, in combination with the complexity of the world, should not generate doubts rather than affirmation? A positive answer to this question, although the most logical, does not take into account the potential of social indignation, which in the situation of political and economic depreciation (which undoubtedly arises in the globalised world) usually turns into the readiness to reach for simple solutions to complex social problems.

But anarchism (especially its insurrectionist manifestation) is a significant and potentially socially dangerous phenomenon for another reason. Emotionally, anarchism is part of a very attractive libertarian ideology, which by its very nature tends to exceed the existing (perceived as conservative) patterns (i.e., hierarchy, morality, state, family). Although the desire for freedom is not universal, especially in relation to other competing desires (such as the desire for prosperity or security), it does have a strong activating power, which in the case of people facing depreciation (their own or someone else’s) can result in a strong will to act – the will, which is capable of exceeding socially acceptable patterns of activity. It seems that nowadays, the awareness of such depreciation (due to the claim to equality and progressing individualism, which leads to belief in the individual’s right to self-determination) is much higher than it was in the past. In the past, the traditionally sanctioned collectivist models were the factors that inhibited the individual desire for freedom. It is very plausible that such will is going to strongly manifest itself within individualist anarchism, for which rebellion is an end in itself and where all collectivist patterns are exceeded (contempt for

stupid masses who no longer need to be liberated or cared for); the patterns that sometimes restrained too violent expression of the mentioned desire for freedom.

Insurrectionist anarchism may also become a dangerous phenomenon for another reason. It has to be noted that during the last twenty years, it has broadened the scope of its objectives. The insurrectionists' ideological goal is no longer just a struggle to free the human being from the shackles of the depreciating system. However, it has expanded to include the fight for the liberation of all natural beings: human and non-human, where the latter refers to both the living (animals and plants) and the inanimate beings (mountain ranges, rivers or glaciers). Such widening the scope of goals does not mean they were "created" based on traditional anthropocentric anarchism. These goals had existed before but were represented by groups that, as we know, did not set themselves (at least openly) social goals. The common objectives have led to the consolidation, under the banners of freedom, of the existing movements and groups, which previously represented different, although admittedly, ideologically similar goals. Of course, for such consolidation to occur, there had to be an "adjustment" of the anthropocentrically orientated social perspective to the ecological perspective, which often negates the former. At first glance, this consolidation does not change much – just slightly ideologically different groups have now started describing themselves as anarchists. However, at the psychological and ideological level, the change seems significant. In a movement that has united under one banner many autonomous and ideologically different groups, there must now be a sense of power, which usually translates into a significant increase in courage. The unification in the insurrectionist movement concerns only ecological and social activists. Individualists do not want such a union and even ideologically dissociate from it. In their case, the action driving forces are extreme individuality and contempt for all collective goals and values. It should be noted that in the case of individualist anarchism, there are no positive demands that could be the subject of negotiations or compromises. Usually, when this happens, it is more about offensive abreaction of frustration, difficult to argue or combat with persuasion methods. This kind of anarchism seems to be the most erratic and destructive, although its range is limited due to the number of potential supporters.

But the threat generated by insurrectionists should also be conceived through their activity's formal and strategic nature. They have adopted loose organisational forms, and even a leaderless resistance model, i.e., such a form where ideology becomes the only unifying element. Leaderless resistance has a significant advantage over other organisational forms of functioning. Classic hierarchical organisations are much more vulnerable to various forms of police surveillance. An effective agent, if they penetrate a specific level of such an organisation, will easily destroy all levels below and pose a serious threat to the levels above. The danger of infiltration is much smaller in the case of "organisations", where individuals or small groups do not have an organisational centre and operate without any structural connection. In this way, "organisations" following the leaderless resistance model are practically "undetected". It is impossible to control "fighting ideas", which play a key

role in managing the extremist activity of the networks operating under the leaderless resistance model, and it is impossible to destroy leaderless resistance if there are no formal ties between the groups.

Moreover, abandoning formal organisational structures in favour of leaderless resistance has other advantages. One of them is the possibility of dissociating oneself from the actions that turned out to be unpopular or, for whatever reason, undesirable under the pretext that they do not meet the ideological criteria (e.g., the requirement of non-violent action that anarchist-ecological organisations take pride in). Leaderless resistance also allows recognising the actions that fit into the adopted pattern of direct actions as one's "own work" (although they could have been carried out for quite different reasons). Consequently, it is the type of action that determines whether an activity is included in the organisational activity. Of course, this amorphism, which can be an asset in certain situations, could also generate some dangers in others. The lack of central and structured authority indicates that these "organisations" have little control over the actions of potential activists who consider themselves members. If there are many such "schismatic members", there is a threat that it contributes to a permanent "organisational blur", or even the end of particular anarchist organisations, even if they are merely a label. It does not necessarily mean the end of the movement because it is not limited to leaders, hierarchy, or connections between the members; the movement is a spiritual community of individuals and groups who fight in the name of common ideals. And this is, undoubtedly, the most important thing in anarchism.

## References:

325. (2013). *Phoenix Project*. <https://325.nostate.net/2013/06/11/athens-responsibility-claim-for-explosive-attack-on-vehicle-of-the-koridallos-prisons-director-in-the-district-of-dafni-on-june-7th-2013-greece>
- Arquilla, J., & Ronfeld, D. (2000) *Swarming and the Future of Conflict*. Santa Monica: RAND National Defense Research Institute. <http://www.analytictech.com/mb021/swarming%20DB311.pdf>
- Beam L. (2003). *Battle in Seattle: American Face off the Police State*. <http://www.louisbeam.com/seattle.htm>
- Bonanno, A. M. (2000). *The Insurrectional Project*. Elephant Editions.
- Bonanno, A. M. (2010). *For an Anti-authoritarian Insurrectionist International: Proposal for a Debate*. <https://libcom.org/library/anti-authoritarian-insurrectionist-international>
- Borum, R., & Tilby, Ch. (2005). Anarchist Direct Actions: A Challenge for Law Enforcement. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, 28(3), 201–223.
- Castells, M. (1998). *End of Millennium*. Blackwell.
- Conspiracy of Cells of Fire, & Mavropoulos, T. (2012). "Breaking down the myths of prison" – Solidarity to Olga Economidou. <https://actforfree.nostate.net/?p=9359>
- Conspiracy of Cells of Fire. (2011). *The Sun Still Rises*. <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/fire-cells-conspiracy-the-sun-still-rises>
- Kiesling, J. B. (2010). *Who are the Conspiracy of Fire Cells?* <https://athens.indymedia.org/post/1129729>
- Kropotkin, P. (1910). Anarchism. In *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Cambridge University Press.

- Malendowicz, P. (2013). *Ruch anarchistyczny w Europie wobec przemian globalizacyjnych przełomu XX i XXI wieku*. Difin.
- Pallotta, N. R. (2005). *Becoming an Animal Rights Activist: An Exploration of Culture, Socialization, and Identity Transformation*. [PhD dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia]. [https://getd.libs.uga.edu/pdfs/pallotta\\_nicole\\_r\\_200505\\_phd.pdf](https://getd.libs.uga.edu/pdfs/pallotta_nicole_r_200505_phd.pdf)
- Pickering, L. J. (2007). *The Earth Liberation Front 1997–2002*. Arissa Media Group.
- Pośluszna, E. (2012). *Ekstremizm ekologiczny – źródła, przejawy, perspektywy*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Revolutionary Struggle. (2009). *Overview – Revolutionary Struggle*. <https://revolutionarystruggle.wordpress.com/2009/01/18/overview-revolutionary-struggle/>
- Ronfeld, D., & Arquilla, J. (2001). Networks, Netwars, and the Fight for the Future. *Robert Paterson's Radio Weblog*. <http://radio-weblogs.com/0107127/stories/2002/09/10/networksAndNetwar.html>
- Rosebraugh, C. (2006). Earth Liberation Front, Ecoterrorism and Lawlessness on the National Forest, testimony given before the House Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 12 February 2002. In D. R. Liddick (Ed.), *Ecoterrorism. Radical Environmental and Animal Liberation Movement*. Praeger.