

**CONTEXT
OF THE INCIDENT
AT
THE GRAZ
ANARCHIST
BOOKFAIR**

*** ***

Lukáš Borl

|| POCKET EDITION || JANUARY 2025

- pocketedition.noblogs.org
- pocketedition@riseup.net



From the 19th to 21st September, the *Anarchist Bookfair* took place in the Austrian town of Graz, which I actively attended since I was invited by the organisation's collective. During the bookfair an incident took place between me and another person. That day, it all started with a verbal conflict that subsequently escalated into a physical conflict. But to find the beginning of this conflict, it's necessary to look into the past and its contexts. However, the start of the conflict must be sought in the past and in contexts that may not have been obvious to the people at this event (or outside it). That's why I decided to write this text and to clarify this conflict's context, history, and broadness. I also want to challenge the idea that it is a kind of "frog and mouse war" in which someone unnecessarily confronts each other over insignificant quarrels. It is certainly not a purely personal dispute between two people or the result of toxic masculinity. As I show in this text, in that conflict, the future of the anarchist movement is decided, and whether it can survive and practically develop or turn into just another force integrated into capitalist society that helps preserve capitalism.

To explain the whole context, I can't limit myself to just a few sentences. I realise that it is a certain limit to my eff-

ort. I ask the readers for patience and respect that this text is so expansive.

I believe everyone genuinely interested in understanding this issue will pay attention to reading the whole text, even if it requires a lot of time and energy.

"I have the impression that the modern method of reading is guided by the idea that one does not have to exert too much effort - it should be simple, as brief as possible, and provide immediate pleasure. Of course, these are all illusions. Nothing truly worthwhile can be accomplished without effort, and even without some sacrifice and discipline."

- Erich Fromm

What is this person saying and supporting?

First, I will tell you part of a story where I describe my first experience with the person I confronted in Graz.

At *Fluff Fest* in Rokycany (hard-core music festival in west Bohemia) on the 30th of July 2022, the *Anarchist Federation* was organising a presentation called "*Anarchists and the war in Ukraine*"⁽¹⁾. This person was actively participating in the organisation of this presentation. I would briefly describe this talk as a mix of war propaganda and support for militarism wrapped in leftie terminology. Their effort was to ideologically justify why anarchists should participate in the war. A significant part was formed of demagogical statements and nonsensical accusations of their ideological opponents. The opponents weren't even given any chance to respond.

On the contrary, what was missing in this presentation? For example, critique of Ukrainian nationalism and consistent criticism of imperialist powers other than just Russia. Critique of the mythical opposition of dictatorship and democracy. Critique of Anti-fascism that, in the name of the fight against fascism/totalitarianism, fights for democratic forms of capitalism...

In short, the ability to analyse the whole context of the war

situation was missing.

And what did I witness at this presentation? The speakers were accusing their opponents (i.e., anti-militarists and war resisters) of "colonial thinking" because criticism of Ukrainian nationalism and criticism of the relationship between NATO and Ukraine is nothing more than just an expression of the feeling of cultural/ideological superiority. To criticise counter-revolutionary and reactionary forces is apparently not permissible because we don't live in the region where these are taking place. We must be silent. Or better, put our energy into their support. If you live outside of Ukraine, you have no right to your own opinion on the war in Ukraine. You have to accept everything that the Ukrainian population says. If you hold a different opinion, it's only *"residue of one's colonial past and post-colonial presence of the West"*. Even if you don't live in "the West" but in Central/Eastern Europe or the Balkans. But what if your opinions are in harmony with the anti-militarist positions of people who live in Ukraine (like, for example, the anarchist group Assembly plus thousands of other proletarians)? That doesn't matter. For those people, it's just the voice of a small group of deluded dogmatics.

"Who could be bothered to ask almost 45 million Ukrainians what they think?" they asked sarcastically when criticising internationalist revolutionaries. Maybe to streng-

then the myth that their pro-war stance is basically the result of listening to the voice of the whole of the Ukrainian population. But somehow, they "forgot" to mention that they are mostly listening to the voices of Ukrainian nationalists, bourgeoisie, politicians, and bureaucrats of the Ukrainian state and a few individuals in the so-called "Anti-authoritarian Unit". In reality, this unit is hiding behind a mask of anti-authoritarianism its collaboration with nationalists and war criminals, as it was very well pointed out in an article called *"Collaboration of pro-war anarchists with the far-right. Masks are off, or the fail of the "anti-authoritarian resistance" myth"* (2)

It's also evident that they are ignoring the voices of thousands of proletarians resisting the forced mobilisation or deserting. And some of them are asking us to organise an internationalist fight for the opening of Ukrainian borders that the Zelensky regime closed for all men on the first day of Putin's invasion. Why would they talk about this if they want to keep alive the myth that most Ukrainians voluntarily answer the call to serve their country and join the queues outside recruitment offices?

A more accurate description by Ukrainian group *Assembly*:

"It turns out that a critical mass of those tired of militaristic rampages has already been created in the country: for too

many people, it no longer makes a fundamental difference under which flag they are robbed. This dull, hopeless despair, on the one hand, paralyses the will to do any social activity; on the other hand, it can make people think about how to do it so that no one robs them at all. For this reason, we say that a revolutionary situation is approaching."

"Although there are certain restrictions regarding travelling out of Ukraine and some attempts for recruitment, the majority of men are joining the army voluntarily," preach the speakers. I think if they said this in the eyes of men who are hunted on the Ukrainian streets and sent to the frontline against their will, not many would hesitate and give these speakers at least a few slaps to wake them up from the dream they live in. Again I can refer to the article of the group *Assembly* from Kharkiv, which bears witness to thousands of men resisting forced mobilisation, their mothers, partners, and sisters organising protests against mobilisation, etc.⁽³⁾

Why would Zelensky close the border and tighten the mobilisation law if most men are joining the Army voluntarily? This is a logical question, but the speakers don't allow any listeners to ask it. They stick to the predetermined line: we speak; you listen, and most importantly, you be quiet. And definitely, don't count on us leaving any room for feedback when we finish talking.

"Ukraine is a sovereign state which was attacked by its much more powerful neighbouring state", claimed the speakers angrily, as if the biggest worry for anarchists should be the sovereignty of this or that state. "Moreover, one country is an aggressor—and a very ruthless one, while the other is a victim that defends itself," continued the speakers in defending one state over another.

By then, I wasn't yet in contact with Ilja, who had escaped from Ukraine to avoid forced mobilisation. Now I'm thinking about what he said:

"When I was getting beaten up in front of a passive crowd of people by a soldier in Ukrainian uniform for refusing to take call-up order papers, it became very clear to me that the Ukrainian Army isn't here to help me but that it represents an immediate danger to me. Only yesterday, you wanted me to be an entrepreneur, factory worker, or clerk who will bring you taxes, and now you want me to be a rifleman and guard of your territory."(4)

I also have words of the Assembly Collective from Kharkiv in my mind; they said:

"Just imagine that your neighbor (Russia) set fire to your house, you or someone from your family is inside,

and outside, someone who lives off your taxes, at gunpoint, forbids to get out and demands to burn down along with the house. Did you imagine? This is the relationship between the people and the state in Ukraine..."(5)

"Every day, I heard stories about how another Russian-speaking man in Lviv was forced violently to go to the front. But hardly anyone believed it because official media were talking about endless queues of volunteers," says Ilja.

Even some corporate media are sometimes willing to inform us of how aggressive the Ukrainian state can be.

"Since the beginning of the war, thousands of Ukrainians have already decided to flee. At the beginning of the war, the government prohibited men from crossing the border, so any such attempt is illegal. Nevertheless, Ukrainians are fleeing in all directions, often over the mountains. Some went to Poland and Hungary; others went to Slovakia. Or to Romania. In the latter case, they have to cross the Tisza River, which follows a substantial part of the Romanian-Ukrainian border. And which is now called the River of Death. Steep banks and a muddy riverbed littered with boulders turn the escape into a fight for life. At least 22 people have already paid with their lives for attempting to cross the

Tisza. Over six thousand men then reached Romania."(6)

Is the Ukrainian state really only a victim that defends itself? Isn't it also a bit (or a lot!) of aggressive power that is endangering the local population, and now it's misusing Putin's invasion as an excuse?

Perhaps just to add some weight to the claims that Russia is the only imperial aggressor in this war, the speakers insisted that "*there aren't any other NATO armies fighting in Ukraine.*" That the Ukrainian Army is entirely dependent on arms from NATO warehouses is perhaps just a tiny banality, right? The interests of Western powers in the continuation of war are also a banality. Are the conditions of NATO's military help in Ukraine yet another banality that is not worth mentioning? It wasn't worth mentioning to any of the speakers who in 2002 took part in the anarchist protests against NATO in Prague. This person likes to label me as 'dogmatic'. I'd call him an opportunist and a hypocrite in this matter. Why? He is capable of publishing articles(7) in an anarchist revue that promotes internationalist rejection of war, revolutionary defeatism, clear class analysis, and rejection of all nationalist tendencies... and then several years later, in a war situation, argues for completely contrary positions to those articles. One day, he is protesting against the politics of NATO; the next, he "supports with

criticism” NATO's politics. Now, you can judge for yourself if this is anything other than opportunism and hypocrisy.

People like him are always hiding behind the phrases like "pragmatism as an alternative to dogmatism" or "support with criticism" or even "tactical alliance" with our enemies. They never acknowledge that Putin's Russia isn't the only significant player that has an interest and part in the war in Ukraine.

"The danger of nuclear escalation is why NATO is doing everything it can to escalate while covering its tracks", aptly notes Bill Beech in the article "War on Anarchism".

After the long months of this protracted war, only a complete ignorant or demagogue with bad intentions can deny the role of the Western imperialist bloc, led by the USA and supported by NATO member states, played in this conflict. And yet these people continue to spread statements like:

"We have argued from the very beginning that the start of a full-scale war in Ukraine on February 24th 2022 is an imperialist aggression by the Russian state. That still applies."

In other words, they reduce the conflict to a black-and-white story: "Russian dictatorial empire as a sole aggressor

vs. non-aggressive democratic countries without imperial nature." And what does this mean for their praxis? They provide financial, material, and propaganda resources to the Ukrainian state and the Western imperial bloc, despite their vague statements and assurances that they are only supporting the people of Ukraine, not the state. Their reductionist logic won't let them understand that concepts like **"people - peoples self-determination - nation - national liberation - state - capitalism"** cannot be separated. They are an integral part of the capitalist complex. And anarchists must destroy all its parts.⁽⁸⁾ Without understanding the connection between these concepts, it is easy for them to argue that they can support a state army without supporting the state, fight for national liberation without strengthening the position of the ruling class of a particular region, provide resources for people's self-determination without helping the local bourgeoisie to dictate the conditions of proletarian misery. They don't see the contradiction because they can't see the connection. And as I will show you in the next part of this text, they deceitfully attack those who expose and highlight the problems of their contradictions.

In addition to reductionism, populism also plays a vital role for these people, as we can see, for example, in the opinion of *Autonomous Action*, which the *Anarchist Federation* willingly shares:

"There is a dominant view among Ukrainians that resistance is now needed, and this resistance is currently primarily associated with the AFU. The presence of anarchists in the ranks of the AFU is therefore useful in gaining the respect of the people." (9)

AFU is the official army structure of the Ukrainian state, and it is evident from the quote above that the main worry of these "anarchists" is how to please the crowd. Therefore, they will always support anything they think has a majority or dominant representation in society. Today, it is support for the national Army. What is it going to be tomorrow? Are they going to call for the support of parliamentary parties because most people see representative democracy as an effective way to positive change in their life conditions? Are they going to ask us next time to join the police forces because the dominant opinion in society is that the police are protecting us?

This type of populism is toxic. People who practice it can never accept revolutionary positions: they will always say that revolutionary struggle isn't realistic at this moment and it could cost us the favour of the masses. They will always be only a tail wiggling behind the masses – no matter how counter-revolutionary or reactionary views are expressed by this mass. Gaining the respect of the people, i.e., crowd-pleasing, is their primary programmatic means.

From the logic of this position, they will always reject any revolutionary impulses as counter-productive because consistent revolutionary struggle will always run into the disapproval of orderly citizens defending the status quo.

Let's think about what this populism, as quoted above, means in practise. The longer the war goes on, the more news of "anarchists" killed on the front. In other words, the insignificant handful of adventurers that is meaningless for the war is getting even smaller. What will be left of it when the war ends? Most of those warriors won't be alive, so who will benefit from the "getting the respect of the people"? What use is any respect to the dead proletarians? And how can dead proletarians use this respect to create an anarchist society? It will probably be primarily liberals from the middle class, all the while hiding in the safe zone, who will be celebrating the "martyrs" who have fallen for "our cause". So call me a dogmatic, arrogant, sectarian, or whatever you want. Still, I really don't see the reason for sacrificing our lives so that some academics in universities can keep alive the historical myth of the enormous importance of heroic "anti-authority fighters" in the national liberation struggle.

After all, the reductionism mentioned above and populism express well their stupid slogan: "*Empire will fall, solidarity will prevail*". According to them, there is only one Empire –

Russia – and if anyone dares to point out the grave mistake in their analysis, their reaction is always the same. Usually, they claim: *"You are Putinists because people who say these things only listen to the voices from Moscow."* These statements with that smell of "Russophobia" are false. They aim to defame the opposition through categorisation that does not correspond to reality. I nor any of my anti-militarist/internationalist friends have ever voiced any support for Putin and/or Putinism. We have always stood in opposition to the imperialism of the Russian state, and it must be emphasised that also in opposition to the imperial blocs that compete with Russia for the sphere of influence and redistribution of the "post-soviet territories". Yet we are criticised for alleged Putinism, which, in reality, we loathe as much as the politics of Zelensky's regime or the war politics of NATO, Israel, Hamas, Hezbollah, and so on.



To be clear, to claim that other imperial aggressors also have a significant position in this war is not to question the aggression of the Russian Empire, nor is it an expression of sympathy for it. It's just trying to understand the overall context. It is a view that considers the role of all significant actors/aggressors. What my opponents consider as an analysis is gravely un-analytical. It's a mixture of populism, reductionism, demagoguery, and opportunism. They take part from the whole, overestimate its importance and ignore other parts or trivialise their significance. But how can we understand a complex mechanism/phenomenon/process this way? We can't! It's impossible. It is like trying to understand the principle of movement of a car by overestimating the function of its steering wheel without considering the function of its wheels, engine, fuel combustion process, physical laws of attraction, aerodynamics, etc. Similarly, the movement of a car isn't only the result of the function of the steering wheel; it isn't the war in Ukraine, only the result of Russian imperialism. But try telling the person I had the confrontation with in Graz and avoid being aggressively attacked by him and his cronies. I haven't succeeded yet. Well, to express myself, yes, but not without then having to face attacks, sabotage, slander, defamation, ostracism, and threats to my safety.

What do the people, with whom this person works, practice?

Now, I'd like to move on to describe how maliciously and ruthlessly the mentioned person and the collectives he works with treat me.

I have a reputation in the anarchist movement for over twenty years as someone critical of others. I'm not going to contradict this part in any way. I see criticism and self-criticism as a process of growth. Especially if its purpose is not defamation but a constructive effort to move forward, reflect on mistakes, and overcome limits. The problem is how the criticised people abuse my tendency to express criticism. It is simple: they have absolutely no regard for my safety, dignity, or privacy. They see every criticism as a personal attack, a declaration of war in which it's allowed to humiliate me in every way imaginable. Maybe even by "throwing" me before the police and giving them an excuse to go after me.

From around 2014 onwards, my name began to be associated in these circles with various illegal actions, anonymous texts, and projects that were attracting the attention of the state's repressive forces. Although I never claimed responsibility for anything on that long list, and nobody ever produced any evidence linking me to anything, my cri-

tics freely construct a myth of the undisputable fact that I am behind it all.

This process works like this: for example if a direct action is carried out and some property is damaged, and a communique explaining the reasons and the target of the action is issued. Some groups decide to publish the communique; others don't. Because the way the action is carried out and communicated is seen as controversial in certain circles, to say the least. Some individuals start to claim that they know who is behind it, so they can point out the alleged culprit and channel their anger towards him. Generally, they have no idea. They only have some kind of assumptions and speculations. Empowered by the grudge against me, they start to vent their assumptions. At first, in their close circle of friends, they allege *"it was Lukáš Borl"*. This claim, without any evidence, is passed on and spreads like wild fire. The more often it is repeated, the faster people lose their ability to question themselves and ask, *"How can someone bring a charge as serious as this and not offer any evidence?"*. The repeated assumption for many people becomes "generally known truth". Nobody is questioning any more, nobody doubts, nobody demands evidence. And what's even worse, almost nobody has any problem with these 'commonly known truths' being communicated in a way that may give the police an excuse to charge me (again!).

I can provide several examples from a long list. For the first one, I'd return to the description of the event at the *Fluff Fest* in Rokycany.

The talk of the *Anarchist Federation* finished, and I was naively waiting for the discussion to begin. I was making notes diligently, but when people from AF left after the talk, I decided to bring my feedback directly to them. One of the speakers indiscriminately told me he wouldn't be discussing anything with me. As a reason, he said that I was spreading information about Dubovik and Kolchenko, which he labelled as lies. And the very next moment in the conversation, he openly linked me to a certain publishing project that may be under police surveillance for its 'illegalist' content. I objected and demanded that he stop linking me to this anonymous project and that I want him to stop saying such things at *Fluff Fest*, where, like other places, it was proven the police have been recording conversations(10). Their reaction was mockery and downplaying the whole situation. Apparently, they couldn't see any police officers and were talking quietly, so nobody could hear it. Can anyone really claim that in the 21st century, the police don't have more advanced methods of spying on people than listening to them from the immediate vicinity? That person has been active in the "movement" since the 90s and knows the cop's methods very well. Still, he decided to openly link me with a certain illegal activity, even though it

may give police a weapon against me.

For context, it's important to mention that at that time, I was prosecuted in the *Fénix 2* case⁽¹¹⁾ and potentially facing 3 to 10 years in prison. One of the charges against me was alleged dissemination of text with illegal content, which the prosecutors labelled as '*support and promotion of movements aimed at suppressing human rights and freedoms*' (section 403 – usually used against neo-nazis). As indirect evidence, the police also provided recordings of conversations where particular people voiced certain speculations. So, a very similar kind of 'evidence' that the irresponsible person mentioned above decided to offer to the police at *Fluff Fest*. In court, I disputed the use of these claims as evidence in the past. However, the fact that I can be brought to court based on speculations should lead to us not making such speculations. But for this person, it doesn't matter. The grudge against me probably blunted his sound judgment ability, or maybe he simply chose not to regard my safety because he wanted to get rid of a firm ideological opponent at any price.

Another example:

a collective that I'm part of received a message with a link to the website 'stopwarpropaganda.noblogs.org', where, among other things, is mentioned:

"During September 2023, several entities actively involved in war propaganda have been attacked, especially in so-called Russia, Ukraine and the Czech Republic. For direct actions were used method "initiation of evacuation". The following targets were under attack.

- TASS = The Russian News Agency*
- The Moscow Kremlin = The official residence of the Russian president*
- Ukrinform = The National News Agency of Ukraine*
- MAFRA, a.s. = Czech media group*
- Riot Over River Fest = The festival provides space for propaganda initiatives supporting the Ukrainian army*

These war propagandists have different perspectives, but they are equally committed to convincing their "audience" of the supposed need to actively support the war, even at the cost of the countless deaths and other suffering it brings. (...) "(12)

Neither our Collective nor I were sharing this statement or glorifying it. I only expressed concern that some people want to connect me and the action mentioned in the statement. I wrote: *"As tradition has it in our little Czech pond, the 'red and black gossip mill' started turning. All sorts of people start to speculate, vent their guesswork, or claim they know for sure how it all happened. But most likely, like me, they know nothing about the background of the incident."*(13)

Although I indicated in my statement that it was not OK to associate me with this, I have since encountered several people who claim that I had something to do with this incident. For example, *Marek Dočekal*, whom I already mentioned in my statement *"The Dilemma Returns: Madness or Death?"*(14) Dočekal was trying to link me to this incident in a particularly insidious and manipulative way. And when I told him to stop, he just carried on.

As for the incident itself, which is being reported on 'stopwarpropaganda.noblogs.org', I'd like to say, I find the way the action was carried out very problematic for more than one reason. I don't think that anyone should glorify such an action and I myself never did. As for the communique for the action, I agree with the criticism of militarism and war propaganda expressed there. That, though, is in no way evidence of my alleged connection to this incident.

It cannot serve as a justification for someone openly associating me with it in a space where police fingers and ears reach.

How do the people who associate me with this think? I know this well from their reactions. They say to themselves: "*Oh, Borl also says similar things; we know his style and diction,*" and this is enough proof for them. Their conclusion is: "*It was Borl*", and now it can be spread widely and freely in every direction, from ear to ear, in info-shops, pubs, and gigs, on social media, or through messages and emails set up on corporate servers that cooperate with the cops.

It went similarly with other events that our collective was informed about via anonymous messages in our email inbox. Once we received this message:

---Original Message---

Date: 2024-06-14 10:46

From: ????????????

To: antimilitarismus@riseup.net

"- Two petrol bombs were delivered to Info-shop Trhlina in Prague

- Car tyre with the incendiary device was delivered to the entrance of Žižkostel in Prague

THIS TIME, IT WAS WITHOUT FIRE, BUT NEXT TIME IT CAN BE WITH FIRE ESPECIALLY IF:

1) If these places won't stop giving space to people who harass anarchists and sabotage their anti-militarist activities.

2) If these places won't stop giving space for glorification of informants Alexander Kolchenko and Anatolij Dubovik.

3) If these places won't stop being used to promote war propaganda that emphasises the crimes of Putin's imperialism, but keep quiet about the crimes of USA's imperialism, NATO member states and crimes of Ukrainian state.

4) If these places won't stop being used as infrastructure for support of the Ukrainian Army, the Army that massacres deserters, prevents people from leaving to the safe zones, hunts men in the streets so it

can forcibly mobilise them and send them to death on the frontline.

5) If these places won't stop being used as mouth-piece for class collaboration - unity of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie which always strengthens the bourgeoisie to the detriment of the proletariat.

6) If those places won't stop spreading defamatory lies about revolutionaries, such as their accusations of 'Putinism' and pacifism etc.

The reactions were like if you copy and paste them—exactly the same as previously. People "can guarantee" they know who is behind it. The communique has "Borl's writing style". The proof was served. The counter-revolutionary tribunal delivered its verdict: Borl is guilty and sentenced to be banished from spaces, to be given up to the police, to defamation and slander, to be ostracised, isolated, and last not least, to lose his right to privacy, and safety.

It's a fascinating phenomenon: these people are linking me to any kind of things that I never wanted to be associated with. They – without any evidence, against my will – make me out to be the leading actor in many such (mostly anonymous) events, projects, and statements. They also very often emphasize my alleged self-centredness. These people

make me out to be the "centre" of everything that stands against them, but apparently, I am acting self-centredly.

I have to disappoint them. I'm not really the only one who has anti-militarist positions, the only one holding a mirror up to the "anarcho-militarists", the only one willing to defend anarchist values despite of the false allies. Yes, in the Czech milieu, I'm one of the few who does it openly. And maybe that's what allows my opponents to target me with such intensity. Moreover, they use it to feed the myth that Borl is the centre of everything controversial, so it is a completely marginal matter because there's no one else like him.

They just need such a myth to strengthen their feeling of importance and grandiosity. They portray themselves as a growing progressive force and their opposition as one crazy guy. If they would accept that many people hold similar values as me, it would make a huge crack in their myth. So they stick to the legendary story: It's all just one crazy Borl and a few dogmatic loonies, insignificant sectarian scum which cannot be compared to our magnificence. And to make the myth even stronger, they use another weapon: they label me as an aggressor who threatens their safety. It's a strange paradox because, as I already said (and I will expand on it later), they're the ones that threaten my safety. And as I will show you on another example, they happily

defend people which maliciously put in danger our anarchist friends.

Before I give you the example, I will return to the text: "*The Left of Capital is Sabotaging the Anarchist Movement: Let's Fight Back!*" It says:

"Keep in mind that the left of capital, despite its declared anti-statism, never hesitates to fight its opponents with the help of the state's repressive forces when it has the opportunity to do so. It is in the interest of revolutionary anarchism to prevent it from doing so and to deprive it of this opportunity. The risks are too great to be ignored or underestimated." (15)

I think the examples I provided show clearly how my opponents are using the power of repressive forces against me. They are linking me to various criminal acts in places that can be monitored by the police. By doing so, they give the police a good excuse to harass me.

And now, the example mentioned earlier.

I want to begin with a quote:

"There are different motivations for doxing. They include doing it to reveal harmful behaviour and hold the offender accountable. (...) Researchers have pointed out that some instances of doxing can be justified, such as when it reveals harmful behaviour, but only if the act of doxing also aligns with the public."

- Wikipedia⁽¹⁶⁾

On the 9.5.2024, I published a statement called *"The Dilemma Returns: Insanity or Death"*⁽¹⁷⁾ In there, I drew attention to the aggressive bullying I was exposed to, and I named four specific individuals who are significantly involved in it.

It's interesting how vastly different reactions this provoked. Quite a few people have told me they were horrified while reading it, which made them worry about my health and life. The logical question of these people then was: *"How can I help you so you can stay well and survive this difficult situation?"* The completely opposite reaction was in the way of: *"It's a doxxing of personal names of anti-authoritarian activists (...), It's an unprecedented breach of the*

safe space which the anti-authoritarian movement is trying to be. "(18)

While the first kind of reaction was very supportive for me, the second understandably only fuelled my negative emotions and thoughts of suicide and insanity. People capable of empathy understood that I found myself in a desperate situation and were trying to help, even though they may have found the form of my message controversial. On the other side are individuals and collectives that are expressing total inconsideration and heartlessness if they only take from the whole text that the names of specific people are mentioned there. But they filter out the most important: I've named people who, by their machinations, almost got me into a mental health institution or grave. A banality that isn't worth mentioning, right? Is it possible to push the inconsideration even further? Yes, it is. People who label my text as doxxing and apparently "an unprecedented breach of the safe space", the same people who don't see any problem in the activities of Alexander Kolchenko and Anatoly Dubovik, who made public names and home addresses of anarchists living in Russia and called for their liquidation.(19)

International Workers Association (IWA-AIT) published a statement saying: "...these fake anarchists, by publishing the addresses of anti-war activists located in Russia, are di-

rectly inciting Russian secret services and nationalist thugs against them, as opponents of the war, in order to deal with them with their hands! In the conditions of ongoing harassment, dismissals, threats, and physical reprisals against anti-military-minded people in Russia, such actions are tantamount to a real denunciation with a direct indication of whom the repressive forces should turn their attention to."⁽²⁰⁾

And in an article from *Voice of Anarchists*⁽²¹⁾ it says: "...the infamous Anatoly Dubovik not only engaged in rudeness and the most brazen dirty slander against internationalist anarchists but also, together with Sergei Shevchenko and Alexander Kolchenko, engaged in doxxing – publishing the home addresses of anti-war anarchists with a direct call for their murder."⁽²²⁾ (...) It is also worth noting that other followers of Dubovik also voiced calls to "eliminate" the anti-war anarchists with state force. However, all these meannesses towards the internationalists did not prevent platforms such as the Czech magazine *Kontradikce*, the website *Anarchist Federation*, and "Pramen" [Ray] from disseminating Dubovik's slander and even inviting him and Shevchenko for an interview!

Moreover, even after the editors of the same "Pramen" were refuted Dubovik's lies with evidence, they... no, they did not apologize to the internationalists for spreading slander,

and, no, they did not apologize to their readers for misleading them – they deleted the message with the internationalists detailed response to this very slander!

Moreover, the same people, who had previously seriously complained about the internationalists because... they ban their critics, cowardly banned and deleted messages with this very response in various chats!"

Would anyone expect those who denounce me also to issue a statement addressing Kolchenko and Dubovik claiming: *"It's a doxxing of personal names of anti-authoritarian activists (...), It's an unprecedented breach of the safe space which the anti-authoritarian movement is trying to be. ?"*

It would make sense, but the complete opposite happened. A hostile statement against me and my friends is signed by at least four projects, which uncritically provide space to those two informants who are doxxing anarchists in Russia. Specifically, it's: the Anarchist Federation, Info-shop Trhlina, Collective organising the Anarchist Book Fair in Prague, and Riot Over River Festival in Prague.⁽²³⁾

Every sensible person who is at least vaguely familiar with the ins and outs of what is labelled as an anarchist movement in Czech surely must see that those who accuse me

are motivated by personal grudges and an inability to handle my criticism. An impartial person surely understands that to be able to label something as dangerous doxxing, more than some names on the internet need to be mentioned. The context is important.

Doxxing is an act of publicly providing personally identifiable information about an individual or organisation, usually via the internet and without their permission. Doxxing usually has a negative connotation because it can be used as a tool for revenge through a breach of privacy. Here, I'd like to add that I didn't publish the names of individuals concerned out of revenge but only to raise awareness of the harm they caused me and to warn other potential victims of the danger that contact with them presents. It's also important to mention that I haven't revealed any sensitive information about their personal lives by listing the names. Nothing was said about their political activity, work, home address, personal relationships, sexual preference, or anything similar. I just noted that they have hurt me seriously. I also mentioned nicknames with some names by which those people usually present themselves in public, and therefore, there are no secret code-names that should hide their identity. I know many people who use these nicknames while referring to those individuals in public or mentioning them on the internet. I haven't revealed any secrets.

Outside the hacker's community, the first prominent examples of doxxing happened on the internet chat forums at the end of the 90s, where users would spread lists of suspected neo-nazis. In Czech, there is an active *Anti-fascist Action (AFA)*, which is for over twenty years monitoring the activities of neo-nazis and making public not only their photos, names, and nicknames but also information about their jobs, family situations, or their leisure activities and so on. I'm glad AFA is doing this. And I don't see anything wrong with it, even if it could be legally labelled as doxxing. Similarly, I'm not bothered when victims of sexual assaults make public the name of the perpetrator together with the details of the traumatic situation they've been put into (as happened recently with sexual harassment by Czech politician Dominik Feri). No, I don't think it's a case of scandalous doxxing of names or that it was "an unprecedented breach of the safe space". Just like we have the right to monitor the activities of neo-nazis and, by doing so, defend ourselves from their aggression. Just like survivors of sexual assaults have the right to publish names of the sexual predators, Borl has the right to make public the names of people involved in bullying, aggression, and machinations.

Note that in the statement signed by seventeen projects, the blog domain 'lukasborl.noblogs.org' is listed, and my first and last name is in that address. It goes on to say that I've done things that mean an unprecedented breach of sa-

fe space. It is a perfect example of doxxing, which aims to harm an individual's reputation or honour potentially – in this case, specifically me. As I have already indicated, I haven't breached any safe space by listing names in my statement.

By the way, if you type 'Lukáš Borl' into the search bar on the *Anarchist Federation* website 'afed.cz', more than ten articles with this name will appear in the menu. For example, these:

- <https://afed.cz/text/7581/slovy-proti-izolaci>
- <https://afed.cz/text/6521/hlukove-demonstrace-v-litomericich>
- <https://afed.cz/text/6493/report-z-odvolaciho-soudu-igora-sevcova>

Suppose I was to behave as stupidly as my opponents signed under the statements mentioned earlier. In that case, I'd put together another article and claim that the *Anarchist Federation* is dangerously doxxing me because they've used my name without my consent. I won't write such an article because I think the *Anarchist Federation* is dangerous for an entirely different reason. I already pointed it out in this text on specific examples, and I'm gladly going to share some more.

An observant person will undoubtedly notice that the statement "*We will not be intimidated!*"⁽²⁴⁾ completely exaggerates certain parts so that the collectives signed could style themselves as innocent victims who are being blatantly harmed. For example, they labelled the following sentence as a death threat: "*History is replete with examples of how revolutionaries deal with snitches and their accomplices.*"⁽²⁵⁾

Their fantasy can paint a non-specific statement in the darkest colours, and they are not afraid to share their fantasies in public. A person not aware of the context might even think that they are the most innocent beings in the world gratuitously terrorised by some maniacs. But as I reveal in this narrative of mine, they aren't such innocent victims. They complain that they are being threatened but fail to mention how they threaten others.

The *Czechoslovak Anarchist Association* (ČAS) wrote this as a reaction to the statement, "*We will not be intimidated!*":

"We don't think this incident is asymmetrical. On the contrary, it is a sad reflection of the state of the movement and practices that became standard. From defamation, censorship, slander, and machinations to threats that even our group has experienced while organising a benefit concert (...)."⁽²⁶⁾

I would add that the threats were about the concert *Make Music Not War*, organised by members of ČAS in Poděbrady (a town in Central Bohemia). The concert aimed to raise money for elderly people in Ukraine who were in danger during Putin's invasion. Members of ČAS stated that the concert organisers had to face insults and threats. And lo and behold, behind it were the same people who agreed with the statement, "*We will not be intimidated!*"

Here are some more examples.

My friends dared to criticise the band *Bezlád*, which performed at the *Riot Over River Festival* in Prague(27). The criticism was mainly about Russophobia and nationalistic positions expressed by the band members and their glorification of the *Azov Battalion*(28), infamous for its connection to neo-nazis and far-right militants. As an answer to their criticism, my friends received threats and spread of snide comments on the internet expressing wishes that their families experienced bombing and their daughter raped, etc.

But this isn't the only example of threats from this milieu. Some time ago, my good friend, with whom I share similar political positions, tried to communicate face-to-face with a member of Info-shop Trhlina in Prague, who is also a member of the *Anarchist Federation* (AF). He told my fri-

end that old militant anti-fascists are terribly angry at Borl and the *Anti-Militarist Initiative* (AMI) and that there's the threat of some kind of reaction to what they say and do. He wasn't very specific about what type of reaction it was supposed to be. However, only his repeated emphasis that it's going to come from militants experienced in street fights, can be interpreted as an indication that the reaction can take the form of a physical confrontation.

This is very interesting because this same Info-shop Trhlina, whose member communicated these threats, signed the statement that reads: "*We consider it normal that within the anti-authoritarian movement we disagree on a number of issues and our paths diverge. However, any criticism must be distinguished from aggression, which in the end is not about a real anti-militarist agenda, but about settling personal scores with specific and randomly selected 'enemies'.*"

Perhaps the collective around *Trhlina* and the *Anarchist Federation* should 'sweep in front of their own door' first before they start accusing others of aggression and threats. I don't believe they will. Because even if they are using aggressive methods, it's easy for them to cover it up and claim that there is no evidence of it. When someone threatened *Trhlina* with an arson attack, it would probably be easy to provide proof that such a thing happened. But

when the member of Thrlina and AF threatened my friend, AMI, and me it's easy to claim that it's only a slander. For these people, a witness account isn't evidence. But beware, nothing like evidence is needed if anyone accuses me of anything. Speculative accusations made against me are "true" simply because they are directed at me. This is how those who talk about justice, equality and solidarity... blah blah blah act. After all that, how can anyone still believe their bullshit?

As it turns out, they have similar experiences with threats in other parts of the world. For example, *Voice of Anarchists* reports:

"Newspapers that dared to inform about the links between BOAK and 'Brotherhood', started to receive threats."(29)

To explain the context: after the death of the BOAK founder Dimitri Petrov near Bachmut in 2023, as well as his "fellow warriors" Finbar and Cooper, it turned out that they all were working with Korchinsky's far-right battalion 'Brotherhood' (of which members are people like neo-nazi Vita Zaverukha). And by Korchinsky, they all became members of his battalion.

The statement of the already mentioned Dubovik can also

be considered threats and intimidation. In one of his doxxing posts, he published the following:

"Just to make sure, I want to remind you that the foremost Russian agent of influence in the international quasi-anarchist movement, the leading scientist of XXXX, Ds C. XXXX, lives at the address: XXXX. At this address is also his name. This information is provided primarily for operators of attack drones of Ukrainian Armed Forces, but if any militant anti-fascist in Russian territory will find them useful, also good" (30)

We could also add cyber attacks on mobile phones to the list. Before *Action Week* (actionweek.noblogs.org) started in May 2024, there were repeated attacks on a mobile phone that was used as a "hotline" for the public. A similar cyber attack was later carried out on my friend's mobile phone. Although I can't point to a specific person/people behind these attacks, certain indications suggest that the attack came from people around Info-shop Trhlina. The friend whose phone got attacked decided to talk about it with a member of the Trhlina collective. In a rush of emotions during the dramatic debate, this member said something he probably wanted to keep secret. He implied that the cyber attack on my friend's phone was in retaliation for threats of an arson attack on Info-shop Trhlina. It became clear that as a member of Trhlina, he knew about the

attacks on the phone (at that time, this information wasn't public), and he knew as much as only someone directly informed by the person responsible for the attacks.

People like me and my friends find themselves in disadvantaged situations where it's difficult to prove the machinations and aggression of our opponents. This situation is maliciously used by those who can't handle our criticism. They don't fail to take advantage of every opportunity to relegate criticism and points of difference to the background, cover up their machinations, or perhaps even twist the situation so they create victims out of aggressors and aggressors out of victims.

One example also comes from my willingness to talk face-to-face with them about a few things. When I found out that the AF and *Utopia Libri* are 'demanding' from another collective to prohibit me, AMI, and the history collective Zádruha from participating at the anarchist book fair in Brno(31), I decided to talk about it directly with those who are behind it. And because I knew that members of AF frequent the Info-shop Trhlina, I visited them there—unannounced.

To understand the context, I must mention that I went there alone with a small, timid dog, unarmed, on a day when Trhlina opened to the public. I sat by a table and as-

ked three people from AF to explain their reasons for acting in such a deceptive way. Things like: *"We are not going to talk to you about internal communication between us and other groups"* were said during the conversation. This only underlined the deceptive context of the whole conflict. Attack from behind - oh yes. Defend it face to face - no, never!

It must be emphasised that the debate was very emotionally intensive on both sides. But for the whole duration we were all seated at the same table and my gestures definitely couldn't be taken as aggressive or as a preparation for aggression. However, after a while, another member of Trhlina entered from the outside. He was looming over me in a standing position and gave me an assertive command that if I wanted to talk about the topic of war, which we just mentioned, I should leave and talk about it elsewhere. To his question: *"Did you understand?"* I answered: *"No, I didn't because I'm in an info-shop that is currently open and declares that it is also intended for discussions. Furthermore, there are posters on the walls directly related to the topic of war."*

This person angrily entered my comfort zone (I need to mention that I was still seated, and he was standing) and said: *"Well, I'm gonna explain it to you in another way."* Although I could see this gesture as intimidation and thre-

ats, I answered: *"Alright, explain."* Luckily, this person quickly made a few steps back and calmed down, even his verbal expression. Suddenly, he tried to present his challenge as something intended for everyone present. *"It's not only for you Lukáš, nobody here will talk about the war now. Furthermore, some people here do their stuff for school, and they are not interested in your disagreements. And there's a person who is scared because you all have a heated argument here."* After that, some people went outside to smoke. I said to those still inside: *"I apologise if my communication disturbed you from what you were doing."* The answer of the people present (people from around the project Dekonstrukce) was: *"No, it's okay, don't worry."* After this assurance that everything was okay with them, I left. But it wasn't the end of it.

A few weeks later I received an email from the Trhlina collective that my unannounced visit was evaluated as extremely inappropriate and I'm no longer allowed in the Info-shop. In another words, it was pointed out to me again, that in their eyes I'm the aggressor and they are the victims of my aggression. All this despite the fact that the purpose of me visiting Trhlina was the need to talk to the schemers about their attacks. Even though I was alone in their space, seated at the table the whole time while the member of Trhlina was standing above me and threatening me. Even though some of the people present didn't see my

communication as a disruption of their activities.

To sum it up: A nice example of how easy it is to turn aggressors into victims, if the aggressors have the upper hand and developed skills of manipulation.

"The Story" later continued in a similar spirit at a different place. Our collective had an agreement with a venue called 'Safe Space' in Žižkov, Prague, to host a benefit tattoo event, *Make Tattoo Not War*. Part of the event was a public discussion called "*Capitalist peace is a continuation of war and preparation for its escalation*"⁽³²⁾. A few days before the start of this event, I was told that two individuals from the *Anarchists Federation* "warned" the collective of *Safe Space* that it was not right to cooperate with us. Apparently, they were saying that the event is organised by a collective which doesn't recognise the right of people in Ukraine to defend themselves from Putin's aggression—one of many nonsenses about us that is doing the rounds. We tried to refute this slander used to cancel our events at the AMI website by the text, "*We refute the lies that are being spread about AMI*"⁽³³⁾. Nevertheless, the event couldn't take place in the place initially agreed upon. Again, it proved that it's easy to make absurd accusations, that nobody bothers to show evidence for it, against me or the activities I'm involved in. Immediately I'm treated like there's no doubt all those accusations are true.

A frequent way of defaming me is to accuse me of indifference towards people affected by the war in Ukraine. However, I repeatedly participated in very practical support for those people – financially, materially, logistically, journalistically, etc.(34)

Accusing anti-militarists of indifference, inaction and non-solidarity are another of many demagogic lies. As is shown, for example, on the flyer distributed by AF at the *Anarchist Bookfair* in Prague(35), these people literary revel in demagoguery. For instance, they claim that internationalists stay neutral in war even though internationalists never stand aside but always stay on the side of the proletariat on both sides of the battle line. In the eyes of the AF (and the likes of the AF), the refusal to support the Ukrainian Army means to be indifferent to the victims of war. Is it possible that they lack imagination and don't understand that practical support of people affected by war can work without cooperation with the state and Army? I don't think so. They want to portray their opponents in the worst possible way. Reality isn't essential for them if lies can fulfil their “pragmatic” function in their strategy. As was mentioned in the *Voice of Anarchism* article, complete ruthlessness in means is a characteristic feature of these people.

Asymmetrical Conflict

After listing all these deeds of individuals and groups that signed the text *"We will not be intimidated"*, it's surprising that anyone can take seriously statements like: *"It is an asymmetrical conflict, where anti-authoritarian collectives have long tried to "wait it out" and go about their normal activities, while sectarians have continuously escalated the level of aggression."*

In case someone still didn't get it, I want to emphasise the following: A significant proportion of people signed under proclamations like this, in reality, don't wait but act, i.e. escalate the level of aggression. And usually in a way that helps them to keep it hidden as much as possible from the wider milieu. Anarchist Federation, Info-shop Trhlina, Utopia Libri, and Marek Dočekal, to name a few.

It's true that in this conflict situation, the escalation is pushed by both sides. Nothing deviates from the logic of the antagonistic relationship between the revolutionary forces and the followers of the counter-revolution. If someone claims that one side is only passively "waiting it out" while the other is escalating the aggression, they are either intentionally lying and rewriting reality or are unable to perceive reality in all its breadth. So, next time someone tries to say that one side is a hurt victim and the other is a sinis-

ter aggressor, it'll be necessary to recall the background of all this.

Yes, it is an asymmetrical conflict, but not in the sense that it's being pushed by those who hate me so much that they are prepared to use any ruthless means to silence or isolate me.

The asymmetry of this conflict mainly lies in complete incommensurability. Whether it's the numbers or available resources. On one side is a minority of internationalist revolutionaries, mostly made of people in a proletarian position, a significant part of which has problems securing even basic human needs (housing, food, clothes, fares, medical care...), and therefore, they have very limited capacity for their political activities. On the other side is a much larger group of 'radical' social democracy – that labels themselves as anarchists/ anti-authoritarians/ anti-fascists/ progressive or non-demagogical left that's mainly made of people with middle-class privileges. Besides considerable funds, these people also have so-called 'cultural capital' – higher education, stable background, far-reaching social connections, social prestige, and access to the media. These are inaccessible to the proletarians.

The revolutionary minority is in the asymmetrical conflict at a disadvantage not only because of the low numbers of

involved people but also because the means available for the 'other side' are unattainable. The revolutionary minority and its community of struggle don't have the means to develop infrastructure (e.g., rental of places for info-shops) nor for quality publication activity (printing books and their distribution is the official distribution network). Even the voice of its 'members' has a lower value because professors, managers, lawyers, and journalists always get more attention. And it's not because they say something more interesting but because their prestigious social status gives their words more 'gravitas'. Even when they are spouting utter nonsense.

Of course, there are exceptions in both 'camps' – middle-class individuals with revolutionary tendencies or proletarians absorbed by reformism. However, here we must be aware of what history is teaching us – middle class, compared to the proletariat, always has a greater tendency to oscillate between revolutionary and counter-revolutionary positions. It's also important to see that in the reformist 'camp' the middle class is the dominant power: primarily, it's them who set the political line, and the proletarians are the 'auxiliary labour' that sometimes helps to cook a stew or fix mouldy wall in an info-shop but never has a fundamental influence on program direction.

The meaning of violent (self)defence

At the end of my extensive text, I would like to return to the part that is the incident in Graz. The fact that I punched a certain person in the face and urged him to leave the place was a result of a situation that gave me the reason to do it.

At first, this person demanded the organisers of the book fair include in the program a presentation about "solidarity activities in connection with the war in Ukraine". He was refused, and the reason given was that the bookfair has an anti-militarist focus, and, therefore, it's not welcome to present activities supporting the state army and capitalist war propaganda. The person, quite nervous about rejection, started to explain to those present that he didn't understand how they could cooperate with someone who was dangerously doxxing activists and was behind aggressive attacks. He meant me and was very specific in describing the attacks he linked to me. Anyone who has carefully read my text to this point will surely understand what problems I see here.

Firstly, to try to spread war propaganda at an anarchist bookfair means actually contributing to the support of the war, which is associated with an enormous amount of illegitimate aggression, from maiming people to murdering

them.

Secondly, I didn't commit dangerous doxxing; I named aggressors.

Thirdly, linking me arbitrarily and without any evidence with illegal activities (especially at a bookfair which the police can monitor) means giving the police the opportunity to harass me.

The situation basically repeated itself the next day when I decided to speak with this person. When words like doxxing and accusations of attacks were mentioned, I clenched my fist and intentionally punched the person in the face. I was defending myself and my collective political space from an intruder who wanted to abuse it for war purposes, from a predator who put me in danger and tried to give me to the police. From a schemer who, with other people, is organising activities that attack anti-militarist initiatives...

I don't regret using violence. But I regret that I wasn't more forceful, which gave that person an opportunity to draw an improvised weapon⁽³⁶⁾. You learn from mistakes. Now I know that we can't give these people an opportunity. Every mistake, weakness, and hesitation we make, they readily use against us.

So what is my lesson? Next time there's violence, I know I mustn't give my opponent any chance to get out of it or even counterattack.

Lukáš Borl

lukasborl.noblogs.org



NOTES:

(1) Transcript of the talk is on the web of Anarchists Federation
<https://www.afed.cz/text/7710/anarchiste-a-valka-na-ukrajine>

(2) <https://antimilitarismus.noblogs.org/post/2024/09/27/collaboration-of-pro-war-anarchists-with-the-far-right-masks-are-off-or-the-fail-of-the-anti-authoritarian-resistance-myth/>

(3) Links to a several articles about forced mobilisation in Ukraine, kidnapping of men on the streets and workplaces and sending them to the frontline against their will.

<https://antimilitarismus.noblogs.org/post/2022/12/30/represe-proti-tem-kteri-nechteji-valcit/>

-

<https://antimilitarismus.noblogs.org/post/2023/04/05/kd-yz-se-obyvateľstvo-bouri-proti-valce/>

-

<https://antimilitarismus.noblogs.org/post/2024/01/11/го-д-начался-новости-облав-тцк-по-улица/>

-

<https://antimilitarismus.noblogs.org/post/2023/10/06/a-volunteer-from-kharkov-was-tortured-by-the-military-after-trying-to-leave-ukraine/>

-

<https://antimilitarismus.noblogs.org/post/2024/04/04/w-ar-against-war-is-starting-the-grapes-of-wrath-in-ukraine/>

<https://antimilitarismus.noblogs.org/post/2024/07/30/judge-lynch-you-have-the-floor-the-murder-of-farion-amid-the-decay-processes-in-the-warring-armies/>

-

<https://antimilitarismus.noblogs.org/post/2024/09/27/catastrophe-for-somebody-salvation-for-others-desertion-is-flooding-ukraine/>

Kiev journalist Volodymyr Boiko, who serves in the 101st brigade of the Ukrainian Armed Forces, stated even more sharply about this law on his Facebook page: *"I have several times come across references to my modest person with information that the number of deserters in the Armed Forces and other armed formations is 200 thousand people. In fact, I said and say that the number of deserters has already exceeded 150 thousand persons and is approaching 200 thousand. With the current dynamics, it's possible to predict 200 thousand deserters by December 2024."*

<https://libcom.org/article/catastrophe-somebody-salvation-others-desertion-flooding-ukraine>

(4) <https://antimilitarismus.noblogs.org/post/2024/06/10/the-advice-led-to-hell-ilya-kharkow/>

For more information about the author see: ikharkow.com

(5) <https://libcom.org/article/despair-and-anger-concentration-camp-assemblys-interview-second-anniversary-big-war-ukraine>

This interview also mentions: *Ukraine is such a “free country” that its authorities consider all people with a Ukrainian passport to be their personal property in the most literal sense of this word. Therefore, they, as slave owners, have the exclusive right to earn money from them and exploit them. If they went abroad, this is a loss for the owners, and they want either compensation in their pocket, or the return of the slaves back to the stable. Something similar happened in the 19th century before the US Civil War (Again, this comparison is not rhetorical but literal: escaping to the EU across the icy Tisza differs from the escape across the winter Ohio River in the novel Uncle Tom's Cabin only in the using of drones and thermal imagers by the pursuers, and already 20 guys have already died during such attempts in this river (two weeks ago, along with this, our compatriot from the Kharkov region drowned in the border river Prut, as reported the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine).*

(6)<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-65792384>

(7)“The position of Anarchist Federation on War”

<https://antimilitarismus.noblogs.org/post/2023/03/01/postoj-anarchisticke-federace-k-valce/> **(article in Czech)**

The person mentioned was and still is editor of the revue Existence (theoretical newspaper of AF), where this great statement appeared in complete contradiction to what he now stands for.

“Our answer is revolutionary defeatism, which in practice means refusing to side with one camp or the other and instead trying to connect the underprivileged from both sides of the conflict. After all, it was already expressed by anarchists from Ukraine just before the outbreak of the civil war: "Rival cliques of business groups, as usual, force us, ordinary people: wage workers, unemployed, students, pensioners, to fight for their interests... They want to intoxicate us with nationalism, pit us against each other, force us to forget our real needs and interests... [...] We can ask ourselves whether in the Czech Republic today at all relevant to ask questions about the war. We think absolutely. We are also convinced that we should pick up where we left off in these considerations after the NATO meeting in Prague In 2002 and the subsequent start of the war against Iraq. Not much has changed since then. (...)

Published in Existence 4/2014

<https://nakladatelstvi.afed.cz/existence/existence-c-42014-valka/>

I completely agree with these words. But the editor of *Existence* now claims and strongly and practically argues for the complete opposite that what it said in the article. Coincidence? No. Specific example unscrupulousness and opportunism. He'd probably use the terms: 'non-dogmatism' and 'pragmatism'.

(8)We can't fight for the people or nation simply because the-

se terms denote an artificial unity between the proletariat and bourgeoisie, between the opponents of state and the managers of state. The people and nation always covers over the collaboration of the exploited by the exploiters, which primarily the exploiters benefit from while the exploited make the greatest sacrifices. We can also see this in Ukraine where mostly the proletarians are dying on the frontline. They don't have financial means or bourgeois privileges which would allow them to avoid forced mobilisation. Even small examples are enough: Who has the bigger chance to bribe border control to leave the country despite Zelensky's ban on emigration? Who has the bigger chance to relocate their loved ones from the war zone, get asylum, means for dignified life i.e. who has the bigger chance to survive shelling? To whom the soldiers will want to deliver the summons: worker in a warehouse or a manager of state enterprise...?

As Bill Beech puts it accurately: *Always it is the working class that gets sent to fight the war of the ruling class. Therefore, the ruling class abides in Kyiv and abroad, remaining untouchable, while the middle-class buys its way out of conscription.*

<https://antimilitarismus.noblogs.org/post/2024/06/12/war-on-anarchism-bill-beech/>

The people and nation is only ideological tool which deviates the proletariat from the revolutionary praxis and channels its energy to benefit certain factions of the bourgeoisie of this or that “nation”, “peoples” or “country”. To fight for “the people”

or “national self-determination” will always mean support for the state and bourgeoisie in this sense. Because, whatever side formally declares victory in the capitalist war, it will always be the bourgeoisie (“ours” or “theirs”) who determine the living conditions of the exploited class. Therefore “national self-determination” or “national liberation” means that it's the local bourgeoisie which acquires a major share in the management of our exploitation and management of repression. Therefore, logically, anarchists do not fight for the people or nation, but unite themselves with all the parts of the proletariat (in Ukraine, Russia, and everywhere else) to fight against all factions of the bourgeoisie (in Ukraine, Russia, and everywhere else).

(9)<https://avtonom.org/en/news/anti-war-leaflets-distribute>

(10)See articles at <https://borodin.noblogs.org/> (in Czech)

Article about the police listening devices at a venue in Prague
<https://borodin.noblogs.org/post/2018/02/01/482/> (in Czech)

(11)<https://antifenix.noblogs.org/english-info/>

(12)<https://stopwarpropaganda.noblogs.org/post/category/english/>

(13)“A bomb at the festival and the “red and black gossip-mill”
<https://lukasborl.noblogs.org/bomba-na-festivalu-a-cernoruda-drbarna/> (in Czech)

(14) "The Dilemma returns: Insanity or death?"

<https://lukasborl.noblogs.org/dilema-se-vraci-silenstvi-nebo-smrt/> (in Czech)

(15) <https://antimilitarismus.noblogs.org/post/2024/06/14/the-left-of-capital-is-sabotaging-the-anarchist-movement-lets-fight-back/>

(16) <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Doxing>

(17) Same link as (14)

(18) <https://afed.cz/text/8248/we-will-not-be-intimidated>

(19) <https://antimilitarismus.noblogs.org/post/2024/05/07/sweep-out-snitches-and-their-accomplices/>

(20) <https://www.anarchistcommunism.org/2022/06/08/anarchists-who-forget-the-principles-statement-by-kras-iwa/>

(21) <https://antimilitarismus.noblogs.org/post/2024/09/27/collaboration-of-pro-war-anarchists-with-the-far-right-masks-are-off-or-the-fail-of-the-anti-authoritarian-resistance-myth/>

(22) "Dubovik's slander of KRAS, even more lies than imaginable"

<https://antimilitarismus.noblogs.org/post/2024/09/29/dubovikova-pomluva-na-adresu-kras-jeste-vice-lzi-nez-se-zdalo/>

(in Czech and Russian)

(23) Firstly, Anarchist Federation (Anarchistická federace) publishes Dubovik's and Kolchenko's articles full of war propaganda on their site afed.cz and in their paper Existence.

<https://afed.cz/text/8097/anarchiste-a-valka-na-ukrajine-iv>

original in English:

<https://kontradikce.flu.cas.cz/en/online-content/156>)

<https://afed.cz/text/7761/levicaci-mimo-ukrajinu-jsou-zvykli-poslouchat-jen-lidi-z-moskvy>

original in English:

<https://freedomnews.org.uk/2022/10/04/leftists-outside-ukraine-are-used-to-listening-only-to-people-from-moscow-interview-with-rkas-anarcho-syndicalists-in-eastern-ukraine/>)

Secondly, AF shares Kolchenko's call for contributions to buy a car for war purposes.

<https://afed.cz/text/7730/sbirka-na-auto?lang=english>

(in Czech)

Thirdly, Info-shop Trhlina distributes the paper Existence, Dubovik's and Kolchenko's texts and promotes them on its social media.

Fourthly, the website Kontradikce (an academic journal) gave space to Dubovik and Kolchenko uncritically. The editor Ondřej Slačálek later defended the decision. Among other things, he stated: *"(...) The questionnaire isn't a political enterprise, but an attempt at a procedure of understanding of an academic journal, although certainly a journal with a certain profile.*

Therefore yes, under certain circumstances, I can imagine I'd ask people with even more unacceptable profile for our questionnaire (...)"

Fifthly, the Anarchist Bookfair in Prague gave space to Kontradikce for distribution of the journal with above mentioned content and presentation of Kontradikce was included in the programme.

Sixthly, Riot Over River festival gives AF the opportunity to distribute publications with Dubovik's and Kolchenko's texts at the festival. And also to present war propaganda which is consistent with how Kolchenko and Dubovik justified the alleged legitimacy of the doxxing they committed.

(24)<https://afed.cz/text/8248/we-will-not-be-intimidated>

(25)<https://antimilitarismus.noblogs.org/post/2024/05/07/sweep-out-snitches-and-their-accomplices/>

(26)<https://anarchiste.org/stanovisko-cas-k-domacim-pomerum-v-hnuti/> (in Czech)

(27)<https://www.crossclub.cz/cs/program/6985-riot-over-river-7-spolecne-proti-rasismu/> (in Czech)

(28)"Interview with the band Bezlád:" *"Yes, at the beginning it was consisted mainly (but not limited) of representatives of right-wing organizations and ultras. But the battalion began*

to grow, and over time turned into a regiment. That's because many people were willing to join it voluntarily due to the fact that it had a good promotion and it was considered one of the most effective since the liberation and defence of Mariupol in 2014 by the battalion and other units of the Armed Forces of Ukraine. (...) In recent years, there have been no grounds at all for accusations that neo-Nazis serve in the Azov Regiment to some notable significant extent. Which, however, does not exclude the marginal presence of some of such individuals."

<https://www.kidsandheroes.com/nikdy-nevite-kde-bude-dalsi-uder-a-kdo-po-nem-zemre-rika-mira-z-ukrajinske-kapely-bezlad/> (in Czech and English)

(29) <https://x.com/jungewelt/status/1687434498235932672>

(30) I'm not giving away the source of this quote. It's still publicly accessible and I could be taking part in the dangerous doxxing by sharing the link. I can provide information about the source to people I trust upon request. In order to protect that person's identity, sensitive informations like name and address are therefore replaced by XXXX.

(31) From the statement "Why won't AMI have a stall at the Anarchist Bookfair in Brno": "The Anti-militarist Initiative (AMI) initially accepted an invitation to the Anarchist Bookfair that is taking place on 21st October 2023. By this statement we want to explain why AMI won't be at the bookfair after all. Later we might expand on some of the points mentioned here in a deeper analysis that could uncover broader context. From

the bookfair organising collective we recieved an information of activities of a known individual from publisher Utopia Libri. This individual told the organising collective that the publisher's participation was conditional on AMI, History Club Zádruha and Lukáš Borl not attending the event. People from around the Anarchist Federation later expressed a similar demand. The justification for this strange demand was that named initiatives hold anti-militarist views which are said to be considered offensive in their form against their friends. It has not yet been explained to us why anti-militarist positions should be considered a problem in an anarchist environment. No one has even explained what specific attacks AMI is supposed to have carried out. Sure, AMI is publishing a commentary and analysis which explains why it is important to distance ourselves from all militaristic tendencies. AF, on the other hand, is publishing texts where the federation defines itself against supporters of anti-militarism. We do not believe that in such a context, activities of AMI should be seen as aggression, while activities of AF should be measured by a different yardstick.

ANTI-MILITARIST INITIATIVE (AMI) 18/10/2023”

<https://antimilitarismus.noblogs.org/post/2023/10/18/proc-nebude-stanek-ami-na-anarchisticke-bookfairu-v-brne/>

(in Czech)

(32) <https://actionweek.noblogs.org/post/2024/05/10/akce-make-tattoo-not-war-je-zrusena-make-tattoo-not-war-is-canceled/>

(33)<https://antimilitarismus.noblogs.org/post/2024/05/22/we-refute-the-lies-being-spread-about-ami/>

(34)<https://maketattoonotwar.noblogs.org/post/2023/03/18/the-beneficial-tattoo-supported-the-solidarity-activities-of-the-ukrainian-assembly-project/>

<https://maketattoonotwar.noblogs.org/post/2022/09/21/your-new-tattoo-can-support-people-in-kharkiv/>

(35)https://panopticon.noblogs.org/files/2024/08/scan_20240527130551-1.pdf

Photo of the flyer on the Anarchist Federation stall (bottom right) at the Prague Anarchist Bookfair

https://antimilitarismus.noblogs.org/files/2024/08/442424204_980041333912539_6363351376744818930_n.jpg

(36) That person used an improvised weapon during the confrontation – a steel bike lock. However, the question is how much of this was really improvisation and whether it was more of pre-planned action/provocation. It is quite strange that someone goes to a bookfair with a bicycle helmet on for the entire time. And after my first punch he suddenly has a bicycle lock in his hand (without having to manipulate the bike beforehand). Really strange, right? However, I admit that I am not sure of the answer to this question.

