



“Y’all telling motherfuckers to come with they hands up and peacefully assemble? For what? Nah, fuck that, fuck that, fuck you, fuck them, fuck anybody who’s peaceful right now. Cuz when Martin Luther King was here we had a million motherfuckers marching saying let’s be peaceful, and now y’all still begging for y’all freedom, so they still shooting y’all down. They must want a war. So get y’all gasoline at y’all gas station.” - Winston “Boogie” Smith

***KEEP
SABOTAGING
SHIT***

Relating to the words of Winston “Boogie” Smith

First and foremost, I would like to say that I have no interest in assigning Winston “Boogie” Smith any particular political label or affiliation. I never had the pleasure of meeting him personally so I have no way of knowing exactly what or how he would politically identify himself – if at all. With that said, I find personal affinity with the views and frustrations he openly expressed in his life and on social media. In this text I intend to elaborate on this affinity, as well as give his own words the elevated presence that I feel they deserve.

“We got guns and bullet proof vest too or should be able to get em... why not just rush these fucks and start this war they keep asking for!”

Winston Smith, also known as *Boogie* and *Wince Me Boi*, was killed by police and US marshals on June 3rd 2021.

There are two different stories of what happened after the State rolled up on him. One side of the story is that Winston was shot and killed after raising his phone to record the police. Another story is that Winston picked up a gun and fired at the police. There is also the theory that Winston intentionally fired a shot to initiate suicide-by-cop. One thing that seems to be certain is that one way or another, Winston refused to go out quietly.

“I think I've been quiet for too long... Like, all this protesting shit, like, y'all still coming with y'all hands up? Saying y'all surrender? Begging for y'all freedom? Asking for justice? Is y'all serious? Like, y'all serious? That's the plan? Motherfuckers been killing y'all for years? Eyy, I ride with my shit yo. Eyy, when it comes to me, that's not the plan yo. Y'all gotta figure out a new plan, and it ain't walking up, asking for justice. It ain't asking for nothing. Something wrong with y'all. I'm coming to the protest, I'm bringing the same shit they bringing.”

Winston Boogie Smith was said to have been a joyful person living a busy life as a comedian and a musician. Like many others, he became enraged over the shooting death of George Floyd, and subsequently frustrated with passive elements that attempted to dominate and suppress riots around the country.

The first thing that comes to my mind is the concern that Winston's words of personal insurgency might not have gained activist

demand energy to uphold. Sometimes within that time and space, an individual finds the freedom and creative capacity to make decisions based on personal desire rather than social obligation.

If there is any “pessimism” to be realized here, any awful tragedy to be recognized and understood, it is the tragedy of industrial society absorbing the lifeforce of every individual with wage-slavery, normalizing a pessimistic reality where life is transformed into a joyless routine of wage-slavery coupled with police brutality or imprisonment.

One can comfortably assume Winston understood this all too well – claiming ownership over his life rather than surrendering himself to the State.

“I'm like, four years? I would rather die...I'm ready to die, for my freedom.”

Without having known him personally, I can not say or assume that Winston Boogie Smith was an anti-authoritarian, an anti-capitalist, or leftist, etc.. Winston Boogie Smith lived and died beyond the neat boxes of political categorization, beyond the order of civilized subordination, and more to the topic of this text – beyond the expectations of those who, based on identity alone, claimed to represent him.

Winston Boogie Smith was more than just another black man murdered in Minneapolis; his words describe a dynamite personality with a fire for rebellion. He spoke a language of personal rage that, past and present has been the catalyst for cities set ablaze.



“Spread out, have y’all shit ready, hit these motherfuckers from the top of these buildings, from everywhere yo, like, it’s more of us than them. That’s the motherfucking plan. Get your shit, spread the fuck out, let’s starting flooding they motherfucking asses. I’m getting my shit together. I’m about to just strike as much as I can, while I can, and just get up out of there, in and out, in and out, in and out. Keep sabotaging shit. And move the fuck around.”

As a person of color, a common sentiment I hear from others is that people of color can’t afford to be violent against the State. The idea of armed revolt or personal attack is disregarded as only for white people who are assumed to have the privilege of getting lighter sentences for crimes. While I’m not totally disagreeing with the reality of this sentiment, I do take issue with the idea that individuals of color *should never* attack. If an individual of color decides a short-lived attack is more fulfilling than life-long wage-slavery or prison, I don’t personally consider it “suicidal”, since suicide, as I relate to it, implies surrendering. I also don’t consider such a decision inherently “pessimistic” or “nihilist”, which are often used to imply negativity. Instead, I view these bursts of fatalistic courage as acts of individual will and desire that asserts total negation as a final expression of insubordination. While the reasons for that will and desire could be infinitely complex, ultimately one’s decision to attack without expecting to survive is a demonstration of individual *power* against social conformity. By social conformity, I specifically mean the collective social pressure that *insists* a person should live through and endure their daily misery rather than reclaiming their life with enough passion to courageously end it when desired.

Winston’s choice to declare his life his own doesn’t have to be remembered as “suicide” in order to be valid or valuable to conversations about personal revolt. And there is the possibility that this was not a suicide in the traditional sense, since an alternative story suggests that he acted in a final act of self-defense. But for the sake of argument, often born from a moralist interpretation of suicide is a depressing view of hopelessness. Hopelessness is often moralized as disempowering – an interpretation that neglects the power and courage instrumental to creating freedom within bursts of personal emancipation. While I can not speak for Winston in relation to hopelessness, I can only offer my own perspective; sometimes hopelessness can also be understood as an experience of clarity – a time and space liberated from the gravity of delusions that ultimately

recognition the way it did, had it not been for his death. It seems that a person’s expression of armed revolt is only validated and supported by The Movement *after* being killed by the State. I can’t help but wonder if this has anything to do with how one’s death could be (and often is) used by those who attempt to frame it in victimist terms, seemingly for the purpose of making the violence and destruction that follow justifiable. Because brazen or “random” attacks on the State are seldom celebrated by The Movement. If an attack on the State is not political in nature, or fails to correspond to the moral expectations of The Movement, those attacks are disregarded, even if carried out by those affected by poverty and or white supremacy. Was the George Floyd rioting and looting a response to an “innocent” man being killed, or was it a response to years of tension and suppressed outrage exploding at once in every city? Does the State have to *kill* an “innocent” person for cities to go up in flames? At the root, I put forward this question: is it *victimhood* that motivates rebellion, or is it being fed up with the miserable conditions of day-to-day social control?

In “*An Obituary for Identity Politics*” I discuss how the most radical voices of a movement – in particular those of individuals of color – are often further marginalized by liberal visions held by groups or individuals of color. And subsequently, radical views held by white people are often shamed with accusations of failed allyship with anarchists of color. In one way or another, people of *any* race who hold *insurrectionary* views end up experiencing some form of silencing or shaming.

Winston’s words of uncompromising hostility toward the State echo the words of so many others drown out by the shaming and disinformation campaigns waged by proponents of reform and non-violence.

During the rupture of the George Floyd uprising – the moments when liberal chants by BLM were drown out by the sound of breaking glass – black individuals who had formed a “human chain” in order to protect the 3rd precinct began physically attacking those who angrily refused to back away. Ultimately those protecting the precinct were dealt with, and the precinct came under full attack by the mostly black but racially diverse crowd of fed up youth. Only a day later organizations, groups, and individuals who shared the views of the defeated precinct protectors began spreading disinformation on social

media: *the violence toward police and their precinct wasn't started by black people but outside agitators – white supremacists wearing all black.*

This narrative was not only designed to uphold a liberalized portrayal of black people as mere law-abiding, passive by-standers but also to suppress and bury any reality of black people using violence and property destruction as expressed forms of rebellion. At its worst, this narrative was then (and continues to be) regurgitated by 'white allies' who shame and police the actions of white radicals in the name of 'anti-racism'.

Within the political framework of black liberation, this is one of many examples of how moralist ideologies and their black proponents ultimately suppress the same voices they claim to uplift. Black people who express their outrage through property destruction or violence against police are often erased from the pages of history, leaving one to assume that only white anti-authoritarians are responsible for (and capable of) insurrectionary action.

Winston Smith was not only a threat to the State by refusing to allow it a monopoly of force, but also to the civil order maintained by those who actively counteracted violent rebellion.

“Y'all telling motherfuckers to come with they hands up and peacefully assemble? For what? Nah, fuck that, fuck that, fuck you, fuck them, fuck anybody who's peaceful right now. Cuz when Martin Luther King was here we had a million motherfuckers marching saying let's be peaceful, and now y'all still begging for y'all freedom, so they still shooting y'all down. They must want a war. So get y'all gasoline at y'all gas station.”

Despite the possibility of losing love and support from the movement, friends, or loved ones, Winston declared personal war against the State, and against all those who he felt protected it.

Winston “Boogie” Smith is not the only black individual to declare war upon the State and its protectors. Black individuals of all different backgrounds have lived lifestyles that included brazen attacks on agents of the State, and have existed for years without recognition

from *the movement*. I believe this is because not every one who fucks shit up is a writer, is “politically correct” or participates in political scenes or organizations.

Some individuals don't require affinity with any particular political ideology in order to feel motivated to attack police.

From a strategic point of view – which Winston was also vocal about - this way of life makes these individuals a particularly dangerous threat to the establishment. Like hiding in plain sight, these individuals have the most advantage for attacking police or State infrastructure.

For example, 28 year old Ismaaiyl Brinsley ambushed two NYPD officers sitting in a squad car, killing them both with such swift efficiency they both never even had a chance to draw their weapons. Keona Holley was a Baltimore police officer who was ambushed and shot twice in the back of the head while on a late night patrol. In both cases no known motive was determined. While there is an extensive, documented history of police being killed by affiliates of political organizations, not all police deaths are carried out by politically-motivated or affiliated individuals.

These spontaneous ruptures of social warfare expose the limitations of politics by demonstrating a drive of individual will and desire that acts independently of organized political influence.

The State, as a mechanistic product of *politcs* - the science of social governance - heavily relies on predictability for the fore-knowledge of a premeditated attack. As long as the game of war is being played on a board, there is an order. And as long as an attack is limited to that order or field of play, the State can configure its own response in advance based on the predictable limitations of that attack. But when an attack happens from off the board, an attack that does not come in a predictable form, the State is blindsided. Predictability is reduced to zero and therefore there is very little to no pre-configured preparation for such an attack. The key element here isn't sophistication or organized specialization – but quite the opposite. A simple but spontaneous attack leaves the State vulnerable to both fear-induced disorientation and under-preparation for defense.