Cultures of Resistance, Cultures of Potential: Anarchist Value-Practices, Settler Colonialism, and Indigenous Resurgence

Adam Gary Lewis

A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty of Environmental Studies

York University

Toronto, Ontario

April 2026

© Adam Lewis

Abstract

This dissertation weaves together diverse theoretical perspectives from anarchism, settler colonial studies, Indigenous resurgence and resistance, the work of Pierre Bourdieu, and social movement research to consider how anarchists in Southern Ontario approach the context of settler colonialism within their political practices and cultures, and how deeper anti-colonial practices might inform prefigurative approaches to the future. This work employs in-depth interviews to explore how anarchists engage with questions of context, land, history, and ongoing Indigenous resurgence, and the work still to be done to deepen anti-colonial politics.

Pierre Bourdieu's (1998, 1990) habitus, capital, and field shed light on the ways that structures and practices are created and maintained, but also carry possibilities of change. Using his work I consider how core anarchist value-practices (Jeppesen, 2010), like anti-authoritarian practice, direct action, and prefigurative politics, persist within anarchist culture, and create a baseline of opposition to structures and systems of domination. This baseline, however, is lacking in a wider anti-colonial orientation that can be broadened through critical disruptions of anarchist theory and practice by Indigenous resurgence.

Interviews with anarchists highlight a number of critical tensions related to anti-colonial value-practices and affinities with Indigenous struggles. Solidarity, leadership, taking direction, committed politics, spirituality, and orientations to land and place are tensions where anarchists are considering the wider implications of broadening anti-colonial value-practices.

Engaging these tensions creates possibilities for 'making time' to work on anti-colonial value-practices, and more concretely orient anarchism towards prefigurative futures in relation to Indigenous resurgence. May Day, as a cultural and spiritual reference point embraced by anarchists, is one possibility for furthering anti-colonial value-practices. Connections to history, ancestry, land and place, and prefigurative possibilities are touchstones that can further inform anarchist movements and cultures. Anarchists can consider their own forms of 'grounded normativity' to orient them to the context of settler colonialism, but also to form complicit and accountable connections to their histories, the lands they inhabit, and the Indigenous resurgence movements they seek to support. These are potent starting points for considering how anarchist anti-colonial value-practices are already taking shape and can be deepened and expanded into the future.

Dedication

For the militants, the radical imaginaries, the blockaders, and the dreamers.

Acknowledgements

This project is shaped and motivated by my own relationship to, and complicity in, settler colonialism. As a white cis heterosexual settler who has lived in 'canada' my whole life, I am embedded within wider structures of the state, capitalism, and settler colonialism. This narrates my complicity, my resistance, and my imagination of radical prefigurative futures.

My family comes from the British Isles and Ireland, including both recent migrations and historic participation in structures of settlement. I have lived in Kitchener since 2006, on Block 2 of the Haldimand Tract. This is part of the lands of the Haudenosaunee Peoples of Six Nations of the Grand River, shared with the Anishinaabe and Neutral peoples, and is part of the Two Row and Dish With One Spoon wampum areas. This is an ongoing context of land theft and settler colonial expansion, as well as resistance.

In this context, I intentionally include myself within the questions raised in this dissertation. When I write 'we anarchists,' I place myself directly within the ongoing dialogues, questions, conversations, and tensions. This stems from my ongoing participation and connection to anarchist movements in the research area of Southern Ontario. My position is both within the community under research, but also outside it at the same time. This leads to complexities and tensions, but also complicities with the contexts and subjects under consideration here.

Academic projects of this sort are often thought of as individual pursuits, and there is some truth to that: Responsibility for any mishaps, omissions, misreadings, or errors is mine alone. But this project is also inherently a community one, and there are a number of people who deserve unreserved appreciation for their contributions and support as part of the community that surrounds this dissertation work. It would be onerous to name every person who has influenced my anarchism, academic trajectory, and this current project (thanks to all of you!); however, there are a few who deserve specific mention and thanks.

I want to thank everyone who participated in the interviews that provided many of the important thoughts and reflections I discuss here. Without each of you, your experiences, your

perspectives, this would be a very different project. I also want to thank anyone who made connections or considered participating but wasn't able to at the time.

Political community is sometimes hard to find, and as I note below, it is often transitory, temporary, and fleeting. I am continually thankful for the anarchist crews across Southern Ontario (and beyond) whom I have gotten to know over the years, and who are still keeping the spirit of anarchism alive. Your words, deeds, desires, and imaginations continue to influence my own anarchist practice and the ideas expressed here. Let us keep fighting for a better world.

I want to thank my supervisor Ravi for his ongoing support and guidance throughout the whole of this project, through many, many rounds of meetings, edits, and discussions. Lesley and JJ as well for your ongoing feedback and suggestions that have honed this work into its final form. Thank you all for continually pushing my thinking throughout and for your ongoing patience as I dove in and out of this whole thing over the years. I feel quite thankful for having had such a supportive committee throughout.

Thank you to the many others who have influenced my academic journey and ideas that have also structured this work, including fellow panelists and participants at conferences over the years, the members of Indigenous-Settler Relations cluster of the Canadian Sociological Association, various editors and reviewers at journals where I have had the opportunity to publish, Glen Coulthard and all the students who attended the 2016 International Political Economy and Ecology Summer School at York, and all those with whom I have had the opportunity to correspond regarding their work on similar issues. In particular, I want to thank Theresa Warburton, Onyx Sloan Morgan, Adam Barker, Craig Fortier, Sara Matthews, Tammy Kovich, and Cedar for their correspondence and discussion on many of the themes and ideas that animate this dissertation.

Thank you to all of the students I have had the opportunity to learn together with across York University, Wilfrid Laurier University, and the University of Waterloo. I have been particularly grateful for the staff, students, and faculty in the Social Justice and Community Engagement Program at Laurier Brantford for their support and engagement.

I have many friends who have lent various supports throughout the whole process. Many of you (Kali especially) provided places to stay when I was doing research, attending classes, or teaching, or who let me bounce ideas around and further solidify my own approach and way forward. Many of you also overlap into organizing communities, groups, and movements I continue to learn from as the years go on. Thanks and appreciation to Bangishimo and Amy for your friendship and ongoing resurgence work. Special thanks to Dillyn, Mercy, Paul, Marco, Fern, Jacob, and Vince for your love and friendship over all these years.

My parents and extended family also deserve a heap of thanks. You have always encouraged the ongoing pursuit of learning and knowledge. This is what started the initial path to university and has continued to influence this present work. I take much of my inspiration for seeking a better world from the values you instilled in me when I was young, and the support that you continue to give me into the present.

Last, and certainly far from least, I want to thank my partner, Laura. You have been beside me through all of the political and academic (mis)adventures that inform the dissertation that comes below. You have always been keen to support me, encourage me, love me, and beyond. Thank you for everything and for enriching my life.

There is no me. There is no you. There is all.
There is no you. There is no me. And that is all.
A profound acceptance of an enormous pageantry.
A haunting certainty that the unifying principle of this universe is love.

—Propagandhi, *Duplicate Keys Icaro (An Interim Report)*

This work was supported by both Ontario Graduate Scholarships and a SSHRC Doctoral Award (# 752–2015–2037).

Table of Contents

Abstract ii
Dedication iii
Acknowledgements iv
Table of Contents vii
Introduction 1
Chapter 1 – Bringing Anarchist Anti-Colonial Possibilities Into Sharper View 13
Context 15
Literature Review 21
Social Movement Theory and Bourdieu 21
Movement Culture(s) and Resistance 28
Anarchism, Political Culture, and Value-Practices 32
Settler Colonialism, Anti-Colonialism, and Indigenous Resurgence 36
Specification of activities 45
Grounded Theory 52
Ethnography and Social Movement Research 57
Outline of Chapters 62
Chapter 2 – 'Value-Practices' of Contemporary Anarchism: Definitions, Tensions, Resistance 66
Anarchist Value-Practices 68
Value-Practices and Core Commitments 72
Positioning Contemporary Anarchism 90
A Contemporary 'Movement of Movements' 95
Blackening and Indigenizing 'Anarchism(s) Otherwise' 115
Conclusion 122
Chapter 3 – Settler Colonialism, Capitalism and State: Structures, Linkages, and Resistance 126
Settler Colonialism 128
Capitalist Expansion and Settler Colonialism 138
Primitive Accumulation 142

Dispossession 149
Expansion in the 'New World' 154
Structures of Identity 163
Black and Abolitionist Interventions 173
Myths of Settlement and Indigeneity 176
'Settler Common Sense' and Everyday forms of Settler Colonialism 178
But is examining settler colonialism enough? 183
Conclusions and Implications for Centering Settler Colonialism 188
Chapter 4 – Social Movements, Political Culture and Resistance: Considering Anarchist Habitus, Capital and Field 192
Bourdieu and Key Concepts for Consideration 193
Bourdieu in Social Movements 204
Anarchist Field and Habitus 215
The Settler Colonial Field of Power 225
Conclusion 235
Chapter 5 – Cultures of Anarchism, Cultures of Resistance: Anarchist Culture and Value-Practices in Southern Ontario 241
Narrating Participants and Their Affinities with Anarchism 243
Anarchist Value-Practices in Southern Ontario 249
Defining Anarchist Culture from the Ground Up 258
Infrastructures of Culture and Resistance 265
Anarchist Forms of Cultural Communication 274
Drawbacks and Pitfalls of Anarchist Cultural Forms 283
Conclusion 293
Chapter 6 – Opposition, Relationships, Solidarity: Anarchist Articulations of Settler Colonial Context and Affinities with Indigenous Resurgence 295
Anarchist Analyses of Settler Colonialism in Culture 296
Anarchist-Indigenous Connections and Affinities 305
Understanding Anarchist-Indigenous Relations 310
Taking Up Tensions in Solidarity and Allyship 318

The ‘Who’ of Solidarity 323
Leadership and Taking Direction 329
Solidarity as Practice 337
Expanding Accountabilities 346
Conclusion 356
Chapter 7 – Grounded Normativities and Subaltern Knowledges: Considering Anarchist Prefigurative Possibilities for the Future 358
Spirituality, Ancestry, and Tradition 360
Embracing Anarchist History and Tradition 376
Connection, Place, and Land 382
Treaty, Wampum, and Radical Autonomies of the Future 396
Stepping Towards Radical Futures 410
Towards Greater Dialogues and Imaginations 425
Conclusion 431
Conclusion: Spaces of Possibility, Spaces of Potential 434
References 443

Introduction

Fucker, I'm resourceful, resilient

I power through the waves of disappointment

Maybe not quite thriving, but I'm buoyant

I am at peace these days

Give or take a fit of blinding rage

—Propagandhi*, At Peace*

This work has been a fair few years in the making. It emerges first and foremost from an ongoing commitment to practice. Sometimes fleeting, sometimes inconsistent, sometimes burning out, and sometimes finding new energy and possibility. The impetus for my academic work springs from experiences within anarchist movements over nearly 20 years. This is fitting given the overwhelming emphasis that anarchists place on practice and living one's politics — being in the world and seeking to change it directly and intentionally. So while this dissertation dwells within an academic space, and uses academic tools and resources, it also springs from thinking about how we might better live our anarchist politics in the world.

Prefigurative politics is the commitment to 'build a new world in the shell of the old,' to tear down systems and structures of violence and oppression while simultaneously putting in place alternatives that speak to our values, living our politics in the everyday, rather than waiting for some far-flung future that might give us a blank slate to start anew. This prefigurative ethos means that we can (and should) start to build right away and bring this approach to all of the work that we do.

My aim, throughout the whole of my academic career, has been to think, write, and theorize as an anarchist, about anarchism, for anarchists (and those fellow travelers along the way). My aim has been precisely to intervene, dialogue, engage, and expand the ways that anarchists and anarchism think about histories of colonization, ongoing forms of Indigenous resurgence, and

the further possibilities of our own anti-colonial politics. I want to catalyze conversations, broaden perspectives, enliven politics, enhance possibilities. One of my overarching concerns is how, as anarchists, we can take questions of anti-colonial resistance and solidarity more seriously.

So, very directly, this whole dissertation project might be seen as an ongoing process of reflection and prefiguration. What began, in some ways, as a more practical departure from my quite theoretical MA thesis on anarcha-Indigenism, has shifted and developed as the years have unfolded. In many ways this dissertation reflects my initial vision for my MA, speaking directly with anarchists and engaging in situated forms of movement scholarship. This was before the convergence of anarchy and state repression got in the way.

My arrest, legal process, and ultimate incarceration after organizing against the Toronto G20 Summit in 2010 was both an interruption in a somewhat vaguely defined academic path and a personal and political rupture that now carries the source of deeper material understanding of the forces of repression and the machinery of the state that I oppose as an anarchist. These experiences in the street, in moments and movements of agitation and opposition and in the furtherance of collective forms of solidarity and support, are inseparable from broader theoretical and academic discussions on such topics; each informs the other, often crossing and intermingling in important ways. The impetus for this academic work is to contribute to greater reflection within the anarchist movements and cultures that I call home. It has permitted me to focus, in depth, on the theoretical understandings and lineages of anarchist politics and put them into conversation, dialogue, and disruption with Indigenous resurgence movements and anti-colonial agitation against the ongoing structures of state, capitalism and colonialism. But this is plainly not enough. Theoretical exercises have a danger of staying at that exact level—of the abstract, a step removed from the street, the barricade and the land reclamation.

Initially, I was much more interested in speaking to anarchists for the purposes of critiquing what I saw as a general lack of attention to anti-colonial politics. This came, in part, from my own observations being in movements and movement spaces, and the limited writing that was available on questions of anarchism and anti-colonialism. I felt a need to be direct regarding the

failures of anarchists in looking at anti-colonial questions. But I was foregrounding theoretical failings at the expense of actually engaging in a more nuanced and detailed way with anarchist practices as they are expressed in the world.

As this project will make clear, anarchists do think about histories of settler colonialism, their own place within it, and the implications for their politics and modes of resistance, and they continually wrestle with a series of ongoing tensions in relation to questions of solidarity and opposition. They are routinely and continually involved in supporting a range of anti-colonial struggles, both through more localized forms of solidarity with Indigenous resurgence and ongoing land defense struggles, as well as articulating solidarity and seeking to learn from more internationalist anti-colonial movements. These practices of anti-colonial politics are a consistent aspect of how anarchists construct their political positions.

Even so, the breadth of theorizing, discussion, and ongoing engagement regarding anti-colonial anarchist theory and practice, must be deepened and expanded. Anarchists have a baseline opposition to settler colonialism, but this can expand and deepen following the challenges and lessons that emerge from ongoing practices. In other words, the more theoretical, reflective, intellectual, and written engagements can be expanded in order to consider, reflect, and process the material anti-colonial practices that many anarchists are engaging in regularly. This is also a crucial consideration in my own work.

There is a tendency to shy away from extended, long-winded, even perhaps 'self-serving' forms of 'navel-gazing,' internal critique, or sustained debrief within movements. There is always another struggle to support, another action to plan, another crisis to respond to. Such is the way of living in a world hell-bent on expanding authoritarianism and capitalism at the expense of the vast many. It sometimes feels irresponsible to take time to process, consider, reflect, learn, and vision when there is so much acute strife that must be responded to in our world. Ongoing crises make this more difficult as time goes on, and as burnout becomes more widespread.

But what is missed when we don't take this time? When we forge ahead instead of reflecting on where we came from? What lessons and possibilities do we lose that could help us in the future? These are some of the questions I face as I think about anarchism and anti-colonial politics and the connections I have had to these struggles for almost 20 years. We gain a clearer view of where we have come from, what we have missed in our earlier attempts, what tensions are still at play, and what lessons we can learn to alter our values and practices in the future if we take time to put in this reflective work. These are the realities that this project springs from.

What follows incorporates my own process of reflection and prefiguration, built into a more traditional academic exercise. My ideas, and what I think is important, have changed throughout this process. Early forms of Chapters 1, 2, and 3 were originally developed between 2013 and 2016. The more substantive theoretical work in Chapter 4, and the core interview data reflected in 5, 6 and 7 were forged in the murky years of the COVID-19 pandemic, and the years after that have been narrated by the ongoing genocide against the Palestinian people. Much has changed through the years, and yet, so much is the same—the war against the earth, the people who seek to protect it, and movements seeking a better world is still very much alive and well, and intensifying by the minute. But so is the necessity of furthering resistance and imagining radical futures.

So, I see this work as a process of reflection, looking back on the ideas and perspectives that originally animated this work, and provided the frameworks and schematics for where I am now. This approach weaves in several theoretical frameworks and approaches to consider ongoing aspects of anarchist practice, from anarchist value-practices, social movement research, settler colonial studies, Indigenous resurgence, and the work of Pierre Bourdieu (2000, 1998) on structure, agency, and culture. Each of these aspects adds nuances and possibilities that aid in the discussion, and expansion, of anarchist anti-colonial value-practices, as lived forms of politics that find their primary expression as practice in the world.

Bourdieu's *habitus* is particularly illuminating for considering the ways that my own experiences and reflections fit into this work directly and intentionally. Habitus, to speak plainly if not crudely, is the values, practices, mannerisms, ways of being, ways of seeing, that each of us is

enculturated into as part of our collective socialization. It structures and gives shape to who we are and why we do the things we do in unconscious, and persistent ways. Habitus, in Bourdieu's formulation, conditions how we know what to do in various day-to-day situations in our lives without having to rigorously think through each and every thought and action. It is, in many ways, a developed and structured sort of commonsense to how we live in the world, how we have been enculturated into it, how we are reproduced, and how we persist.[1]

This notion of habitus therefore applies to anarchists, who enter, maintain, and live within anarchist movements, and I apply it to myself directly. Bourdieu does raise some doubt about how perceptible such a habitus is, and our actual ability to change or alter it with intention. While we might never get a full picture of the ways that unconscious conditioning and reproduction occur, we are also not wholly beholden to it. There are elements of agency that we can consider in the ways that we approach the world, and the desire for change. We can consider where we come from, how we got here, and how that affects the things we do in the here and now. As anarchists we can consider how we got into anarchist politics, how we learned about what matters and what doesn't to anarchists, why we emphasize certain aspects of our politics over others, and the tensions or critical ways that we might think about developing them further. This, it seems to me, is a very worthwhile set of reflections we can take from Bourdieu, even if it is limited, and even if we can never fully comprehend the ways that we are affected, conditioned, or structured by the various forces of the world and those around us.

My point, then, is that this framework, this approach, this way of seeing, is important for anarchists who want to think about prefigurative politics. It is important for me, and the ways that I see and reflect on my own anarchism, and the ways that these ideas weave into something like this dissertation. Examining the aspects of my own habitus, my own perceptions, histories, developments, and future possibilities of my own anarchism in a directly personal

[1] There is surely more to this, as I detail below, and especially in Chapter 4, but I hope this crude caricature suffices for my next point.

sense, helps with the wider project I am taking on here. I don't just want to prefigure a wider anti-colonial anarchism for some far flung, 'out in the world,' 'over there' theoretical movement (although also this!). I want to do it for myself. I want to consider, reconsider, reflect, and reimagine the contours and structures of my own anarchist politics. I want them to find greater movement and wider possibilities.

So that is my aim here, keeping in mind the tensions and possibilities that undergird what follows. I see this work as both my own engagement with anarchist habitus, culture, politics, values, and practices, and an exploration of a wider set of movement considerations. I see the way that these chapters and overall project of research have come together as a prefigurative and imaginative process itself. Not static to a previous place and time, bound to a way of seeing that seemed relevant 10 years ago, but as something that is continually imperfect and under ongoing development and experimentation. This is what animates how I write here, and I make some direct reference to these aspects of reflection as I go along.

Very directly, by way of an example, anarchism was perhaps at a much higher point in 2012 when I started this project, given the rise of occupation politics stemming from the Occupy movement and the international energy of resistance buttressed by the revolutions of the Arab Spring and the practice of taking and reclaiming space. Idle No More, too, was a major watershed moment in ongoing efforts of Indigenous resurgence. While things had never been 'idle' in any sense whatsoever, it was hard to deny that there was a certain awakening afoot, and much more pronounced disruption of the status quo of colonial politics and the complicities of the state in such an ongoing legacy. Radical possibilities seemed to be on an upswing. But as many have pointed out, movements and struggles ebb and flow, and while the visibility of these movements has faded, conversations around Indigenous resurgence, anti-colonialism, decolonization, land, reconciliation, and possible futures are much more present as a result of these continual struggles and the visibility of ongoing Indigenous land defense.

The pandemic threw a significant wrench into collective struggles, forcing new ways of relating and organizing and being in the world. Fascism and the out-and-proud politics of the far right now loom larger than they ever have within recent collective memory. The war on poor people,

racialized people, migrants, queer and trans folks, and anyone collectively dreaming of a better world has been steadily ratcheted up, in destructive ways. The radical promise and possibility of years gone by maybe doesn't seem to so rosy and bright these days. But resistance persists and for many the commitment to struggle remains strong, with many more continuing to find their feet.

My practice and process here should be considered alongside these ebbs and flows—both larger movement/societal based, and my own more intimate and personal ones. The ways that we, and I, understand anarchism, and imagine anarchism, have changed throughout this process, and will continue to do so into the future. The ongoing reality of change is a force that is baked into the words that I write and the ideas that frame the work that follows.

I would be remiss if I didn't name another ongoing process that is also intimately bound up with anarchist politics and the possibilities of change and prefigurative imagination. The course of my engagement with anarchism, social movements, anti-colonial politics, Indigenous resurgence and resistance continues to be punctuated with the forces of state repression. This begins with historical antecedents and moves into the ongoing histories of radical agitation and anti-colonial resistance that have been forcefully targeted and repressed by agents of the state, capital, and colonization. Social movement and resistance activities have always garnered the eye of the forces of power, and movements against and beyond capitalism, the state, and colonialism continue to feel the effects of violent reaction the world over. It is important to acknowledge and learn from the histories of Indigenous resistance on the land where we live, as well as the histories of the political movements where we find home. Anarchists are no strangers to running up against the violent methods of the state.

My own clash with the forces of the state began in the lead up and resistance to the Vancouver Olympics and the Toronto G20 meetings in 2010, involving various iterations of police surveillance, undercover infiltration, arrest, detention, legal proceedings, and incarceration. These two events were significant for both their collective displays of militant resistance and, in the case of the G20, the resultant wave of repression against social movements. This repression was a response to the state's perception of a great 'threat' posed by radical forms of

Indigenous resistance and their building connections with radical anti-capitalist currents. This is a backdrop to my own life, but also a crucial node in my continued development and articulation of anarchist politics, both practical and academic. This is a genealogy that cannot be separated from the work I take up here, the context of my study and life, nor the politics that I continue to hold and fight for.

The sting of repression has not abated. Through the course of this PhD work there have been innumerable examples of the violent realities of state power on display that hit close to home and continue to affect friends and comrades in struggle, including ongoing RCMP invasions of Wet'suwet'un territory; arrests of anti-pipeline direct action activists; mass public outcry and police hysteria following Hamilton's Locke Street Riot; targeting of Pride events by violent racist homophobes; the continual rise of fascist and far-right movements that find company, if not outright alliance, with the police; the continued brutality of the OPP (Ontario Provincial Police) against Haudenosaunee land defenders at Six Nations; and the ongoing targeting of Palestine liberation organizers. Movements and struggles for a better world—and in particular those of Indigenous, Black, and racialized peoples who throw the very existence of colonial white supremacist states into stark relief—face such repression on an ongoing and persistent basis. When speaking about radical alternative futures or resurgence, the forces of violent reaction and repression remain as a potent reminder of the sacrifices made and the work to be done.

Bringing anarchism back into the street, this project brings in the voices of anarchists that were very much missing and difficult to include in my previous MA work. State repression, non-association bail conditions, and ongoing surveillance continue to stifle the willingness and ability for anarchists to engage in interviews that record their thoughts, feelings, and reflections on theory and action. The forces of state repression are always keen to further their understandings of movement of opposition, and especially those who they deem pose a threat to the status quo and the very foundation of their power.

This may seem an odd place to begin, as this work does not focus on repression, but on the cultures of resistance and prefigurative futures that animate anarchist movements. The pages that follow are more about possibility (I hope!) than despair. This work does, however, consider

the anti-colonial implications of anarchist work and its relationship to Indigenous resurgence. The state has a great deal of anxiety regarding the challenges put forth by radical political projects. The state, and its techniques of repression, as I detail below, is a crucial force for the continuation of capitalism, colonialism, white supremacy, and the foreclosures of a better world. The fundamental violence of the state, long pointed out by anarchists (amongst others), is one of the major bulwarks against imagining and putting into practice something better. As such, I think we would do well to remember this ongoing reality, as structures that oppose our efforts, often left intact or by the wayside by 'progressive' movements or those that seek change through the authoritarian state itself. The state, as a key force of repression and violence needs to be overcome and dismantled as we move forward to see an end to structures and systems of oppression, hierarchy and domination.

With ongoing interest in Indigenous resistance and resurgence in particular, stemming from community efforts of self-determination, forceful calls for justice, state discourses of 'reconciliation,' and a litany of high-profile blockades and land reclamations, questions of anti-colonial and decolonial resistance are more pressing now than ever and punctuate the mainstream political landscape. For left radical, anti-authoritarian, and anarchist social movements, such resurgence and resistance brings settler coloniality and colonial complicity to the forefront and problematizes the politics of solidarity, alliance, and complicity with Indigenous struggles alongside broader alternative political visions. This prompts social movements broadly to consider the particularities of the contexts in which they resist, and the ways that forces of power, in particular the state and capital, continue to seek to manage, neutralize and repress moments of rupture and resistance. In the context of Canada, settler colonialism is directly tied to the state and capitalism, and the ongoing forms of repression targeting movements (Coulthard, 2014).

Pointedly, then, this work considers the implications of proposing comprehensive radical future visions in the context of ongoing settlement and occupation. What are the implications of anarchist futures on stolen land? These are the sorts of questions that this present work considers: how they might be approached from a specifically anarchist position, and how this

must necessarily disrupt our theories and practices. As I have stated, grappling with these questions has been occurring only piecemeal in theoretical quarters, but not widely considered. This grappling is much more common and sustained at the level of everyday politics. The streets and blockades perhaps have a different story to tell that can inform anarchist theory much more directly.

Therefore, I hope that this particular work can contribute to ongoing discussions of anarchism and anti-colonialism, and the continued promise of thinking through prefigurative approaches to the future. I hope that it brings some of the elements that are often spoken about, debated, refined, and articulated at the level of movement cultures to greater prominence so we can continue to engage, argue, develop, and reflect on our theories and practices as anarchists. I hope this work gives some space to do this in an intentional way—not to replace the ongoing day-to-day informal theoretical and practical discussion that is so endemic to anarchist culture—but to bring it to a broader audience and lead to greater introspection across a range of anarchist contexts. So much of anti-colonial anarchist work has stayed at the level of localized scenes and groups without greater discussion across distance, restricting the ongoing development of our ideas. As interview respondents noted over and over, there is a need for greater intention, writing, reflection, and circulation of anarchist thought on these themes. It is my hope that I might contribute in some way to this circulation and discussion, and open further avenues for it to grow beyond what I have written here.

Part of the context of repression requires considering the intersections of hope and grief. Anarchists are well acquainted with grief given historic and continued forms of repression, and the ways that they have foreclosed future possibilities. But there are still glimmers of hope that things might change, which animate anarchists' belief that we can and must continue to build. Throughout this project there been various tragedies of violence and state repression that afflict the world, including recently the (still) ongoing genocide against the Palestinian people by the settler colonial apartheid state of Israel. I frequently ask myself how we hold these two aspects together—hope and despair, grief and promise. I have yet to find answers, but there is something in the power of anarchist politics and ongoing resistance that keeps me going.

As one of my interviewees Lila offered, in a way that continues to stick with me throughout this project:

> What is beautiful about heartbreak is when we're so raw and vulnerable and we find connection. And what is so deeply painful about grief and suffering is when we're not able to find people, we're not able to connect. That can be the difference between experiencing something as painful, but ultimately that there can still be nourishment and beauty, versus, like, you wither and die.

Collective movements and moments, like anarchism, are one way to weather the storms that have persisted, and show no signs of letting up quite yet.

The recent work by the post-rock band Godspeed You! Black Emperor seems to be one of the most articulate expressions of this ongoing tension—the promise of other worlds, those already here and fit to expand, and those still to come, but also the despair and grief at the potentials and lives that have been snuffed out in the interim.

Their most recent release 'NO TITLE AS OF 13 FEBRUARY 2024 28,340 DEAD,' an explicit reference to the ongoing brutality and death count of the genocide against Palestinian's, engages both hope and grief, captured by the band's liner notes:

> *NO TITLE= what gestures make sense while tiny bodies fall? what context? what broken melody?*
> *and then a tally and a date to mark a point on the line, the negative process, the growing pile.*
> *the sun setting above beds of ash*
> *while we sat together, arguing.*
> *the old world order barely pretended to care.*
> *this new century will be crueler still.*
> *war is coming.*
> *don't give up.*
> *pick a side.*

hang on.

love.

GY!BE

Hope is powerful tool against the persistence of structures of violence and destruction in the world. But it is something that needs nurturing and cultivation. I have found elements of this hope in the movements, movement cultures, and ideas that I discuss here, but also in the cultural works of music and art that are so crucial for resistance.

As my discussion of anarchist culture, anti-colonial politics, Indigenous resurgence, and prefigurative futures attests, we are not without tools to fight such despair and construct something else. But we need to pick them up. We need to hone our skills with them. We need to share, disrupt, and challenge our knowledge of how to use them and for what ends. I hope that this work makes but a small contribution to this goal—to show the ways that anarchists continue to wrestle with questions of settler colonialism and enduring Indigenous resistance—and how there is still much more work to be done. But also that this work can be done, and there is hope for a (new/old) world on the way.

Someday, somewhere, today's empires are tomorrow's ashes.

—Propagandhi

Chapter 1 – Bringing Anarchist Anti-Colonial Possibilities Into Sharper View

With ongoing interest in Indigenous resistance and resurgence in the wake of a litany of high-profile reclamations, blockades, community efforts of self-determination, significant academic interventions, and ongoing conversations about reconciliation and decolonization, questions of anti-colonial and decolonial resistance are more pressing now than ever. For left radical, anti-authoritarian, and anarchist social movements, such resurgence and resistance brings settler coloniality and colonial complicity to the forefront and problematizes the politics of solidarity with Indigenous struggles. Further, this prompts social movements broadly to consider the particularities of the contexts in which they resist. In the context of Canada, settler colonialism is directly tied to the rise of the state and capitalism (Coulthard, 2014). As movements against the state and capitalism (in addition to all other forms of oppression and domination), anarchist movements need to carefully consider the implications of settler colonialism on theory and practice. This dissertation explores how anarchists respond to the context of settler colonialism and Indigenous resurgence/resistance. More directly, this dissertation asks how, based on this context, anarchists understand, articulate, and engage in resistance to settler colonialism through the articulation and expansion of their value-practices and cultures of resistance, the lessons and reflections from such resistance so far, the considerations moving forward, and possible implications for broader social movement practices.

I examine these questions by looking at anarchist political/movement cultures of resistance (Gordon, 2008)[2] and how resistance to settler colonialism is understood, contextualized, articulated, and reproduced within them using Bourdieu's concepts of habitus, capital, and field. How do anarchists make this a component of the daily practice of 'everyday life' of anarchist culture, and the ways our value-practices are communicated, transmitted, and

[2] I use the terms political culture, movement culture, and resistance culture interchangeably to refer to the lived processes of anarchist resistance.

reproduced? I engage these questions through a study of anarchist political cultures in Southern Ontario, and interviews with anarchists themselves.[3] I am interested in the movement implications and possibilities of anarchist resistance to settler colonialism.

Rather than 'answer' these questions in a definitive sense, I hope to engender further reflections and conversations in anarchist communities, cultures, and movements on anarchism's current anti-colonial articulations, orientations, value-practices, and future potentials. I do so through speaking with anarchists directly to gather their understandings of settler colonialism and its influence on their context of resistance. I sought to have frank conversations, asking them to talk about their views on anarchist culture, the context of settler colonialism and Indigenous resurgence/resistance, and how this plays into their core definitions of anarchism, day-to-day activities and organization, and conversations about radical futures. In this discussion I include the writings of anarchists on the subject, both academic and movement-based—their analysis of settler colonial relationships and context, the implications for resistance, and how they relate such topics to organizing directly.[4]

I also look at the day-to-day articulations of anti-colonial anarchist value-practices,—whether through the organizing actions and utterances of anarchists—including the use of land acknowledgements, statements of solidarity, aesthetic forms of visual propaganda—the books and zines that are distributed, and the events that anarchists organize. Articulations and engagements, in this sense, are both the explicit words and views of anarchists, and their responses to changes in context or challenges and disruptions of their work, but also the 'practices of everyday life' that are part and parcel of anarchist movement cultures. I am

[3] This is a particularly interesting time for such examination given the recent Canada 150 celebrations that both celebrated and covered up Canada's continued settler colonial structures, and some seemingly renewed energy within anarchist movements given the repressive political climate of the United States and the re-emergence of militant anti-racist and anti-fascist forms of organizing. For one example of resistance, particularly in the context of Indigenous art, see http://canadianart.ca/news/artists-resist-canada150-social-media/.

[4] Important sources for much of this writing will be websites like north-shore.info, It's Going Down, and NoCanada.info, run by anarchists and foregrounding anti-state, anti-capitalist and anti-colonial politics.

interested in what is shown and spoken, but also in elements that maybe 'silent' or missing from the ways that anarchists articulate themselves, their politics, and their culture.

Bourdieu's framework encompassing habitus, capital, and field sheds light on the ways that structures and practices are created, maintained, and persist, but also carries possibilities of change. Using his theoretical work I consider how core anarchist value-practice (like resistance to all forms of oppression an domination) persist within anarchist culture, but are also lacking in a wider anti-colonial orientation that can be broadened through more direct interrogation of their positions and practices, as well as through greater engagements and disruptions that come from Indigenous resurgence. Anarchist habitus, in particular, maintains the current trajectory of anarchist value-practices, but needs to be more directly disrupted towards anti-colonial ends if anarchist are to attend to the specifics of the context of settler colonialism and Indigenous resurgence where they dwell, and if they are to more explicitly and committedly orient their prefigurative politics to anti-colonial futures.

Context

This dissertation examines the intersections and engagements between contemporary anarchist cultures of resistance, Indigenous struggles in Canada and the United States, and the ongoing context of settler colonialism. It draws on broader anarchist and Indigenous theory and practice to take up a specific case study of the cultures of anarchism in settler colonial Southern Ontario, Canada, a relatively small anarchist scene, but one that has had historic connections to Indigenous and anti-colonial struggles and one that has figured prominently in the significant resistance to ongoing moments of Indigenous resistance and land defense as well as previous moments like resistance to the 2010 Vancouver Olympics and the G20 meetings in 2010. While such movements were affected directly in significant ways by the forces of police repression in the wake of such events, there has been a continuation of anarchist activity in recent decades, with ongoing anarchist bookfairs and events, as well as with the establishment of anarchist political spaces, such as The Tower (RIP) and Black Oak in Hamilton or AKA in Kingston, that have built upon previous iterations in Toronto, Kitchener, and Guelph. Anarchists continue to

be involved in myriad movements, from Palestine solidarity, anti-fascism, Indigenous resurgence, ecological land defense, and queer/trans community defense.

I see Southern Ontario as a specific context of anarchist struggle that is distinct from the more developed and militant cultures of resistance in Quebec (in particular Montreal), geographically separated from both the east and western coasts of Canada, and also distinct when compared to the closer areas of the United States, with the border being a limiting factor, but also given the different ways in which Indigenous resistance is located vis-à-vis the state and settler colonial histories. Southern Ontario contains a number of a smaller cities (Kitchener, Hamilton, Guelph, Kingston, etc.) that host a range of anarchist organizing and projects that are outside of, though connected to, the often larger focal point of Toronto (while still significant for its size, range of groups involved in resistance, and as a hub of capitalism). These smaller communities are notable for their proximity to increased Indigenous resurgence and resistance events; ongoing forms of city expansion into ecological areas; majority white populations with large university communities; decline in the manufacturing sector over the last several decades; increased population growth, in part because of the volatile housing market in and around Toronto leading to movement outward with increased commuting to larger urban centres; and increased connectedness to one another through transportation and public transit corridors. These factors have led to increased social movement activity around a number of issues, and increased attention to Indigenous issues specifically, as well as to greater physical connections between these communities and movements within them. These areas are significant in part because of such connections and their ongoing discussion within anarchist movements.[5]

These smaller locations also contain smaller movements, where in many cases there may be only one or two clusters of anarchists working on various projects of organizing and resistance,

[5] It is further important to note that, from my experience in particular and from the sentiments of many anarchists that I know, that anarchists in these outlying cities are consistently more willing to travel between their own communities and the larger city of Toronto than those in the larger city are willing to do. I think this presents an interesting set of exchanges within movements that might be pertinent for the ways that tactics, strategies, and analysis are shared, discussed, and disseminated in the broader movement.

which means that such organizers carry out the multi-fronted work of creating and maintaining spaces of anarchist culture, organizing anarchist projects, spreading educational propaganda about anarchism, supporting other struggles, bringing anarchist analysis to a range of issues, and responding to ongoing events. There is perhaps something significant about the ways that these anarchist cultures coalesce on such a small scale that warrants attention. So, while I am interested in the ways that anarchist culture arises in the context of larger cities like Toronto, which I include in this work, I prioritize the activities in the smaller cities outside of Toronto, and consider possible comparisons.

The histories of Indigenous resistance in this area are both longstanding and significant. There has been resistance to colonial forms of imposition since early contact, and a long history of betrayal of treaty relationships. Susan M. Hill (2017; see also Monture, 2014), for example, notes the ongoing history of the Haudenosaunee people of Six Nations on much of the land in Southern Ontario and the land seizures, dispossession, and ongoing implications; Leanne Simpson (2020, 2014, 2017) notes the ongoing power of Nishnaabeg resistance and resurgence in the Great Lakes region; and Kathryn Magee Labelle (2013) details the history of the Wendat peoples in this region and their dispersal from ongoing conflicts and processes of colonization. These are some of the key examples that provide greater understanding of the context of land and colonialism in Southern Ontario. This resistance, however, has continued with ongoing reclamations at Six Nations beginning in 2006 and again in 2020 (see for example Ahmed, 2020; McCarthy, 2016), ongoing anti-pipeline organizing across the area, high profile blockades and confrontations at Tyendinaga or resistance to resource extraction by the Ardoch Algonquin. Here there is an active history of Indigenous land defense struggles, but also of non-Indigenous, and often anarchist, solidarity with such struggles (see for example Davis et al., 2022; Hiller, 2017; Krebs & Olwan, 2012; Lewis, 2012a; Abdou et al., 2009; Day & Haberle, 2006;). These combined factors point to something worthwhile and particular to examine in this area.

There are broad movements that inform the present context of struggle in Southern Ontario, that are themselves closely connected to broader struggles in the Canadian context (captured in part by the breadth of discussion in the journal *Upping the Anti*, AJ Withers' [2021] detailed

work on the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty, Dixon's [2014] work, Walia's [2011] reflections, and Neigh's two volumes [2012a, 2012b]). While I have yet to find a detailed account of movements that deals directly with Southern Ontario and considers more routinely focused movements in Toronto alongside other urban and rural contexts, there are important movement histories in the region that range from anti-poverty organizing and resistance to neoliberalism in the 1990s, to the wider anti-globalization movement and organizations like the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty (OCAP), and various "CAP"s in other cities (Withers, 2021; Wood, 2010; Shantz, 2009); the historical work of migrant justice organizations drawing explicit connections to capitalism and colonialism like No One is Illegal (Fortier, 2015, 2013; Walia, 2013; Shantz 2009); continued prison justice and prison abolition organising in Kingston and across the region (EPIC, n.d.); more recent anti-Canada forms of anti-colonial resistance (Dupuis-Deri & Pillet, 2023); ongoing agitation against the Israeli occupation of Palestine and recent student encampments, the connections to pinkwashing raised by groups like Queers Against Israeli Apartheid, and increasing numbers of motions to support Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions; a number of high profile strikes at York University and college campuses; ongoing disruption and resistance to pipeline projects such as Line 9 or Line 10; queer/trans solidarity organizing and drag defence events; resurgent anti-fascist and anti-racist organizing against the far-right; tenant and eviction defence and pandemic mutual aid (the COVID-19 pandemic forms an overall recent backdrop to movement struggles and a changing context of struggle; see Skyer et al., 2025); and resistance to ongoing police brutality and the murder of black bodies by local chapters of Black Lives Matter and grassroots abolitionist coalitions against police brutality (Maynard, 2017), amongst myriad other struggles. The range of social movement activity in this area is far reaching, and much more complex than can be discussed here. This does, however, give a sense of some of the histories of resistance on these lands. Anarchists have long participated in and supported such movements, and much organizing occurs in wider movements rather than necessarily in anarchist-focused groups or collectives. In this sense, it is important to situate anarchists who participate in other movements/projects/cultures and how these elements are connected to, or could contribute to, understandings of anarchist culture. In this sense, how do such anarchists translate

anarchist culture into their broader organizing contexts, and how is settler colonialism discussed here?

Southern Ontario is also the area that I call home, and the general range of my own participation in anarchist cultures of resistance. This colours both my account and my analysis and serves as the impetus for this project. I see my direct connection as part of an ongoing process of reflection and prefiguration—as a means to consider the movements I have been a part of, the lessons that can be learned from them, and also the critical and prefigurative possibilities for the future. Reflection and prefiguration occur 'in the world' through social movement participation, but also through the ongoing process of putting together this dissertation. This has happened over, perhaps, a more extended period than some, which has allowed an ongoing development of my own theory, practice, and value-practices. There is a personal element that resonates with the form of ethnographic practice that I discuss below in ways that maintain a commitment to ongoing involvement in struggle, to persist as a participant, an accomplice, a co-conspirator. There is no neutrality or distance here, even if I take a certain space for reflection using some wider academic tools. This approach presents a rich possibility for examining anarchist political cultures and their connections to supporting Indigenous resistance, analyzing settler colonialism and developing anti-colonial politics. It allows for a discussion of what anarchism looks like 'in place' in a regionally interconnected setting, from within the place itself. As such any generalization or wider application of this work might be difficult. It would need to be questioned and contextualized in order to be taken up in a range of other settler colonial locales and multiple levels of geographic focus, including but not limited to other parts of Canada, the United States, Australia or New Zealand and beyond. Even so, I hope that my work here presents sketches of models and approaches that could be taken up other places in ways that might contribute to the ongoing study and possibilities of anti-colonial struggle.

In particular I hope to generate insights into areas that are smaller than major cities, but where there are significant movement activities (and often where many anarchists live who might participate in larger city spaces where they do not live). There are many expressions of

anarchism and Indigenous resistance the world over and I hope that this work aids in examining them in a range of other places and times. Importantly then, my focus locates Southern Ontario anarchism within broader 'transnational' and 'multi-scalar' movements of resistance that exist outside the confines of the state and is embedded in the lived relationships of participants (Juris & Khasnabish, 2013, p. 8). My own direct connection and ongoing learning, theorizing, participation, analysis, and reflection is a direct aspect of the work I take up here.

The examination of this specific context also allows comparison to more generalized accounts of anarchist, or more generally anti-authoritarian (Dixon, 2014), engagements with anti-colonial and decolonial questions (Fortier, 2015, 2017). Theresa Warburton's work (2021, see also the contributions to Kauanui, 2021a) is a key text in this regard, as she considers the direct implications of anarchist, politics, practices and histories and their connection to settler colonialism histories, ongoing dynamics, and Indigenous resistance. I return to her work throughout. Fortier (2015) looks at 'how the practices of Indigenous decolonization and resurgence influence urban social movements and transform their political frameworks' (p. 2) and expands the geographic context much further to Canada and the US to argue 'that decolonization is not only different from other forms of liberatory politics in settler colonial states but is foundational to their success' (p. 4). Fortier examines a range of radical anti-authoritarian perspectives of which anarchism is but one smaller part. I am interested in a particular segment of this broader movement, both ideologically and geographically, in hopes of drawing out some theoretical and practical insights for those struggling against systems of oppression in smaller urban communities.

My work is also firmly situated within more recent studies of radical, authoritarian, or anarchist social movements that seek to move away from more conventional accounts of social movement studies (for general criticisms of such approaches see Williams, 2017; Choudry, 2015; Haiven & Khasnabish, 2014; Bevington & Dixon, 2005; and Day, 2005) and contribute directly to furthering resistance. Montgomery and bergman (2017) explore the intersections of joy and militancy, and consider the ways that movements uphold the toxic contours of 'rigid

radicalism;'[6] Bey (2020), Anderson (2021), and Samudzi and Anderson (2018) expand the possibilities for Black and abolitionist anarchist politics; Skyer et al. (2025), Firth (2022), and Spade (2020a, 2020b) trace the practices of mutual aid and social movements for transformation in the face on ongoing crises; Dixon (2014) details the broad range of anti-authoritarian lineages, contributions, and possibilities; Cornell (2016) revives a seemingly forgotten history of 20th century anarchism and suggests connections and lessons for future struggle; Haiven and Khasnabish (2014) consider the implications of social movement reproduction and the cultivation of the radical imagination; Walia (2021, 2013) discusses the complexities of border imperialism and connections to other systems of oppression and domination to inform broader resistance; and Crass (2013) considers the development and further intersection of anti-racist and feminist anti-authoritarian politics and practice. Each of these accounts contributes directly to the development of anti-authoritarian/anarchist resistance efforts and are themselves firmly situated within each author's own histories of struggle and their particular contexts. I aim to add a localized richness to these broader works of social movement and anarchist understandings, and build on them to consider the future possibilities of prefigurative anti-colonial value-practices.

Literature Review

Social Movement Theory and Bourdieu

In this work I consider a range of theoretical perspectives from social movement studies, cultural studies, Bourdieusian theory, anarchism, Indigenous resurgence/resistance, and settler colonial studies. Each of these elements informs how we might understand the dynamic interactions that occur within anarchist cultures of resistance in the context of ongoing structures of settler colonialism. To frame the structured/structuring dynamic at play within social movements and cultures, the work of Pierre Bourdieu is of significant importance. Bourdieu (1984) notes that 'agents are … the subjects of acts of construction of the social

[6] I return to their work in particular to consider the ways that anarchist culture operates, and renewing ways to construct affinities and relationships against settler colonialism.

world;' they are acted on and influenced by the structures of the world, but there is also the 'social genesis of the principles of construction'—the world itself is socially constructed (p. 467).[7] His notion of habitus, 'the set of dispositions, reflexes and forms of behaviour people acquire through acting in society,' along with 'field' and 'capital,' outlines the ways that people are differently situated in society and the ways that 'society reproduces itself.' But, he says, 'there is also change. Conflict is built into society. People can find that their expectations and ways of living are suddenly out of step with the new social position they find themselves in' (Bourdieu, 2000, p. 19). In each of these instances there is a two-way dynamic of influence between people and the structures and meanings in society. Speaking of activism and resistance more directly, Nick Crossley (2003) points to the activist habitus as

> structured through their involvement in protest and activism; it is a structured structure. At the same time, however, it is this same habitus which leads the activist to continue in activism and thus to contribute to the perpetuation of activism as a social practice; the activist habitus is thus a structuring structure, or rather, as Bourdieu says of the habitus more generally, a structured and structuring structure. It is generated by structured movement practices and it generates structured movement processes. (p. 51)

Put another way, critique of dominant structures of oppression and domination, and the desire for resistance to them, is generated through participation in such activities—'it is both a structured and a structuring structure.' A radical form of habitus generates both critique and protest, while protest and critique itself also aids in the generation of radical habitus (Crossley, 2003, p. 61).[8]

---

[7] 'Social subjects comprehend the social world which comprehends them,' Bourdieu (1984, p. 482) suggests, and the understanding of class is 'defined as much by its *being-perceived* as by its *being*, by its consumption … as much by its position in the relations of production' (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 483).

[8] This structured and structuring dynamic is also highlighted by McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilley (2009) in their discussion of contentious politics: 'Interaction between actors does not simply use or reproduce the relation between them (p. 262). Incrementally or explosively, it transforms both actors and relations.' See also Tarrow and

Protest and resistance occur within, following Bourdieu (1998), a 'field': 'a particular sector of the world' where the habitus dwells, structures, and is structured (p. 81). It is both a

> field of forces, whose necessity is imposed on agents who are engaged in it, and as a field of struggles within which agents confront each other, with differentiated means and ends according to their position in the structure of the field of forces, this contributing to conserving and transforming its structure. (Bourdieu, 1998, p. 32)

This means that there is a field of protest and resistance (Crossley, 2003, p. 674) where anarchist culture and habitus is located, but also a field of settler colonial relations, also where a structuring/structured dynamic occurs. As anarchists are forced to engage with other actors in these fields (the state, corporations, the forces of repression, other resistance movements, etc.), their actions 'mutually interfere with one another and interpenetrate, giving rise to an irreducible dynamic of interaction' (Crossley, 2003, p. 674). The different actors possess different elements of capital (based on resources, political competency, social standing etc.) that can be mobilized to assert political power and political influence, both externally against forces of power, but also within movements themselves. This is a useful framework with which to examine the ways that the context of settler colonialism influences anarchist politics and resistance cultures, while also noting the ways that anarchist movements are seeking to destroy such a structure as well. In other words, how this 'dynamic of interaction' plays out and how anarchists situate themselves within it and within settler colonialism. I engage Bourdieu's work in greater detail in Chapter 4, placing his theoretical work into conversation with social movement theory and anarchist resistance to settler colonialism as a crucial means to understand why anarchist anti-colonial value-practices persist in some forms, but also have difficulty widening their criticism and practice in others.

Tilley (2009) on culture etc. Actors exist 'not merely as expressions of structure' 'but as active sites of creation and change' (p. 446).

Daphi (2014) notes a specifically spatial element as well, which often comes as a replacement for social structure, and pushes for a greater examination of both the material and social constructionist dimensions of space within movements. Despite such the 'cultural turn' in social movement theorizing noted below, Flesher Fominaya (2016) argues that perspectives looking at diffusion and transnational advocacy are not framed as 'cultural processes,' and notes a lack of reflexive discussion of cultural circulations and manifestations within movement theorizing (p. 153). Even those social movement theories that have a cultural referent still lack reflexive discussion beyond strategic analysis. Ultimately, with an over emphasis on movement success, rather than failures or more complex framings,[9] 'these conceptual frameworks and methodological agendas have led to a "blindness" to the role of place-specific cultures in shaping the dynamics of transnational encounters' (Flesher Fominaya, 2014, p. 153), and points to Bourdieu and habitus as a useful corrective to understand the dynamics of movement encounters and clashes of perspective. Place and context are foundational considerations for the work I engage here given the specific location of my research, and the foundational nature of place and land to Indigenous resurgence/resistance struggles.

It is important to situate my discussion within the scope of the broader social movement studies literature. There are a range of social movement theoretical orientations that may be considered (on the history and development of social movements as a concept, see Tilly, Castañeda, & Wood, 2020). Transnational advocacy networks (Keck & Sikkink, 1998) emphasize the common frames of campaigns waged by international networks of activists and their engagement with political opportunity structures. This is perhaps more useful on a larger scale where broader constellations of actors and movements from various locales are engaging beyond national borders with more general collective aims. Contentious politics looks at the

[9] On the complexities of framing success vs. failure and a need to go beyond see Haiven & Khasnabish (2014). Their work is an important provocation on the dynamics and problematics of social movement research in a general, advocating a move from a focus on the 'instrumental outcomes' and strictly 'institutional impacts' towards 'engaging movements as living spaces of encounter, possibility, contestation, and conflict' (Haiven & Khasnabish, 2024, p. 53). I offer that Bourdieu's work and a look at the cultural complexities of movements can aid in moving in such a direction.

'episodic, public, collective interaction among makers of claims and their objects when (a) at least one government is a claimant, an object of claims, or a party to the claims and (b) the claims would, if realized, affect the interests of at least one of the claimants' (Tarrow & Tilley, 2009, p. 438; see also McAdam, Tarrow, & Tilley, 2009).

Diffusion (Tilley, 2005) considers 'how and why ideas and practices travel' (Wood, 2012, p. 6). Wood applies the concept to the tactics that arose out of the Seattle 1999 resistance against the WTO meetings and considers how such politics were differentially adopted in the context of cities like New York and Toronto. She notes the increased likelihood of diffusion when newer adopters are able 'identify with past users' as they deliberate the uptake of new or experimental forms of tactics (p. 8). *Deliberation* notes the process of exchanging ideas that determines the possibilities of adoption in specific areas vs others. *Discussion*, in an open and reflexive way, is more likely to lead to greater deliberation and consideration, and therefore a wider possibly for the diffusion of tactics. Wood (2012) notes, as well, this also comes down to the relative commonalities of cultural practices between activists' locales (p. 11). These processes of diffusion are useful for understanding how ideas, tactics, and strategies move and change as they travel across contexts and fields. As Wood (2014) shows, this can be helpfully combined with Bourdieu's work to understand how knowledge and practices circulate.

A strategic interactionist perspective (Duyvendak &Fillieule, 2015; and Jasper, 2015, in the same volume) pushes against both contentious politics and Bourdieu. Duyvendak and Fillieule (2015) argue for the utility of concepts such as 'players,' 'social worlds' and 'arenas' instead of Bourdieu's field, which they say limits its focus to dominant actors and the forces that are engaged between them in the field (p. 302) and 'lead to an examination deliberately focused solely on the leaders and activists, ignoring the rank and file' (p. 303). This perspective promotes a move less so towards social movements and rather 'players'—'those who engage in strategic action with some goal in mind' that include both individuals and collections of individuals (Jasper, 2015, p. 10). Players can also be arenas themselves, where sub-players in the form of smaller groups or individuals engage in strategic action (p. 12). Such orientations argue that fields are external concepts created by researchers and examiners, while the arenas

are constructed by players themselves through dynamic processes of competition, cooperation, strategy and goal setting (Jasper, 2015, p. 18). In such a view, Bourdieu's concept of fields just doesn't allow for enough complexity to account for the dynamic processes at play.

Further, 'the sphere of social movement players does not seem sufficiently institutionalized, structured, and unified to correspond to Bourdieu's definition,' Duyvendak and Fillieule argue (2015, p. 303), citing Mathieu.[10] Fields overly focus on competition between dominant actors at the expense of the often ad-hoc and unstructured nature of social movement politics, unduly bounding fields and a certain intensity of actor within them that seeks recognition from the state, and do not account for life outside of the specific frame of the field (i.e., activism).[11]

They argue that worlds are 'more inclusive than that of a field in not limiting the boundaries only to dominant actors' and anyone who is 'part of a given world' has 'a stake in the accomplishment of a task' (Duyvendak & Fillieule, 2015, p. 305). An arena 'brings together all the players, individual or complex, participating in the emergence, definition and resolution of a problem. The emergence of a problem generates the arena as a function of individuals and groups which intervene in the situation, and mobilize a specific part of the social world or field, either openly or discreetly' (Duyvendak & Fillieule, 2015, p. 306).

This strategic interactionist approach appears to unduly set limits on the possibilities of engaging Bourdieu's framework. We cannot expect his work to transfer to any and all instances. But the notion of the field, when combined with capital and habitus, provides an illuminating framework to aid in the understanding of how actors within movements, within segments of movements, and in relation to broader structures, come to engage. The notion of a social world

[10] Jasper argues that this kind of analysis requires a breaking down and cataloguing of all players within a given arena: 'Once we break both the movement and its environment down into their component players and arenas, we can judge when there is enough coherence to these players to warrant the term "social movement"' (2015, p. 14).

[11] They concede that "The concept of the field is the most powerful concept we have today to examine the historical process of structuring our societies. Nonetheless, all the varieties of relations do not fall within fields, and their forms of structuration and modes of functioning fail to fully account for protest activities in particular and their interactions with other social actors' (Duyvendak & Fillieule, 2015, p. 302).

or arena doesn't seem wholly different from an understanding of the multiple possibilities of fields. As I argue below, it may make sense to break fields down into smaller parts, to better understand the more specific dynamics within them (from a social movement field, to a protest field, to an anti-capitalist field, to an anarchist field, etc.). A field need not, despite Duyvendak and Fillieule's assertion, only include dominant actors—the concepts of capital and habitus suggest quite directly a disparate number of actors who engage with one another. Capital—its acquisition, conflict, and mobilization—leads to differing levels of power and influence, as well as integration and membership, within fields. This helps us to understand the dynamics of conflict within movements, but also sometimes the unsettling lack of conflict and contention, as the prevailing doxa takes hold, or habitus becomes more uniform and cemented. This is why Bourdieu's framing of crisis becomes useful, to aid in understanding how habitus and the taken-for-granted 'rules of the game' can be altered and changed. By attending to Bourdieu's three concepts, we are permitted, I think, quite a dynamic and complex view of social movement interaction and structure. Social worlds and arenas, as proposed, seem to either limit this, or reword and relabel key elements of Bourdieu to begin with.

Conventional social movement approaches and theories, then, are a useful background to consider the specific dynamics of social movements generally, but can be extended further, and reframed to account for specificities of differential contexts. Bourdieu resonates more forcefully with the specific, local, and internal movement culture based focus of my work here. Wood (2014) combines contentious politics, deliberation, and diffusion with Bourdieu's field/habitus/capital to understand the logics of policing protest to understand 'how practices and strategies' 'are patterned and clustered into fields of interaction' (p. 14). This approach highlights the utility of combining Bourdieu with others forms of social movement examination to highlight the cultures of action that persist within groups/communities and ways that they are constrained. In particular, Bourdieu's habitus:

> enriches our understanding of the role of culture by taking us beyond limiting ourselves to an analysis of practices (what activists actually do in transnational encounters), by also encompassing meanings (how activists make sense of

> what they experience), preferences and strategies (choices made below the level of rational conscious thought) and emotions (how they feel about what they experience). (Flesher Fominaya, 2016, pp. 167–168)

Movement Culture(s) and Resistance

A key element of my work requires consideration of the relationship between culture, movement culture, anarchism, and political economy. Culture, following the work of Geertz (1973), might be approached as the acted, public document that the ethnographer seeks to understand through 'thick description' (p. 10)—the 'meaningful structures' situated in particular contexts that might be interpreted and discussed (p. 11).[12]

Lawrence Goodwyn (1973) presents an early understanding of 'movement culture' (p. xix), in reference to mass democratic movements that eschew hierarchical forms, with the aim to influence others through their practice. It is 'a new way of looking at things' that leads to 'a new and heretofore unsanctioned mass folkway of autonomy' (p. xix). Movement cultures, in this sense, seek to embody ways of being in the world that are outside of and contest the dominant culture in favour of broad-based social change. Accordingly to Melucci (1989), this accounts for the increasingly 'cultural ground' where movements are located, outside of previously dominant 'political' focal points (p. 789), insofar as they influence and are influenced by culture as well as politics (p. 798) and 'try to change people's lives … while fighting for more general changes in society' (p. 797). Movements are networks 'submerged in everyday life,' that come to fore to act on specific issues (Melucci, 1989, p. 800). They respond to the dominant forces and systems at play in society but also affect them as well. The 'against and beyond' of the broader anti-authoritarian current that Dixon (2014) identifies both in opposition ('against') to dominant systems but also seeks to affect their hold on people's lives and the potential for

[12] 'Culture,' he argues, 'is not a power, something to which social events, behaviors, institutions, or processes can be causally attributed; it is a context, something within which they can be intelligibly—that is thickly—described' (p. 14). Ethnographic description is 'interpretive; what it is interpretive of is the flow of social discourse; and the interpreting involved consists in trying to rescues the "said" of such discourse from its perishing occasions and fix it in perusable terms' (p. 20), with a focus on the 'microscopic'—the particular contexts in which the ethnographer is situated (p. 21), with the understanding that all accounts will always themselves be incomplete or partial (p. 29).

radical futures ('beyond') is one more explicit framing with regard to radical politics. This is one example of the 'structured and structuring' dynamic highlighted by those such as Pierre Bourdieu.

T.V. Reed (2005) suggests *movement cultures* are 'the general meaning-making patterns that develop among participants in the subculture formed by a given moment,' vs culture *in* movements: 'those specific aesthetic-cultural artifacts (songs, poems, murals, and so forth) deployed within the shifting orbit of a movement culture' (p. 296). Movement cultures 'offer alternative models of what our collective civil and civic lives might be like, as part of their argument about the ways we have continually fallen short of creating a just, egalitarian community' (p. xv). In this sense movement cultures are themselves political experiments in living differently and carry seeds of prefigurative politics.[13] Movement cultures therefore compel us to look at the ways that movements articulate value-practices and processes both internally and externally.

Jeffery Juris (2004) points to the 'cultural logic of networking' that characterizes contemporary movement cultures and practices that seeks 'expansion' and 'connectivity' rather than political hegemony, to create 'broad umbrella spaces, where diverse organizations, collectives and networks converge around a few common hallmarks, while preserving their autonomy and identity-based specificity' (p. 351). Juris identifies a 'dominant spirt' of anarchist principles within such movements, a point echoed by Day (2005; see also Graeber & Grubacic, 2004) with the affinity-based politics of contemporary movements. This framework of affinity is what I argue narrates the relationships between anarchists and Indigenous resurgence movements as a key value-practice, and is a helpful concept for deepening and expanding anti-colonial politics.

Additionally, anarchist theorists have noted some of the ways that dominant strands of social movement theory have been at odds with the theories and practices of anarchists. While I do not have the space for a comprehensive examination here (that would be a chapter all on its

[13] Rather than other subcultures that 'don't have as their aims systemic change, although they may be useful for recruitment purposes or to keep movement ideas alive in times of intensive repression' (Reed, 2005, p. 304).

own, for ex., Williams, 2017) this does suggest some of the potentials of turning to Bourdieu's work for anarchist purposes. Apoifis (2017) challenges the limitation of agency with political process theory, and points to, again, a solidification of the state as a hegemonic structure to which social movements orient themselves. His work on Greek anarchism challenges the idea that there is 'no collective public struggle' (McAdam et al., 2001, p. 5, cited in Apoifis, 2017, p. 28) asserted by political process theory, and pushes for the explicit research on localized processes of movements in action. He prompts a look at the every-day, local, action-oriented aspects of social movement identities and practices through the lens of militant ethnography. While not engaging Bourdieu directly,[14] his work prompts a turn to the politics and practice of the everyday, which leads me back to Bourdieu for looking at culture within (anarchist) movement spaces.

Williams (2017, p. 104) notes that the state is one of the largest possible incompatibilities between contentious politics theories and anarchism, where anarchists contend with the state on some level, but primarily seek resistance and alternatives outside. Anarchists do not accept the state as a given and ongoing durable structure, and do not seek greater access to it for policy development purposes, raising questions as to the fit of theories like contention and political opportunity structure with anarchism (p. 115). Anarchists do seek political opportunities, but in terms of being outside or disengaged with the state, not reliance on it (p. 138). It is much more a relationship of outright antagonism and dismissal rather than conflict over resources and opportunities. Overall, Williams argues, there is some utility to a discussion of political opportunities for the purposes of seeing possibilities for the expansion of anarchist movements, but it requires 're-operationalization' and change of focus to the 'subjective opportunities perceived and sought by movement participants themselves' (pp. 140–141), beyond only political/state-based forms of opportunity towards the social and cultural.

[14] He opts for a collective identity frame as a dominant framework, which encompasses culture, but to a lesser degree than what I think Bourdieu's framework offers us here.

Williams makes a similar critique of 'new social movement' theories for their focus on 'utilizing the state' to achieve movement goals, even if there is a certain opposition to current constellations of state power. This is a familiar critique advanced by Richard Day (2005; 2004) who suggests a framing of 'newest social movements' to account for the move away from the hegemonic conquest of power that typifies both old and new social movements, towards a logic of affinity. He argues that an anarchistic logic of affinity has permeated the terrain of contemporary movements beyond those strictly anarchist in definition. This logic of affinity is 'a desire to create alternatives to state and corporate forms of social organization, working "alongside" the existing institutions; proceeding in this via disengagement and reconstruction rather than by reform or revolution; with the end of creating not a new knowable totality (counter-hegemony), but of enabling experiments and the emergence of new forms of subjectivity' (Day, 2004, p. 740). Day notes an anarchistic influence and impulse that radiates through a breadth of movements and thus needs alternative theoretical perspectives to make sense of it and take it further. Here I argue that Bourdieu can be useful in order to engage the specifically cultural dimensions of contemporary movement constellations, and most explicitly within anarchism.

Finally, in laying out an anarchist and insurgent form of ethnography Juris and Khasnabish (2013) note that the dominant tendencies of social movement research uphold modern political institutions while reducing them to 'existing political, epistemological, and ontological frameworks' that tacitly accept, or at least leave pointedly unaddressed, the 'social logics' of 'capitalism, liberal democracy and individualism' that 'may come to arbitrate and evaluate the significance of struggles that seek to explicitly contest, subvert, and replace that system' (p. 6). There is a specific change in orientation required in order to research, and specifically address anarchist forms of social movement activity and resistance (see Shantz &Williams, 2013, p. 9, on defining a specifically anarchist sociology founded on anti-authoritarian praxis—'an action-oriented study and theoretically informed transformation of societies'). Anarchism and anarchist movements require specific and intentional frameworks to best understand, and ultimately further, their theory and practice. This informs my approach here, as someone

involved in the struggles and movements under consideration, with a wider commitment to reflection and prefiguration as a sustained commitment to this kind of work.

Anarchism, Political Culture, and Value-Practices

By anarchists I mean a significant segment of the anti-authoritarian movements that Chris Dixon (2014) discusses with the dual aim to fight all forms of oppression and domination 'while also putting liberatory visions into practice' (p. 25).[15] As a key segment of anti-authoritarians, anarchist theory/practice is a touchstone for examining politics that claim to resist all forms of oppression and domination (on this point see Milstein, 2010, p. 39). Anarchist influences on contemporary movements range from 'autonomy, self-management, federation, direct action and direct democracy,' even while such movements are not reducible to anarchism specifically (Juris, 2004, p. 351). Anarchism is thus a vital influence on contemporary movement cultures[16] and looking at anarchism specifically has the potential to generate insights for anti-authoritarian, and perhaps even wider social movement politics. Chapter 2 looks explicitly at the contours of contemporary anarchism, through the lens of 'value-practices' (Jeppesen, 2010) to ground anarchist resistance to all forms of oppression and domination, which can be more concretely focused towards settler colonialism, and the construction of radical, prefigurative futures in relation to Indigenous resurgence.

Uri Gordon (2008) argues that anarchism may be understood in three senses: as a movement, as a political culture, and as a collection of ideas (p. 4). The network nature of anarchist movements (suggested by Juris above), which refuses centralization, is animated by political culture, and embedded with anarchism's key ideas and values. It is a core means of expressing,

---

[15] Anti-authoritarian movements are grounded in a series of core commitments to reject the state, organize in non-hierarchical and horizontal ways, and a critique of vanguardism combined with anti-capitalism, anti-oppression and anti-imperialism (see pp. 64–75 in Dixon, 2014). Such movements, according to Dixon, have a distinctly anti-racist, feminist and anarchist lineage, while also not being reducible to these influences. They combine anti-capitalist, anti-authoritarian, anti-oppressive and anti-imperialist opposition with a commitment to prefigure a better world. So while anarchist movements have a lot in common with anti-authoritarianism broadly, they are a more specific variant that makes for a more specific window for viewing anti-state, anti-capitalist and anti-colonial politics.

[16] As a further example see Graeber (2011) and Bray (2013) on anarchism's influence on the wide ranging 'Occupy' movement.

translating and spreading anarchist ideas. The term political culture is 'understood here as a family of shared orientations to doing and talking about politics, and to living everyday life' (p. 4), including forms of action, organizing, cultural expression and political language of resistance. 'Cultural expression,' Gordon argues, 'can serve as a shorthand designation of affiliation and connection with others. It thus plays an important role in the articulation of personal or collective identities in the anarchist movement' (p. 19).

Important for the discussion of culture is the relations of political economy taken up by anarchists. Political economy, as Angela Wigger (2014) suggests, might be understood as the '(re-)production of everyday life through work' and the interaction with social institutions that is 'at the foundation of every economic and political system' (p. 739). As Jeppesen et al. (2014) argue, anarchist movements put forth a 'political economy of mutual aid based on self-determination and prefigurative social practices fostering horizontal social, political and economic relationships' (p. 883). Or as Wigger (2014) argues, anarchists identify the '(re-)production of social life is essentially a collective endeavour, which engenders social power relations' and seek to challenge the dominant means of production while 'striving to create the material conditions for a non-exploitative and egalitarian society with communal ownership structures of the means of production' (p. 743). Anarchists, more directly, seek to create alternative relations and institutions on the ground and in daily life, as both a response to ongoing systems of domination, but also in attempts to surpass them. This includes housing or food collectives, self-managed and worker-owned workplaces, non-hierarchical or horizontal group structures, alternative structures to police and institutionalized mental/reproductive health services. These tactics often involve taking (via squatting, direct action, or alternative economic arrangements) and defending space against status quo forms of commodified property and ownership relations.

These elements of anarchist political economy thus form key ways that anarchist political culture is constructed and expressed, as an 'anarchist commons' (Jeppesen et al., 2014) that employs these forms of anarchist political economy with anti-oppressive intersectional politics

to resist enclosure and continue an open, dynamic, experimental, and prefigurative push forward.

Some of main features of dominant anarchist political culture, in North America and Western Europe (though far from exhaustive and exclusive), according to Gordon (2008), tend towards:

- A shared repertoire of political action based on direct action, building grassroots alternatives, community outreach and confrontation.
- Shared forms of organising—decentralised, horizontal and consensus-seeking.[17]
- Broader cultural expression in areas as diverse as art, music, dress and diet, often associated with prominent western subcultures.[18]
- Shared political language that emphasises resistance to capitalism, the state, patriarchy and more generally to hierarchy and domination. (p. 4)

Importantly, however, we might add shared values as a key element of anarchist political culture—what Jeppesen (2010) refers to as anarchist 'value-practices' that make political values inseparable from the ways they are lived and put into action. She suggests an understanding of a 'sliding scale of autonomy' for anarchist value-practices depending on the various 'circumstances, skills, needs, desire, resources, collectives, and commitments' (Jeppesen, 2010, p. 477). Anarchism contains a set of political, ethical and value-focused aspirations always under construction (Milstein, 2010).[19] This includes principles of mutual aid, political

[17] Consensus is by no means universally adopted by anarchists, although principles of direct participation and individual autonomy are typically embraced. For example, practical limitations may move towards more majority driven decision making, or in general anarchists may consent or collectively agree to pursue other forms of decision making. Consensus is perhaps highlighted here for the spirit that it embodies rather than a rigidly prescriptive practice. Practically, a core aspect of this political culture is anarchism's modes of organization, namely the affinity group, which is a 'small and autonomous group of anarchists, closely familiar to each other, who come together to undertake a specific action, whether in isolation or collaboration with other affinity groups' (Gordon, 2008, p. 15).

[18] Again, this is by no means exhaustive, as I have noted anarchism draws and is taken up in a range of locales the world over. Gordon is, here, pointing to the dominant trends in anarchism in the North of the Americas and Western Europe. Anarchists have tended to associate quite directly with punk, feminist etc. subcultures. For some discussion of this see Portwood-Stacer (2013).

[19] As Jeppesen importantly clarifies: 'We may map anarchist value-practices but there is no cultural or ideological system that is the same for everyone in anarchist culture; there is no single or even binary system of production to

confederation, direct democracy (Milstein, 2009); more specific often consensus-based decision-making and gift economies (Shantz, 2010, see pp. 158–164); anti-oppression as a 'crucial value-practice' (Jeppesen, 2010, p. 481); 'mounting challenges to authoritarianism in many cultural spheres' to 'cultivate social forms that will foster egalitarian relationships of voluntary association and freedom of creative expression for all' (Portwood-Stacer, 2013, p. 14); and taking up a practice of direct action and propaganda of the deed (p. 19).[20] I detail the specifics of these anarchist 'value-practices' in Chapter 2.

Jesse Cohn (2014) frames anarchist resistance culture in opposition to the very oppressive nature of the society and world in which anarchists live (p. 8–9). 'Anarchists practice culture,' Cohn argues, 'as a means of mental and moral survival in a world from which they are fundamentally alienated' (p. 15). Anarchist culture is both a place for the maintenance of anarchist ideas but also a 'revolutionary transfer culture' to prepare and prefigure the future society to come (Ehrlich, 1996b). As Ehrlich (1996b) argues, anarchist transfer cultures require explicit forms of political community, 'acting as if the future is the present' (p. 332), 'based on experiments in social arrangements' 'to build freedom in community' (p. 333).

This prefigurative element is actualized via direct action as a 'dual strategy of confrontation to delegitimise the system' as well as 'grassroots alternative-building from below' (Gordon, 2008, p. 18). This oppositional and constructive aspect of anarchist culture is what Sharif Gemie (1994) terms 'counter-community,' an aspect of anarchist culture that dates from its earliest

---

which everyone aspires or every text conforms.' This means that there many expressions of anarchist cultural value-practices, with commonly understood key threads, used and strived for within anarchism, even if they aren't 'completely achievable' (Jeppesen, 2010, p. 479).

[20] Complementary to the collective cultural forms, there are also more personal expressions of anarchist culture, or what Portwood-Stacer (2013) terms anarchist lifestyle politics. She refers to lifestyle politics as 'the whole cultural formation around individuals' use of everyday choices as a legitimate site of political expression' that are combined with broader critiques of capitalism and the state (etc.) to form a dual focus within social movements (p. 5). She argues that to understand activism we need to account for the ways that cultural work 'is necessary to produce political resistance and, second, that resistant practices perform cultural work as well. … At the same time these collective practices of resistance performatively reproduce the same norms and identities that enabled them. Lifestyle activists make clear that culture and politics are co-constitutive; to resist one is to resist the other' (pp. 7–8). Culture, lifestyle, and movement combine to create the everyday lived realties of anarchism.

articulations of Kropotkin and Bakunin. While we build, we must also aim to destroy systems of domination and oppression.

Hence, we return to prefigurative politics as a key element of anarchist culture, as Cohn (2014) suggests, seeing anarchist resistance culture as 'a way of living in transit,' a 'tunnel' through which we move towards a new society (p. 21). It is a continuing revolution that is at times forced underground or out of view, not a fixed end point or destination, but the journey itself (on 'permanent revolution,' see also Jeppesen, 2010, p. 494; Ehrlich, 1996b). There is no one future, or system, that anarchists seek to create, but rather they dwell within a commitment to experimentation, change, and flexibility that takes up personal and collective empowerment in the here and now. The nature of prefiguration, although there are many common forms that tend to be employed (like collective houses, non-monogamous relationships, non-hierarchical, decentralized and localized communities etc.), is one of constant innovation and development, whereby power is built within and between radical projects to establish an alternative society.[21] Hence the concept of the 'permanent revolution' describing on ongoing development towards freer societies and relations. Prefigurative politics is a key consideration for anarchists given the desire for radical futures and commitments to build them in the here and now, and especially given the context of settler colonialism and Indigenous resurgence that problematizes some of these desires. I take up this conversation most explicitly in Chapter 7.

Settler Colonialism, Anti-Colonialism, and Indigenous Resurgence

A key commitment of anarchists is to resist all forms of oppression and domination while noting the connections and intersections between them, but such only a simple declaration may not have much substance behind it. George Ciccariello-Maher (2011) argues that the 'harder work—that of grasping how the capitalist system operates and how it can be brought down through strategic action—remains, despite our declarations of opposition' (p. 21). Citing the

[21] It might be noted that prefiguration is perhaps symptomatic of the difficulty in overthrowing the current systems of oppression and domination, and a refusal to wait to do so. Were the state and capitalism etc. to fall there might be a need for other ways of building up social systems and relationships. However, the point is not to wait and to take up prefigurative politics here and now, as a form of preparation and practice for the future.

work of the late Joel Olson (2009), Ciccariello-Maher reiterates the need for anarchists to see the fundamental ways in which race in the US context fundamentally structures relations and engagements with capitalism and the state. We must importantly add colonization to this challenge (Lewis, 2015), in that colonial processes continue to affect and structure relationships in both the US and Canada. This is fundamental to my work here.

Through an international lens, historically anarchists have been involved in myriad anti-colonial and anti-imperialist struggles. A number of recent works have sought to recover and emphasize anarchist's explicit anti-colonial and anti-imperial commitments and activities (Khan, 2023; Galián, 2020; Laursen, 2019; Anderson, 2007; Hirsch & van der Walt, 2010; van der Walt & Schmidt, 2009; Ramnath, 2011; Porter, 2011) and push them further (Warburton, 2021; Ciccariello-Maher, 2011; Ervin, 1994; Olson, 2009; Nangwaya, 2011; Evren, 2012; Crass, 2013).[22] These accounts, while noting that histories of such anarchist activity have been lacking, assert the strength and potential of anarchist anti-colonial and anti-imperialism.[23] While these discussions of anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism that take a world-wide scope aid in understanding the range of anarchist activities, it is also important to contextualize discussions of anarchist anti-colonialism to more specific locales and the particular context of settler colonialism and Indigenous resistance/resurgence, in this case in Southern Ontario.

[22] The authors on an article on anarchism and anti-imperialism in Africa argue that there is an 'exceptionally proud record of anti-imperialism' (African Anarchists on Imperialism, n.d. para. 7) within anarchism. Michael Schmidt argues that anarchism was also one of the first perspectives to 'systemically confront racism and ethnic discrimination' (Schmidt, 2013, p. 2).

[23] Following van der Walt and Schmidt (2009, p. 310), and using David Porter's (2011) work on anarchism in Algeria, there are three key ways in which anarchists can be seen to have engaged with anti-colonial movements and politics: 1) rejecting their nationalism and attempts at seizing state power; 2) critical engagement with such movements, lending support as well as criticism; and 3) generalized support and active participation. The majority of anarchists, drawing from early anarchist theorists like Bakunin, Kropotkin and Malatesta, have been generally supportive of struggles that take on a nation-based character, in recognition of their desire for self-determination, but their specific analysis of colonialism and imperialism could be significantly developed. This is a particular tension that might arise in this dissertation, given that nationhood is a foundational articulation for Indigenous resurgence/resistance and narrates the context of land where anarchists are involved in struggle (although this occurs outside of the Western conceptions of state, nation and sovereignty, see Alfred, [2005] on this point).

As I have noted previously (Lewis, 2015), Indigenous theorists, among others, have challenged radical left social movements to take up a concerted analysis of the settler colonial context in which they struggle. As Glen Coulthard has argued (in addition to Simpson, 2017, 2011), this is fundamentally important for all struggles that seek to destroy both capitalism and the state, and it will compromise attempts to do so if the settler colonial implications are not considered. 'By ignoring or downplaying the injustice of colonial dispossession,' he says,

> critical theory and left strategy not only risks becoming complicit in the very structures and processes of domination that it ought to oppose, but it also risks overlooking what could prove to be invaluable glimpses into the ethical practices and preconditions required for the construction of a more just and sustainable world order. (Coulthard, 2014, p. 12)

While anarchists often name colonialism as something that is to be opposed, there is typically little specific analysis incorporated into social movement work and little discussion of the implications of glazing over analysis of settler colonialism and Indigenous dispossession while seeking to create a future society.[24]

There are some, however, beginning to consider the settler colonial implications of anarchism, with work on anarcha-Indigenism (Dupuis-Deri & Pillet, 2023; Day, 2003, 2008; Day & Lewis, 2013; Lasky, 2011; Lewis, 2012a; Coulthard, 2003; Alfred, 2005); broader relations between anarchism and Indigenous resistance (Benally, 2023; Ferguson, 2023; Warburton, 2021; Lagalisse, 2019; Aragorn!, 2018; Sloan Morgan, 2016; and the contributors to Kauanui, 2021a); Adam Barker's work in general (2010, 20221 and with Pickerill, 2012); my own contributions (Lewis, 2012a, 2012b, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2022); intersections with abolitionist politics and

[24] As I have previously pointed out (Lewis, 2016, pp. 15–16) and as can be seen by responses to the Occupy Movement (Barker, 2012; Grande, 2013), accumulating land to set up autonomous alternatives outside the state, without reference to settler colonialism and Indigenous resurgence repeats the logics of colonialism. As Day (2010) summarizes: 'it would appear that the resurgence of settler autonomy, our escape from the tyrannies we have foisted on ourselves, once again can only come on the backs of Indigenous peoples' (p. 268). Prefiguration is a key element of the radical social movement imagination, but needs to be carefully refined, and contextualized within the history and continuance of settler colonialism.

Blackness (Anderson, 2021; Samudzi & Anderson, 2018) or within anti-authoritarianism more broadly (Dixon, 2014; Walia, 2013). Richard Day (2008) summarizes anarcha-Indigenism as 'a meeting place, a site of possibilities, a potential for mutual aid in common projects within, outside, and against the dominant order (p. 3). 'It is not an ideology or a party,' he continues, 'but an emergent and ever-changing network of autonomous subjects, organizations, and institutions': a meeting point of 'anarchisms, indigenisms and feminisms,' not some form of rigid, limited, or homogenous set of political possibilities, but something broadly defined, dynamic and evolving (p. 3).

Departing from the specifically anarcha-Indigenist approach, J. Kēhaulani Kauanui (2021b, and the wider contributors to Kauanui, 2021a) reviews in detail the intersections and tensions between anarchist politics and Indigenous resurgence struggles, not only how these forms of politics and conversations have developed, but also the ongoing aspects of 'Indigenous anarchist praxis.' Her work, and the wider articles of the special issue, show the breadth of discussion regarding anarchist-Indigenous relations, the overall development of the work that is ongoing, and the continued necessity of anarchists engaging in more direct, and personally disruptive, ways with ongoing forms of Indigenous resurgence and resistance to settler colonialism. Johnson and Ferguson (2019) engage a similar project, 'looking for resonances across these fields of thinking and acting, without insisting on correspondence or eschewing tensions' (p. 697). They consider the connections between anarchist and Indigenous approaches to both time and state, as both are disruptive of authoritarian, centralizing, and dominating temporalities, which serve as a basis for connection and relationship across a range of further possible points of contact (e.g., autonomy, prefigurative politics, relationships to land; Johnson & Ferguson, 2019). There is a conversation that is continually building; it has not, however, seen general consideration within anarchist theory and practice.[25] There is still much work to be done.

[25] Benally (2023) contests the expansion of anarcha-Indigenism, in part due to the academic focus of such work, but also in terms of more forcefully upholding Indigenous autonomy. He notes the necessity of Indigenous led and grounded approaches that can perhaps draw from anarchist works, and find affinity with them, but that these

Greater attention has also been building within anarchist geographies (see Barker, 2021; Springer, 2012, 2013, 2014), though there is still much work to be done (Lewis, 2016); and in recent work on historical anarchist movements such as Andrew Cornell's history (2016) of the more forgotten period of anarchism from the 1930s to the 1970s, or in Chris Dixon's discussion (2014) of 'Another Politics,' although the references and discussions are quite brief. Dixon, for example argues throughout his book for taking a hard look at the context of struggle. Drawing from his interviews he argues that 'acknowledging the ground on which we struggle as a starting point for anti-imperialism' is becoming a 'basic stance' for anti-authoritarian movements (p. 79), along with support for Indigenous resistance. This accords with the perspectives of those I interviewed, discussed in Chapter 5. These are certainly brief glimpses but ones that indicate that there is some opening up of discussion of white supremacy, racism, settler colonialism, and Indigenous resistance within anarchism.

The work of Theresa Warburton (2016, 2020, 2021)[26] in particular is crucial in developing and building upon these engagements and considerations of the relationship between anarchism and Indigenous anti-colonial/decolonial/resurgence politics. Warburton argues that there is a 'structure of settlement' that persists within contemporary anarchism that prohibits a sustained and detailed examination of the ways in which structures of settler colonialism persist within the movement, its theory, its practice, its mythologies and its relationship to place. Warburton foregrounds a discussion of the relationship between anarchism and settlement, rather than anarchism and Indigenous movement of resurgence/resistance. She potently questions:

> Namely, if there is a correlation between the ethical commitments of anarchist and Native movements and ample discussion about how to develop an activist praxis that addresses settlement, why is there not a more concerted

need not be subsumed under a more conventionally anarchist banner. His work argues for a more specifically Indigenous orientation on its own terms. This resonates, as I discuss in later chapters, with Black anarchist interventions as well (see Anderson, 2021).

[26] For a discussion of the importance and relevance of Warburton's 2021 work, see Lewis (2023).

> engagement with the question of *how* settlement has become normalized, or *settled*, in such movement spaces? In practice, the presumption of a natural affinity between anarchist and Native political movements obfuscates the problems that underlie the need for the restructuring of the relationships between Native and non-Native activists. (Warburton 2021, pp. 17–18)

While affinities are important in their own right (as the work of anarcha-Indigenism above suggests, and as I argue below) there is perhaps a much more disruptive, and therefore essential, conversation to be had about the ways that structures of settlement themselves persist within anarchist movements and cultures. We may variously declare our opposition to all forms of oppression and domination, and even colonialism explicitly, but this does little to challenge the residues of such structures within our spaces. Warburton highlights three 'structures of settlement' existent in contemporary anarchist movements: 'the invocation of anarchist stories without a grounding in both place-based and historical context, the flattening rather than reckoning with histories of conflict between Native and non-Native communities, and the attempt to assert inherent parallel relationships between anarchist movements and Native sovereignty' (Warburton, 2021, p. 61). Such structures, present in the anarchist mythology around the 'Battle of Seattle' in 1999, the Haymarket Riot of 1886, and the rise of the Occupy Movement in 2011 (amongst others), develop a genealogy of anarchism that is stripped of the Indigenous, colonial and anti-colonial contexts in which such events occur. These contexts need to be re-engaged and reconsidered as part of anti-colonial anarchist politics going forward.

The ultimate result, Warburton (2021) argues, is that intentionally or not, such moves erase prior Indigenous presence, resistance, and alternatives to the state and capital, and result in a form of 'settler anarchism' that 'aligns itself with the settler colonial project both structurally and philosophically.' This term serves 'to both acknowledge and push beyond the argument that settlement is merely inherited in anarchist spaces, bleeding through into radical politics from the dominant social and political structures' (p. 33–34) and is rather a constituent part of anarchism historically and in the present.

The aim then, is to challenge such structures and logics of settlement. A possible way forward, Warburton highlights, is through direct engagement with Indigenous women's literature that foregrounds, acknowledges, and integrates a 'transformational accounting' of the realities of ongoing processes of settlement as well as Indigenous resistance to, and beyond, them. In particular, she notes the place-making possibilities and 'other worlds' that come through mapping and storytelling methodologies, and which can serve as disruptive reference points to the continuance of structures of settlement. These works show that, 'Yes, another world is possible. One of the reasons we can even know this, though, even entertain this thought, is because there are other worlds here—if only we would honor them' (Warburton, 2021, p. 206). This raises profound critique and consideration for anarchist prefigurative aims and desires.

Warburton's work, and specifically her concept of 'structures of settlement,' serves as a central theoretical and analytical reference point for my work here. I take this as a thread that weaves through this dissertation and is crucial for considering the ways that anarchist cultures of resistance do engage with the realities of settler colonialism, but the omissions as well. 'Structures of settlement' is a foundational concept that directly, explicitly, and unapologetically brings together the different bodies of theory that I engage here and prompts concerted consideration and disruption within contemporary anarchism and anarchist cultures of resistance.

A further key background of my work, and crucial for situating anarchism in context, is settler colonial theory, which aids in specifying the particularities of the settler colonial context, and to ground social movement politics. Settler colonialism is, following Patrick Wolfe (2006), a specific structure of domination that continues long after an initial point of contact, and continues to structure the relations and identities within settler colonial states, such as Canada and the US. While race and white supremacy are intimately bound up with the settler colonial project, land and territory are at the foremost interest of settler colonialism, with the fundamental desire of eliminating of Indigenous communities (Wolfe, 2006, p. 388). It is intimately connected, then, to other mutually reinforcing pillars of white supremacy, capitalism, imperialist war, or slavery (Smith, 2006). While such work allows for more detailed description

of the ongoing structures of settler colonialism, it is also crucially important consider its limitations, especially in relation to Indigeneity and Indigenous struggles (Schayegh, 2024; Warrior, 2021; Kelley, 2017; Snelgrove, Dhamoon & Corntassel, 2014; Byrd, 2014; Tuck & Yang, 2012). Settler colonial theory without expressed engagement, dialogue, disruption and accountability to Indigenous resurgence, does little to disrupt settler colonialism itself, beyond describing the structure and its constituent parts more fully.[27]

Closely related, primitive accumulation is an important process that ties settler colonialism, the state, and capitalism together. Primitive accumulation, with modification of Marx's original conception by Sylvia Federici (2004) and Glen Coulthard (2014), shows the complexity of the rise of capitalism and its expansion and links with settler colonialism. Resistance to capitalism and the state will always be incomplete without detailing the connections and overlaps with settler colonialism. As Barker (2012) argues, referencing the 2011–2012 Occupy movements, 'the reality of capitalist oppression is inseparable from the history of colonization' where wealth, and the resultant wealth disparity that was deemed so objectionable was (and certainly is) a direct result of settler colonial conquest (p. 3). Coulthard (2014, pp. 9–11) argues that dispossession, in addition to proletarianization and the move towards wage work, is a fundamental logic that underscores capitalism, and continues attempts to divest Indigenous peoples of their lands. Dispossession, and the ways that theft of land has been transformed into property, is a key element of settler colonial expansion (Nichols, 2020) and deserves greater attention as part of analysis of capitalism. 'Indigenous peoples are primarily viewed and treated as physical obstacles standing in the way of resource capital,' Pflug-Back & Kesīqnaeh (2016) note, 'rather than as a source of exploitable labour, they are obstacles to be removed through violence, assimilation, criminalization, and other genocidal measures' (para. 5). This provides a basis for how the context of resistance might be understood. I return to settler colonialism and

[27] While greater description and therefore understanding of settler colonialism is a crucial goal in and of itself, this doesn't inherently offer useful alternatives, or ways forward to cultivate greater complicities with Indigenous struggle. It also risks a certain over-determination on the force of the structure itself, rather than considering the ways that greater autonomy and agency may be cultivated within it towards anti-colonial aims.

primitive accumulation more specifically in Chapter 3 to add greater detail to the context of anarchist movement activity.

Resistance to settler colonialism isn't a new process—it encompasses more than 500 years of Indigenous resistance and ongoing resurgence. As Taiaiake Alfred (2010) suggests, Indigenous peoples have been actively creating and furthering a decolonial imagination since the point of contact, carried forward by Indigenous traditions, struggles, and actions. I draw from the breadth of Indigenous work on resistance and resurgence, such as that of Alfred (2005, 2008), Leanne Simpson (2011, 2014, 2020) and Glen Coulthard (2014). Coulthard suggests that 'Indigenous resurgence is at its core a *prefigurative politics*—the methods of decolonization prefigure its aims.' Decolonization, in his sense, is a core element of a prefigurative politics that seeks the revitalization of Indigenous culture, ways of life and ways of relating against the state and capitalism, one that needs to be considered in relation to non-Indigenous social movement contexts that often centre prefigurative aims themselves. Alfred (2010) suggests that for non-Indigenous peoples/settlers:

> Radical imagination is reenvisioning your existence on this land without the inherited privileges of conquest and empire. It is accepting the fact of a meaningful prior Indigenous presence, and taking action to support struggles not only of social and economic justice, but political justice for Indigenous nations as well. (p. 5)

Part of moving in this direction requires a fundamental rethinking of our relationships to land and place—in order to situate ourselves in the context and histories that continue to structure our relationships to settler colonialism and systems of domination. Barker and Pickerill (2012) argue that doing so means engaging with questions of land on Indigenous terms—rather than seeking to bring Indigenous peoples into settler-dominated social movements or into settler structured forms of relating. As forcefully cautioned by Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang (2012), 'decolonization is not a metaphor'; the term cannot be an easy stand-in for the general things that we might want to improve in society or our lives. It speaks directly to histories of settler

colonization and settler/non-Indigenous relations of domination with Indigenous peoples. It is about fundamentally restructuring relations and overthrowing settler colonial society, as well as those systems that support it like the state, capitalism or heteropatriarchy (see Coulthard, 2014, pp. 165–179). My work examines the ways in which anarchist cultures of resistance engage the interconnections between the context of settler colonialism, ongoing Indigenous, and their own prefigurative and anti-state aims. As my interviews demonstrate, there is a general baseline understanding and opposition to settler colonialism, but there has been little intentional 'time' given to the expansion of such anti-colonial politics within anarchism, and what the ongoing implications might be for anarchist value-practices, and radical prefigurative futures.

Specification of activities

To examine forms of anarchist culture within and against the context of settler colonialism I employ interviews with participants in anarchist movements, the examination of key movement texts, and to a lesser extent, observation of/participation in anarchist spaces of culture. This work began in May of 2018 and carried forward through May 2019, although the process of reflection, consideration, and embedded relations predate and persist beyond the specific research gathering timeframe. Each method presents a different view to the ways that this culture is both articulated and lived.

This dissertation employs the following methods:

1) Detailed interviews with 17 participants who self-defined as anarchist/anarchist-adjacent and actively participate/have participated in anarchist culture, from a diverse number of Southern Ontario locales and projects (including from major Southern Ontario cities such as Hamilton, Kingston, Kitchener-Waterloo, Hamilton, and Guelph, in addition to the more typical Toronto). I prioritized the views of those who are embedded and actively creating anarchist culture, and who also engage in a range of anarchist projects (from community organizing, to running social spaces, or internet-based propaganda). Interviewees were sourced from the connections I already

possessed as a long-time movement participant and organizer, and by seeking referrals to others. Through the interviews, we discussed creating/participating in anarchist culture and how settler colonialism figures in the context of struggle. We discussed how they understand the context of resistance, relationships to settler colonialism, Indigenous struggles and land, and how this enters into their considerations of theory and practice, and lessons learned from such work.

Taking seriously Wolfe's point about the differential ways people are situated within settler colonialism, I interviewed a diverse range of participants in both the ways they engage with anarchism but also how they are structurally located within settler colonialism (as Indigenous, racialized, immigrant or settler). This included Indigenous peoples who themselves self-define as anarchists (or who articulate their closest political affinities with anarchism, and who have participated in anarchist events and anarchist spaces in the past, or voiced/published critiques of anarchism publicly. In part, I conceived of including such conversations as a means to avoid an overly insular (white) anarchist echo chamber and also provide critical points of discussion to be taken up within anarchist movement cultures.

Fortier (2015, pp. 23–26) reflects on this directly, and the ways that Indigenous voices can be silenced, appropriated, or ignored in research that has direct implications for Indigenous land and life if the focus is placed unduly on settlers/non-Indigenous peoples and their anti-colonial work. I sought to balance this, at least partly, through the inclusion of these Indigenous perspectives.[28] As Elizabeth Carlson notes (2016), any

[28] They will not, of course, be representative of whole nations or Indigenous peoples in general, and the further question of how they relate to broader Indigenous communities and identities will be important to clarify. As land and community is fundamental to Indigenous life, culture, and resistance, there are a host of further important considerations of how Indigenous voices could be incorporated into broader social movement research. My aim here is to ensure that Indigenous voices who have direct participation and connection to the specific anarchist elements I am interested in here are also represented as they are critical to any dialogues around settler colonialism and in many cases are those who are bringing these issues to the forefront most forcefully. There is a broader need to investigate and engage Indigenous anarchist perspectives directly, and this presents necessary future work.

semblance of anti-colonial work needs to have a foundation in Indigenous scholarship and perspectives and requires thinking through positionalities and relationships to Indigenous peoples, settler colonialism, and land. There is a required self-critical aspect, but also a requirement of moving forward in ways that forge new relationships of accountability and reciprocity, and contribute to Indigenous struggles. As a settler anarchist this requires consideration of the implications of someone like myself judging or analyzing Indigenous perspectives. This was part of an ongoing dialogue with the people that I interviewed, and an openness to challenges and critiques of my work. I see this part of the research more so as a means of providing a further critical perspective on anarchism, rather than an evaluation of Indigenous perspectives.[29] I explore relations of affinity, accountability, and complicity in Chapters 6 and 7.

2) Movement texts, writings, analysis, statements, etc. that discuss the key elements of anarchism as well as those with a more specifically anti-colonial focus, in addition to the relevant academic writings on anarchism, settler colonialism, and Indigenous resurgence noted above. A key means of expressing anarchism comes through the circulation of literature and ideas including books, zines, artistic works, workshops and blogs (etc.). I consider how writing and other forms of expression in culture connect to discussions of context. I refer to texts that are represented in spaces of anarchist culture, materials and analysis that are published by anarchists through their connections to radical spaces, counter information and media projects like north-shore.info, or itsgoingdown.org, and those in relation to events and struggles. Looking at these

[29] Further, work on Indigenous research methodology and practice is crucial for engaging in research that aims to disrupt colonialism and move towards decolonial possibilities (see for example Kovach, 2009; Smith, 2004; Wilson, 2008). Though, as Carlson (2016) cautions, it is difficult, if not impossible and inappropriate, for settler peoples to attempt to take up Indigenous methodologies directly, as they lack the situated understandings, both epistemological and relational, to do so. I have examined some of the possibilities required to move towards a firm anti-colonial ethic, attuned to the context of settler colonialism and the ways in which research processes often replicate colonial dynamics and power structures. Situating in land and context is a crucial starting point, along with situating oneself, taking up an ethic of reflexivity, and resistance to systems of oppression (Lewis, 2012). I seek to continue such work in this dissertation.

materials presents a view to the ways that anarchists construct and disseminate their analysis to both the wider world, and smaller, more culturally-specific audiences. This gives a sense, as I show, of how anarchists are constructing their values and practices within particular contexts and cultures.

3) The observation of, and participation in, anarchist culture in myriad forms, such as key spaces of anarchist congregation (bookfairs, physical spaces like social centres or other gatherings), as well as one-time events (with explicit anti-colonial overtones) and other movement happenings in the context of anarchist movements in Southern Ontario. Such ethnographic work allows an insider's view of the complex nature of anarchist culture, most specifically the ways anti-colonialism and the context of settler colonialism are understood, articulated and engaged within anarchism. It looks at the ways in which an anarchist habitus within anarchist cultures of resistance has been created and how this has been influenced by, but also pushes back against, the context of settler colonialism that structures relations on these lands.

   I had originally intended this to be a much more formal component of the study, but given the (low) number of events and happenings within the specified research period (perhaps part of a relative downturn in local anarchist activity), I was able to gain much deeper data and perspective from the interviews themselves. Even so, my own extended process of research, writing, and theorizing itself takes key cues from ethnographic practices. I place myself firmly within the work as a both a participant and an observer, within movements with which I have a long involvement and ongoing commitment. I am firmly seeking to generate 'partisan insights' (Apoifis, 2017, p. 50) into movements and struggles that I care deeply about. I reflect throughout not just on the words, writing, or actions of the anarchists and movements under consideration, but also my own history and continuing present within such spaces. I see this work as not just an external critique, but also of one that occurs close to home as well. I engage this

work as an ongoing commitment to (re)considering my own anarchist value-practices and prefigurative hopes for the future.

As such, the interviews were prioritized to get into the depth of anarchist understandings of settler colonialism, anti-colonial politics, and relationships to Indigenous resurgence. As I discuss in the later chapters, while anarchist culture shows a 'baseline' commitment to resist settler colonialism as a foundational aspect of anarchist theory and practice, there has been little explicit discussion and expansion of many of the themes of anti-colonial politics that I discuss here. As a result, the interviews were able to gain a much deeper set of insights into the ways that anarchists are thinking about these topics, but also their own assessments that this is something that needs much more concerted effort in terms of discussion and theorization. Interviews, while individual, also show that this process of deeper thinking and interrogation is also frequently an individual process, and indicates the greater need to engage in such politics and discussions at an intentionally collective level, more broadly across and within anarchist culture.

Observations, conversations, reflections, and notes were recorded in a research journal, carried by the researcher at the research sites and during the interviews. Entries were divided between participatory/observational and personal reflections, notes, connections, etc., so as to make the data as clear as possible for later review. Notes were taken primarily as events and interviews occurred, noting the content, framing, and tone of the events and those that participate, with more detailed follow up notes and additions immediately after. As Juris and Khasnabish (2013) argue, ethnography is not just as a set of research methods, but

> also a mode of analysis and writing, allows us to capture the subjective mood, feeling and tone of such events. Ethnographic descriptions provide a vivid sense of actually "being there" (Geertz 1989) during transnational social movement actions and gatherings, contributing descriptive flesh to what might otherwise be read as dry, distant, and disengaged analytic accounts. (p. 3)

To this end, I attempted to keep interviews and discussions as natural and free-form as possible. Although I referred to the interview guide as necessary, I opted to let the conversations flow, not shying away from offering my own perspectives at times. This allowed for deeper discussion, but also a much more honest discussion, as most participants were already familiar with me.

This also allowed themes and ideas to develop beyond my initial interview guide. In particular, discussions related to treaty relationships and their connection to and problematization of anarchist desires for autonomy came to the fore in early interviews, prompting me to raise this intentionally in later interviews. This was also the case in terms of anarchist relationships to spirituality. As several participants articulated their anarchist politics through a spiritual lens (either as Indigenous peoples, or as settlers with connections to their own ancestral spiritualties related to cultural groundings or as self-identified witches), this was also something that I asked about in later interviews when it seemed pertinent. Both aspects revealed further points of contact between anarchists and anti-colonial politics, and further avenues that could be explored in the future. My interviews were quite spread out over the course of the year-long research period and so there was time for me to digest between interviews and consider the ways that they might alter and enhance my research process and questions.

As such, the interview process itself fundamentally altered my research and theory. Initially my theoretical orientation was focused towards a critique of the lack of settler colonial analysis within anarchism, and has morphed, via the interview process, towards a frame that includes this critique, as well as the critiques of others like Warburton (2021), but also upholds the voices and perspectives of anarchists on the ground themselves, and more definitely considers the ways that they have constructed their own responses to cultivating cultures of resistance in the context of settler colonialism.

This was also the case given the timeframe in which this work occurred, staring in 2012 and reaching the current moment of its completion in 2026. While often an extended duration can make the data and conversations feel out of date or less relevant, in this case it allowed for more reflection, consideration, and refinement on my part. I continued to sit with the ideas,

theories, data, and possibilities while still intimately connected to movement spaces and organizing. This work became a prefigurative process in and of itself, that compelled an ongoing and sustained process of disruption of my own politics and perspective that in turn continued to inform the project itself. This process of ongoing reflection, I contend, fits well within anarchist prefigurative and critical value-practices, as a lived form of doing politics. It is a means of doing anarchism for my present (academic) purpose, but also a way of engaging in going forms of culture, possibility, and anarchist life. Ethnography is a key element that informs this ongoing approach.

Ethnography, in this case, seeks a view to understanding the 'flow of events' of activism and resistance, and comprises specific moments, but also a longer-term view. This requires a detailed note-taking process that I employed, as well as a personal reflexive process that situates myself with regard to my research processes (Fernandez, 2009). Researchers, as I take up here, act as 'reflexive agents who work in solidarity with movements to build their capacity for resilient and transformative struggle' (Haiven & Khasnabish, 2014, p. 2). This means interrogating/exploring my own participation and the ways that I have carried out the research process. This included the use of a research journal and an intentional and frequent practice of writing memos, as part of the ongoing discussion of my own thoughts, reflections, and challenges/difficulties of the research process, and consideration of my ongoing organizing in anarchist/anti-colonial contexts. As I suggest below, I took a wide view of anarchist culture and include a range of facets of how it is articulated, discussed, and reproduced, looking at the aesthetics/construction of the spaces in which such manifestations of anarchist culture occur.[30]

[30] Looking at anarchist culture from interviews, participatory ethnography, and analysis of documents permits a check, of sorts, on which kinds of expressions, analysis, and practice are most characteristic of anarchist culture. Interviewing Indigenous peoples, as well, as I suggest below, further prevents the possibility of a self-congratulatory echo chamber effect. As I note above, anarchist culture is not one narrow thing, but there is a range of ways of expressing anarchist culture. This context needs to be considered when comparing anarchist understandings of settler colonialism and anti-colonial politics, and so I employ a range of methods to understand these aspects of anarchist culture.

Grounded Theory

My research and analysis employs a grounded theory approach (Charmaz & Bryant, 2008; Denzin, 2011, 2010; Timmermans & Tavory, 2011; Cho & Lee, 2014) that builds and instigates theory from the ground up. I build a theory of how anarchist cultural production occurs in context, in relation to settler colonialism specifically; how it is articulated by those embedded within it and creating it; and what the implications of this are for broader anarchist theory and practice. In short—how anarchist cultures of resistance reproduce resistance to settler colonialism, and the possibilities for the future. This requires parsing through the ways that anarchist cultures are themselves conditioned, influenced, and structured by the context of settler colonialism and how their terrain of struggle is shaped more generally by settler colonial structures, but also how anarchist resistance pushes back against and influences the settler colonial structure. Engaging Bourdieu, understanding these ongoing forms of interaction with 'structuring structures' considers cultures of resistance as dynamic, and carrying the possibility of structural change. Grounded theory can thus be used as a means to build a theory of anarchist cultures of resistance within, but also against, settler colonialism by looking at the 'habitus,' capital, value-practices, interactions, and understandings of those embedded in and creating culture. As anarchists develop their own understandings, theoretical approaches, and practices of resistance to settler colonialism, this alters anarchist culture, just as existent anarchist cultures influence how anarchists respond to the settler colonial context.

Speaking of grounded theory with regards to research on settler-Indigenous alliances Davis, O'Donnell and Shpuniarsky (2007) suggest the use of grounded theory forms of thematic analysis to 'identify key storylines and themes that become the seeds for theory development' in areas where there may be little previous theoretical work or established processes of analysis (p. 99). Such a methodology 'guides researchers to make systemic comparisons and to engage the data and emerging theory actively throughout the research process' (Charmaz & Bryant, 2008, p. 374). Here the stories and narratives of anarchists themselves add context and clarification to the observation and ethnography of anarchist culture. They help to give substance to habitus and capital within anarchist culture (structured through ongoing processes

of resistance and generating structured movement processes as well [Crossley, 2003, p. 51]), the ways that settler colonialism is integrated and resisted in such cultures, and the ongoing discussions amongst anarchists.

This radical social movement project benefits from grounded theory following Denzin (2010) who argues that left critical theory generally 'must be localized, grounded in the specific meanings, traditions, customs, and community relations that operate in each indigenous setting' while also rejecting universalist views of resistance and change (p. 298). This means critiquing and undermining the colonial histories of research as well (Denzin and Lincoln, 2014; Smith, 2004) and seeking disruptive and complex counternarratives. Grounded theory permits an exploratory and theory-generating approach with which to understand anarchist culture within structures of settler colonialism in Southern Ontario. It allows for explicit attention to the everyday forms of culture and the ways that anarchists reflect on them and connect them to broader resistance against settler colonialism, and their affinities with Indigenous resurgence struggles.

In particular the constructivist form of grounded theory advocated by Charmaz and Bryant (2008) has direct resonance with my project. This approach emphasizes 'a) the social conditions of the research situation; (b) the researcher's perspectives, positions, and practices; (c) the researcher's participation in the construction of data; and (d) the social construction of research acts, as well as participants' worlds' (Charmaz & Bryant, 2008, p. 376). This generation of 'situated knowledge' continues to understand the ways that the researcher affects and is affected by research, and as I noted above, requires critically examining the role of the researcher—in my case as both observer and participant.[31]

[31] Timmermans and Tavory (2011) suggest an intimate and practical connection between grounded theory and ethnographic work in the mutual focus on interactions in the field, looking at the ways that practical knowledge is employed, and the ways that action is both embodied and a carrier of meaning for people who interact with one another in the world (p. 497). Further, following Charmaz (2006, p. 22), they argue that grounded theory ethnographies tend towards the analytic rather than strictly descriptive and zero in on the processes at play within the research area rather than the structures at play (Timmermans & Tavory, 2011, p. 504). They do also point out some potential drawbacks on linking grounded theory with ethnography, such as overfocusing on memoing,

Fortier (2015) highlights a number of strengths of employing constructivist grounded theory, following Charmaz: '(1) strategies need not be rigid or prescriptive; (2) the focus on meaning should be seen as furthering, rather than limiting the researcher's interpretive understanding; and (3) the method can be practiced without the positivist leaning of its earlier proponents' (p. 35). Importantly, however, Fortier notes that grounded theory itself needs to be subjected to anti-colonial and decolonial criticisms as well, so as not to replay the colonial nature of research. This, in part, requires having direct dialogues between research and participants on their relation to Indigenous struggles and responding directly to 'questions emerging from the movements themselves in their interactions with Indigenous processes of decolonization and resurgence' (Fortier, 2015, p. 36). Denzin (2010) notes that grounded theory 'must resonate with the local. It should be shaped by local needs. It should make a positive difference in the world' (Denzin, 2010, p. 306). I use grounded theory in order to generate a theory of anarchist culture in the context of settler colonialism, and the ways that it is influenced and conditioned by the this context, and how anarchists articulate value-practices, and resistance.

Put into Bourdieu's terms (see also Crossley, 2003, p. 51), I consider how anarchist habitus, embodied within anarchist cultures of resistance, is both 'structured and structuring' of settler colonialism, in relation to movement capital and the field of struggle. Grounded theory allows understandings of anarchist culture in the context of settler colonialism to arise from anarchist cultures themselves. It is one means of examination that might respond to the calls (such as from Crossley, 2003, p. 59)[32] for more detailed ethnographic examinations beyond the typical economic rationality that assesses the actions of social movement actors, and thus might examine 'fields' of settler colonial relations and of social movement resistance that I take up here. Employing a grounded theory approach to understanding the relatively unexamined

---

coding, and concepts, while losing sight of the 'in-depth, first-hand knowledge ethnography provides (p. 506). They argue that grounded theory has the ability to enrich ethnographic work in the organization of materials from the field in writing, and writing itself as a part of the analytic process.

[32] Crossley (2003) notes that resource mobilization theories have often been applied to social movements but cannot account for the elements of personal risk and sacrifice that often characterises activism that yields limited or non-existent personal benefits and gains.

existence of anarchism within the context of settler colonialism, can lead to greater understandings of the contexts where movement resistance occurs.[33]

Grounded theory also presents a useful guide for the processes of analysis. In particular, grounded theory focuses on a close reading of the data, with theory generation and reflections occurring as the research goes along, and applying insights and reflections to later data gathering processes (Cho & Lee, 2014). Initial coding procedures 'aim to ask what is happening in these data and invokes short analytic labels in the form of gerunds to identify specific processes and treat them theoretically (Charmaz & Bryant, 2008, p. 375). This can include open coding to identify initial categories, axial coding to understand or explore relationships between categories, selective coding that focuses on particular codes and their relationships to form specific picture or story about the data, or theoretical coding to understand the relationships between codes with an eye to generating summarizing theories (Cho & Lee, 2014, p. 8).

I used multiple rounds of coding, working with the full transcripts of interview conversations in order to immerse myself intentionally within the data. I did an initial round while transcribing and editing the transcripts to form an initial set of codes and themes to prompt my own reflection and discussion with the research data. Once full transcripts were edited and complete, I engaged in a second round, building on the initial codes and themes, and seeking deeper levels of analysis and complexity. At this point I began to extract key summary quotations and passages, to bring focus to the volume of interview material. This helped to distil the transcripts, while still keeping a significant portion of the conversations. I frequently included snippets of conversation and the back and forth between myself and the participants, to capture the dynamic nature of our conversations, and to preserve some of the flow of the original transcripts. I found that this kept me 'close' to the original conversation and the data at

[33] Here I am less interested in 'mapping' the wide range and nuanced differences of key actors and organizations, resources, dynamics, etc. of movements, something which Crossley suggests might be useful (p. 63). Rather I am interested in the ways that culture, with its embedded values-practices, ethics, theories, and future visions is structured and structuring of the settler colonial context. How anarchist movements dwell and respond to the particular structure of settler colonialism, rather than what are the range of actors, etc. in such a context.

hand. Finally, these focused extracts were coded into more precise themes using a schematic of hashtags (such as #defns-settlercolonialism; #defns-culture; #cultureinpractice; #anarchistframings-defns; #critiquesofanarchism; #indig-anarchist-relations) that could be recalled and sorted across transcripts. This also allowed for overlapping coding of particular sections, further linking the processes of analysis with the conversations. These hashtags were then compared across interviews, and key similarities and differences parsed out.

Most importantly, and usefully perhaps, is the grounded theory focus on the writing of continual memos regarding the data. As Charmaz and Bryant (2008) summarize

> Memo writing (a) engages researchers with their data and emerging comparative analyses, (b) helps them to identify analytic gaps, (c) provides material for sections of papers and chapters, and (d) encourages researchers to record and develop their ideas at each stage of the research project. (p. 375)

This allows tracking and working with the data as the research process goes along, to inform subsequent data gathering, and to continue building and developing theoretical reflections on the data. I was continually memoing throughout the data gathering, transcription, analysis, reading, and writing stages which allowed an ongoing dialogue of my own, and continual development and refinement of the ideas that now comprise this dissertation.

This is especially pertinent given the importance of learning from movements and movement participants themselves. Grounded theory presents one avenue of glimpsing the 'struggle knowledge' (Choudry, 2016) of lived experiences and practices that many have developed in the processes of anarchist social movement resistance, culture and reproduction. It foregrounds the daily 'lived realities' (Haiven & Khasnabish, 2014, p. 50) of anarchist culture and the way anarchists talk about the settler colonial context of struggle and ongoing Indigenous resurgence/resistance, in conversation with broader theoretical perspectives. Given the need for greater forms of in-depth and sustained anti-colonial and decolonial analysis within anarchism, a grounded theory approach permits greater theoretical insights into the complexities of anarchist movements and anarchist culture—the ways that anarchist culture

and the anarchist identities that exist within it are reproduced, transmitted, and articulated, and their relation to resisting ongoing structures of settler colonialism. Overall, by employing a grounded theory perspective that engages directly with ethnographic social movement research, my work generates a localized, situational understanding of cultures of anarchist resistance and reproduction in settler colonialism that privileges the experiences, understandings, and 'struggle knowledge' of movements and their participants directly. It seeks to dwell at the intersections of how anarchist cultures are structured by settler colonialism, but also how their action and activity carry potential for change in such overarching structures as well.

Ethnography and Social Movement Research

In addition to grounded theory, ethnography, following Juris and Khasnabish (2013) presents a glimpse of 'being there'; in the throes of social movement happenings, to detail the 'flow of events' and permit in-depth reflection and discussion (p. 3). I come to ethnography through the militant/insurgent forms suggested by those such as Graeber (2004), Juris and Khasnabish (2013), the contributors to Shukaitis and Graeber (2009), as well as through the work of Haiven and Khasnabish (2014) on the radical imagination within social movements. Juris and Khasnabish note the transformative potential of insurgent forms of encounter that 'suggests the clearing of a path for new forms of sociopolitical imagination and construction. An insurgency is always a provocation, a forceful intervention that aims not to constitute a singular new order from whole cloth but to radically destabilize authorized forms of power, knowledge, and organization and, in so doing, to create the space necessary for new acts of constitution' (Juris & Khasnabish, 2013, p. 7). This links closely with Apoifis (2017) and his notion of militant ethnography that is 'derived from the vigorous pursuit of, and dissemination of, partisan insights' (p. 50) to blur the boundaries between research and activism and put oneself into the topic of study. As per my reflections above, ethnography became a core inspiration for maintaining a focus on the everyday and directly personal ways that anarchists discussed culture, settler colonialism, and anti-colonial resistance, to suggest ways to intentionally further these forms of politics.

Ethnographic practice is firmly committed to understanding the context in which movements occur: 'situated in place' and 'in relation to other acting subjects,' while also challenging the binary between researcher and researched, as social movements themselves produce knowledge (Juris & Khasnabish, 2013, p. 5). This means that we need to look to the 'everyday practices, imaginaries, and emerging subjectivities' of movement cultures and movement actors to 'grasp the[ir] complexity, contingency, and transformational potential' (Juris & Khasnabish, 2013, p. 6). These 'everyday' expressions of culture allow glimpses into the varied and complex ways that anarchist culture is expressed, responds to, and resists settler colonialism. The politics of the everyday helps to furnish an understanding of anarchist habitus, following Bourdieu.

A key element I wish to draw from here is the generation of strategic insight and discussion to build greater movement capacity and resistance, within the spaces in which movement participants come together or encounter one another and ideas. Anarchist bookfairs and physical anarchist spaces present opportunities for exchange between anarchists and are key articulations of anarchist culture. These also tend to be spaces that generate texts that are well suited to analysis, whether the books and zines that are distributed, the workshops and panels that are presented, or the cataloguing of events and happenings. Anarchist events such as bookfairs etc. are, Portwood-Stacer argues following Geertz (1993), 'paradigmatic' 'in that they are key occasions for performing the ethos of anarchist movement culture' (p. 17; see also Wood, 2014). These serve, at least to some degree, as repositories for anarchist resistance culture (Cohn, 2014) and as lived spaces of anarchist movement reproduction.

Work on social movement cultures and 'radical milieus' needs to go beyond cataloguing and 'collecting information' and move towards contributing directly to social movement processes (Haiven & Khasnabish, 2014, p. 76). Such 'movement relevant theory' should be directly usable by movements, and 'draw out useful information from a variety of contexts and translate it into a form that is more readily applicable by movements to new situations' (Dixon & Bevington 2005, p. 189). Movements generate their own theory and knowledge, what Choudry (2013)

calls the 'knowledge-practice' of social movements, and act as 'incubators of knowledge' to put research towards political aims (Graeber & Shukaitis, 2007, p. 11).

As Montgomery and bergman (2017) argue in their work on 'joyful militancy,' a move towards 'affirmative theory' permits

> a kind of theory that *participates* in struggle and the growth of shared power rather than directing it or evaluating it from outside. We are after a kind of theory that is critical but also affirmative. Rather than pointing to the limits of shortcomings of movements and declaring what they should do, affirmative theory homes in on the most transformative edges and margins. (p. 27)

This is my aim here, not just to critique, but to participate in building, developing, and expanding the possibilities of anarchism and anti-colonial politics. This comes through my engagement with theory, texts, interviewees, as well as my own ongoing process of reflection.

There is also, however, the important question of how systems of repression and disruption represented by the broader security apparatus of the state, corporate counters to resistance movements, or reactionary movements of the right and far right could also use this sort of research. This is a constant consideration for those engaging in or participating in social movement research. I am intimately aware of the implications of infiltration, disruption and surveillance given my own participation in resistance to the Toronto G20 in 2010.[34] In this work, as in the work of movements themselves, a focus on security culture and solidarity is imperative. Security culture is

> a set of customs shared by a community whose members may be targeted by the government, designed to minimize risk. … The central principle of all security culture, the point that cannot be emphasized enough, is that people should never be privy to any sensitive information they do not need to know. The greater the number of people

[34] For a general summary that correlates well with my own experience and analysis see 'Toronto G20 Main Conspiracy Group: The Charges and how they came to be' (2012).

> who know something that can put individuals or projects at risk—whether that something be the identity of a person who committed an illegal act, the location of a private meeting, or a plan for future activity—the more chance there is of the knowledge getting into the wrong hands. (Crimethinc, 2004, para. 1)

The zine 'Confidence. Courage. Connection. Trust.' (2019) further defines security culture:

> Security culture refers to a set of practices developed to assess risks, control the flow of information through your networks, and to build solid organizing relationships. There are countless different possible security cultures, but the important thing is that they come from clear, explicit conversations about risk that are ongoing and respond to change. (para. 8)

This includes refusing to broadcast or detail the commission of activities of interest to the forces of repression within the research, and at times leaving such accounts, if they do arise, out of transcripts and specific forms of discussion that could have direct negative implications for movement participants.

As Williams (2018) notes, anarchists engage in various facets of security culture in order to push back against the increasing context of police and state repression of movements, as detailed by those like Wood (2014). According to Robinson (2008) security culture further 'provides an adhesive for a community confronted with the potential fracturing effects of intensified scrutiny and social control,' and puts forth a study of some of the complexities of engaging such processes in practice (p. 249). Each of these elements places security as part of the practice of anarchist culture, and a necessary consideration for research.

In this work I consider the implications of the knowledge generated and how it could be used against social movements. In particular I seek to safeguard the identities of those I interview and encounter by using pseudonyms, storing participant identities separate from interview data, encrypting transcripts and interview files, allowing participants to revisit the elements of their interviews used in the dissertation and remove any details they desire, as best as possible

removing unnecessary identifying features, and focusing on the theories, practices, ethics and values of movements and cultures more generally, rather than individualizing these elements such that they can be directly attributed to particular individuals and thus might leave them open to the forces of repression. I aim to limit the 'mapping' of social movement networks, in ways that are often easily exploitable by counter-movement forces. In particular, I have forgone the use of gendered pronouns in describing research participants, opting for a generic descriptor of 'they,' to add another layer of anonymity to those involved, and as a pushback against the more general gendered dynamics that privilege certain voices over others. This also moves to consider participants 'ideas rather than their personalities' (Apoifis, 2017, p. 59).[35]

I find myself, like many social movement researchers, pulled in two directions, as a movement participant who has long been plugged into anarchist, Indigenous solidarity, and decolonial movements and spaces, while also having been embedded in the teaching and researching processes of the academy with a desire to continue work there. I have resided and organized with anarchist networks in Southern Ontario for more than 15 years and have a detailed insider's view to the dynamics of such places and spaces, although this is also determined by my own position and identity as well. There are a number of difficulties in straddling the two worlds, in the 'dynamic interplay between activist research and organizing' (Choudry, 2014, p. 485) that must be examined, but such a location also permits direct insight into movement processes and dynamics.

[35] There is also the consideration of those who declined to participate in this project as well. Interestingly, there was a strong hesitancy of a number of prospective participants on account of their feeling like they had 'nothing to say' or that they had drifted perhaps too far from being 'in' anarchist struggle. There was a certain refusal of their own potential as 'experts' and holders of knowledge and insight even despite my reassurance of the potential for their own experiences to be important in and of themselves. There is also a certain wariness among anarchists with regard to academic projects due to security/repression concerns (justifiably so!) even by other anarchists themselves. A final consideration, for researchers on movements in general is that of those who might be hesitant to participate due to being on bail or parole conditions due to their anarchist activity. This is not potential future repression risk, but an active and ongoing monitoring and surveillance process by the state. While I only mention this briefly here, this is something to further consider, especially as we seek to bring in the knowledge and analysis of those participants who are most directly involved in struggle. On some of this experience of those facing incarceration/release conditions and ongoing social movement work, see Ann Hansen's (2018) reflections.

Oppressions related to settler colonialism and white supremacy that non-Indigenous peoples benefit from are a key area of examination that needs to be taken up within anarchist movements. My work examines how the context of settler colonialism has influenced anarchist political culture and how anarchists have dealt with these issues directly, and taken steps to resist settler colonialism, pushing back against such a structure as well. Overall, this work aims to contribute to discussions, theory and practice in anarchist movements directly, in hopes of expanding anarchism's potentials for anti-colonial and broader resistance to the ongoing structures of domination and oppression, the possibilities of creating greater affinities to Indigenous resurgence struggles, and a more intentional orientation to the prefigurative anti-colonial possibilities for the future.

Outline of Chapters

The subsequent chapters are outlined as follows:

2) 'Value-Practices' of Contemporary Anarchism: Definitions, Tensions, Resistance

   This chapter critically reviews contemporary forms of anarchism, their emergence, historical development, and particularities within the last three decades. I argue that anarchist 'value-practices' (Jeppesen, 2010) are a central means for understanding the content of anarchist culture, and the ways that anarchists exist within their own scenes, but also the ways that they interact with and diffuse their politics and practices into other movements. Anarchist value-practices form a basis for considering greater contributions to anti-colonial politics, as they uphold commitments to resist all forms of oppression and domination, engage in non-hierarchical forms of organization, undertake direct action, and seek prefigurative alternative futures.

3) Settler Colonialism, Capitalism, and State: Structures, Linkages, and Resistance

   This chapter engages the literature on settler colonialism as a specific structure that frames the context of anarchist resistance in North America, and more specifically Southern Ontario. I consider the definitional aspects of settler colonialism, connections to the state and capitalism,

the relationship between dispossession and primitive accumulation, the structuring of identities and relationships to land, and the broader implications for taking up settler colonial theory. I argue for a central focus on settler colonialism (in addition to Indigenous resistance/resurgence) to understand the dynamics of oppression and domination within such a context, as well as the potentials for resistance, but only if in direct relation to Indigenous resurgence/resistance. This section provides a basis to disrupt and problematize anarchist prefigurative projects and relations to land that occur on contested Indigenous territories, where a core issue has been a lack of attention to the underlying settler colonial context, and the need for expanding anti-colonial politics.

4) Social Movements, Political Culture, and Resistance: Considering Anarchist Habitus, Capital, and Field

   This chapter considers the work of Pierre Bourdieu and its relevance for understanding the ways in which social movements both structure and are structured within the context of settler colonialism. Bourdieu's theorization of habitus, capital, and field are useful in understanding the operation of social movement cultures, and how anarchist cultures of resistance dwell within structures of settler colonialism. In particular, I argue that we might understand anarchist value-practices as existing within a specific habitus, set of capital relations, and both anarchist and settler colonial fields. Combining Bourdieu's work with Theresa Warburton's (2021) 'structures of settlement' that persist within anarchism aids in understanding how cultures of anarchism are structuring and structured, how ideas persist within contexts of power and domination (like structuring structures of settler colonialism), and how dynamics of crisis and disruption might prompt moves towards deeper forms of anti-colonial politics. I bring Bourdieu into a specifically social movement context, building on the work of those who have set to this task before, and push it further into the context of anarchism that is embedded within the ongoing structures of settler colonialism.

5) Cultures of Anarchism, Cultures of Resistance : Anarchist Culture and Anti-Colonial Potential in Practice

This chapter sets out the context of anarchist cultures of resistance in Southern Ontario and builds an understanding of anarchist culture from the ground up, with a central focus on the interview data. I introduce my interviewee participants to illustrate the breadth of their perspectives and their important movement-based contributions. Culture is a necessary means that allows anarchist movements to cohere, in particular using physical and digital forms of infrastructure, ongoing events and places of meeting, forms of cultural communication, and shared value-practices. Relationships, affinities, and value-practices are crucial to the coherence and persistence of anarchist cultures of resistance, and offer places of critical discussion as to the implications of politics that can also drift into insularity, 'rigid radicalism' (Montgomery & bergman, 2017) and inadequate attention to the ongoing context of settler colonialism. I consider how we might understand forms of anarchist habitus and field within Southern Ontario in order to deepen the approach to context and anti-colonial politics.

6) Opposition, Relationships, Solidarity: Anarchist Articulations of Settler Colonial Context and Affinities with Indigenous Resurgence

This chapter details the ways that anarchists in Southern Ontario engage with the context of settler colonialism and ongoing Indigenous resurgence/resistance, and the implications of such approaches. Drawn directly from the research data, I build a theory of anarchist culture in a settler colonial context by exploring not only anarchist approaches, but also a series of ongoing tensions related to the context of settler colonialism. I argue that affinity and relationships built on accountability and trust are important value-practices for the ways that anarchists engage with settler colonialism and narrate their ongoing engagements with Indigenous resurgence movements and anti-colonial politics. Engaging in deeper levels of discussion and interrogation of the tensions and lessons of anarchist approaches to affinity, solidarity, and accountability offers key means to further expand anti-colonial habitus. This chapter argues that while there is a great deal of work being done regarding current forms of anarchist engagement in a settler colonial context, there is still discussion, writing, and agitation needed to further articulate a deeper anti-colonial anarchism as a 'committed politics' within the context of settler colonialism and propel it ever forward.

7) Grounded Normativities and Subaltern Knowledges: Considering Anarchist Prefigurative Possibilities for the Future

This final concluding chapter examines how anarchism might move forward and the potentials for continually developing anarchist theory and practice towards anti-colonial ends. I begin with a further tension around spirituality as a means to consider the ways that anarchists might not only ground their politics within their own experiences of history, ancestors, and subaltern knowledge's, but also form greater affinities with Indigenous resurgence. I use anarchist approaches to May Day as a key example of the ways that value-practices, relationships to land and place, and prefigurative orientations to the future are being combined by anarchists, and how they might be pushed further. In particular, I consider the ways that anarchists have oriented themselves to land and place, their relationships to treaties and wampum belts, and how leaning on some of their own perspectives in more direct and committed ways might foster even greater forms of affinity and possibility going forward.

Chapter 2 – 'Value-Practices' of Contemporary Anarchism: Definitions, Tensions, Resistance

Anarchists, radicals, militants, abolitionists, anti-fascists, and beyond continue to be targets of political and media tirades, with a variety of derogatory terms slung in their direction: 'terrorist,' 'extremist,' 'violent hooligans,' 'thugs,' 'mobs,' 'outside agitators.' Recent anti-ICE uprisings in Minneapolis were derided as the work of 'anarchist protestors' (CBS News, 2026) and during the George Floyd uprisings Donald Trump was quick to declare the uprisings the work of 'professional anarchists' (ABC News, 2020). Similar rhetoric has been deployed in relation to Palestine solidarity encampments and movements (Collins, 2024). This trend only continues classic portrayals of an anarchist terrorist, holding a bomb, planning chaos.[36] Anarchism is also often derided as practically utopian or impossible, anachronistic, or overly decentralized. Anarchism just isn't seen to be a practical approach for the future (Johnson & Ferguson, 2019, p. 698). Indeed, according to Klausen and Martel (2011) some of these criticisms and dismissals of anarchism might be some of its 'greatest strengths' (p. xx). If anarchism is given little attention this can allow for subversive resistance and the creation of alternatives out of the spotlight or forefront of social movements or media attention, and allow for the articulation of anarchism on its own terms—'hiding in plain sight' and continuing to develop through everyday practices. Further they argue that anarchism's long-term vision, that refuses finite time constraints for change to occur, is reflective of a dismissal of liberal notions of progress and time and a more nuanced, open understanding of history and change (p. xix). This is also a further point of contact with Indigenous struggles which have been derided as nostalgic for a past that will never return. Both dismissals reconstruct the hegemonic construction of time on the terms of the state and empire (Johnson & Ferguson, 2019, p. 698).

[36] The term anarchy is often used as a synonym for chaos. This might be true, but in reference to anarchism and anarchist theory, movement and resistance, the term anarchy might be better known as the 'goal of anarchists' (Kinna, 2009, p. 5), namely the construction of a new society free from capitalism, the state, and oppression and domination as I discuss in the remainder of this chapter.

Since the beginning of self-identified anarchist movements in the mid-1800s, and into the present, anarchism continues to face negative stereotypes and portrayals, often used to sideline others who don't even subscribe to the label. But there is, and always has been perhaps, something else afoot. Anarchism has often been lurking in the background, in various social and political movements, coming to the surface, and then falling away only to return again. At the current moment with many forms of high profile resistance struggles, revolutions, occupations, and emerging forms of political consciousness, anarchism is again on the scene participating in these struggles but also putting forth its own strategies and tactics as well (Williams, 2018; Chase-Dunn et al., 2019; Sitrin, 2019).

This chapter examines the contemporary anarchist moment and reviews its core commitments, influences, and complexities in greater depth. While far from an exhaustive account, this chapter teases out some they key aspects of contemporary anarchism amongst accounts of the contemporary anarchist movement represented by popular works and introductory texts on the subject (Milstein, 2022; Branson, 2022; Williams, 2017; Dixon, 2014; Amster, 2012; Kinna, 2009; Ward, 2004; Milstein, 2010).[37] Constructing contemporary anarchism in such a way helps to understand the core elements of anarchism and how they are translated through key cultural reference points. This creates a baseline understanding of anarchist 'value-practices,' following Jeppesen (2010). Despite anarchism's widespread commitment to resist all forms of oppression and domination, I argue that this is insufficient unless it attends to the particularities of settler colonialism directly. How we understand contemporary anarchism – what is included and what is taken as core influences and disruptions, coupled with the baseline of opposition– creates a framework to engage with resistance and resurgence movements outside of those strictly defined as anarchist. Anarchism continues to hold promise as a means

[37] Many of these texts are highly circulated within anarchist movement cultures—at anarchist bookfairs and from major distributors of anarchist publications, like AK Press. These are the texts that anarchists and those interested in the movement often first encounter to gain a view of the world of anarchism that goes beyond media portrayals. They are significant, therefore, for their widespread readership and their relevance.

of resistance in the contemporary, but only if it continues to expand and diversify the ways that politics, value-practices, and future visions are constructed.

Anarchist Value-Practices

Anarchism, perhaps, is best understood a 'lived tradition' based in core commitments, practices, principles, and values; and translatable into a variety of contexts and applications (Grubacic, 2013, p. 200). Not as a 'grand theory of revolution' but 'an ethical disposition that finds expression in practice and as practice' (Critchley, 2013, p. 4). Understanding such an 'ethical disposition' requires attention, according to Montgomery and bergman (2017), to the dynamics of relationships and relationality. As Gustav Landauer (1910/2010) argued, we can understand the state is a 'social relationship,' which should prompt our consideration of how to create new forms of relating, anchored in anarchist values and practices. He argues that

> Those who believe that the state is also a thing or a fetish that can be overturned or smashed are sophists and believers in the Word. The state is a social relationship; a certain way of people relating to one another. It can be destroyed by creating new social relationships; i.e., by people relating to one another differently.
>
> The absolute monarch said: I am the state. We, who have imprisoned ourselves in the absolute state, must realize the truth: we are the state! And we will be the state as long as we are nothing different; as long as we have not yet created the institutions necessary for a true community and a true society of human beings. (p. 214)

The state, as Landauer (1907/2010) suggests, is something we are all bound up within, help to create, and sustain. 'What causes oppression,' he argues,

> is self-coercion, self-denial, and the worst of all emotions: mistrust, not only towards others but also towards oneself. All this is engrained in the notion of

> the state itself; a notion that replaces spirit, inner sovereignty, and life with domination, external control and death.' (p. 173)

As a result, he argues for people to 'disengage' from oppressive elements of society, 'rebel' against oppression and 'take' what they need (Landauer, 1892/2010, p. 80); with the understanding that people must 'flee the state and replace it, that they must build an alternative' (Landauer, 1910/2010, p. 214). He advocates that we move through separation to community; that is, 'separate ourselves from the old communities' to find new communities (Landauer, 1901/2010, p. 96) and leave behind the state. This understanding means a radically different approach to resistance, where anarchism begins with cultivating new forms of relationships, and putting different values, practices and modes of organization into place now, rather than waiting for a particular revolutionary moment.

Landauer is referenced by Montgomery and bergman (2017) in their broad ranging discussion of joyful militancy, and his work resonates with the construction of alternative radical values and practices through affinity and 'common notions'. I turn to affinity in later chapters as a framework to understand anarchist and Indigenous connections and relations. Montgomery and bergman (2017) conceptualize common notions as 'shared values and sensibilities that are flexible and based in relationships with human and non-human others'; 'pragmatic sensibilities, *material* conceptions that arise out of embodied, mutually enabling face-to-face relationships' (p. 132). They prioritize relationships and shared ethics that prompt movement towards greater forms of trust, responsibility, accountability, and possibility. Common notions promote a 'recovery of people's capacities for autonomy and struggle here and now' and 'tends towards breaking down old divides between organizing and everyday existence, and opening the question of collective life in all its expansiveness' (p. 238). A 'relational ethics' comes to the fore with the 'willingness to nurture and defend relationships' (p. 90). As such, this conception of common notions (and the whole of the Joyful Militancy framework) prompts greater attention to the dynamics and importance of relationships, and to promoting deeper forms of relations that can enhance and further struggle on an ongoing basis. Conceiving of anarchist value-

practices requires a necessary consideration of relationships that comprise, and have the potential to strengthen, anarchist cultures of resistance.

'Value-practices' highlighted by Sandra Jeppesen (2010), and introduced briefly in the previous chapter, illustrate key hallmarks, from anti-authoritarianism, anti-capitalism, and anti-oppressive politics to more positive affirmations of collectivity, autonomy, vision, and experimentation. Anarchist 'guerilla texts,' the 'irregular non-uniform anti-authoritarian texts' that seek to combat the 'much larger normalized authoritarian system of textual production that tends to be capitalist, patriarchal, heteronormative, racist and/or ableist' (p. 475), are a key element in the formation of value-practices alongside broader commitments to anti-capitalist production, collective empowerment, and accountability that are constituent of anarchist culture. Anarchists, in part, write for each other, which Jeppesen argues collapses some of the frequent separation between producer and audience and leads towards 'assemblages of assemblages: endlessly multiplying production' (p. 478) across a range of media. The multiplicity of perspectives, and the heterogeneity of expressions, helps to further cement anti-oppressive value-practices.

This includes, Jeppesen (2010) argues, the important interventions of Anarchist People of Colour (APOC) and other anti-racist/anti-colonial forms of anarchism. Such texts form crucial interventions, 'transgressions of process, content and access coupled with intersectional identities' that 'issue critical challenges to external hegemonic power structures' as well as the internal processes of anarchist cultural production (p. 482). They fundamentally alter understandings of anarchist culture and the value-practices within it. I argue below that recent works on Black anarchism (Salmudzi & Anderson, 2018; Anderson, 2021; Bey, 2020) and Indigenous anarchism (Benally, 2023) do such work, and issue potent and necessary challenges to constructions of contemporary anarchism. Omitting or excluding these 'multiplicitous' influences misrepresents contemporary anarchism as narrowly and limitedly white/European and forecloses more significant disruption and potential offered by such perspectives (Jeppesen, 2011, p. 151). This is one of the crucial tasks that is necessary to expand the anti-

colonial potentials of anarchist theory and practice with which I am concerned here.[38] Crucial interventions are needed through renewed anarchist engagement with Black anarchist and Indigenous resurgence modes of thought and practice.

There is a danger, Jeppesen (2010) points out, in that such processes of heterogeneity can lead to elements of separation, a lack of intersectionality or accountability to such perspectives and disruptions, isolation, and a 'fail[ure] to see our own implication in roles of domination' (p. 483). Disruptions from within anarchism become segregated or maligned as their own individualized projects, rather than as disruptive of the broader whole, which holds the potential to re-structure what is understood to be the dominant or hegemonic set of anarchist value-practices. Looking at value-practices, and the ways they are contested, provides a useful framework for understanding both the core elements of contemporary anarchism, but also the ways that it can continue to be disrupted and expanded. The necessary approach then is to foment greater forms of connection, disruption, and 'inter-connected collective autonomy' (p. 484).[39] This recalls the dynamics of relationships that uphold the state (and other forms of domination) as highlighted by Landauer above. Relationships form a key element of value-practices and the ways that anarchists (re-)imagine collective struggle and possibility.

---

[38] These sorts of disruptions also dovetail with ongoing debates within anarchism regarding the anarchist 'canon,' the limits of which are frequently remade on through the characterizations of anarchism and anarchist histories in introductory or broader-based survey works that present a survey of key works and articles. From early survey works by Eltzbacher (1900/1907) to more contemporary collections like those of Marshall (2010), or those like Guérin (2005) and the volumes put together by Graham (2004, 2009, 2012), there have been a variety of ways of constructing what we understand anarchism to be and who is included in such a definition. We can also understand what 'counts' as anarchism by looking at the various academic anthologies that have proliferated in recent years as well (for ex. Levy & Adams, 2019; Kinna, 2012; Amster et al., 2009; etc.). While I have neither the space nor time to fully take up an assessment of the problematics of constructing the anarchist canon (or better 'canon(s)'), it is important to mark that this is a crucial aspect of the ways that anarchism has been and continues to be contested. It is also indicative of the limited ways that anti-colonial questions have been considered alongside more generalized anarchist concerns as well. On the disruption of the anarchist canon, see Kinna and Evren (2013) and Ramnath (2011, 2019).

[39] I consider this through 'affinity' and 'committed politics' in later chapters. It is necessary to consider the ways that greater forms of anti-colonial value-practices can come to inform the core elements of contemporary anarchist theory and practice itself more broadly. This is a key aim of my work here, as successive chapters consider directly the ways that anarchists in Southern Ontario narrate perspectives, lessons, and reflections on settler colonial contexts and anti-colonial politics.

This specific consideration of texts in the construction of value-practices prompts my discussion of key anarchist works, to assess the contemporary character of anarchist value-practices, but also the ways that 'guerilla' texts can disrupt anarchism further. Such guerilla texts disrupt the generalized and baseline opposition to all forms of oppression and domination, and expand further, into an explicit and committed realm of anti-colonial politics. This prompts, then, the need for greater anarchist attention, writing, and discussion on the context and resistance to settler colonialism, that in later chapters, I examine through the use of interviews with anarchist themselves, and their everyday and specific theorization and action against colonization. I begin by detailing the general parameters of anarchist value-practices and their articulation through key texts.

Value-Practices and Core Commitments

Given the frequent slander of anarchism and more general confusion regarding its complexities, practices, and histories, one of the key means of delineation has been to assert what anarchism is not. Alexander Berkman was perhaps the most famous in doing so in 'What is Anarchism?' (1929/2003), an exemplary push back against the propaganda of the media and the state:

> Therefore I must tell you first of all, what Anarchism is *not.*
>
> It is *not* bombs, disorder, or chaos.
>
> It is *not* robbery and murder.
>
> It is *not* a war of each against all.
>
> It is *not* a return to barbarism or to the wild state of man.
>
> Anarchism is the very opposite of all that. (p. xv)

Classically, Emma Goldman (1917/1969), writing in the early 20th century, argued for an anarchism committed to the destruction of all forms of oppression and domination:

> Anarchism, then, really stands for the liberation of the human mind from the dominion of religion; the liberation of the human body from the dominion of property; liberation from the shackles and restraint of government. Anarchism stands for a social order based on the free grouping of individuals for the purpose of producing real social wealth; an order that will guarantee every human being free access to the earth and the full enjoyment of the necessities of life, according to individual desires, tastes, inclinations. (p. 62)

Her definition points to the expansive character of anarchism and its wide-ranging resistance, but can be expanded into more recent formulations. While detailing such a lineage is a wholly other project, classical anarchist texts (those from the European context dating roughly from the 1860s to 1939) continue to influence the ways contemporary anarchism has been formulated, and the key value-practices it carries. They are frequently referenced in contemporary accounts of anarchism, but must be read alongside other dynamic and disruptive influences as well.

In *Anarchism: A Beginner's Guide,* Ruth Kinna (2009) presents a detailed overview of anarchism and its complexities through the lens of theory and thinkers, to categorize key traditions within anarchism (i.e., mutualism, communism, collectivism, individualism;—see chart on p. 24, for example). Kinna points to the similarities and subtle differences between classical and contemporary anarchist theory (p. 29), but most specifically to the variety of ideas that are present within anarchism. The key thinkers, she argues, give us the general character of anarchism, but carry the danger of imposing uniformity over the field (p. 16)[40] as teasing out anarchism's complexities, in her estimation, requires looking at the various schools of thought (i.e., individualist, communist, feminist, ecological, philosophical, etc.; p. 18).

---

[40] Kinna specifically responds to and critiques the methods of Paul Eltzbacher (1900/1907) who sought to tease out the 'seven sages' of anarchism, locating the different approaches of anarchism in exclusively key thinkers, united only by a rejection of the state, which in and of itself was varied. This approach to defining anarchism primarily on the basis of key thinkers (and classical ones at that) has been carried forward in more contemporary works by Woodcock (2004) and Marshall (2010). For further criticism of this approach see van der Walt and Schmidt (2009, pp. 18, 37).

Kinna (2009) argues that most of all anarchism 'can be defined as an ideology by the adherence to a core belief, namely, the rejection of the state' (p. 1), actualized through the use of 'direct or non-governmental action' (p. 3). Kinna brings in theorists who have aroused debate as to the appropriateness of their inclusion in the anarchist canon, such as William Godwin. Her starting point, then, is a sort of anarchist minimum, which taken alone is inadequate to capture the necessary elements of anarchism discussed so far.

Kinna (2009) suggests three ways to consider its thought, action, and development: 1) as a 'political movement directed to the liberation of the working class,' where other issues and areas of resistance are viewed through the lens of class (what we might call a classical anarchist framing); 2) as a 'vast umbrella movement' that includes a multitude of queer, ecological, feminist etc. influences, but which rejects categorization into particular 'isms' (i.e., anarcho-communism, -primitivism, -feminism, etc.) in favour of anarchism as a 'way of life' with counter-cultural collective commitments based on 'interdependence and mutual support' (a diverse and expansive anarchist framing perhaps); and finally 3) as a movement rooted in the 'aesthetic dimensions of liberation' of 19th century artistic movements aiming to overcome a rigid working class definition, as well as to overcome alienation and boredom (pp. 4–5). It is important to begin to move beyond anarchist characterizations in number 1, which have a much more classical bent that takes the state as an anarchist minimum and where oppression is filtered through class analysis, and begin to push for a much more dynamic and expansive view of anarchism, with elements of number 2 but also more keenly focused on organizing prefiguratively for the future. The third framing has made important contributions to anarchism and its socio-political culture, but does not reflect a core influence on contemporary theory and practice.[41] In this way, Kinna's schematic does point to some general ways to see different forms of anarchist movements, which can be examined against contemporary forms.

[41] The final framing that Kinna suggests seems to be the least relevant to understandings of anarchism. This is not to suggest that the aesthetic movements and art practices have not been significant in developing anarchism's form and substance (works by those such as Allan Antliff [2004], or Sheehan [2003] show the importance of such influences), however these influences have not seemed to greatly influence the prioritization of certain types of

As a detailed introduction to anarchism's contemporary character, *Anarchism Today* by Randall Amster (2012)[42] points to anarchism as anti-authoritarian, as 'naturally anti-government and anti-capitalist' (pp. 6–7); voluntary with relations free of coercion and imposition; committed to mutual aid of 'solidarity, affinity, or community,' holding anarchist visions together (p. 9);[43] autonomous, maximizing individual and collective liberty and ability to make decisions and choices freely and unimpeded; egalitarian, rather than equal opportunist, in favour of 'active equality' and empowerment (p. 13); naturalist, anarchism as 'inherently ecological' (p. 13); anti-capitalist; dynamic while uncompromising and revolutionary,[44] but filled with creativity and spontaneity; pragmatic, addressing oppression and domination now through a 'condition of permanent revolution and vigilance' (p. 18); utopian, looking to the future but actively beginning to construct such utopia's here and now; and decentralized/non-hierarchical. This account provides an outline of key tenets, values, and commitments that characterize anarchism.

In *Anarchism and Its Aspirations,* Cindy Milstein (2010) emphasizes anarchism as a wide reaching and diverse movement that carries within it aspirations for a better world and a new

---

oppressions or types of resistance within anarchism. Rather, the aesthetic dimensions are perhaps just that, another dimension within the broad quilt of anarchism, and one of the possible focuses within the second frame that Kinna highlights or even tactical considerations for the first frame. There certainly have been aesthetic movements within anarchism, but they are hardly a core component within a movement based primarily on action and putting theory into practice. They are perhaps aspects of anarchism that contribute most to the culture of anarchism and the spread of anarchist ideas (Purkis & Bowen, 2012, p. 221).

[42] Amster's is a typical presentation of anarchism detailing anarchism's core commitments, values and points of reference, although he does devote some additional space to a discussion of anarchism and ecological concerns, and, interestingly argues for a pacifist interpretation of anarchism, which can hardly be presented as a core anarchist value in any way. The anarchist debate over violence or non-violence continues to be unresolved since classical formulations, thus it is interesting that Amster takes a rather principled stance on non-violence within his book, which aims to set out a general character of anarchism 'today.' In this way, some of anarchism's complexity is collapsed given the range of perspectives on the ethical, moral, tactical, or strategic usefulness or justifiability of violence. Amster's is one view, but does little to hint at the other side or the points of disagreement. On this critique of non-violence see Gelderloos (2007) and on specifically insurrectionary histories and politics see Loadenthal (2017) and Apoifis (2016).

[43] Or better understood as 'a lavish, boundless sense of generosity, in which people support each other' (Milstein, 2010, p. 56).

[44] Or alternatively anarchism as 'anti-dogma' and moving away from the trappings of official canonization (Errandonea, 2001). Or as Williams (2017) argues, anarchism should continue to practice a 'theoretical openness' (p. 307).

society, free from the trappings of oppression and domination. Their anarchism is an expansive one, where the key to understanding and delimiting anarchism is not through particular theorists, but through actions, values, and possibilities. Milstein (2010) argues that while anarchism comes from the Greek root *an-arkhos* for without rulers it has now come to stand for the 'absence of both domination (mastery or control over another) and hierarchy (ranked power-relations of domination and subordination) (p. 13)[45]. Milstein points to a more expansive conception of anarchism, which most definitely includes anti-state politics, towards resistance to all forms of hierarchy and domination.

Milstein (2010) argues that it isn't whether one defines as anarchist or otherwise, but how we act and seek to create alternatives to the domination and oppression that exists in society that is most important (p. 6). Labels, perhaps, mean a little less than the actual practice and attempts at realizing something better. In this sense, anarchism is a bit 'messy' with lots of its own work to do, but the important thing is to keep moving forward, keep trying and to draw inspiration from wherever we can (p. 3). Milstein foregrounds lived anarchist experiments that continue to emerge, morph, and fall away to make room for new attempts. The perceived 'messiness' of anarchism contributes to the diverse and dynamic nature of anarchism in the contemporary period. There is much to experiment and figure out still, especially with regard to the intersections of oppression and domination that go beyond a reductive class analysis.

Milstein (2010) adds a specific orientation towards voluntary association[46] (and accountability), where individuals freely choose which projects and desires they wish to explore along with the free association with others who share similar commitments (p. 59). Further, anarchism also contains a prefigurative element, where alternative and possible futures are sought to be enacted here and now, rather than waiting for some single rupture or capital 'R' Revolutionary

[45] Sean Sheehan's *Anarchism* (2003), too, emphasizes the non-hierarchical nature of anarchism that holds at its core 'a rejection of the need for the centralized authority of the unitary state' (p. 25). Anarchism affirms individual and collective responsibility over daily life and the creation of 'participatory, democratic government for modern, complex societies' (p. 15).

[46] See also Sartwell (2008).

moment (p. 68). Dixon (2014) names prefiguration as 'efforts to manifest and build, to the greatest extent possible, the world we would like to see through our means of fighting in this one' (p. 83). 'This means building the facts of the future in the present;' Grubacic (2013) argues, 'not after the revolution but in the shell of the existing social order,' with 'our means' 'consonant with our ends,' 'to embody the society we wish to create,' and a rejection of 'authoritarian means' (pp. 187–188). It is actualized via direct action, where 'one proceeds as if the state does not exist,' rejecting appeals to authority to solve problems and make change, and instead taking up said change collectively (Graeber, 2009, p. 203). Direct action links with prefiguration to produce immediate change in the present, through one's own means and actions.[47] There is a foundational aspect of practice here. Hence, an inseparable fusion as 'value-practices.'

There is a 'dual strategy of confrontation to delegitimise the system' as well as 'grassroots alternative-building from below' (Gordon, 2008, p. 18).[48] It signifies a correlation of the means of resistance and action taken up in the present, with the desired ends of a radical society of the future. Dixon (2014) names four specific kinds of prefiguration: from 'countercultural lifestyles' and 'counter institutions,' to organizing people's capacities for action, and expanding 'egalitarian modes of interacting within movement contexts' that put radical values into practice (p. 85).

Shannon, Nocella II, and Asimakopoulos (2012, p. 12), as well as Albert (2012), argue that part of this prefigurative element must also involve specific and renewed thinking about anarchist alternatives to capitalism and economic relations and how these alternatives are linked with

[47] Classically formulated early on by Voltarine de Cleyre (1912/2004): 'Every person who ever had a plan to do anything, and went and did it, or who laid his plan before others, and won their cooperation to do it with him, without going to external authorities to please do the thing for them, was a direct actionist. All co-operative experiments are essentially direct action' (p. 48).

[48] In later work, Gordon (2018) considers the historical development of the term prefigurative politics, its incorporation into anarchist politics, and some of the particular recursive and temporal issues with the term. Despite its frequent use within anarchist circles, Gordon considers whether the term is still the most useful, given the promise of radical futures is becoming eclipsed by realties of crisis and collapse. He offers, instead a consideration of 'concrete utopia' (p. 522) and 'anxious/catastrophic forms of hope' (p. 534).

broadly defined political and social spheres. Further, they suggest a need to move beyond European histories and seek a wider view for alternatives and inspiration.

Laura Portwood-Stacer (2013), in *Lifestyle Politics and Radical Activism,* adds emphasis to the countercultural/lifestyle area of prefiguration, often met with criticism or disdain.[49] Lifestyle politics, as 'the whole cultural formation around individuals' use of everyday choices as a legitimate site of political expression,' combined with broader critiques of capitalism and the state (etc.) to form a dual focus within social movements (p. 5), need to be considered alongside other forms of anarchist resistance and not just dismissed outright. Such actions, where individuals 'are compelled to shape their own personal behaviour and choices towards the ideals they envision,' 'reconfigure' 'everyday life…into an ongoing struggle against domination' (p. 2). Lifestyle politics, as an example of anarchist 'culture and collective identification,' are perhaps the 'primary basis upon which an anarchist "movement" coheres at all.' Lifestyle activism is but one component of resistance, alongside direct action and resistance. It encompasses a crucial component of everyday, lived, and practical expressions of anarchist value-practices. Indeed, Portwood-Stacer argues that lifestyle politics are themselves a form of direct action because they 'materially change one's everyday experience without appealing to a central entity' (p. 20). They also may be the only real form of possible political expression or resistance if the particular climate of repression is particularly severe (p. 10). As I discuss in subsequent chapters, lifestyle politics is a crucial point of consideration for the ways that anarchist culture is actualized and lived in the every-day, and maintains and reproduces anarchist habitus.[50]

---

[49] On the topic of critique and disdain, see Murray Bookchin's *Social Anarchism or Lifestyle Anarchism: An Unbridgeable Chasm* (1995). Bookchin characterizes lifestyle politics as overly personalistic, devoid of genuine politics and ultimately unable to assist in the creation of social revolutionary change. This critique is certainly important in relation to lifestyle politics, however, as a perhaps smaller aspect of anarchist theory and practice I forgo an in-depth discussion in favour of looking at more of the outward and collective aspects of resistance.

[50] Lifestyle expressions of anarchism therefore must be considered within the general field of anarchist culture and politics and present possible avenues to prefigure possible futures here and now. There must, however, be important considerations, like all forms of resistance, to the effectiveness of such forms of anarchism in the every-day. Lifestyle forms of anarchism cannot and should not become a substitute for the creation of collective forms of anarchist resistance, or continuing efforts to build connections between a variety of social, political and economic

Anarchist forms of prefiguration are also reflective of a sentiment borrowed from the Zapatistas, as a movement and possible future where 'many worlds fit' and there are no predetermined blueprints for how society will be structured (Milstein, 2010, p. 93; see also Amster, 2012, p. 149). There is a 'radically open-ended and undetermined' view of the future and the 'million possibilities' that loom on the horizon, of which anarchist constructions and visions exists as potentials amongst many others (Martel, 2023, pp. 9–10). Prefiguration, in the anarchist sense described here, encompasses the ways and means to create a new society and relationships in the future by building here and now in the present—to construct a 'new world in the shell of the old,' to recall the old IWW adage, rather than waiting for some future 'blank slate.'[51] Prefiguration is a crucial anarchist value-practice, and a means of spreading value-practices ever further.

Uri Gordon (2008) argues that a defining feature of anarchism is its shared political culture of forms of action, organizing, cultural expression and political language of which lifestyle anarchism discussed above is a crucial part (p. 4). He argues specifically for a three-fold core of anarchism: 'a rejection of all forms of domination,' 'an ethos of direct action' and prefigurative politics with a commitment to diversity, similar to Grubacic's anti-state, anti-capitalist and prefigurative definition (p. 4).

A core aspect of this political culture, which becomes a core export and hallmark of anarchism in the contemporary period, is anarchism's modes of organization, namely the affinity group, which is a 'small and autonomous group of anarchists, closely familiar to each other, who come together to undertake a specific action, whether in isolation or collaboration with other affinity groups' (Gordon, 2008, p. 15). Within political culture arise the different debates and discussion of anarchist forms of organization, tactics and solidarity that Gordon discusses, many of which

movements. Even so, neglecting lifestyle and cultural expressions of resistance also does a disservice to the many ways that anarchism is expressed and how different people come to identify with anarchism in the first place.

[51] In particular see also Shantz's (2010) 'infrastructures of resistance' that I discuss in chapter 5 and their importance to the maintenance of anarchist culture.

continue to be unresolved.[52] Political culture is a further avenue, as I consider in later chapters, within which the particularities of anarchist anti-colonial value-practices might be assessed, and then expanded. Anarchist culture is one of the means by which value-practices are maintained, expanded, developed in a collective sense, and come to be a form of habitus.

Chris Dixon (2014), on the other hand, discusses anarchism as part of the broader anti-authoritarian tradition that has a number of 'anti's' that it seeks to resist, alongside a constructive or positive prefigurative impulse. His is an 'against and beyond' approach that holds resistance and vision at the same time, 'opposition to all forms of domination' and the 'work to build new social relations and forms of social organization through struggle' (p. 8). Anarchism holds both a critique of the structures of domination that persist today and a transformative desire for a radical future. Dixon notes the persistence of anti-authoritarianism, anti-capitalism, anti-oppression, and anti-imperialism that creates a richer account of contemporary anarchist value-practices.

Dixon (2014) employs a 'synthetic approach' that draws from a range of radical and militant influences including anarchism itself, but also anti-racist feminism, and prison abolitionist struggles. The common value-practices he identifies comprise: 1) 'Struggling against all forms of domination, exploitation, and oppression'; 2) 'Developing new social relations and forms of social organization in the process of struggle' (prefigurative politics); 3) 'Linking struggles for

[52] Gordon's account is also significant for his examination of debates around violence/non-violence and tactics of resistance, anarchist conceptions of power, the politics of technology, and most significantly, anarchism in relation to the ongoing Israeli state occupation of Palestine. He notes that the context of Israel-Palestine requires anarchists to reformulate their thinking around concepts of nationalism, national liberation struggles, and the politics of solidarity. Interestingly, he doesn't particularly discuss the context from the standpoint of colonization, rather through the more typical anarchist lens of state domination, and the pragmatics of Palestinian statehood within such a framework. Ultimately, he moves towards a more place-based set of forms of relating based in bioregionalism that might work across difference, and foreground, more practically speaking, a cooperative and collective struggle against state domination based in direct action. There are some interesting threads that can be, and have been, developed by anarchists, but a lack of anti-colonial analysis limits more general interventions into contemporary anarchism. This is a whole further conversation that is more intentionally needed at the intersection of anarchism and anti-colonial politics. For a more current take given the ongoing genocide in Palestine see, for example, https://itsgoingdown.org/formulating-an-anarchist-approach-to-the-so-called-israeli-palestinian-conflict/.

improvements in the lives of ordinary people to long-term transformative visions'; and 4) 'Organizing that is grassroots and bottom-up' (pp. 6–7). While anarchists can, and often do, specify these value-practices in their own contexts, Dixon captures a general character of anti-authoritarian movements that is useful for teasing out a baseline of anarchist commitments. With regards to anarchism itself, he notes the enduring prefigurative element, and resistance to all forms of domination, in addition to commitments to 'self-management, mutual aid, and social equality' all informed by a 'global character' 'propelled by migration and circulations of struggle' beyond a narrowly European lineage (p. 27).[53]

Opposition to all forms of oppression and domination is a cornerstone of anarchist value-practices. Contemporary anarchists, Gordon (2017) summarises, understand 'societies as inherently constituted by systemic and intersecting regimes of domination' resisted through non-hierarchical forms of organization (p. 63).[54] Anarchists have been 'early consistent opponents of racism and imperialism, both in advanced capitalist countries and in the colonial and post-colonial world, reflecting the movement's transnational connections and internationalist outlook' (p. 63). We return again to the commitment to resist all forms of domination as a key part of anarchist politics, and more specifically anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism.

Intersectionality, in the anarchist sense (borrowed from Black and anti-racist feminist interventions, like those noted by Dixon, 2014), according to Shannon and Rogue (2009), posits

---

[53]Sheehan's 2003 account of anarchism is wide ranging and illustrates some of the wider influences of anarchism outside of its own designated boundaries, in a similar fashion to Dixon. The wide range of material and examples helps to characterize anarchism as a 'tension' between 'the way things are and the way things could be' (p. 158). Tension persists around the borders of what constitutes anarchism.
There is a rich history of give and take indicated in Sheehan's account; however, at times the work feels scattered. Each chapter has a broad overarching theme but the diverse examples of theory and practice that he draws from come in and out at varying intervals, with sometimes little degree of transition or connection between particular examples or sections. Overall, Sheehan's account does well to open up anarchism and seek out many of its lesser discussed forms (in literature, art, aesthetic) and influences but creates boundaries that are unclear or unnecessarily porous.

[54]Gordon discusses specifically anarchist engagements with multiculturalism, as connected to opposition to state discourses and forms of diffusing opposition. Importantly, he notes that the necessary trajectory for anarchist forms of opposition and alternatives must move towards decolonial forms of resistance.

'that our social locations in terms of race, class, gender, sexuality, nation of origin, ability, age, etc. are not easily parsed out one from the other' and intersect in daily life (p. 7). Intersectionality suggests the necessary and ongoing resistance to all forms of oppression, as co-constitutive and sustaining of one another:

> As anarchists, we have found that intersectionality is useful to the degree that it can inform our struggles. Intersectionality has been helpful for understanding the ways that oppressions overlap and play out in people's everyday lives. However, when interpreted through liberal frameworks, typical intersectional analyses often assume myriad oppressions to function identically, which can preclude class analysis, an analysis of the state, and analyses of ruling institutions. Our assessment is that everyday experiences of oppressions and exploitation are important and useful for struggle if we utilize intersectionality in a way that can encompass the different methods through which white supremacy, heteronormativity, patriarchy, class society etc. function in people's lives, rather than simply listing them as though they all operate in similar fashions. (Rogue & Volcano, 2012, p. 45)

An intersectional view also pushes back against forms of universalism that often persist within anarchism. Hillary Lazar (2016) discusses the ways that anarchism often upholds a universal definition of freedom and ethics, dating from classical formulations. She summarizes the development of anarchism from the classical to the contemporary as follows:

> Although current anarchism remains committed to supporting these movements and acting in solidarity with other struggles, it speaks less to humanitarian concern with universal freedom and more to an inclusive, interlocking framework as the vital starting point for revolutionary struggle. This change is attributable to the complementary overlap between post-

> structuralist anarchist theory[55] and other influential radical currents such as Black feminist intersectionality, queer theory, and decolonial thought. (p. 160)

These continue to be fruitful avenues for engaging in the intersections between anarchism and range of struggles. As Ferguson (2023) argues, this is already underway but there is further work to be done to continue 'producing a rich cacophony of elaborations: Indigenous anarchism, anarcho-blackness, anarcha-feminism, queer and trans anarchism, ecological anarchism, anarchic species relations, and no doubt others as well' (p. 1). Engaging with these influential adjacent and disruptive currents can continue to propel anarchist opposition to all forms of oppression and domination further. Lazar (2016) notes, as well, the particular definitional considerations of intersectional vs. interlocking understandings, and the ways that these forms of analysis have been developed in Black feminist, queer, and anti-colonial thought,[56] and which continue to be a necessary reference point of import to anarchist understandings.[57]

Importantly, as noted in Chapter 1, Chris Dixon (2014) highlights a crucial anti-colonial commitment within the broader anti-authoritarian current. Seeing the ongoing nature of colonialism as a 'process,' Dixon suggests that anti-colonial politics and solidarity with Indigenous struggles have become a 'basic stance' in the current moment (p. 79), and he links

---

[55] Post-structuralism, and the fusion with anarchism (post-anarchism), seeks to challenge universalisms, essentialisms, and singular or primary forms of oppressions (on post-anarchism in particular see Newman, 2011 and Rouselle & Evren, 2011). Lazar notes the specific connection between such (often) theoretical work, and Black, Indigenous and queer struggles that reject such universalisms, deploy analysis of interconnected oppression but also opposition, and problematize and de-centre narrowly Western conceptions of anarchism. I turn to some of these elements further in later sections.

[56] On these connections with anarcha-feminism in particular, see Lazar (2016) and Warburton (2016).

[57] Interestingly Lazar's chapter in Franks, Jun, and Williams (2018) is listed under the 'Peripheral Concepts' section of the text, after 'Adjacent Concepts' ('horizontalism,' 'organisation,' 'micropolitics,' and 'economy.' and 'Core Concepts' ('anti-hierarchy,' 'prefiguration' 'freedom,' 'agency,' 'direct action,' and 'revolution.') This is an interesting division, if not hierarchy, of concepts related and defined in anarchist terms. This also presents another means of assessing the relative centrality or importance of anarchist value-practices. Franks, Jun, and Williams (2018), quoting Freeden, describe the peripheral concepts as important, but more contextual or momentary, rather than durable in a long term sense: 'on the margin or on the perimeter. On the margin, an ideology contains ideas and concepts "whose importance to the core, to the heart of the ideology, is intellectually and emotionally insubstantial"' (p. 9).

the ongoing process of Indigenous resurgence as a foundational starting point to the broader construction of anti-authoritarian politics, as struggles that have consistently challenged the state, capitalism and private property, and put forth significant alternatives to such structures (p. 25). Dixon's account, therefore, expands some of the aspects that inform anarchist value-practices.

In terms of the more practical and everyday potentials for anarchism that present fertile grounds for prefigurative politics and the diffusion of value-practices, *Anarchy in Action* by Colin Ward (1982/2008) looks to examples of anarchism in areas as diverse as education, city planning, relationships, economic arrangements etc. Ward's approach attempts to convince people of the applicability of anarchism through 'the common experience of the informal, transient, self-organizing networks of relationships that in fact make the human community possible' (p. 10).[58] Play, he argues, might be the best 'parable' for anarchism as a self-directed and self-chosen expression of joy (p. 15).[59] At its most basic, anarchism requires the 'rejection of external authority' (Ward, 2004, p. 3), which casts anarchism as a broad tendency. Ward (1982/2008) argues that anarchists 'make a social and political philosophy out of the natural and spontaneous tendency of humans to associate together for their mutual benefit (p. 24). Anarchism is in fact the name given to the idea that it is possible and desirable for society to organize without government.' Anarchism occurs first and foremost in practice, as something that is lived and renewed daily. Ward's work, therefore, suggests a practice of resistance rooted in aspects of daily life seeking freedom beyond the state. Ward draws from classical anarchist texts primarily, but often uses them under the guise of experience and possibility rather than meticulous citations of theorists. Ward's anarchism is one that is first and foremost lived (see

[58] The practical demonstration of anarchism is also, according to Roussopoulos (2012, p. 33), the way to renewing anarchism and expanding its relevance.

[59] Joy, as a crucial part of resistance and imaging possibilities of radical futures is a cornerstone of Montgomery and bergman's book Joyful Militancy (2017). Joy, they argue, is about how embracing and making space 'for collective feelings of rage, grief, or loneliness can be deeply transformative' (Montgomery & bergman, 2017, p. 62). 'With joyful militancy we want to get at what it means to enliven struggle and care, combativeness and tenderness, hand in hand' (p. 68). I expand on a number of their crucial and engaging discussions around joy, militancy, and resistance in the following chapters.

also Colson, 2005, p. 462; Shantz, 2009), rooted in anti-authoritarian politics against the state and coercive authority. Ward's 2004 work expands the practical engagements of his previous writing to present a more detailed introductory version of anarchism. Anarchism is still very much connected to the everyday, and he points to the resonance that anarchism might have across wider movements as an illustration of the importance and possibilities of anarchism.

Anarchy Works by Peter Gelderloos (2010) engages a similar overview beyond anarchism in theory, towards how anarchism has been actualized in a number of instances, such as in neighbourhoods, decision making, with regard to crime and justice or the environment, and the ultimate construction of a future society. He tackles practical questions frequently posed to anarchists while also highlighting its 'basic principles' of autonomy and horizontality ('freedom to define and organize … on their own terms' and against 'all coercive hierarchies'); mutual aid (solidarity and support to expand collective power); voluntary association (free cooperation between people, and also refusal of relations that don't work or precipitate freedom); direct action ('Free people do not request changes they want to see in the world; they make those changes.'); revolution (against reform of oppressive systems); and self-liberation ('people must be at the forefront of their own liberation. Freedom cannot be given; it must be taken') (pp. 3–4). Such an outline presents a key list of anarchism's core value-practices.

Gelderloos (2010) is notable for his use of international examples in the illustration of anarchism in practice, from the historical to the contemporary, and escapes overly academic portrayals of anarchism. He specifically notes the pluralistic nature of anarchism, and rejects the application of anarchist terminology to those who have not chosen it for themselves. He uses the terms 'anarchy' to denote 'a social situation free of government and coercive hierarchies hold together by self-organized horizontal relationships' (p. 4) while 'anarchists' are those that identify with the historical movement and philosophy of anarchism. As such there are many non-state/anti-state formulations that are not anarchist per se, though they may share common forms of politics and practices.

Gelderloos (2010) specifically highlights colonization as a core structure for anarchist opposition and doing so requires looking beyond a narrow Eurocentric presentation of anarchism itself, to

explicitly 'offer solidarity' with Indigenous/anti-colonial struggles on *their* terms, 'widening the struggle and supporting other peoples who struggle against authority without calling themselves anarchists. After all, if we are inspired by certain other societies, shouldn't we do more to recognize and aid their ongoing struggles?' (p. 9).[60] 'Anarchy,' Gelderloos argues, 'must make itself wholly incompatible with colonialism, either a colonialism that continues to the present day in new forms, or a historical legacy which we try to ignore. Thus an anarchist revolution must also base itself in struggles against colonialism' (p. 224).

Further, he argues that historical and contemporary Indigenous resurgence struggles are some of the

> most uncompromising struggles against the state' and 'have created some of the only zones in North America that enjoy physical and cultural autonomy and have successfully defended themselves in periodic confrontations with the state. These struggles do not typically identify themselves as anarchist, and perhaps for this reason anarchist have even more to learn from them. But if learning is not to be another commodity relation, an act of acquisition, it must be accompanied by horizontal relationships of reciprocity, which is to say, solidarity. (Gelderloos, 2010, p. 194)

Specifically, he names the Mohawk resistance at Kanehsatà:ke, struggles against water privatization in Cochabamba, and the Zapatistas in Chiapas as central inspiring examples. Gelderloos (2010), therefore, is one of the few introductory accounts that outlines the practical aspects of anarchism, core value-practices and commitments, while also bringing in resistance against colonialism and solidarity with Indigenous struggles as central parts of any contemporary anarchist politics.

---

[60] In later chapters of his book, Gelderloos specifically points to Indigenous social and political formations, like the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, that have constructed forms of communal life outside the state and capitalism (p. 256). He does similar work throughout his (2022) book, where there are already myriad, often Indigenous, solutions to the climate crisis that are already underway.

He continues this thread in later work that seeks to address anti-authoritarian responses to the climate crisis (Gelderloos, 2022).[61] The climate crisis in his view is caused and based in colonialism, as the 'engine' for industrial expansion that have extended through processes of destroying communal and communing forms of living, rapacious forms of resource extraction and destruction, economic precarity and dispossession, and the further consolidation of state power. In the face of such horrific forms of destruction it is solidarity, an intersectional understanding of systems of oppression and domination, ongoing direct action, the construction of alternatives based in local knowledges, practices, and landbases ('territoriality'), 'heterogeneity,' and 'ecocentrism' that are the keys to fomenting greater forms of resistance to ecocide. Crucially, Gelderloos argues that anti-colonialism and autonomy are vital to underscore such movements and their ability to create radical alternatives, but also to not become recuperated by state forms of power (pp. 148–152). Overall, Gelderloos proposes, with clear reference to the Zapatistas, 'anarchism as a methodology for building a world in which a thousand worlds can fit' (p. 165), prefigurative across a range of contexts and struggles, open to infinite forms of anti-authoritarian possibility. This is a 'situated imagining' (echoing Montgomery and bergman [2017] on joyful militancy): 'looking at the world around us, tracing the relations we have and could have, listening to their needs, and giving those needs free rein to develop, to see what directions they pull us in' (p. 173). There is a great promise in anarchism, but only as one smaller piece in the overall constellation of anti-authoritarian forms of resistance against the state and climate catastrophe.

A recent introductory anarchist text by Scott Branson (2022) engages the value-practices and ethics of anarchism through everyday considerations. Much like Ward or Gelderloos, Branson considers the everyday practicalities of living and being an anarchist in the world, but with an 'additional reframing' 'to focus on anarchism as a daily practice of care' (p. 17) that foregrounds anarchism's commitments to relationships, solidarity, and collective struggle. 'Anarchism in the

[61] While not an introductory, or even intentionally anarchist text per se, this subsequent work shows the further development of his anti-colonial anarchist thinking and presents some crucial value-practices to consider going forward.

daily mode is rooting out where we let power dictate our relationships and actions; it opens up time and space for us to live otherwise' (p. 7), creating a 'no place' that 'exceeds the official recording of history or the geographical contours of mapping, and yet is the daily experience of most of us, much of the time' (p. 16).

Branson (2022) specifically draws from a wide range of abolitionist and Indigenous influences to construct their account, outside the frequent narrowness of Eurocentric or white-dominated influences that I noted in many of the texts above.[62] Branson seeks to address the 'power structures inherited from European colonialism and slavery' (p. 9) that narrate contemporary power relations but also anarchism itself. They propose a process of 'disidentification,' drawing from Black/Indigenous/Abolitionist feminisms, 'with inherited and ingrained cultural logics that naturalize the lives we are living under state and capital, regimes of racial oppression and genocide, compulsory labour and nuclear families, and so on' (p. 5) that considers the taken-for-granted and assumed aspects of our ideas and politics and subjects them to an analysis of 'whom these ideas serve. Can we rethink these ideas from an angle of sharing power and resources, promoting collective freedom, operating through care?' (p. 6), and use them to 'reframe these ways of living from an anarchist perspective … that aims for collective liberation, mutual aid, and self-determination' (p. 7).

Branson pushes back against some of the normative and narrow ways of conceiving contemporary anarchism reviewed above, towards a more expansive, changeable, disrupted, and ever-developing form of anarchism in the present. Such work points to efforts to become accountable/complicit with Indigenous/Black/Abolitionist/Feminist interventions that take stock of the ongoing context of colonization and white supremacy and seek to supersede accounts that name such structures of violence alongside the typical anarchist concerns of the state and capitalism, but do little to actually understand their complexities, and engage those

[62] In the included further reading section at the end of the book Branson highlights 'Black Feminism,' 'Indigenous/Decolonial Texts, 'Abolition/transformative Justice,' 'Other Feminist Texts,' 'Queer' and 'Science Fiction' as key influences with which to construct, disrupt and expand this practical and every-day anarchism.

communities who have long been in active resistance to them. Branson's text, therefore, is a useful jumping off point to expand the trajectories and possibilities of contemporary anarchism.

Anarchist value-practices, therefore, are rooted in both a series of oppositions—to the state, capitalism, and all forms of oppression and domination—and ongoing commitments to create prefigurative futures and relations through autonomy, voluntary association, direct action, mutual aid, and collective forms of cultural construction. Anarchist politics are little without the central commitment to practice, to doing, to living.

As Milstein (2022) argues:

> Anarchism's intertwined values are only as good as they play out in histories and cultures of resistance, brave spaces like revolutions and autonomous communities, and other lived experiments and prefigurative practices. They are only as good as they manifest in actually lessening hierarchies and domination in the present—never losing site of abolishing them—and concurrently replacing them with the presence of things such as social solidarity. (pp. 49–50)

These commitments constitute, I would argue, a minimum of anarchist value-practices in the contemporary, based in values, core commitments, practices, and collective forms of relationship. 'Not a single ethic,' Milstein (2022) argues, 'but a mass of entangled ethics, like healthy plant roots, together nourishing a liberatory politics,' without each of which a crucial element would be missing (p. 38).

The ongoing tension, or dual focus, of 'against and beyond' (Dixon, 2014) carries forward a historical lineage represented by Bakunin's classical formulation that 'passion for destruction is a creative passion' (cited in Graham, 2005, p. 44); and Spanish Civil War militant Buenaventura Durruti's assertion that 'We are not in the least afraid of ruins. … We carry a new world, here, in our hearts. That world is growing this minute' (cited in Paz, 2006, p. 478). This continues to be the promise of contemporary anarchism. Anarchist value-practices need to be continually developed to analyze the changing nature of structures of domination, like settler colonialism,

and mount more forceful and precise resistance to them. They must be lived, renewed, and expanded.

Positioning Contemporary Anarchism

While value-practices give shape to the commitments and forms of anarchism, it is further necessary to consider what, who, and where we find the contours of 'contemporary' anarchism. And how these definitions and boundings intersect with questions of colonization, settlement, resistance, and the future.

Anarchism in name dates directly to a specific moment that arose in Europe in the 1860s, among a particular milieu, and begins theoretically with Pierre Joseph Proudhon taking up the term anarchist in his famous essay 'What is Property?' (1840/2011). Its philosophy and practice were then spread and expanded by other 'classical' theorists like Mikhail Bakunin (1916/2009); and Dolgoff, ed., 1972), Peter Kropotkin (1892/2007; 1902/2006), Alexander Berkman (1929/2003), Emma Goldman (1917/1969), Voltairine de Cleyre (and Brigati, ed., 2004), Lucy Parsons (Ahrens, ed. 2003), Gustav Landauer (and Kuhn, ed., 2010), Errico Malatesta (and Turcato, ed., 2014) and many countless others.[63] Classical anarchist works continue to narrate anarchist politics into the contemporary (even if not all contemporary anarchist have read or care about them).

While anarchism may have originated in Europe as a distinct and identifiable perspective, it is unfair and overly Eurocentric to characterize anarchism as strictly a Western perspective wholly imported to other locales. Maia Ramnath (2011; see also 2019) argues that Western anarchist traditions that find ancestry in the classical works and authors listed above should be

[63] The classical period is usually understood as beginning in the 1860s and running up until 1939 with the outbreak of World War Two and the end of the Spanish Civil War. It is important to note, again, that my examination here skews towards the anarcho-communist/collectivist/social anarchist vein of anarchist theory. There is a whole legion of references and ensuing debates regarding anarchism's individualist etc. variants as well. As I am speaking of anarchist movements and cultures, it seems pertinent to centre and detail the collective and social variations primarily. This is not to suggest that they others do not exists, or cannot have useful reference points. But rather to mark this as another project, that is different than the one I am taking up here. Graham's collected anthologies (2004, 2009, 2013) show the breadth of anarchist positions and writings.

understood as one tradition amongst many other anti-authoritarian currents throughout the world at various times. We might see 'anarchism as *one* instance of a polymorphous engagement with certain key questions and issues, as *one* manifestation of a larger family of egalitarian and emancipatory principles' (Ramnath, 2011, p. 1). Employing such a view of anarchism moves away from 'always trying to construct a strongly anarcha-centric cosmology' to 'locate the Western anarchist tradition as one contextually specific manifestation among a larger—indeed global—tradition of antiauthoritarian thought/praxis, of a universal human urge (if I dare say such a thing) toward emancipation, which also occurs in many other contexts' (p. 6). Conceptually, Ramnath views Western anarchism as often constructed as 'big-A' anarchism, while other forms are referred to in 'small-a' terms. The 'big-A' has a lineage from the Western movements in the late 1800s (p. 6), while 'small-a' variants are the 'reoccurring tendency' throughout the globe with shared principles and aims (p. 7). Milstein (2022) makes a similar distinction between the 'bold, assertive' direct form of anarchism, the 'family name' that encompasses specific forms of 'culture and tradition' that comes with the 'big A' (p. 18). 'Our little *a,*' rather, 'brings millennia of wisdom with it,' eschewing formal labels and instead opting for 'practices as a testing ground for ethics' (Milstein, 2022, p. 18). Here there is ongoing tension, sometimes conflict, but in ways that can make anarchism, even in 'Big A' variety, more dynamic and attuned to the contexts in which it finds itself.

Dana Williams (2018) suggests a distinction between 'explicit' and 'implicit' anarchists, those who use the label and connect to the extended history directly, and those who share similar values but engage other labels and terminologies (like autonomist, anti-authoritarian, etc.). Sürreyyya Evren (2012) similarly argues for seeing anarchism as having a 'global body' where European variants are but one part. He suggests that such a view actively works against the myths of borders, states, and continents that anarchists themselves seek to resist.

This global nature, Jason Adams argues, allows for a pluralization of 'anarchism***s***' against the singular that defaults to speaking in Eurocentric terms, towards greater focus on 'non-Western' anarchisms of the global nature that have existed primarily in the most exploited regions of the globe (Adams, 2003, p. 2). Sharif Gemie (2007), in response to Adams, argues that 'anarchisms'

plural makes an examination too easy, but also too fragmented, where disparate movements in anarchist name can simply be cited from different geographical areas in order to provide a global picture (p. 61). He argues it is more crucial to identify the aspects that such movements have in common and which identify them with the generalized anarchist fold. As such we need to return to the specific value-practices that are employed by such movements, while also situating them in the specific contexts in which they occur. Histories and accounts of anarchism must be global, because anarchism is global, but also engage perspectives that inform anarchism's contemporary character outside of capital-'A' forms. To do otherwise is to dilute the promise and dynamism of anarchism.

Anarchism then, Evren argues (2012), is not something carried and planted in far off locales by Europeans, but is a certain set of ideas and practices formed with and through a specific network of radical reformists/revolutionaries in different parts of the world: 'Anarchism is multi-centred, fluid and it operates through temporary centres—hubs, extra functioning nodes of a network' (p. 303). This also means that those who are putting these sorts of value-practices into the world may not even 'have immediate contact with the "formal" anarchist movement' (Shantz & Williams, 2013, p. 164), and thus we also need to consider the wider, more small-'a' connections as well.

Creating moments of meeting and interconnection is the precise function of the nodal cities, like Alexandria, Cairo, and Beirut that Ilham Khuri-Makdisi (2010) identifies, where anarchists from across the globe transited through and were influenced by the interaction of their differing global perspectives. In *The Eastern Mediterranean and the Making of Global Radicalism, 1860–1914* (2010), she argues that the context of late 19th/early 20th century globalization (1870–1914) provided a fruitful atmosphere for the expansion of anarchist ideas throughout the globe. She argues that radicalism in general might be seen as both an 'indicator' and a 'marker' of globalization and cites Karl (1998, in Khuri-Makdisi, 2010) to suggest that this was a 'moment when crises in … global world orders produced an urgent attempt to rethink the very bases of politics, culture, and activism—on a local as well as a regional and global level'

(pp. 16–17).[64] Anarchists were a core part of this. She points to four key elements that assisted and encouraged the spread of global radical currents like anarchism: 'international (and internationalist) organizations and associations, networks, nodal cities [like Alexandria, Beirut and Cairo] and the printed word' (p. 17). Anarchism itself had a strong connection to migration, in part from the tendency for anarchists to get exiled for their political activities, which gave them a certain strength and experience with establishing new networks and means to disseminate their ideas (Khuri-Makdisi, 2010, p. 19; see also Byrne & van der Walt, 2015, p. 99).

This 'multiplicity of radicalisms and a global convergence of subversive ideas revolving around anarchism' is what Grubacic (2013, p. 191) argues characterizes the first 'anarchist moment' of influence and widespread popularity from 1870–1917, that is again coming back to the fore as a 'bridge to other, non-Western philosophies and to other practices of social interpretation and social transformation, and as a vehicle and instrument of translation of struggles' (p. 198). It was 'a genuinely popular, global, anticolonial movement that was able to translate between struggles,' which needs reinvigoration today (p. 199).[65]

Benedict Anderson (2007), in *Under Three Flags,* narrates the exchanges between European anarchists and various moments of anti-colonial struggle throughout the world. As Anderson suggests, this work could take any number of turns throughout the globe: 'one could open the

[64] Phrased differently, Galián (2020) suggests that the spread of anarchists and their ideas is itself a product of the 'colonial project' which permitted outward flows from the centres of Empire, even if in this case it was for radical purposes (p. 3).

[65] Grubacic goes as far to argue that although we need to travel more intentionally to the 'South' 'as a site for excavation of the hidden modernity needed to reinvent emancipatory energies and subjectivities;' anarchism is 'singularly qualified to guide us in the construction of noncapitalist, noncolonialist intercultural dialogue' as 'insurgent common sense' (p. 199). While inspirational in its own right, and reflective of the forms of radical politics within anarchism and finding affinity with a range of others across the globe, the creeping centralization of anarchism, in general, as the common reference point, continues undue processes of centralization. To return to my discussion above, anarchism in name is but one tendency among many that share value-practices embedded in anti-authoritarian, non-hierarchical, anti-oppressive politics. We can, for sure, point to its significance and resonance across a range of contexts and struggles, but only alongside the importance, significance, and resonance of non-explicitly anarchist perspectives as well. Here, for example, the practices of Black and Indigenous radical perspectives deserve greater attention to distrust the centralization and normalization of anarchism that can creep back in, despite the acknowledgement of influences outside the narrowly Western lineage. Such is the work of 'decolonizing anarchism' advocated by Ramnath (2011) and Galián (2020) amongst others.

study of this vast rhizomal network anywhere—Russia would take one eventually to Cuba, Belgium would lead one to Ethiopia, Puerto Rico would bring one to China' (p. 4). Anderson's work is significant for the specific trajectories of anarchism and its connections to Filipino anti-imperialist movements that it traces. It foregrounds the internationalism of anarchism that brought anarchists into contact with a variety of anti-colonial and anti-imperialist movements throughout the world.[66]

Hirsch and van der Walt (2010) argue that the spread of anarchism throughout the globe, while rooted in the rise of anarchism in name in the 1860s in Europe might be better understood as a form of 'informal internationalism' where 'anarchism was not a West European doctrine that diffused outwards, perfectly formed, to a passive "periphery." Rather, the movement *emerged simultaneously and transnationally*, created by interlinked activists on three continents' (p. liv).

'Location,' Laura Galián contends (2020), 'as a differential key element within a global capitalist system, generates alternative ways in which anarchism is experienced and practiced and by doing so, it challenges European ownership of anarchistic praxis and thinking' (p. 48). By attending to the specific position in which one articulates anarchist(ic) politics (the 'locus of enunciation'), and attention to *form* (i.e., practices) rather than *content* (narrow ideology/labels) there can be greater attention afforded to subaltern elements from the Global South that destabilize and subvert any semblance of a dominant and singular anarchist position (pp. 47–48) and a move to 'rethink decolonization as the first premise of liberation of any emancipatory project' (p. 20).

These particular histories and accounts show how anarchism has continued to be both a specific and distinct political perspective, but also one among many throughout the world sharing an anti-authoritarian bent. Anarchism has a global character, not reducible to a

[66] The question, however, that Anderson doesn't turn to in any great capacity, is what influence anti-colonial struggles had on anarchism and anarchists more generally. Certainly there was the influence on particular anarchists, like Malatesta who was involved in struggles in Buenos Aires, as mentioned above, but who also participated in anti-imperialist revolts in Egypt as well. Clearly there was a personal impact that led anarchists to become directly involved in such revolts. The greater question to ask is what were the greater theoretical and practical impacts of anti-colonial movements and participation in such movements by anarchists?

Western collection of ideas and practices, but forged throughout a range of contexts. There are countless influences that might be considered beyond a narrow anarchist label as well. As Ramnath (2011) argues:

> The totality of the conversation generated by a particular set of ethical questions and concerns can't be identified solely with any one utterance, or any one answer to its defining questions. The anarchist tradition is a continuously unfolding discourse-meaning not just the writings and rhetoric of anarchism but also its body of practices and history of performative acts. (p. 37)

Part of this process of unfolding involves a dynamic of disruption and alteration, as argued by Jeppesen above. In order to account for some of the richness and crucial contributions to contemporary anarchism the specific disruptions by Black and Indigenous anarchisms need to be considered. Such works contribute directly to the destabilization of a narrowly Western form of anarchism, but also can disrupt and enrich those of us who also dwell within this specific vein of the movement. Following Ramnath and others above, Western anarchism is but one segment of the broad anti-authoritarian impulse, and as such, other forms need to be considered on their own unique and specific terms as well.

A Contemporary 'Movement of Movements'

What, then, makes for a 'contemporary' form of anarchism, as the current holder of the value-practices discussed above, and to which I orient the argument for greater forms of anti-colonial theory and practice? A major 'watershed moment' in the development of a contemporary anarchist movement is often linked to the mass protests against the World Trade Organization (WTO) that took place in Seattle 1999 (Amster, 2012, xxii).[67] The protests are perhaps most

[67] This point is further emphasized by Sheehan (2003), which he uses as his starting point for looking at anarchism.

famous for the images of black-clad black bloc anarchists smashing corporate windows and engaging in street confrontations with the police (see, for example, Day 2005, pp. 1–4). This event, Day (2005) argues, is what to some extent catapulted anarchism into the mainstream media, which has also led to continued demonization to this day. Cindy Milstein (2010), as well, argues that Seattle helped to reinvigorate and provide new energy and relevance to anarchist theory and practice and a renewed interest in the ideas and possibilities of anarchism, even if this is but one of the moments of resurgence within anarchism (pp. 29–30). This moment of renewal after Seattle 1999 is perhaps significant given the observed dip or lower point in anarchist movements in the 1970s and '80s (Graham, 2013, p. 1),[68] when compared to the heyday of anarchism from 1860–1939. Seattle in many ways inaugurates a period of contemporary anarchism that continues up to the present, although with its own ebbs and flows and ongoing developments (on this overall trajectory, see Williams, 2018).

A number of authors point to the general development of a new or modern conception of anarchism beginning in the 1960s. Kinna (2009) points to the post-1968 period that might be distinguished from earlier periods and certainly from the heyday of anarchism in the late 19th century (p. 3). Gordon (2008) points to the new anarchism being influenced by the 'processes of intersection and fusion among radical social movements since the 1960s' (i.e., feminist movements) even if they weren't explicitly anarchist in any way (p. 5). This is particularly significant given the emphasis on intersectionality and diversity that has come to characterize contemporary anarchism. Bowen and Purkis (2012) argue that the current moment might be termed as the period of 'global anarchism' that began in France with the events of May 1968, but the resultant 'paradigm shift' within anarchism was not finally realized until the 1990s (p. 5). Anarchism, in a loosely defined contemporary sense and in distinction from the classical, thus dates from the emergence of a variety of other social movements in the 1960s that

[68] Robert Graham's three part series *Anarchism: A Documentary History of Libertarian Ideas* (2005, 2009, 2013) collects and organizes key texts from each of the three periods in terms of themes. Graham points to an initial period of anarchism from 300CE to 1939, a second period 1939–1977 and a final period of 'New Anarchism' from 1974–2012 (which we might extend into the present).

brought a number of issues to the forefront, linking them together and showcasing the need for a more expansive view of oppression beyond rigid class analysis, and led to the emergence of different social movement forms of organization that have crystalized into a contemporary form most publicly after Seattle.

Milstein (2010) argues for five key influences leading to the development and emergence of a new anarchism:

> From the Situationists, anarchism embraced the critique of alienation and consumer society, and faith in imagination; from Bookchin, the connection between anticapitalism, direct democracy, ecology, and postscarcity; from the antinuke movement, the stress on affinity groups and spokescouncils as well as nonviolent direct action; from the Autonomen, militant confrontation, the black bloc strategy, and an expansive do-it-yourself emphasis; and from the Zapatista's, the power of the Internet, cross-cultural solidarity, and "globalization" for transnational resistance. (pp. 83–87)

However,

> the anarchism that received notoriety in November 1999 [in Seattle] is more than the sum of these parts. It is the only political philosophy today aspiring to balance a variety of social change agents and strategies—or ultimately, a diversity of tactics, visions, and people—with universalistic notions of participatory freedom outside all imposed institutions and behaviours. (Milstein, 2010, p. 87)

Sheehan (2003) charts a similar set of influences that emerges in the 1990s with major catalyzing events like the Zapatista uprising in 1994 or Seattle in 1999, amongst others. His account traces anarchism's growth by bringing in movements and groups that might be said to have been on the fringes of anarchism, such as the Situationists in the late 60s and early 70s, surrealist art or utopian literature movements or militant direct action groups such as the Angry Brigade or Red Army Faction. Sitrin (2019) locates a significant emergence in the Zapatista

uprisings and close connections to horizontalist Argentinian movements that have put direct action, horizontalist, and prefigurative politics front and centre and continued to influence struggles throughout the globe since. Gordon (2008) further argues that the contemporary understanding of anarchism might be differentiated from other periods with the 'generalisation of the target of anarchist struggle from 'state and capital' to 'domination' (p. 20). Again, we return to resistance to all forms of oppression and domination as key, contemporary, anarchist value-practice.[69]

The most notable characterization of the current 'moment' of anarchism, perhaps, comes from an article by David Graeber and Andrej Grubacic (2004), "Anarchism, Or The Revolutionary Movement of the Twenty-First Century." They argue that anarchism is on the upswing and has become the key source of influence for social movement politics and resistance movements, supplanting the previous overarching influence of Marxism. They argue, in fact, that this new century, beginning in the year 2000, is perhaps the 'anarchist century,' with anarchist values and forms of organizing finding resonance in movements well outside of anarchism itself, most especially within the global resistance 'movement of movements' (Graeber, 2002). Giorel Curran (2006) constructs anarchism as the 'heart' of 21st century dissent, having been able to 'rally a disenchanted left in considerable disarray' after the fall of communism and the expansion of neoliberal capitalism (p. 4).

Has the anarchist century yet been realized? That might be up for debate, given some shifts towards electoral political strategies (Wilson, 2023), rising fascism and right wing reaction, and an even more recent drift towards more centralizing forms of organizing. One of the lasting imprints, however, has been the infusion of 'anarchist common-sense':

> anarchism helped shape a common-sense of not only the radical left, but within a much broader social field of practice: organising using consensus, or

[69] This generalization is perhaps also reflective of a change of degree of influence on a more global ideological scale with the decline of the influence of Marxist/Socialist politics with the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989. This, Shantz (2009) argues, left a gap which then began to be filled by anarchism, although in his view, there has not been adequate examination of the on-the-ground practical aspects of anarchism in action (p. 6).

> with horizontal structures, for example, have become the norm in many groups; so too has the emphasis on prefigurative praxis and DIY culture, rather than looking to the state to solve our problems. (Wilson, 2023, p. 8)

There continue to be anarchist value-practices that are diffusing and being reworked within contemporary struggles (Sitrin, 2019; Williams, 2018; Wood, 2012). Impacts continue to be felt insofar as 'the standard by which the Left organizes itself today has become anarchist' (Markoff et al., 2024, p. 61). Anarchism continues to be a potent political alternative to status quo, authoritarian, electoral, and centralizing politics, even if it isn't always front and centre in name. There is a persistent 'anarchist spirit' that begins with classical theorists and movements and continues to influence social movements up into today, with 'a way of organizing and relating that opposes hierarchy and embraces direct democracy' as part of its fundamental value-practices (Sitrin, 2015, p. 84).

To understand the development and spread of contemporary anarchist value-practices, Richard Day (2005), in his book *Gramsci Is Dead,* points to the anarchist influence in the 'newest social movements,' notable for their break from the patterns of previous new/old social movements that share a Gramscian hegemonic conception of social change—through appealing to state power in the 'new' sense, or seeking to take state power in the 'old' sense. Day highlights the pervasive 'hegemony of hegemony' that assumes effective social change 'can only be achieved simultaneously and *en masse*, across an entire national or supranational space' (p. 8). The 'newest' social movements, he argues, have sought to undermine hegemonic appeals to the state for change. Such movements are more closely aligned with an anarchistic logic of affinity that encompasses 'a desire to create alternative to state and corporate forms of social organization, working "alongside" the existing institutions; proceeding in this via disengagement and reconstruction rather than by reform or revolution; with the end of creating not a new knowable totality (counter-hegemony), but of enabling experiments and the emergence of new forms of subjectivity' (Day, 2004, p. 740).

Further, Day (2005) argues that a logic of affinity involves both engaging in solidarity with others who are engaged in similar or common forms of resistance, but also actively working against negatively opposed practices of oppression and domination. Necessary for engaging in any degree of common struggle is the development and commitment to 'shared ethico-political commitments that allow us to achieve engaged solidarity to effectively create sustainable alternatives' (p. 186). Anarchism has had a particular impact here, bringing forth affinity-based forms of organizing and relating that seek to resist the state, capital, and all forms of oppression outside established political realms and without the aim of changing the power holders within established institutions and systems.[70] Further, horizontalist and non-hierarchical approaches are a key point of emphasis that has found wider appeal beyond narrowly anarchist quarters. 'These are movements grounded in forms of organisation that are not "new" in and of themselves,' Sitrin (2019, p. 660) argues, 'but are new in the sheer numbers and diversity of people participating in organising in these ways' that continues into the present. The anarchists I interviewed continue to use affinity, in particular, as a key framework for both relationships and resistance, and this helps to illuminate greater anti-colonial possibilities going forward (see Chapter 6).

While Shantz (2009) agrees with the similar characterization of the changing nature of social movements indicated by Day's 'newest social movements,' he argues that the overemphasis on affinity assumes and agrees with the postmodern perspective that class relations[71] are no longer a primary point of consideration and have given way to cultural considerations (p. 60). Rather, Shantz looks at the 'intersection of cultural transformations both with ongoing and emerging practices of the state and capital' , which might draw inspiration from the do-it-

[70] Day, and more recently Montgomery and bergman (2017), in contrast to many other writers, does place some importance on Indigenous people's movements as key examples of affinity-based politics, beyond the politics of demand/hegemony, for contemporary movements. His work is instructive here as it pushes anarchism to move beyond looking at its own self-defined movement towards those that share a commitment to build alternatives outside the state and in opposition to it. It also indicates the points of connection and resonance between anarchism and, for ex. Indigenous resistance. I use this formulation of affinity explicitly in chapter 5 to consider anarchists relationships to Indigenous struggles.

[71] I turn to some of the specific aspects of anarchist orientations to class struggle later in this chapter.

yourself politics of ‘self-valorization’ originating from autonomist Marxism and linked closely to the work of Michael Hardt (p. 62).

Shantz’ (2009) approach seems to suggest a need to bring class back into the central analysis of anarchism and that cultural focal points of an affinity-based politics are not enough for resistance. It seems mistaken to assume that these so-called cultural aspects do not have political implications. Day (2005) isn’t suggesting a trade-off of the class for culture, but is indicative of a more nuanced and intersectional approach that refuses to take class as primary and also takes into account the cultural aspects of resistance, and which continues to persist into more recent years (see, for example, Markoff et al., 2024). An overreliance on affinity is perhaps not desirable but it seems much worse to recenter class at the expense of a more nuanced understanding. Day’s argument marks, against Shantz, the significant development within anarchism towards a dynamic, diverse and intersectional movement that seeks to move beyond class as a defining focal point of resistance. Anarchists are against class divisions, but also any others as well. This is a key defining feature of anarchism’s contemporary value-practices.

In addition to expanding the critique to all forms of oppression and domination, anarchism has also left a number of imprints on movements that bear brief mention. Several authors have argued that anarchism was the ‘heart’ or ‘soul’ of the anti-globalization movements (see Amster, 2012, p. xxii; Graeber, 2002, p. 62; Gordon, 2008, p. 2), its ‘central aspect’ (Goaman, 2012, p. 163) or its basic forms of inspiration (Grubacic, 2003, p. 39). Robert Graham (2013) points to anarchist resistance to capitalism and the state, as well as more generally all forms of oppression and domination, and the interconnections between all of these within an international context (p. iv). Anarchism is framed as unique in that its ‘denunciation of the state is both bottom-up and top-down, that is the state is insufficiently local and global at the same time-representing a “unhappy medium” that has served more often than not as an agent of oppression, and even genocide’ (Amster, 2012, p. 125). Anarchism, therefore approaches resistance from both a locally and globally oriented perspective (Gordon, 2008, p. 16), necessary in the expansive and diverse contemporary moment.

As David Graeber (2002) argues, anarchism has provided contemporary movements with the 'very notion of direct action, with its rejection of a politics which appeals to governments to modify their behaviour, in favour of physical intervention against state power in a form that itself prefigures an alternative' (p. 62). Amster (2012), as well, points to anarchism's pervasive influence on social movement forms of organization that emphasize decentralization and autonomy (p. xviii). Anarchism has brought affinity groups, spokescouncils, black blocs, direct democracy, and consensus decision-making into the contemporary 'movement of movements' (see Graeber, 2002, p. 70; Goaman, 2012). Curran (2006) adds further that the key contributions of anarchism have been most visible in the 'anarchist sensibilities that have penetrated the modern protest lexicon and helped shape visions of socio-political alternatives' (p. 11). There is a distinct culture of resistance that has been greatly influenced by anarchism and anarchist political culture.

Anarchism is thus perhaps a 'cultural resource' and 'political conscience' that has informed current movements (Bowen & Purkis, 2012, p. 215). Anarchism itself is perhaps its own 'movement of movements' where diversity and a range of focal points and practices of resistance cannot be overstated. Contemporary anarchism, then, is perhaps better understood as a set of contemporary anarchism***s*** in a wider global context (Bowen & Purkis, 2012)—diverse, expansive and seeking to take on all forms of oppression and domination in a variety of contexts. This continues up into more present constellations of anarchism and wider struggles that have perhaps moved beyond the label of anti-globalization movements, and rather represent a wider intersection of struggles that still have both strong anarchist influence and anarchist participation, but are also not necessary anarchist in name.

As Sitrin (2015) suggests 'These newer movements are looking to one another for power, and creating it, horizontally and through self-organization (p. 85). The state is increasingly rejected as the site from which to change society. Distinct from people who identify as anarchists, most members of newer movements reject the state out of experience and based on their observations from recent history.' (p. 85). They are in many ways 'pursing anarchist practices' even if they aren't becoming anarchists directly (Markoff, 2024, p. 55). There are strong

affinities and connections to anarchism here, but such movements are not easily reduced to an anarchist label, either. As Black and Indigenous traditions show, there are a wide range of anti-state, intersectional, and radical politics that are also articulating similar value-practices on their own terms as well (Warburton, 2016; Lazar, 2016).[72]

The disparate parts of these kinds of wider movements are not 'interchangeable' with an anarchist politics. One result is such movements becoming

> associated with an anarchist politics that many of them would or actually do oppose. If one looks beyond a few organizational affinities one finds great differences within alternative globalization policies. Most are not anarchists, and many … are rather hostile to anarchism, though for different reasons. (Shantz, 2009, p. 7)

This point from Shantz (2009) further highlights this reality and cautions against attempts to 'over-anarchize' the movement of movements. Highlighting the anarchist influences is key given the spread of anarchism in this current moment, but we cannot forget that this movement is not singular but a broader 'multi-tendency movement of movements' (p. 7). We also cannot forget that there are disparities in terms of how the movement is organized and how it resists depending on particular locales.

In "Anarchism That is Not Anarchism: Notes Towards a Critique of Anarchist Imperialism," George Ciccariello-Maher (2011) warns of the danger of anarchists, often in Eurocentric

[72] These most contemporary movements include ongoing struggles against fascism, the ongoing revolution in Rojava, Palestine solidarity organizing, and persistent land defense struggles. Williams notes the ongoing participation of anarchists in anti-fascist movements (both historically and into the present moment; Abdullah Öcalan (2017), as a key theorist of the Kurdish revolutionary movement, most widely recognized through the autonomous region of Rojava, draws directly from the work of Murray Bookchin in his formation of Democratic Confederalism, and anarchists continue to support, join, and learn from the struggles for territory and community defense in there. Gelderloos (2022), discussed above, notes a directly anarchist ethos in contemporary ecological and land defense struggles, with a strong anti-colonial focus.

contexts, seeking out only explicitly anarchist struggles with which to express their solidarity across borders and contexts. He suggests, examining the case of Venezuela, that anarchists are quick to gravitate to other anarchists despite the lack of representation, influence, or support they might have with local movements. He argues that seeking out exclusively other self-described anarchists misses out on the particularities of social movement resistance in specific contexts.

Uncritical support for other anarchist ideas, at the expense of others, privileges anarchism in name while ignoring other possible points of social movement contact that lie outside the 'anarchist lexicon.' The result, Ciccariello-Maher (2011) argues, is a form of 'anarchist imperialism' where a deeper analysis of strategic relationships and context is forgone for the sake of seeking out explicit forms of anarchism (p. 39). Such a form of 'anarchist imperialism' over emphasizes what are often small and disconnected anarchist movements while displacing other radical movements that don't fit within an explicit anarchist definition. In Venezuela, he suggests that this 'imperialism' lead to alliances with anarchists who saw Hugo Chavez as no different than any other quasi-fascist authoritarian dictator despite real differences in many people's lives that Chavez made and commitments to social justice, far beyond those he is compared to. This is not to say that Chavez, and the broader political movements that sprung up as Chavismo, is beyond critique, but by 'privileging nominally "anarchist" voices and erasing others, this approach can lead us to miss the anti-state forest for the anarchist trees' and create an anarchist imperialism that seeks to 'spread the faith internationally by demanding that all struggles, regardless of context and conditions, assume the form that it has chosen as preordained' (Ciccariello-Maher, 2011, p. 40). An anarchist imperialism, in this sense, occurs when one seeks out those who self-define as anarchists uncritically rather than seeking a more expansive look at the nuances of context, broader social movement influence, and currency with local populations. Anarchists can't just accept alliance or support of other anarchists uncritically without looking at their relevance to the contexts they are involved in, and without attention to other anti-state or non-state forms of being in place.

This echoes the interventions of Warburton (2021) discussed above and suggests caution when engaging with Indigenous forms of anarchism specifically. There is the danger of anarchists attempting to fit Indigenous resistance into anarchism as fellow travellers, or to go even further and assert that anarchists are the inheritors of previous forms of radical resistance, without critically assessing the fundamentally differential context of colonial position in which such resistance occurred, and continues to occur (Warburton, 2021). This is not to discount possible affinities or connections (which I consider below), but suggests that the contexts, histories and complexities of resistance are essential for fostering solidarity and interaction on non-hierarchical terms. There is also the danger that anarchists might only seek out Indigenous peoples or groups that use the anarchist label explicitly, while ignoring those whose politics or principles that might find further affinities and critical engagements.

As Warburton (2021) notes there needs to be a wariness to unduly incorporate other resistance perspectives within the sphere of anarchism, or suggest an equal 'exchange approach' between disparate perspectives. Referencing anarchism, feminism, and Indigenous resistance directly, Warburton challenges the notion that anarchism has much to offer Indigenous perspectives that already have their own core rejections of the state and capitalism.[73] With regard to the Zapatistas, despite their influence and reference for contemporary resistance movements across the board, and anarchism in particular, Warburton argues that: **'**Rather than inspiring an interest in concomitant indigenous movements across North America, however, the anarchist fixation on Zapatistas has continually located indigeneity outside the boundaries claimed by the United States and Canada, reifying US claims to territory and sovereignty within an anarchist paradigm' (p. 152). She argues that there is a centralizing of the US state as a reference point to order the world, even by anarchists, which places Indigenous peoples in a dependent sort of

[73] 'In the simplest terms,' however, as Warburton argues, 'Native feminists don't owe anarchists anything in exchange for the development of a critical approach to settlement that accounts for its gendered and sexualized dimensions. Instead, an approach to anarchism and feminism that does not replicate either an implicit or explicit claim to Native resources, whether land or knowledge, requires not an exchange or synthesis, but rather a transformational accounting for what it means to do anarchist feminist work on stolen land' (p. 105).

relation to this structure of empire, rather than as resistant to it. This dynamic is illustrated by anarchist approaches to nationalism that continue to conflate Indigenous nationalism with the nation-state (p. 158). It continues with anarchist framing of past core events, such the Haymarket affair, where migration and transnationalism are emphasized as crucial aspects of anarchist 'movement' (as noted above), rather than looking to the ongoing movements of resistance concurrent in the context at the same time, or by forgoing an intentional examination of structural processes of settlement and dispossession (p. 167).

Finally, Warburton (2021) argues such forms of anarchist transnationalism maintain the internal/external framings of borders and border imperialism (see Walia, 2013) that take as their primary reference the structures of the state, rather than 'centering a definition of the transnational that accounts for the sovereignty of Native nations and their complicated status within US articulations of domesticity and foreignness' (p. 171). In this sense, anarchist frameworks employ the language and delineations of the state itself, rather than incorporating or being disrupted by Indigenous frameworks that displace the state and fundamentally trouble structures of settlement.

The hyper focus on specific, large-scale moments of resistance (like the Zapatistas, important in and of itself) occurs at the expense of more locally focused and close-to-home Indigenous resistance moments that are likely to be much more disruptive of the 'structures of settlement' that persist within North American anarchism. As such, Warburton's work presents both a caution regarding the ways that anarchist history and influence is constructed understood, and a prompt for greater critique and attention to anarchist engagements with anti-colonialism and Indigenous resistance.

While it is important to also assert and uphold the history of Indigenous anarchists, as indicated by the works of Benally (2023), Tawinikay (2018), and Aragorn (2018), and further support their dissemination, development, and intervention in anarchism writ large, there is a danger in collapsing or forcing Indigenous struggles against the state into an anarchist container, and thereby stripping them of the particular groundings, contexts, and histories in which they appear. There is a danger of anarchist imperialism. While Indigenous anarchism is a potent

intervention in both anarchist and Indigenous spheres, there is greater engagement and disruption possible through a wider dialogue with Indigenous resurgence and resistance (such as the Native women's literature currents that are taken up by Warburton, 2021; see also Gómez-Barris, 2021). Indigenous (and Black) forms of anarchism are intentionally disruptive of normative/Western forms, and cannot be subsumed within a Western contemporary canon uncritically. They demand reading, discussion, and disruption on their own terms.

(Western) anarchists often have a certain anxiety regarding the frequently white and European-dominant character of the movement (in North America) that prompts a desire to cast a wide net to incorporate and 'claim' other struggles within the anarchist label. This becomes a problem of historiography (Warburton, 2021, p. 149), and inclusion within the anarchist canon, rather than an impetus to engage a deeper analysis of the ways that structures of white supremacy and settler colonialism become incorporated into anarchist politics (p. 151).

Another key element that is crucial to an understanding of contemporary anarchism is the sheer breadth and diversity of identities, focal points and ways of interacting with this expansive movement. There have long been a number of tendencies within anarchism (whether communist, syndicalist, feminist, queer, social ecological, Indigenous, post-anarchist, or an ever-expanding number of others) that may or may not be emphasized in strategic instances, rather than rigid, dogmatic and sectarian adherence to a particular anarchism.[74] For example, the text on the poster 'Fight Where You Stand' by the anarchist collective Crimethinc reads: 'We are anarcho-syndicalists on the shop floor, green anarchists in the woods, social anarchists in our communities, individualists when you catch us alone, anarcho-communists when there's something to share, insurrectionists when we strike a blow.' 'Anarchist' might be the overall identity of an individual, but more specific articulations can be emphasized

[74] Williams (2017) and Chase-Dunn et al. (2019), for example, detail the diverse demographics and political identities of contemporary anarchist and transnational movements, resulting in a detailed sociological analysis of the movement.

depending on the circumstances. This is but one example of the dynamic and expansive nature of anarchism.[75]

A key tension within contemporary definitions of anarchism and anarchist value-practices revolves around questions of emphasis. In stark contrast to framings that promote a wide ranging, and dynamic discussion of anarchism, and refuse specific emphasis on a specific mode of oppression and domination being 'most' or 'more' important, *Black Flame* by Lucien van der Walt and Michael Schmidt (2009), upholds a narrow, and arguably regressive, view of anarchism.[76] This work has elicited, at the time (and since), a range of responses, polemics, and dismissals. They overview the 'broad anarchist tradition,' as a global movement that is rooted in 'universal class struggle,' workers agitation, and syndicalist movements. They argue for the close relationship between anarchism and syndicalism referring to syndicalism as 'in essence, and anarchist strategy, not a rival to anarchism,' a 'variant of anarchism' and therefore part of the anarchist tradition (p. 16).[77]

Van der Walt and Schmidt (2009) argue, very explicitly, that '"Class struggle" anarchism, sometimes called revolutionary communist anarchism, is not a type of anarchism; in our view, it is the *only* anarchism' where most anarcho-communists have promoted and championed syndicalism as a strategy for resistance and bringing about revolution (p. 19). Further, they argue that the addition of the prefix or adjective 'class' in 'class struggle anarchism' 'implies that there are anarchists *who do not favour class struggle* [emphasis mine] or who are

---

[75] On the expansiveness of anarchist positions, definitions, locations and contexts, and specific approach to analyzing anarchism as a movement, see Williams' 2017 detailed work.

[76] I admit some hesitancy in even including this text in the discussion here, in large part to various claims and investigations that have suggested that Michael Schmidt is at the very least apologetic of, if not supportive of, white nationalist forms of 'anarchism' and other regressive forms of racist politics. Alexander Reed Ross and Joshua Stephens (2015), in a series of published posts, specifically examined and deconstructed Schmidt's association with, and proliferation of, white supremacist perspectives, alongside his purportedly anarchist politics. As a result, AK Press pulled the book from publication and distribution. Despite this I include a discussion of Black Flame here because at the time it made a significant splash within the realm of anarchist discussion, and is a useful example of the ways that class-reductionist forms of anarchism still persist.

[77] This account may be defined as a capital 'A' anarchist, which in part may be part of a generational divide that has led to differential engagements with anarchism (Graeber and Grubacic, 2004, p. 2; see also Williams, 2007, p. 298 and Grubacic, 2003, p. 37).

individualists, neither of which is an accurate usage' (p. 71).[78] Their anarchism, emphasizing classical theorists Bakunin and Kropotkin, whom they quote extensively throughout the text, is firmly rooted in a class-based framework.

Despite doubling down on the class-centric nature of anarchism, van der Walt and Schmidt (2009) do detail the importance of anarchist anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism. They argue that 'the broad anarchist tradition was hostile to imperialism' (p. 309), with anarchists participating and supporting anti-colonial/anti-imperialist movements (despite their often nationalist character) across the globe. The danger is that framing anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism as simply logical extensions of anarchism (which they no doubt are and should continue to be) does little to enhance our understandings of colonial dynamics, and how they operate in particular contexts. It does little more than add anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism to a list of things to be opposed. In this sense the work of looking at specific instances, and their local contexts is important to add nuance to such otherwise principled opposition.[79] The result is a vague opposition to all forms of oppression and domination that, while highlighting necessary oppositional 'anti' politics, makes it difficult to assess anarchist movements (Williams, 2017, p. 18), and actually extend their effectiveness and commitments for specific forms of resistance. A crude class-centric view arguably makes the wider intersections of oppressive structures even more difficult to work with and actualize resistance to.

George Ciccariello-Maher (2011) suggests that the class centrism that so obviously characterizes *Black Flame*, creates a 'doubling of anarchism's Eurocentric baggage' (p. 22). 'Class-centrism,' he argues, 'is itself Eurocentric , it speaks to specifically European conditions, and fails to grasp situations of historical social heterogeneity in which race frequently functions

[78] Curiously, earlier in the text they state that: 'It is difficult to identify a distinct 'anarchist-communist' strategy or tendency that can be applied as a useful category of anarchism' (2009, p. 19), which seems to literally contradict their overall claim of the specificity a class struggle anarchist communist perspective, and as I have already argued their contention that syndicalism perhaps a strategy of their form of anarchism.

[79] As I have argued (Lewis, 2016) anarchists have had little engagement with Indigenous resistance and practice in the settler colonial contexts of Canada and the US, and the specific implications of voicing a prefigurative politics on unacknowledged stolen lands.

as a class category and the two are in many cases irretrievably intertwined' (p. 23). We can add further the specific structural constellations of colonialism, as intimately connected to both class and race. The crude class-centrism of *Black Flame*, despite its internationalist view that helps to diversify the anarchist canon, slips back into Eurocentric class premises.[80]

Overall, it is difficult to see how *Black Flame*, and other similar class-centric positions, are not elevating class to a primary focal point of oppression, which flies in the face of the resistance to all forms of oppression and domination advocated by contemporary anarchism writ large. While they detail the international character of anarchism, and provide a convincing account for anarchism's existence outside of the usually established Euro American centres[81] that ought to be better known by anarchists, their class reductionism dilutes anarchism of its inherent diversity that so many others considered a strength. As Roger White (2004) argues: 'Political universalism is part of the residue of Anglo-European colonialism' with its creation of a universal subject that references the values of dominant cultures (p. 16). Anarchists advocating for class struggle as the primary (or sole) form of resistance create a narrow universalist idea that determines the way forward for all struggles, even despite their inclusion of anti-colonial and anti-imperialist commitments.

---

[80] Further, *Black Flame* suffers from a methodological framing issue, lacking a clear and upfront delimitation of the time period of anarchism that they are speaking about. The majority of the text focuses on historical movements that fall outside of the 'new' anarchist period beginning in the 1960s, and yet they present their argument as a review of the 'broad anarchist tradition' and continually repeat this claim throughout the text, while ignoring or paying lip service to contemporary understanding and realities that might contest their framing of anarchism. Whether conscious or not, they have written out the importance of a diverse and nuanced contemporary anarchism. This is especially concerning that early on in the text they list a number of moments in the 'broad anarchist tradition' that they will be examining and include Seattle 1999 in the list without making any later reference its particular place in anarchist history. While a compelling account of the international character of anarchism, done in a historical way, Black Flame fails to account for recent and significant developments in anarchist theory and practice, resulting in a static view of anarchism, its potentials and its value-practices and commitments. They also speak of the creation of 'counterpower' to 'confront and supplant the power of the ruling class and the state' (van der Walt & Schmidt, 2009, p. 7) which seems to run right into the dangers of the hegemony of hegemony that Day (2005) challenges and deconstructs as having failed and not being an accurate reflection of the character of anarchism.

[81] This is certainly something to continue to be keenly aware, as anarchism still has lots of its own internal work to be doing as well, and is far from perfect, even in terms of its own values (see, for example, Milstein, 2010, pp. 3–4; Day, 2005, p. 197). As Colson (2005) argues, anarchism might looks outside the shell of European modernity and towards those abandoned by modernity for further and more expansive sources of inspiration (p. 463).

As a significant counterpoint to the narrowness of anarchist definitions like *Black Flame*, Ruth Kinna (2009) points to Richardo Mella, a late 19th century Spanish anarchist, who argued for an anarchism that was 'pure and simple,' unbound by the sectarianism, infighting and rigid dogma, in favour of a more general and unifying conception of anarchism that allowed a greater deal of diversity, an 'anarchism without adjectives' (Kinna, 2009, p.18). Mella's view is closely linked in the contemporary period with 'small-a' anarchism, where aspects of anarchist theory and practice are taken up but without necessary reference to anarchism; as opposed to 'capital-A' anarchism that is self-defined and explicit (see Graeber & Grubacic, 2004, p. 2). Another term for this anarchism in form but not in identity/label might be defined as 'nonanarchist anarchism' where anarchist 'spirit' not anarchist 'word' is more important and leaves space for broader potentials (Ciccariello-Maher, 2011, p. 28). This approach helps find greater forms of non/anti-state affinity across movements and contexts.

Anarchism without adjectives maintains the importance of the anarchist label but doesn't dwell on the need to overdefine with a particular tendency, or tie anarchism down (Gordon, 2008, p. 11). It is more open-ended and dynamic, evidenced by the Crimethinc poster discussed above. An anarchism-without-adjectives perspective limits the 'factionalism or antagonism' within anarchism and instead aims to show 'a rich variety of emphases and passions' (Milstein, 2010, p. 26) that are fluid and adaptable and form the 'common ground of anarchism' (Amster, 2012, p. xv).[82] An anarchism without adjectives therefore is crucial to continuing to develop an anarchism for the future that is 'a non-dogmatic, flexible and inclusive one' where many tendencies can continue to co-exist and exchange with one another as 'parallel' forms of anarchism (Bowen & Purkis, 2012, pp. 213–214). This prompts movement beyond narrowly ideological definitions, and forms that uphold 'rigidly radical' and exclusionary forms of politics (Montgomery & bergman, 2017). This is still the work to be done, as noted above given the

[82] There is of course the danger of applying the anarchist label to those who wouldn't self-define as such, or who reject any and all labels, as they are not fundamentally important when compared to the activities and commitments one is attempting to live by, as is another tendency within the movement (see Gordon, 2008, 12; Milstein, 2010, p. 6).

critiques put forth by Ciccariello-Maher (2011), Olson (2009) and Warburton (2021). This is perhaps the subtle aim of my project here, to expand with a slant towards specific forms of anti-colonial theory and practice. This is both a crucial part of the ways that anarchists in Southern Ontario understand their anarchist politics in context, but also an aspect that needs ever greater forms of development and discussion.

In similar fashion to anarchism without adjectives, Giorel Curran (2006) suggests that the character of contemporary anarchism at the 'heart of 21st century dissent' might be understood as a 'post-ideological anarchism' that requires a 'loose and more flexible embrace of anarchist ideas and strategies' away from doctrine, sectarianism and ideology to borrow from a range of influences outside of rigidly defined anarchism (p. 2). A post-ideological approach to anarchism is also able to glean contemporary relevance for classical works of anarchism using a 'hybridized' approach that moves away from rigid doctrinal boundaries and sectarian debates (p. 12).

There is a clear resonance with postanarchist approaches— 'post' in the sense of bringing poststructuralist theory and anarchism together, but also being post-ideological and rejecting universalist forms of analysis and understanding of power. In Curran's (2006) view, postanarchism combines a more forceful and complex understanding of power from poststructuralism with anarchism's 'more viable political form' (p. 36).[83] The post-ideological dimensions of anarchism suggested here, also, perhaps push towards a 'non-essentialist' form of anarchism that begins to move beyond anarchism's rationalist and essentialist aspects that continue to confine strands of anarchism to a distinctly Eurocentric worldview.[84]

---

[83] Postanarchism and poststructuralist contributions to anarchism have not been a focus of this chapter. While these engagements within anarchist theory have expanded in recent years (see Newman, 2011; Rousselle & Evren, 2010, 2011), there is not the adequate space to detail the complexities of this strain of anarchism. Postanarchism has been much more confined to the academy than other perspectives on anarchism and thus in favour of giving preference for examining the contemporary aspects of the anarchist movement I have forgone specific engagement with this theory here. In later work I hope to explore in greater detail the postanarchist implications for anarchist social movement theory and practice.

[84] On anarchism's continued acceptance of a rationalist and modernist worldview that is linked to European Enlightenment, as well as colonization, see, for example, Ciccariello-Maher (2011).

Each of these variants of understanding anarchism shows the complexity of anarchism and anarchist definitions in the contemporary period. They suggest that anarchism does exist in explicit and self-defined forms that are important to maintain its visibility as an alternative, as a historic movement and to keep its comprehensive and synonymous critique of all forms of oppression and domination alongside the state and capitalism vibrant when participating in non-anarchist movements. Anarchism is made up of a number of key value-practices that cohere into such a specific radical politics. Even so, 'small-a' anarchism or 'nonanarchist anarchisms' point to the need for a continued flexibility of anarchism to steer away from overemphasizing explicit forms of anarchism at the expense of others and to also help keep anarchism relevant in particular contexts, locales, and struggles. How anarchism is articulated, and what aspects may need to be emphasized or put into greater dialogue with other forms of struggle is a necessary consideration of how generalized anarchist politics can become more specific in particular contexts.

This expansive view of anarchism, combined with flexibility, reinforces opposition to all forms of oppression and domination, and that although some forms may come to the fore at specific times and in specific contexts, anarchism generally rejects the view that there is some singular primary issue or oppression (Milstein, 2010, p. 39). This also sets anarchism apart from other political philosophies (Markoff et al., 2024; Milstein, 2010, p. 39). As this chapter has argued, this is the key hallmark of contemporary anarchism. Despite the importance of this perspective and the need for a continued intersectionality of oppression within anarchism, there are drawbacks to endlessly stating opposition to all forms of oppression and domination without more concerted action and analysis. One could think here of the anarchist failings in terms of taking on issues of race, racism, and white supremacy or in the case of my work here, a lack of attention to colonization and colonial histories of land. The result of this inattention is the need for more concerted anarchist analysis, but also an anarchist turn to the work, writing, and reflection of those who are actively resisting, within movements, and beyond. Anarchists need to read Indigenous, Black, anti-racist, and anti-colonial theorists, and take up their challenges to improve value-practices.

Stating opposition to all forms of oppression is an easy way to put a radical politics forward that may or may not have much substance behind it. George Ciccariello-Maher (2011) argues that the 'harder work—that of grasping how the capitalist system operates and how it can be brought down through strategic action—remains, despite our declarations of opposition' (p. 21). It is one thing, he argues, to commit to anarchist principles in a theoretical way, but quite another to actually figure out how to implement them in practice. Part of this difficulty is sometimes related to the lack of contextualization that anarchists glaze over or reduce to a much more general politics. Citing the work of the late Joel Olson (2009), Ciccariello-Maher reiterates the need for anarchists to see the fundamental ways in which race in the US context fundamentally structures relations and engagements with capitalism and the state.

In "The Problem With Infoshops and Insurrection: US Anarchism, Movement Building and the Racial Order," Joel Olson (2009) argues that 'Anarchism has always had a hard time dealing with race,' in part due to racism being construed as something to be dealt with after The Revolution, or more frequently as a by-product of capitalism rather than a constituent structure itself (p. 35). Olson argues, however, that racism and white supremacy are core logics that structure capitalism and class consciousness with the US context. White supremacy is the 'central means of maintaining capitalist hegemony' (p. 36) and organizes other forms of oppression in the US context (p. 39). White supremacy has a 'strategic centrality' to the US context that other forms of oppression do not. Anarchist critiques of oppression and domination are unable to recognize that 'various forms of hierarchy are themselves hierarchically organized' while substituting a 'moral condemnation of all forms of oppression' for a more necessary 'political and strategic analysis of how power functions in the US' and beyond (p. 37). Olson's argument prompts attention to the specificities of the context of resistance, rather than a hierarchy of oppressions or a more general and non-specific opposition to all forms.

More directly related to the construction of anarchist culture, Olson (2009) argues that there has been a move towards more insular, if not self-serving, anarchist cultural projects, like infoshops, or militant cultures of insurrection and attack, rather than concerted attention to the structural dynamics of white supremacy that fundamentally narrate the context in which these

other forms of anarchist resistance occur. He argues for a movement building approach that directly engages, supports, and learns from abolitionist histories, practices, and analysis. It is a 'task of anarchist theory' to 'develop a theory of history that can explain the United States and suggest strategies for building an anti-capitalist movement there' (p. 38), a move to 'view the US from a non-white perspective' (p. 43).

We must importantly add colonization to Olson's challenge, in that colonial processes are central to structural relationships in both the US and Canada (Warburton, 2021). Settler colonialism has structured the possibilities for various types of relations, and thus needs to be problematized within anarchist resistance and hopes for the future.[85] Anarchists need to not just state an opposition to racism, white supremacy, or colonialism in a laundry list of things to be opposed, but begin to tease out what actualizing an anti-colonial politics could mean in practice. What does it mean to engage in anti-colonialism as a committed value-practice? What would it mean for anarchists to develop theory and practice that takes stock of the specific contexts and structures in which they are embedded? What would it mean to expand the range of perspectives that come to inform anarchist value-practices?

Blackening and Indigenizing 'Anarchism(s) Otherwise'[86]

There is the possibility to construct notions of contemporary 'anarchism(s) otherwise' that disrupt and displace much more narrow definitions and reference points through direct engagement with, and disruption by, Black and Indigenous anarchisms and radical perspectives (Gómez-Barris, 2021). 'The "otherwise",' Gómez-Barris (2021) argues:

> here points to disruptive, anti-normative, and decolonial activities that makes for individual and collective action, dissident acts that accrue meaning across

[85] I consider the specific aspects of settler colonialism, as a means to add greater depth to anarchist understanding of such a structure, in the following chapter.

[86] While I don't have the space here to detail all of the ins and outs or histories of Black and Indigenous politics and theory that might resonate with anarchism, some preliminary remarks are necessary, as these present potent and crucial places to continue to disrupt any semblance of a narrowly Western anarchism, and further places to expand anarchism's direct forms of opposition to colonialism and white supremacy. On this point with Indigenous resurgence theory and practice see my previous work (Lewis 2012, 2015, 2016a, 2016b).

> time and space after colonialism. By attending to modes of organizing from within the Américas that address authoritarianism, heteropatriarchy, colonialism, and capitalism, we begin to imagine what a politics of liberation looks like that stretches far beyond one horizon of activity. (p. 120)

This also pushes back against the 'male anarchist archive' to forefront the voices of Black and Indigenous women and organizers. Such perspectives might be understood as key recent examples of 'guerilla texts' that Jeppesen (2010) identifies as challenging both dominant structures of power in society as well as the ways they persist within anarchism.[87]

Zoé Salmudzi and William C. Anderson (2018), in their book *The Anarchism of Blackness,* sketch out the contemporary contours of the intersections of anarchism and Blackness. In particular, they note that this is a formulation of anarchism that has a distinct departure from the narrowly Western canon, echoing my discussion of the necessary plurality of anarchism above. They argue that the oppression of Blackness is tied to both structural histories but also the state itself: 'We are Black because we are oppressed by the state; we are oppressed by the state because we are Black' (p. 9). 'Blackness,' then, 'is the anti-state just as the state is anti-Black. The oppression of Black people ought not to inspire the modification of this existing state or the aspiration to create a purportedly better state'—Blackness is anti-state, is stateless, is anarchic, wholly unassimilable into the folds of the state (p. 112–113). This is 'not necessarily advocacy for anarchist politics or ideology,' they argue; 'rather it describes a condition that might lend itself to a form of organization reflecting that tendency … more readily primed for radical politics, which include anarchist and anti-authoritarian ideas' (p. 109). This anarchic reading of Blackness is not to assimilate it into more conventional anarchism, but to suggest a means of disruption, and the potential to expand anarchic politics on specifically Black terms.

Further, they argue:

[87] For examples of the ways that these sorts of interventions can be taken up in anarchism see for example Warburton (2021) and Lazar (2016).

> Attempting to reclaim and repurpose the settler state will not lead to liberation, and it will not provide the kind of urgent material relief so many people desperately need, though electing empathetic officials sometimes can arguably mitigate against harm. Only through a material disruption of these geographies, through the cultivation of Black autonomy, can Black liberation begin to be actualized. (Salmudzi & Anderson, 2018, p. 50)[88]

Theirs is an interest, first and foremost, in Black liberation, and opposition to the white supremacist and colonial state, not anarchism per se, although there are connections to be made. They note the foundational history of slavery on the United States, directly connected to structures of settler colonialism, where 'Nothing short of a complete dismantling of the American state as it presently exists can or will disrupt this' (Salmudzi & Anderson, 2018, p. 8).

Blackness in relation to the state, Anderson (2021) argues, 'has required us to react and survive in anarchistic ways without necessarily laying claim to "anarchism" as a set of politics' (p. 24). As such, the persistence of Blackness foments that negation, total and complete 'ruination': 'the total dismantling of the white supremacist state and all the institutions that keep us subjugated' (p. 160) through specific forms of Black anarchism and abolition. There is a specific context of Blackness that disrupts more generalized accounts of anarchism.

Anderson (2021) argues that Black anarchism is a 'split from within Black movements as opposed to simply being an effort to diversify or revise classical anarchism' (p. 82). It is 'Black-centred, specific to Black people and our unique conditions' (p. 82). It is 'anarchism otherwise'

[88] Salmudzi and Anderson (2018) engage very directly the settler colonial context of the United States in which they are writing, specifically in Chapter 2. They argue that 'Because Africans were forcibly removed from the continent and trafficked to the United States and did not largely participate in the European process of domination, … Black people cannot be considered as settlers in the United States. Though we may participate in ongoing settler processes and ultimately benefit from the elimination of Indigenous people and the expropriation of their land, we are not settlers. But championing the creation of a Black majoritarian nation-state, where the fate of Indigenous people is ambiguous at best, is an idea rooted in settler logic. Is settler adjacency what a truly intersectional framework and multifaceted approach to Black liberation entails? (p. 28). This highlights the necessity of Black resistance to settler colonialism and struggle alongside Indigenous resistance.

to quote Saidiya Hartman's introduction to Anderson's text (p. xvi; see also Gómez-Barris, 2021).

This disruptive 'otherness' is echoed by the work of Marquis Bey (2020), who draws and departs from Salmudzi and Anderson, to conceive of a specific 'anarcho-Blackness' in which anarchism is changed, altered, disrupted, and remade—'necessarily corrupted by the radicality, the lawlessness, the mutinous primordiality of Blackness' (p. 3). This 'anarchism of another type … recognizes its intimacy with anarchism as conventionally understood, but it revises anarchism, anarchizes anarchism, remixes and samples anarchism to produce something distinct but very much indebted' (p. 3). Anarcho-Blackness draws upon Black queer trans feminist intimacies with a core 'anti-colonial sensibility' towards disruption and the breaking of new ground. This is a form of 'transgressions of process, content and access coupled with intersectional identities' that Jeppesen (2010) highlights as a necessary intervention of guerilla texts, and their direct influence on anarchist cultures and value-practices (p. 482).

As Bey (2020) summarizes:

> Perhaps what I am designating as anarcho-Blackness, as the operative modality for Black anarchism, is no mere incorporation of Black people into the folds of anarchism—i.e., add and stir. I am thus designating Black anarchism's anarcho-Blackness as a Black feminist critique and taking up of anarchism, asserting that 1) the "Black" in front of anarchism is to be understood not as a "mere" marker of identity but as a political and capaciously politicized affixation. It designates more of a mode and posture of reading, engaging, and undermining the tenets upon which hegemonic sociality rest. 2) Inherent to (Black) feminist mobilizations is ground-disturbing, and thus to disturb grounds—even its own grounds—is a necessary component of the project at hand. Anarcho-Blackness thus designates the disturbing of anarchism's ground, which capacitates what anarchism can be and who it can liberate. (p. 4)

Anarcho-Blackness, so conceived, is not about a clearly and easily defined Black anarchism 'but concerns the variegated modalities, methodologies, habits, trends, thoughts, and imaginaries that might be given to anarchic—which is to say unruled, non-coercive, coalitional—affinities and textures for being with others' (Bey, 2020, p. 6).

Bey does not argue for doing away with anarchism, as we know it, altogether. It still has much to contribute along the lines of the value-practices I have noted in this chapter. But:

> anarchism cannot simply do what it has always done (which is itself a multifarious enterprise) as such has been predicated on, in part, an elision of the weight of white (and cis male) supremacy. That is, we cannot just add in racial and gendered perspectives to an already-functioning anarchism; we cannot, also, simply throw out anarchism on the grounds of these elisions. The task is to mobilize the effects of Black feminism and anarchism colliding in harmoniously complex chaos. (Bey, 2020, p. 18)

The aim is something wholly disruptively different.

In a similar, but also specifically different, fashion, Klee Benally (2023), considers Indigenous intersections and relationships with anarchism. Benally, like Salmudzi, Anderson, and Bey, doesn't seek an Indigenous anarchism, but rather aims to put the two perspectives into conversation and disruption, allowing for the generation of something wholly different, if still connected:

> When anarchism speaks we locate an affinity in our hostility to those who have imposed themselves upon us. But we resist to be reduced to political artifacts, so this has also made us hostile towards anarchist identity, though not entirely to anarchism. (p. 323)

There are affinities to be articulated, but as Benally (2023) argues, they 'have almost always been skewed towards the pursuit of a settler colonial future' (p. 327), and notes the lack of direct and concerted attention to the context of colonization by anarchists in North America,

resulting in a ‘compatibility issue with settler colonialism’ (p. 332). The check-box listing of opposition to colonization amongst a laundry list of other oppositions does little to affect the destruction of settler colonial structures, and more often results in attaching anarchist forms of analysis to already existent anti-colonial movements (p. 332), rather than seeing the ways they disrupt anarchism and settlement.

The ‘incompatibility’ of ‘anarchism and Indigenous existence’ creates a moment, an opening, a ‘no-space’ of possibly:

> In this way we view anarchism as a sort of dynamic bridge. A set of radical (as in total negation) ideas that are a connecting point between anti-colonial struggle and Indigenous liberation. A practice that expresses and asserts autonomy with respect to the context of where it is located (place). It is an antagonistic connection between the point of where we are dispossessed and ruled over, to a point towards liberation and autonomy. As a rejection of all systems of domination and coercion, it is the utility anarchism has for Indigenous liberation of which we are interested in. And most specifically, it is in its indictment of the State and total rejection of it that we find the greatest use. Indigenous anarchism is a commitment to the destruction of domination and authority, which includes colonialism, white supremacy, cis-heteropatriarchy, capitalism, and the State. (Benally, 2023, p. 344)

The sort of Indigenous anti-state politics Benally (2023) argues for then, is not an ‘appendage’ to already existent anarchism, nor an add-on to address the limitations of white anarchism, but an anti-state politics on specifically Indigenous terms ‘to replace the principle of political authority with the principle of autonomous Indigenous mutuality (pp. 332–333). To live a life in conflict with authoritarian constraint on stolen occupied land is negation of settler colonial domination’ (p. 343) and all of its impositions.

While there is a refusal to be subsumed within Western/white/settler anarchisms, these sorts of anti-state politics articulated from Indigenous and Black standpoints, and on their own

terms, do not negate the possibilities of forming alliances, affinities, and complexities with broader anarchist/anti-state tendencies. Rather, such perspectives uphold the importance of doing so on specifically Indigenous and Black terms, rather than requiring incorporation into other pre-existent frameworks, definitions, or labels. Attending to the articulation of specifically Indigenous and Black interventions, such as those I review here, ought to prompt greater anarchist consideration for structures of settler colonialism, anti-Blackness, and white supremacy in the contexts that we also inhabit in our own ways.

In similar fashion to Anderson's 'ruination,' and drawing from Tuck and Yang's "Decolonization is not a metaphor" (2012), Benally (2023) puts forth a practice of 'negation,' to frame Indigenous resistance as necessarily requiring the anti-colonial destruction of settler society, through ungovernable antagonism (p. 374). Benally refuses inclusion in the settler mediated forms of reconciliation/recognition, and the incorporation of decolonization into the structures of the state and colonization itself. This mobilizes Tuck and Yang's assertion of 'incommensurability' that refuses any conception of settler normalcy and futurity:

> To fully enact an ethic of incommensurability means relinquishing settler futurity, abandoning the hope that settlers may one day be commensurable to Native peoples. … The Native futures, the lives lived once the settler nation is gone—these are the unwritten possibilities made possible by an ethic of incommensurability.' (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 36)

Given the recuperation of decolonization into personal politics and state institutionalization, 'anti-colonialism is negation of colonialism, it does not lend itself to positive or progressive projects no matter how it is marketed' (Benally, 2023, p. 391). Colonial domination, through force and dispossession, as 'an act of total desecration' requires 'anti-colonial struggle as abolitionist liberatory regeneration and destruction,' as '(de)generative settler destruction,' as a profound undoing (Benally, 2023, p. 391). It is, to recall Bakunin's formulation above, a form of creative destruction. 'No spiritual surrender,' Benally (2023) declares (p. 406): 'To live a life in conflict with authoritarian constraint in stolen land is a spiritual, mental, and material

proposition; it is the negation of settler colonial domination' (p. 405). This is a politics of refusal, negation, and deeply seated anti-colonial opposition, one likely to disrupt settler colonial residues and structures that persist within anarchism. As such, these are crucial interventions that put contemporary anarchism on notice, and exact pointed critique at the ways that anarchist oppositions to all forms of oppression and domination are ineffectively theorized. Such interventions suggest a means to move towards anarchist value-practices otherwise constructed.

There is room for relationships and affinities between anarchism and Black/Indigenous perspectives, but also something necessarily disruptive in a politics that refuses to be subsumed within anarchism. These are forms of 'anarchism otherwise' that come from, and resonate within, their own particular contexts. Engaging such disruptive (re)framings of anarchism, from particular and situated but also expansive perspectives, thus allows a generative set of potentials for anarchist-type politics, without the trappings of overly sectarian and exclusionary defined histories. Such perspectives, while only glimpsed at briefly here, suggest the changing terrain of contemporary anarchist/anti-state politics, and the necessity for looking beyond only the narrower constructions of anarchism. These are also perspectives that give much more context to what it might mean to expand anarchist commitments to resist all forms of oppression and domination, and how such value-practices become intentionally situated within specific structures of domination. Contemporary anarchism is beginning to drift further in these directions, expanding its influences and reference points, while at the same time moving over and making space for other forms of anti-authoritarian politics to come to the fore. As such, these perspectives and interventions require greater attention by anarchists themselves and how they can inform ongoing anarchist value-practices.

Conclusion

Anarchist value-practices are a necessary and essential framework to understand contemporary forms of anarchism, and their continued possibilities for articulating radical alternatives to structures of domination. Anarchism has risen to a sort of prominence now through the anti-globalization movement and has continued to influence a range of transnational social

movement struggles through its values-practice (Markoff et al., 2024; Williams, 2018; Sitrin, 2019; Bray, 2013; Amster, 2012). Anarchists (and others) continue to create and explore prefigurative futures in the here and now, putting forth transformative value-practices and visions. Anarchism is not utopian in the sense of lusting after an impossible future, but rather as a movement that aims to realize the impossible and build towards a society free of capitalism, the state, oppression, and domination without a coercive blueprint, and with all the diversity that has come to be one of anarchism's strengths. This is the key prefigurative promise of anarchism's value-practices. While anarchists do dare to dream, they more forcefully seek to create those dreams in the present.

There is indeed a distinct anarchist 'current' that weaves itself through movements of resistance (Graham, 2013), neither perfect, nor static, but constantly on the move. Anarchism is perhaps 'a spring fed stream that is ever present, especially in social movements and in opportunities afforded in a variety of social cultures,' a 'river of transformation' (Roussopoulos, 2012, p. 31) 'constantly changing, with different sources, eddies and currents, sometimes percolating below the surface, at other times bursting forth in revolutionary torrents, but generally moving "between the banks of certain unifying principles"' (Woodcock in Graham, 2013, p. 475). It's time to keep anarchism flowing, ensuring the current doesn't subside, but perhaps continues to grow into a great flood, fed by a range of influences, expanding value-practices and overturning oppression and domination in a variety of distinct contexts, alongside other connected anti-authoritarian projects.

This chapter developed anarchism's promise for resistance through an examination of its key value-practices, reconsidered the baseline opposition to all forms of oppression and domination in relation to context and location (with particular reference to settler colonialism), considered and reframed of how we understand the 'contemporary' and what/who/where is included under the banner of anarchism, and engaged directly with provocations brought forth by Black and Indigenous perspectives that disrupt normative anarchist politics and push towards greater anti-colonial and abolitionist possibilities.

While I don't have space to detail each and every one of anarchism's tendencies (whether feminist, primitivist, social ecologist, queer, trans, etc.), this chapter has given substance to a general character of anarchism in the particular moment, with a baseline against the state, capitalism, and all forms of oppression and domination. Contemporary anarchism is perhaps best characterized by its broad and dynamic character, one that refuses a rigid form of definition in favour of affinity-based, 'small-a' anarchist, or anarchism-without-adjectives perspectives. This leaves anarchism open, and maintains a necessary and continual set of value-practices that give shape to forms of anarchist habitus that I discuss in Chapter 4 using the work of Pierre Bourdieu. This openness creates possibilities to take anarchism further, as evidenced by Black and Indigenous interventions and expansions of what anarchic, anti-authoritarian, and anti-state politics could look like.

Much of what we understand contemporary anarchism to be is but one snippet, one reading, one perspective among many that take up an anti-state and anti-authoritarian politics. It means that settler, white, dominant forms of anarchism can be, and in fact must be, disrupted by the multitudes of anarchism, represented here by Black and Indigenous interventions. Such disruption is crucially necessary given the settler colonial context in which anarchists in North America (and specifically Southern Ontario) struggle, and the anti-colonial and abolitionist positions they purport to hold. A generalized opposition to all forms of oppression and domination does not hold without attention to the particularities of the context and structures where we are located. Such baseline declarations continue to be limited when they refuse direct reference to struggles that would bring such opposition alive, and problematize the necessary complexities of thinking about resistance on stolen land.

Contemporary anarchism continues to be a key reference point for anarchist value-practices and will no doubt continue to capture the radical imagination of many. But if only narrowly conceived, it remains definitively limited, if not poised to maintain many of the structures of settlement and white supremacy that it claims to oppose. In the next chapter I turn to specific theorizations and specifications of settler colonialism as a necessary theoretical framework and

structural understanding that needs to find connection and integration with anarchist politics that occur within contexts and forms of resistance narrated by colonization and land theft.

Chapter 3 – Settler Colonialism, Capitalism and State: Structures, Linkages, and Resistance

The previous chapter argued for an expansive understanding of contemporary anarchism and considered the core anarchist value-practices as a means to understand the key commitments and possibilities for anarchism(s) in the present moment. Looking at value-practices also shows that while anarchists include colonialism within the wider scope of opposition to all forms of oppression and domination, there is still work to be done to contextualize our oppositional politics, and very specifically understand the key siting of colonialism where we are. As such, committing only to a baseline opposition to all forms of oppression is insufficient given the specific context of settler colonialism, and its ongoing structures.

In this chapter I consider the complexities and particularities of settler colonialism as a structure in greater detail, including its relationships to other forms of domination. Developing and expanding such a structural view provides a more detailed framework for anarchist anti-colonial opposition and builds on anarchism's intersectional forms of analysis. Anarchists already see the state and capitalism as core structures that facilitate and uphold domination, and turning a more intentional eye to settler colonialism can further structural understandings within context of resistance.[89]

I begin by examining the emergence between the state and capitalism, along with colonization. Primitive accumulation, as theorized by Karl Marx, and expanded by Coulthard (2014) and

[89] My personal context of writing, as mentioned in the introduction to this work, is being a self-defined anarchist in the settler colonial state of Canada. There are a number of overlapping characteristics that apply to settler colonial states such as Canada, the US, Australia, and New Zealand first and foremost, but also with others like Israel and South Africa. For the purposes of this chapter and the context of anarchist anti-colonialism in Southern Ontario, I confine my explicit comments to the US/Canada settler colonial context, although there are a number of differences in history and relations with Indigenous communities between the two as well. Engaging work around settler colonialism carries wider resonance for a) anti-colonial and decolonizing struggles, beyond a grounding in anarchism; and b) anarchist struggles that might be situated outside of settler colonial contexts. This could apply to other forms of colonial relations, or in other centres of empire. This is especially the case given the necessary upsurge in Palestinian liberation struggles in the current moment against the genocidal policies of the Zionist Israeli state.

Federici (2004), has been essential to the spread of capitalism through enclosure and proletarianization. Engaging Nichols' (2022) critique and specification of dispossession, I consider the complexities of this term and its relationship to structures generated through displacement and land theft that persist into the present.

A fundamental part of the continued expansion of capitalism and colonialism connected to the state requires persistent, yet changing, forms of repression. These processes of repression circulate through a process of 'imperial feedback,' a term employed by Khan (2023; citing go 2020) to note the ways that violence is a persistent feature of settler colonial/capitalist/statist structures of domination. This sheds light on continued social movement repression and its intimate connection to persistent forms of colonial violence. Settler colonialism narrates persistent logics of dispossession, domination, and elimination, but also the actualization of resistance and imagination.

I consider 'settler' and 'Indigenous' categories to mark important differential locations under settler colonial structures. A binarist approach, however, requires caution, given the complexities and dynamics of identity within settler colonial contexts that include immigrant, slave-descendent, refugee, etc. populations. The interventions and challenges of Black theorists prompt a more complex accounting for the ways histories and legacies of slavery and forced migration intersect with settler colonial structures, beyond a settler-Indigenous binary. I argue therefore for the utility of the term settler to mark the elevated structural position within this specific dynamic, and as a 'starting point in defining settler colonialism' (Englert, 2022, p. 201), but not the whole picture. Naming alone lacks the potency of actions taken once structural benefits are recognized, along with efforts to resist such structures and support Indigenous and anti-colonial alternatives.

Settler colonialism is primarily interested in emptying out 'Indigenous' categories and claims to land. The modes of transfer, as well as enduring settlement myths and frameworks of settler 'common sense,' construct relations that seek to disappear Indigenous peoples, and further cement settler claims to land.

Finally, I then turn to recent work that challenges settler colonial studies and theory for assuming the continuation of settler colonialism even as it seeks to illuminate and critique it, and for providing little agency to ongoing Indigenous resistance and resurgence. The dominant current of settler colonial theory, represented by Lorenzo Veracini (2011), has limited offerings in terms of possible de/anti-colonial futures outside of reconciliation processes and the bounds of the state. An important corrective to settler colonial theory must come from engaging with Indigenous theory and practice directly. Settler colonialism is a useful and essential tool in order to gain a greater understanding of the structure(s) at hand, but cannot alone provide detailed tools to move towards decolonization and greater anti-colonial politics.

In conclusion, I suggest movement towards highlighting settler colonialism as a structuring structure (following the work of Bourdieu introduced in Chapter 1, and more in depth later in Chapter 4), linked to capitalism and the state, for anarchists and other social movements, and the necessity of continuing and furthering alliances, affinities, and complicities with resurgent Indigenous perspectives. This conclusion sets the stage for the discussions with my interviewees throughout chapters 5, 6 and 7, building towards understanding anarchist engagements with Indigenous resistance/resurgence movements, and the work still to be done. Understanding settler colonialism as a structuring structure also provides a complementary lens to Pierre Bourdieu's notions of field, capital, and habitus discussed in the next chapter, and affirms that while there is a durability to settler colonialism as a structure, in ways that determine and influence the possibilities for action and resistance, it is not inevitable or unmalleable. It may also be 'structured,' altered, resisted, and (hopefully) wholly dismantled. Settler colonialism is a specific and necessary backdrop for understanding of the context of resistance, and the ways that cultures of resistance can be built and broadened into the future.

Settler Colonialism

Settler colonialism is a distinct form of colonization that comprises an ongoing and active process of Indigenous replacement by settlers, connected to capitalism and the state, through both dispossession and elimination of people from land. This structure fundamentally

underlines the context of struggle within North America.[90] The structural approach focuses on the persistence of colonial dynamics that fundamentally undergird the societies in which it occurs, and presents a crucial point of consideration for anarchists especially, who are already attuned to the structures of the state and capitalism, and broader forms of oppression and domination, in their value-practices.

This specific theoretical perspective is, in many ways, inaugurated by Patrick Wolfe (1999) in *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology*, along with continued work in the journal *Settler Colonial Studies* and beyond through the work of those like Lorenzo Veracini (2013), Adam Barker (2021).[91] Wolfe summarizes that: 'Settler colonies were (are) premised on the elimination of native societies. The split tensing reflects a determinate feature of settler colonization. The colonizers come to stay—invasion is a structure not an event' (p. 2). Settler colonialism is primarily predicated on the destruction of native populations, to make way for settler populations, and secure access to land. The aim of settlers is the creation of 'a new colonial society on the expropriated landbase,' where settlers come to stay (Wolfe, 2006, p. 388). Wolfe forefronts a 'logic of elimination' as a core aspect of settler colonialism.

---

[90] Again, my context of examination is North America, particularly Southern Ontario. While settler colonial studies, and the term settler colonialism, might be applied in more various contexts, the theorists and discussion that I take up here are firmly within the collection of states linked primarily to British imperialism (Canada, US, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa). Israel stands as an exception of sorts, with a much later point of settler colonial instigation, while the other states mentioned generally see the process of settler colonial construction occur in the 1600s. This isn't to say that settler colonialism doesn't exist in other times or locations, but the settler colonial theory I examine is relatively narrowly defined (although it continues to be expanded). On Israel in particular, see Veracini (2006), as well as Krebs and Olwan (2012).

[91] This is a very crude and limited history of the study of settler colonialism. For a more detailed genealogy of the concept see Veracini (2013), Faragher (2014), and most recently Schayegh (2024). Schayegh (2024, 475), in particular, assesses and critiques the elaboration of Settler Colonial Studies as a unique field unto itself given a persistent 'Anglo-bias' of perceived 'domestic similarities and international centrality through the 1990s' that limits comparative work across a wider range of contexts, including Latin America and Africa. We should be mindful, as Coulthard (2014), Simpson (2017), Nichols (2020), and Barker (2021) remind us in various ways, of Indigenous critiques and resistance of settler colonial structures that have persisted since contact and long pre-date Settler Colonial Studies as a theoretical perspective. This is not to say that there is no utility to this more recent theoretical work, but to affirm that this is hardly the only means with which to engage in comprehensive critique. Indigenous resistance/resurgence is foundational to re/imagining resistance, anti-colonial futures, and grounded normativities beyond settler colonialism.

Framing settler colonialism as a structure and not merely an initial event, point of contact, or moment of violence considers that the ongoing aspects of dispossession and elimination. Removal, destruction, and elimination of Indigenous peoples is ongoing in part because colonial processes are never complete, but also because of the persistence of Indigenous resistance (Coulthard, 2014).[92] Capitalism requires ongoing expansion to feed profits and accumulation, continually seeking new spaces for domination (best understood via primitive accumulation, discussed below). Settler colonialism exists, according to Englert (2022), 'not as a discrete, self-contained structure of domination, but one that interacts with—and is co-constituent of—key processes of domination that continue to define the present moment' (p. 4). He articulates the important connections as follows: 'Capitalism, race and dispossession, as well as different forms of state violence and gender oppression, emerged within, through and/or in relation to settler colonial domination' (p. 4). Settler colonialism is a crucial part of the intersections of wider forms of oppression and domination.

As Wolfe argues, although race and white supremacy are intimately bound up with the settler colonial project, it is the desire for land and territory that structures settler colonialism's fundamental logic of elimination (2006, p. 388; see also Elkins & Pedersen, 2005).[93] In comparison to enslaved peoples, Wolfe argues, 'whose reproduction augmented their owners' wealth, Indigenous people obstructed settlers' access to land' and so had to be removed, and

[92] This framing within settler colonial studies has been critiqued for its emphasis on 'presentism' and preoccupation with desired outcomes rather the processes that are underway to achieve them. Schayegh (2024) suggests that 'events' themselves cannot be lost in the considerations of operation of settler colonialism, and in citing Ostler and Shoemaker (2019) suggests a greater consider of 'process' and 'phases' of settler colonial development, to account for the dynamic and changing nature. I don't think this negates a view of settler colonialism as a structure that has an element of durability, but is also dynamic, changing, and far from inevitable. The reminder here is that structures are not totalizing, as ongoing Indigenous resistance attests.

[93] For a more specific treatment of the intersections of white supremacy and settler colonialism, see, for example, Andrea Smith's important article 'Heteropatriarchy and The Three Pillars of White Supremacy' (2006) and on race as a pivotal part of settler colonial political economies, see Mar and Edmonds (2010).

prevented from reproducing (p. 388).[94] Wolfe therefore argues that elimination is the core logic, rather than other forms of oppression/domination/exploitation.

Robin D.G. Kelley (2017) contests this view, noting the specific ways in which African populations throughout the slave trade (and after) were marked for both exploitation as labour *and elimination* (p. 271). They were rendered disposable to further buttress the settler colonial, capitalist, statist project. This recalls the connections of settler colonialism to slavery noted above. Kelley argues that considering elimination and exploitation, with specific attention to Black/African experiences is crucial to understand dynamics of class and identity in Europe (and beyond) as well—'how it is possible to move from native to colonized, to dispossessed, to proletarian, to unfree labour, to settler' (p. 273). As Tuck and Yang (2012) note 'some labour becomes settler, while excess labour becomes enslaveable, criminal, murderable' (p. 18). A distinction needs to be made between those who enact dispossession and those who are dispossessed/marked for elimination. Wolfe's work needs to be read alongside other interventions that consider the wider dynamics and implications of settler colonialism, dispossession, elimination, and resistance. I return to the importance of greater considerations of the experience of Blackness in the section on identity below.

Englert (2022) suggests that while elimination is a core settler colonial *aim*, it has not always been a material *reality* (p. 17). It is aspirational, but has rarely succeeded, hence the 'importance of integrating Indigenous liberation struggles into analysis of settler colonialism.' Englert (2022) argues that settler colonial regimes have desired to employ and exploit Indigenous labour, as a means to disconnect peoples from their lands (p. 15). It is an aspirational aspect—it has not occurred in any absolutist sense, due in no short order to the enduring power of Indigenous resistance. Yet processes of exploitation are still quite fundamental to settler colonialism (p.19).

[94] On the specific heteropatriarchical and reproductive aspects of settler colonialism's impacts on Indigenous communities see Smith (2005). I return to some of these particular questions of identity locations within settler colonialism below.

Looking at the persistence of settler colonial exploitation of natural resources firmly sited on Indigenous lands, and the use of Indigenous labour within industries of extraction, as well as the ongoing threat that Indigenous alternatives present to the capitalist status quo, exploitation is enthusiastically maintained as a core settler colonial logic (the ongoing case of the Tar Sands or #NODAPL stand as contemporary examples of this; see, for example, Estes, 2019). In some sense, where elimination fails, exploitation comes in to articulate a further dynamic of domination. This echoes Coulthard's (2014) discussion (explored below) of the continued primitive accumulation of alternative lifeways—grounded normativities—that have not yet been fully incorporated in the capitalist/colonial fabric of the state, a forced move from communal and non-capitalist lifeways into exploitative capitalism. This is also the basis from which Indigenous resurgence is continually oriented. Indigenous agency needs to be continually considered, to refuse settler colonialism as a completely totalizing structure. Elimination is still at the forefront of settler colonial aims, but it is not the whole of the dynamic at play.

Settler colonialism, of course, must be distinguished from other forms of colonialism, such as colonies set up for more explicit purposes of labour and resource exploitation/extraction from native communities, but then have colonists return to their home country. The extractive colonial setting is indicative of the directive to the native population "you, work for me," while settler colonialism demands "you, go away." 'This is why,' Veracini (2011) argues, 'colonialism is not settler colonialism: both colonisers and settler colonisers move across space, and both establish their ascendancy in specific locales. While significant, the similarities end there' (p. 1). Recalling Kelley (2017) above, this also isn't sufficient to define settler colonialism on the basis of exploitation or elimination, as both elements have continued to be present across a range of locales. Such forms, although theoretically carrying differential aspects and relations, are often explicitly intertwined in real-world contexts (Schayegh, 2024, p. 483). We can, and should, distinguish settler colonialism's distinct attributes to mark this important structural form, but also place them in specific contexts with particular processes, dynamics, and relations.

Settler colonialism is a specific and distinct structure insofar as settler societies seek to break from their home countries. Anne McClintock (1992) argues that settler societies like Canada or

the US might be understood as 'breakaway settler colonies,' characterized by 'formal independence from the founding metropolitan country [i.e., Great Britain], along with continued control over the appropriated colony (thus displacing colonial control from the metropolis to the colony itself)' (p. 89). Settler colonies' eventual separation from their former metropoles did not end the fundamentally colonial dynamic. The fight was not principally with the former country, but those who stand in the way of expansion in 'new lands.' As such it is the 'settler collectives' that seek to further expand the reach and structures of settler colonialism by 'carry[ing] sovereign capacity with itself through space'; continually developing for the purpose of 'enacting the total and enduring transfer of land from Indigenous to settler control' (Barker, 2021, p. 44). Englert (2022) frames this as the core conflict that separates settler colonialism from other forms of colonial relations—'conflict is not with the colonial power, but with the Indigenous peoples who settlers (aim to) dispossess, exploit and/or eliminate' (p. 7).

'Settlers make Indigenous land their new home and source of capital,' Tuck and Yang (2012) argue, in addition to the ongoing 'disruption of Indigenous relationships to land' as a form of 'profound epistemic, ontological, cosmological violence' (p. 5). There is a desire for settler permanence: 'the settler positions himself as both superior and normal; the settler is natural, whereas the Indigenous inhabitant and the chattel slave are unnatural, even supernatural' (p. 6). This underscores the importance of specifying 'settler' as a structural identity—it matters in very many ways what settlers *do*, not just who they *are.*[95] Settlers are at the forefront of dispossession, while Indigenous peoples bear the brunt of violent separation from lands, cultures, identities, and histories.

[95] Importantly, Tuck and Yang distinguish one of the important differences between Indigenous and Black locations within settler colonialism. Indigenous peoples are desired to be 'subtractive' through processes of making them fewer and 'less native' through the regulation of blood. Dilution is designed to render legal numbers of Indigenous peoples fewer, even more so through regressive gender policies around who can pass down status (Lawrence, 2004). Black peoples, on the other hand, are 'expansive' whereby 'slave/criminal status will be inherited by an expanding number of 'black' descendants' (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 12).

'Settlers, by definition, stay,' as Veracini (2010) summarizes; 'in specific contradistinction, colonial sojourners—administrators, missionaries, military personnel, entrepreneurs, and adventurers—return' (p. 6). The process of settlement and intention to stay is foundational. The desire for settler permanence requires ongoing and expanding access to land. I turn to this continued process of primitive accumulation below.[96]

The 'effects' of settler colonialism 'are permanent and the process is still current' (Bateman & Pilkington, 2011, p. 2), though we should be careful not to over determine the durability of such a structure, especially given the persistence of Indigenous resistance and the simple fact that there has been no finality to such a process. Settler colonialism, however, continues into the present as 'the foundational governing ethic of … "new world" state[s]' (Elkins & Pedersen, 2005, p. 3). It forms a central aspect of the state, a foundational aspect of the context resistance struggles on stolen lands, and forms, and persists as, following Joel Olson's 2009 work covered in the previous chapter, a 'strategically central' point of consideration for anarchists and all those seeking a better world.

There is also a persistent geographic element to settler colonial structure, given its preoccupation with land and desired accumulation/dispossession. As Mar and Edmonds (2010) detail, geographies of settler colonialism mark the land, inscribing structure, violence, and dispossession into the landscape itself:

> In geopolitical terms, the impact of settler colonialism is starkly visible in the landscapes it produces: the symmetrically surveyed divisions of land; fences, roads, power lines, dams and mines; the vast mono-cultural expanses of single-cropped fields; carved and preserved national forest, and marine and

[96] There are a number of ways that the structure of settler colonialism might play out. As Coombes (2006) suggests, state engagements with Indigenous peoples through 'resistance, containment, appropriation, assimilation, miscegenation or attempted destruction' are key determinants of the particular relationship that settlers and Indigenous populations have (pp. 1–2). This will be different for each state given different processes of settlement, dispossession, and inclusion/exclusion, as well as resistance. While this pushes for a more contextual view of settler colonialism, the structural aspects of settler colonialism are maintained. The outcomes may be different, but dispossession, violence, and destruction of Indigenous peoples is still foundational.

> wilderness parks; the expansive and gridded cities; and the socially coded areas of human habitation and trespass that are bordered, policed and defended. Land and the organised spaces on it, in other words, narrate the stories of colonisation. (p. 2)

Settler colonialism is not just a structuring of relations of domination and identity, but of the land, the very physical and material aspects of the world itself. Domination becomes a physical set of marks on land, as settlers leave their stamp on what has been stolen and remade.

Adam Barker (2021) argues that settlers moving through the landscape and enacting new structures, 'do not see themselves as entering or traversing the sovereign space of Indigenous nations' (p. 44). Rather, they reiterate a belief in *terra nullius* (empty land) in order to deny Indigenous presence, but also to affirm that their ways of marking the land lead to its improvement and transformation. Based in 'natural law,' terra nullius constructs land as 'not possessed,' as lacking in human control and governance (defined through a European legal private property framework), and thus requiring 'civilized' forms of relating and relationship (Mackey, 2016, p. 47) through enclosure, dispossession, and 'property-generating theft' (Nichols, 2020, p. 9). Liberal traditions, à la John Locke, promote enclosure and domestication of land for the purpose of creating social relations based on private property. Since Indigenous peoples did not mirror European private property relations, and appeared to not be 'using' the land, it was the right of settlers to take such 'idle' land and put it to use (Sherman, 2010).[97]

On one hand terra nullius suggests that Indigenous peoples do not exist at all; on the other it suggests that Indigenous people's presence can be disregarded/disposed due to a lesser humanity. In economic terms this justification of settlement constructs Europeans as civilized and Indigenous peoples as uncivilized and subhuman. Settlers conceive of Indigenous peoples and their lands as wild, chaotic, and lacking order; in need of domestication and control, whether by the decimation of landbases, the destruction of cultures or the

[97] It was this relationship of domination that Sherman suggests also began the disconnection of settler societies from their own lands and relationships to the natural world (2010, p. 117).

assimilation/removal of populations. Again, the land and relations to it are transformed in the image of the societies that they left, they re-enact capitalist relations and notions of property.

Barker argues that the 'self-perpetuating' (2021) aspects of the social reproduction of the settler polity continue with the ongoing arrival of settlers from afar and the expansion/reproduction of 'local' settler populations (p. 55). These geographic and population relations are 'anticipatory,' following the work of Darby Cameron, as an affective set of relations: 'the longing for a land that is modelled in part on the metropole yet never quite exists except in the imagination of the settler' (Barker, 2021, p. 71). These 'spaces to come' are referenced as 'inevitable' and propel the ongoing creation and expansion of settler colonial structures.

There are many further forms of settler domination and justification that require some brief mention. Lorenzo Veracini (2010) highlights 26 different forms of settler colonial 'transfer' that share the logic of dispossession to solidify settler permanence, and, insofar as 'all these strategies aim to manipulate the population economy by discursively or practically emptying the indigenous sector of the population systems (or sections of it), they share a transferist rationale' (p. 34). In other words, these are attempts to remove Indigeneity in order to secure a final state of settler dominance and permanence.[98] These include death, forced migration, references to a post-colonial present to deny claims to Indigeneity and land, accounting (through the regulation of blood quantum or underestimating population numbers), contesting the authenticity of contemporary Indigenous people by comparison to a romanticized past that cannot be lived up to, racialization that asserts the primary categories are only black and white, or through executive termination, whereby the category Indigenous is simply removed alongside the treaties and agreements with the state. These different forms of transfer indicate

[98] Many of these recall Tuck and Yang's (2012) identification of 'settler moves to innocence' that belie continued settler culpability with the structures and processes of dispossession and violence, and seek to naturalize and eternalize settler dispossession and occupation of Indigenous lands.

the wide breadth of settler colonial strategies to remove Indigenous communities from lands, but also as peoples themselves.

Settler colonialism, then, specifically structures society, social relations, and space in a number of particular ways. It is, in essence, all about access to the land, which can only occur via the dispossession, assimilation, or extermination of Indigenous peoples. Settler colonialism seeks permanence on the landscape, while resource extractive colonialism makes its mark, but eventually leaves, moving onto to fresh spaces of exploitation and extraction. Settler colonialism as a structure therefore requires directed attention.[99]

Settler colonialism, as a structure, is durable in the sense that it has maintained hierarchical, oppressive and dominating relations of settlers over Indigenous peoples, where violence and dispossession are at the very heart of the relationship (even it isn't the total of the relationship). It is has infected all aspects of settler societies, and very directly 'structures' their systems of governance, economy, social reproduction, land relations etc. The settler state continues to seek the suppression of Indigeneity, and facilitate access to Indigenous lands in the name of capitalist accumulation.[100] It is durable, but not inevitable, as Indigenous resistance continues to blunt any possibility of totalization.

---

[99] Lisa Ford (2013), on the other hand, contests the view of settler colonialism as structural in nature, which warrants brief mention. Ford, contra Wolfe, 'rejects the notions that settler states were ever total institutions and that settler colonialism is a structure bent inexorably on dispossession, subordination, erasure or extinction (cf. Wolfe 1999, Wolfe 2007).' Rather, 'the contingency and incompleteness of settler states and their collective, indigenous interlocutors' comes from 'the constitutive nature of their interactions, however unequal' (p. 11). Both Indigenous peoples and settlers 'are historically emergent as individuals and collectivities' and refuses reference to an 'eternal indigene' (Ford, 2013, p. 3). I think this is salient to a degree, in that Ford points to how both settler and Indigenous societies have engaged one another, with elements of reciprocity and exchange over time. Settler colonialism is not total, in the sense that there are many gaps and crevices where spaces of Indigenous resistance and autonomy have been and are created, despite its overwhelming power and dominance. Settler colonialism is not a total finished product. This contains, and leaves room for, ongoing processes of resistance and resurgence.

[100] This point is reflected in Coombes (2006), who suggests that despite a shared settler colonial structure, the particularities of the various settler states, such as Canada, the US, New Zealand, or South Africa have been determined and contingent with regard to the specific relationship that they have with Indigenous communities. In this sense, each state has had a slightly different history. Elkins and Pedersen (2005) cast an even wider net to include many countries in both Africa and Southeast Asia as well. My analysis here looks more so at the general traits of settler colonialism, with a slight emphasis on the Canadian and US settler states. There are many, like

A structural view, as per Wolfe, indicates the direct relationship that settler colonialism has to both the state and capitalism, hence its importance as a framework for both anti-state and anti-capitalist movements. A structural view 'highlight[s] the systemic effects of a set of social processes, which are more than the mere aggregation of the individual actions taken within' (Nichols, 2020, p. 88) and indicates the importance of not just the intent of respective actors and individual events, but considers their wider effects and implications.[101]

Capitalist Expansion and Settler Colonialism

Settler colonialism did not arise on its own, without connections to the development of the state and capitalism that had been slowly occurring in Europe before settlers and colonizers came to North America. This section considers the earlier development of these structures in order to clarify the explicit and ongoing links between capitalism, the state, and settler colonialism. This draws explicit connections between structures at the forefront of anarchist opposition to all forms of oppression and domination, but whose direct links, and continued implications, need to be more deftly incorporated into anarchist theory and value-practices.

The state is a structure that carries the monopoly on force, as the 'relatively centralized, differentiated organizations the officials of which more or less successfully claim control over the chief concentrated means of violence within a population inhabiting a large, contiguous

---

Coombes (2006) or Elkins and Pedersen (2005) who take up a much more comparative analysis of settler colonialism, which at times can feel more like a patchwork of articles and examinations of particular locales. I argue for a structural view of settler colonialism as a necessary starting point for analysis in this particular context, linked to the state and capitalism.

[101] Despite these important reasons for considering settler colonialism as a structure, Nichols also points out that dispossession needs to be consider as a process: 'Generating its own conditions of possibility, dispossession entails producing property out of systemic theft. … Recursion therefore combines self-reference with positive feedback loops. This feature is occluded by the language of "structures", which cannot account for dynamism within endurance' (p. 91). Therefore 'Dispossession can thus be used to name a historical process with supervenient properties, which has important implications for both descriptive and normative analysis. This characterization is preferable to one that juxtaposes structure versus event, since it specifies the mediation between structure and event by accounting for how various individual "events" of dispossession related to one another in recursive fashion' (p. 92). Discussing settler colonialism as structure I don't think forecloses such ongoing and expansive processes, and their differential operation across variant spaces and times. Despite the reasons that Nichols notes about highlighting systemic aspects of ongoing processes, I still find the structural framing useful, especially when considered alongside structural analysis of connections with capitalism and the state.

territory' (Tilly, 1985, p. 170). The state is not just government, but the associated arms that include police, military, and prisons, but also social service/welfare affiliated programs and organizations. As Erik Laursen (2021) argues, the present constructions of states can be understood as a 'vast operating system for ordering and controlling functions and relations among human society, economy, populations, and the natural world,' not simply controlled by a specific group or set of relations, but a centralizing and expanding structure (p. 59). It is a 'comprehensive means of organizing and exercising power that, once launched, expands to cover more and more aspects of existence according to a direction and logic of its own' (Laursen, 2021, p. 60), both in physical and official terms (as hardware), but also through 'ideas, doctrines, demands, and processes that direct the deployment of human beings and their deployment of physical resources' (software) (p. 61).

Despite the range of contexts in which states continue to predominate, even those that avoided forms of European colonization have been modelled on of a European referent, 'as their elites sought to guarantee themselves a seat at the table the Europeans were setting' (Laursen, 2021, p. 85), and away from any other traditional/alternative forms of organization. The state has an element of uniformity, expansiveness, and totality as a structural form (though this cannot be confused with an unchangeable inevitability). Anarchists have been particularly interested in the ways that the state has arisen and given way to authoritarianism and domination.[102]

The modern state arose in the early 1600s, Linebaugh and Rediker (2000) note, marked by the change in the balance of power consolidated by Northwestern European states in place of power centred in the Mediterranean (p. 15). It is intimately connected to the rise and persistence of capitalism. The state, according to Laursen (2021), was the 'original capitalist,' whose 'fundamental aspiration is to incorporate every inch, every corner of the society over which it presides into a vast wealth-producing machine' (p. 99). The state and capitalism seek continual expansion of power, influence, and organization—'perpetual growth' with an

[102] For a more detailed anarchist assessment of this, see Gelderloos (2016).

'insatiable need ... to track, record, evaluate, and make these resources more exploitable' (Laursen, 2021, p. 104). They share an inseparable, co-dependent relationship.

The structural view of settler colonialism accords very much with anarchist understandings of the state. The state, as per above, is a large, if not imposing structure in its own right, with many moving parts and cannot easily be reduced (or 'smashed') in any simple way. It is durable insofar as it is a widely cast structure and seeks its own maintenance, proliferation, and expansion. War is one of the key means that states are maintained and expand, much like settler colonialism. The state is also a structure, composed of a range of institutions, ideologies, norms, techniques of power, and forms of violence—it isn't one building, one government, one moment, or one idea. As noted by Gustav Landauer (2010) in the previous chapter, the state is also a series of relationships, and one means of resistance is to begin to conceive of new forms of relating. The state is a significant obstacle to the imagination and construction of alternatives. But it is not an inherent, all encompassing, or inevitable structure either. As James C. Scott (1999, 2010) suggests, across many of his works, the state can at times be directly resisted, but also ignored, evaded, or over-extended.

Capitalist expansion, in addition to forces of war and violence noted above, persists via primitive accumulation (which I take up below), the privatization of previously communal lands, and the push of former subsistence/peasant workers into wage work, largely in urban centres. Capitalism carries the expansion of international trade networks, the rise of national economies directly tied to the state, the rise of corporations and trading companies, and the expansion of resource extraction throughout the world. Along with the state form, capitalism has come to structure nearly every corner of the contemporary world.

The state and capitalism, in some ways, predate the elaboration of structures of settler colonialism, while settler colonialism, and colonialism generally, allows for greater expansion of both the state and capital. The result, then, is a complex set of interdependent relations between these three structures, in addition to other forms of oppression and domination such as white supremacy or heteropatriarchy. As a result, for those committed to radical forms of

transformation and opposition to oppression and domination, each cannot be understood in isolation, even if there may be moments that demand more specific emphasis.

Ultimately, 'Structuring logics of dispossession, racialization, elimination, and exploitation need to be denaturalised, before they can be overthrown' (Englert, 2022, p. 25). This is the task of understanding and detailing the structural nature of settler colonialism, capitalism, and the state, and my overall aim here. 'To understand settler colonialism,' Englert (2022) argues, 'as co-constitutive of power structures that continue to dominate us all, is also to engage differently with the ongoing struggles against it' (p. 234). It is to reframe the context of resistance and re-orient radical political projects towards an anti-colonial and Indigenous resurgent future. Analysis, theory, struggle, and solidarity are all essential ingredients for expanding the radical potentials for resistance on stolen lands. This continues to be a necessary task within anarchist movements most specifically (Lewis, 2016, 2017).

Part of this impetus is to bring in settler colonialism as a much more significant structure. Hall (2010) argues that there has been little concerted work to consider the connection of colonization to the rise of capitalism, and especially in major theorists such as Karl Marx or David Harvey (p. 32). This is especially troublesome given the 'imperial history of empire building has been a major driving force in the transformation of Earth into property,' the mass and rapid processes of accumulation and commodification that have taken place in the 'New World'—leading to accelerated capitalist growth and expansion, and all predicated on Indigenous dispossession (p. 32). There is a need to look directly at the relationship between the consolidation of the state, the development of capitalism, and the expansion of settler colonialism.

The rise of capitalism, following Silvia Federici (2004), cannot be easily divided into defined periods of transition. Rather than a sort of linear narrative whereby capitalism builds along a chronological continuum, Federici suggests viewing the rise of capitalism in temporal terms with elements already existing and taking shape before a precisely defined capitalist moment. Primitive accumulation is one such continual process, not just one initial point to kick-start the

ascendance of capitalism, and is a necessary lens for understanding the development and continued structure of settler colonialism.

Primitive Accumulation

In Chapter 26 of *Capital* Karl Marx (1887) frames primitive accumulation as the 'starting point' of the 'capitalistic mode of production,' (p. 505):

> the process which takes away from the labourer the possession of his means of production; a process that transforms, on the one hand, the social means of subsistence and of production into capital, on the other the immediate producers into wage labourers. The so-called primitive accumulation, therefore, is nothing else that the historical process of divorcing the producer from the means of production. It appears as primitive, because it forms the prehistoric stage of capital and the mode of production corresponding to it. (p. 506)

Workers were stripped of their ability to subsist on the land, expropriated 'in letters of blood and fire,' and forced into wage-labour relations (Marx, 1887, p. 506). Feudal exploitation, in service to a lord, was moved to service of industrial capitalists. Commonly held lands were enclosed with the ability of subsistence foreclosed. Private property was created and individually parcelled at the expense of social and communal forms (Marx, 1887, p. 539). Marx (1887) contends that the 'expropriation of the agricultural producer, of the peasant, from the soil, is the basis of the whole process' (p. 506), though the specific aspects of such a process look different across contexts. The fundamental aspect is severing relationships and access to land, and dependence on selling one's labour/body for a wage to survive.

He argues:

> As soon as this process of transformation has sufficiently decomposed the old society from top to bottom, as soon as the labourers are turned into proletarians, their means of labour into capital, as soon as the capitalist mode

> of production stands on its own feet, then the further socialisation of labour and further transformation of the land and other means of production into socially exploited and, therefore, common means of production, as well as the further expropriation of private proprietors, takes a new form. That which is now to be expropriated is no longer the labourer working for himself, but the capitalist exploiting many labourers. (Marx, 1887, p. 539)

One of the essential starting points, then, for examining the expansion of capitalism linked with settler colonialism begins with primitive accumulation in Europe, and Britain specifically, with the enclosures, and the privatization of the commons. Communal use was prevented, illegalized, and severally punished (to the point of death) in favour of private plots that had to be purchased or rented. While previously peasants may have had access to land to build small cottages, and were able to produce for themselves, enclosure meant a regime of reliance on a feudal lord for work, with little to no safety net that might come from the self-sufficiency of communal lands.

Silvia Federici (2004) suggests that the move towards capitalism and the enclosures came from the feudal lords as a response to previous gains of the peasants to widely access lands. This included the peasant view that the land which they used was 'their own' and promoted self-reliance that led to a push for more freedoms from the lords. 'The commons' provided an impetus for further resistance, and has been mythologized into present aspirations for a better society as well, though there is a danger in fetishizing or idealizing such an experience that was frequently filled with hardship and repression (Federici, 2004, p. 24).[103]

Federici (2004) uses the term 'land expropriation' to cover the range of land privatization that took place, beginning in the late 15th century, where 'the evictions of tenants, rent increases, and increased state taxation, leading to debt and the sale of land … occurred against the individual's or community's will and undermined their capacity for subsistence' (p. 68).

[103] On the problematic colonial aspects of commons discourses see Fortier (2017). On the commons, and resistance in general, as 'history from below' see Linebaugh (2015).

Enclosure, on the other hand, refers more precisely to the efforts in the 16th century, and well into the 18th, to abolish the 'open-field system,' fencing off the commons and destroying the shacks of poor peasants who could live on the commons via customary rights (p. 69). The implication, in addition to dispossessing people from their lands and pushing them towards a wage economy with many seeking work in the cities and towns, was a breaking of peasant collective decision making, sociality, and solidarity (p. 71). The fundamental aspect of enclosure is the creation of fenced and registered private property that kept others out and livestock in (Hall, 2010, p. 171). The enclosures broke up not only land, but also the ability for the peasants to self-organize and agitate for greater freedoms. This was a process of dispossession that was to soon be exported to North America.

There was also a move towards, in conjunction with land enclosures, social enclosure, from the community to the family, and from the public to the private. This comes with the move of peasant populations to cities, and the resultant explosion of the population, precipitating a crisis of overpopulation in Europe and the rise of programs of social assistance (Federici, 2004, p. 84).[104] Land privatization was thus just the first step in getting more people into waged work that was located in cities, and then with the rise of the population, the resulting mass unemployment and increase in poverty.

As Linebaugh and Rediker (2000) argue:

> the many expropriations of the day—of the commons by enclosure and conquest, of time by the puritanical abolition of holidays, of the body by child stealing and the burning of women, and of knowledge by the destruction of

[104] There is also a profoundly gendered dimension of primitive accumulation: 'the power-difference between men and women and the concealment of woman's unpaid-labor under the cover of natural inferiority, have enabled capitalism to immensely expand the "unpaid part of the working day," and use the (male) wage to accumulate women's labor; in many cases, they have also served to deflect class antagonism into an antagonism between men and women (p. 115). Thus, primitive accumulation has been above all an accumulation of differences, inequalities, hierarchies, divisions, which have alienated workers from each other and even from themselves,' including the land as an initial form. Patriarchy is a key mediating factor of primitive accumulation.

> guilds and assaults on paganism—gave rise to new kinds of workers in a new kind of slavery, enforced directly by terror. (p. 40)

These workers were defined, by those such as Sir Walter Raleigh or Francis Bacon, as the many-headed hydra which had to be put down (Linebaugh & Rediker, 2000, pp. 40, 3). State forms of repression swung into play to silence collective resistance.

So begins the intensification of capitalist wage-labour relations, large scale industrialization and the acceleration of other key Marxist concepts of alienation, exploitation, extraction of surplus value, etc. Marx (1887) notes that colonization, land theft, and slavery are the 'chief momenta of primitive accumulation' with the extracted resources fuelling capitalism in the colonial centres, and then precipitating further expansion in the colonies (p. 531).[105] Force and violence are the primary means of theft and dispossession:

> These methods depend in part on brute force, e.g., the colonial system. But, they all employ the power of the state, the concentrated and organized force of society, to hasten, hot-house fashion, the process of transformation of the feudal mode of production into the capitalist mode, and to shorten the transition. Force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one. It is itself an economic power. (Marx, 1887, pp. 531–532)

[105] Marx notes as well in Chapter 33: The Modern Theory of Colonisation that such primitive accumulation processes are extended to the colonies as well, though he focuses, here, much more directly on its impacts on settler wage relations, rather than Indigenous nations and land (a fundamental intervention of Coulthard's work). He notes the ways in which the wide availability of (stolen) land limits the need for wage relations as individual property and subsistence does not compel workers to sell their labour, but to work for themselves. This is uprooted through government/capitalist land sales schemes: 'Let the Government put upon the virgin soil an artificial price, independent of the law of supply and demand, a price that compels the immigrant to work a long time for wages before he can earn enough money to buy land, and turn himself into an independent peasant. The fund resulting from the sale of land at a price relatively prohibitory for the wage-workers, this fund of money extorted from the wages of labour by violation of the sacred law of supply and demand, the Government is to employ, on the other hand, in proportion as it grows; to import have-nothings from Europe into the colonies, and thus keep the wage labour market full for the capitalists' (p. 544).

The state is linked directly to the expansion of primitive accumulation and capitalism. Marx's theorization of primitive accumulation provides a framework to consider the expansion of capitalism and its explicit connection to the state and colonization.

It is evident, however, that Marx intends this as an early stage in the transition to capitalism, which will eventually be complete so capitalism 'can stand on its own'. There is a definitiveness in Marx here, suggesting that at some point this process of primitive accumulation will be complete, and that fails to account for contemporary forms of expansion and dispossession pushed by capitalism.

Federici (2004) suggests that Marx's conception of primitive accumulation, which 'consists essentially in the expropriation of the land from the European peasantry and the formation of the "free", independent worker' with some tacit reference to slavery and colonization, is an insufficient characterization (pp. 63–64). She suggests, rather than just focusing on workers, with international processes of slavery and colonization as an addendum, that understandings of capitalist development need to consider the 'transformation of the body into a work machine,' with primitive accumulation as the 'accumulation of differences and divisions within the working class,' specifically race, gender and age (p. 63). Federici is significant in her treatment of the gendered nature of capitalist accumulation and the specific impacts on women and their resistance to it. The witch hunts, which I turn to below, are a key manifestation of its profoundly gendered, violent, and repressive manifestations.

Adding further nuance and contextualization suitable to settler colonial contexts, Glen Coulthard (2014) argues that Marx's concept of primitive accumulation must also be translated in 'conversation with the critical thoughts and practices of Indigenous peoples themselves' (p. 8). To do so, Coulthard argues, like Federici above, Marx's concept needs a temporal reframing. Its 'normative developmentalism' and modernist associations with progress need to be jettisoned (as Indigenous alternatives to capitalism stand on their own, outside the framework of developmental stages; p. 152), along with a contextual shift 'from an emphasis on the *capital relation* to the *colonial relation,'* away from the primary subject as the waged worker to the colonized (pp. 9–11).

Settler colonialism is a process of domination 'structured into a relatively secure or sedimented set of hierarchical social relations that continue to facilitate the dispossession of Indigenous peoples from their lands and self-determining authority' (Coulthard, 2014, p. 7). State and capital seek ongoing access to land and resources, and expand to 'forcefully open up what were once collectively held territories and resources to privatization (dispossession and enclosure),' while also cementing disconnection from the land and reliance on wage labour for survival (Coulthard, 2014, p. 7). Coulthard (2014) echoes Marx's original formulation but places it squarely within a settler colonial context narrated by dispossession, that is a core logic rather than proletarianization alone, and further evidenced by the ways that it informs 'Indigenous resistance and critique' related to land as a foundational concern (p. 13). By reframing primitive accumulation in this way, as a recurrent and ongoing process, Coulthard suggests that dispossession is a fundamental logic that underscores capitalism within the context of settler colonialism, not simply proletarianization alone. It is an 'ongoing practice of dispossession that never ceases to structure capitalist and colonial social relations in the present. *Settler colonialism is territorially acquisitive in perpetuity*' (p. 152).

Part of this dynamic, Barker highlights, is the ongoing construction of settler colonial spaces as 'frontiers.' Frontiers are outside claimed and structured settler colonial space, at the edges forefront of dispossession. Barker (2021) describes the process:

> The configuration of frontier spaces as the targets of land acquisition for new settler colonial ventures drives the expansion of settler colonial space. Consequently, although a frontier may be outside of settler colonial space, it is incorporated into settler colonial imagined geographies. The anticipatory geographies of colonization need to reference frontiers becoming settler spaces in accordance with the myths of progress that underpin settler colonial claims to place. (p. 139)[106]

[106] Barker agues further that there are also 'internal' spaces that have been constructed as frontiers, such as suburban areas that have historically prompted 'white flight' from the inner cities. The suburban, in this sense,

The spatial aspect of settler colonialism, therefore, continues to engage processes of primitive accumulation and dispossession, seeking new places of expansion, while also constructing their incorporation into settler colonial structure as inevitable.[107]

Further, despite ongoing and sustained forms of violent dispossession of Indigenous lands, Coulthard (2014) argues that this is also sustained through the 'productive' application of colonial power—'its ability to produce *forms of life* that make settler-colonialism's constitutive hierarchies seem natural' (p. 152). Settler colonial power seeks to naturalize and regularize the existence of colonial relations and their maintenance by the state and capitalism in the past, present, and into the future.[108]

Coulthard's intervention into Marx suggests the very real need to engage with settler colonialism as a structure that developed alongside and in connection to capitalism, and which is also maintained to this day. This modification, or recontextualization, of primitive

---

provides a haven or escape from the racialized, crime-ridden, dangerously constructed city, and is able to be re-made in a safe settler colonial image. It seems relevant as well to consider process of gentrification here, as forms of primitive accumulation and dispossession that seek to take back, or re-colonize, spaces that have become wild, unruly, etc. See Coulthard (2014, pp. 175–176) on the concept of 'urbs nullius' as a process of gentrification to further empty out the existence of Indigenous peoples and sovereignties from urban space.

[107] The context of land and geography is a foundational aspect of settler colonialism. Despite anarchist (and other radical geography perspectives) engagements with systems of violence and domination, there has been little sustained discussion of how settler colonialism figures into such contexts, despite some interventions by Springer (2014, 2013, 2012) and much of Adam Barker's work (2010, 2012, 2021, and with Pickerill, 2012). Anarchist geographic perspectives combine opposition to all forms of oppression and domination, critique of the state, and prefigurative possibilities (highlighted in the previous chapter) with an orientation to the 'cultural, social, economic and political environs,' as located in particular places and spaces (Ince, 2010, p. 282). If, following Clough and Blumberg (2012), 'geography cannot be tangential in understanding the development of anarchist perspectives,' where geography 'is precisely what shapes the *place-based* diversity of anarchist approaches' (p. 340; emphasis mine), there needs to be an explicit consideration of settler colonial structures. As I have argued elsewhere: 'If anarchist perspectives and alternatives are understood as *place-based*, what are the grand implications for failing to engage with settler colonialism and Indigenous struggles for autonomy? The implication, as has been argued, is at worst creating a specifically anarchist terra nullius, or at least writing Indigenous peoples out of histories of struggles and examples of alternatives to state. In this sense, there is a need for a much greater decolonial turn in anarchist geography, and anarchism writ large, given our location in the structural context of settler colonialism' (Lewis, 2016, p. 226).

[108] Although beyond the scope of my discussion here, Coulthard brings in the work on Frantz Fanon and the politics of recognition, internal colonization, and ultimately alternative means of 'self-empowerment through the reclamation and revitalization of pre-colonial social relations and cultural traditions' (p. 153). The antidote, ultimately, is a resurgent Indigenous mode of life and practice based in community-specific grounded normativities. I consider the implications of grounded normativities for anti-colonial resistance in later chapters.

accumulation therefore shows the root of capitalist expansion in dispossession of Indigenous nations and relationships to land.

Dispossession

Dispossession, as a term closely linked but also distinct from primitive accumulation, deserves some further consideration. Robert Nichols (2020), drawing from and reformulating Marx, while engaging Coulthard and other scholars of dispossession (Luxemburg, Harvey, Federici, etc.), argues that dispossession provides a more specific account of the processes of land theft than primitive accumulation.[109] Nichols argues that primitive accumulation is best left to the earlier 'originary' framing, noted above, that gave rise to widespread capitalism and wage labour discussed by Marx, rather than a recurrent constituent aspect of settler colonialism. Dispossession, he argues, is a more clear and potent terminology, that can be developed from Marx's original work.

Nichols (2015) argues that dispossession is about the specific relation of theft—'the process by which "immediate producers" are separated from direct access to the means of production and/or subsistence' in a structured and continuing way (p. 22). The move is towards 'disaggregating primitive accumulation' to 'allow for the possibility of relating exploitation and dispossession' as more potent and specific descriptors of the processes at play, 'rather than assuming they hang together in the manner envisioned by Marx's "classic form"' (p. 22). Nichols (2015) argues that dispossession has greater and differential explanatory power as it is not reducible to a push for proletarianization, but rather alters relations to land. Land is not simply another form of property or possession, but 'the condition of possibility for the *production* of goods and, ultimately, for the reproduction of social life itself' (p. 23).

[109] Nichols (2015) specifically takes Harvey to task for borrowing the language of dispossession/primitive accumulation as 'essentially a stand-in for privatization: "the transfer of productive public assets from the state to private companies", especially as a result of the supposed over-accumulation of capital in neoliberal times' (p. 20).

Dispossession from land is indicative 'of the ways in which capitalism disrupts or disturbs our orientation in space, our place-based relations' (p. 22).[110]

In sum:

> dispossession comes to name a distinct logic of capitalist development grounded in the appropriation and monopolization of the productive powers of the natural world in a manner that orders (but does not directly determine) social pathologies related to dislocation, class stratification and/or exploitation, while simultaneously converting the planet into a homogeneous and universal means of production. Moreover, since we have freed this formulation from the specific historical configuration envisioned by the original analysis of primitive accumulation, we can properly view it as a process that is constitutive and contemporary. (Nichols, 2015, p. 27)

Nichols (2020) considers how dispossession alters and structures property relations as a form of 'property-generating theft' (p. 9), which 'merges commodification (or, perhaps more accurately, "propertization") and theft into one moment' (p. 8). Within the context of settler colonialism, dispossession 'refer[s] to a process in which new proprietary relations are generated but under structural conditions that demand their simultaneous negation. In effect, the dispossessed come to "have" something they cannot use, except by alienating it to another' (p. 8). Dispossession 'transforms non-proprietary relations into proprietary ones while, at the same time, systematically transferring control and title of this (newly formed) property.' Original 'ownership' is acknowledged only 'retroactively, that is, refracted backward through the process itself' (p. 8). This form of recursive dispossession, Nichols argues, is thus more

[110] This is an important distinction. Structures of settler colonialism, dispossession, and primitive accumulation are not just about theft, but the disruption and destruction of whole ways of life, to refer back to Wolfe's logic of elimination. Nichol's summarizes: 'This basic point has important implications for any theoretical analysis of the specificity of political struggles mediated primarily through relationships to land, belying any simple reduction to questions of property and theft. To give but one quick example, a 'right of return' in the context of struggles over land entails not a return of the property to the original owner, but a return of the owner to her original home' (p. 24).

reflective of the phrase 'theft is property' (rather than the more common anarchist phrase 'property is theft')[111] as it is only through the colonial process of theft/dispossession that property relations are created—they cease to exist before such theft occurs, and are then only acknowledged after the fact, after they have been disposed of. Theft, in this formulation, is what makes property to begin with. Such a transformation of theft into property refuses both prior Indigenous 'ownership/possession' and any argument of wrongdoing in the present.

Nichols (2020) argues that dispossession, rather than primitive accumulation, captures 'the real sense that colonization (especially settler colonization) does involve a unique species of theft for which we do not always have adequate language' (p. 30). It gets at the combination of processes that 'transforms non-proprietary relations into proprietary ones while, at the same time, systematically transferring control and title of this (newly formed) property. It is thus not (only) about the *transfer* of property but the *transformation into* property. In this way, dispossession creates an object in the very act of appropriating it' (p. 30).[112]

Primitive accumulation, Nichols (2020) argues, explains 'the strange alchemy of capital's emergence out of *noncapital*' rather than 'the subsumption of noncapital by *already existing* capital. This is why colonial policy of the nineteenth or twentieth century is not analogous to primitive accumulation in seventeenth century England' (p. 69). In Nichols' view, primitive accumulation would need to be overly reconstructed to remain as a framework after the

[111] Nichols (2020) discusses the anarchist formulation 'Property is theft' directly here, and details his reformulation to account for the ways that Indigenous claims to property are dismissed even while a process of theft, which would require property to begin with, is underway. The anarchist framework employed here, Nichols suggests, focuses on expropriation from original peasants as 'a coercive and illegitimate transfer of property from the original owners' whereas Marxism mobilized dispossession 'to refer to the initial "separation-process" … that separated "immediate producers" from direct access to the means of production, thus forcing them into new labour conditions, now mediated by the way of the wage' (p. 27). Thus there is a move away from 'theft' as the core concept here and towards dispossession, as claiming theft is also to suggest that private property exists before theft occurs (p. 26). Nichols is trying to clarify this dispossession process, in particular as a set of colonial relations.

[112] In other words: 'Indigenous claims to the land are not mistaken or confused at all but rather reflect the paradoxical fact that, in this context, possession does not precede dispossession but is its effect' (Nichols, 2020, p. 34). Such is a further means of refusing Indigenous claims and supplanting settler claims to land.

original movement from noncapital to capital, as Marx speaks about it. This is not to say that capitalism doesn't continue to expand, but that this occurs after a specific initial process.

Engaging Marx directly, Nichols (2020) identifies 4 key elements of primitive accumulation that occur simultaneously: '1) dispossession, 2) proletarianization, 3) market formation, and 4) the separation of agriculture from urban industry' (p. 59). For Marx, dispossession is tied to these other elements: 'The enclosures of the commons and the clearing of the land are undertaken *in order that* a labour market will emerge' (p. 73). Nichols suggests that dispossession does not always equal proletarianization, and therefore it is 'possible to recast dispossession as a distinct category of violent transformation independent of the processes of proletarianization and market formation' (p. 74).[113]

With direct reference to relationships to land that are so foundational here, Nichols (2020) argues:

> Most obviously, generalized concerns with the commodification of land tend to ignore the extent to which this process has been subtended by systematic transfer, loss, and group differentiation. It is not only that the earth has been commodified, privatized, and "enclosed" but that colonization generates a form of commodification so as to divest Indigenous peoples in a distinct and particular way of their ancestral homes. The duality of this process (propertization and systemic theft) is what the concept of dispossession is meant to capture. (p. 98)

As a result Nichols advocates for a terminology that still considers the initial aspect of primitive accumulation, but seeks to uncover the enduring and expansive elements.

---

[113] Nichols argues that when looking at Marx, and his conceptions of exploitation and expropriation, dispossession must be understood as a particular and distinct form of violence. It cannot be reduced to either of these also important concepts. Rather, 'the "separation process" at the heart of dispossession is a separation of the bulk of humanity from the productive power of nature' (p. 83), rather than accumulation of surplus value in exploitation or the means of production in expropriation (p. 82). Land, again, is foundational to dispossession, and indicates its explanatory power in colonial contexts.

The recursive nature of dispossession that Nichols emphasizes, however, seems to also have a certain 'originary' character, in a somewhat similar way to his critique of reframing's of primitive accumulation by Coulthard or Federici. The specific recursive relationship that Nichols notes is an important contribution and generates greater insights into how processes of dispossession occur on directly settler colonial terms, as a further disavowal of Indigenous sovereignties and autonomies. It does, however, suggest an initial step, where theft generates property. Under the ongoing structures of settler colonialism, where property relations have functionally invaded many lands already, at least under the eyes of the law, it seems like there may be little space for continued aspects of such a recursive dynamic. Property has been made up to this point, and may even be relatively complete as a process, more so than the actual dispossession and clearing of peoples from their lands. In this sense, while the notion of dispossession is still important in marking the separation of peoples from land, it needs to also be considered in the current set of relations as well.

As Pflug-Back and Kesīqnaeh (2016) argue: 'Capitalism assimilates non-capitalist ways of being, quashing Indigenous communitarian economies. Imposing extractive industries on Indigenous people who are denied other options is a powerful way for capitalism to expand its reach and eliminate alternative livelihoods' (para. 16). The Canadian economy is predicated on continual forms of resource extraction, based on expanding forms of primitive accumulation and dispossession against Indigenous communities. Indigenous peoples are primarily viewed as 'physical obstacles standing in the way of resource capital—rather than a source of exploitable labour, they are obstacles to be removed through violence, assimilation, criminalization, and other genocidal measures' (para. 5).

As a result, I continue to find Coulthard's reframing of primitive accumulation, when coupled (but not replaced) with Nichols' detailed discussion of dispossession and theft, as a potent understanding of the ongoing process at play. There certainly is an 'originary' process of primitive accumulation at the outset of capitalism, but with greater contextualization towards colonial relations, the concept of primitive accumulation more deftly helps to understand the continual process of capitalist/colonial expansion. It is a dynamic embedded in the structures of

capitalism and settler colonialism and their continual co-constitution. While dispossession is still useful (as I employ below and throughout) to mark the aims of settler colonialism and separation of peoples from land, primitive accumulation is more detailed in its discussion of the drive for such separation, how it happens, and how it continues into the present. This helps to understand the ongoing processes of capitalist expansion.

Expansion in the 'New World'

Colonization was promoted in a number of ways, including expanding religious influence or for national glory, but also, as Linebaugh and Rediker (2000) argue, as a solution to domestic social issues in England (pp. 15–16). The propaganda of colonial advocates made continued reference to the 'swarmes of idle persons,' resulting from rampant unemployment, who might be better put to work in the 'New World' (p. 16). Colonization was viewed as a possible solution to decrease the population of workers in Europe, to quell their unrest as a result of being unable to work and thus get what they needed to survive, and as a means to populate the colonies.

Lorenzo Veracini (2021) notes that states employed displacement, emigration, and colonial settlement as 'an alternative to revolution,' to 'pre-empt social unrest' (p. 29). Migration was also taken up by 'radicals' who found revolution difficult or impossible in their respective European locations (p. 8). As a result, those with alternative visions of the world were pushed and/or invited to partake in settler colonial expansion 'to establish political orders elsewhere rather than replace existing ones' (p. 9) in the colonial metropole. Veracini argues that the result was not a revolutionary 'world turned upside down' but a 'world turned inside out' that creates a desire for 'settler utopia's' in other places and mobilizes discourses of terra nullius to do so (p. 20),[114] while also displacing class conflicts in Europe in favour of a 'new' settler colonial racial dynamic in North America (p. 16). These forms of displacement, movement, and settlement to set up a new polity based on the one that was left behind '*against* someone—in

[114] Such dynamics have continued to play out in the contemporary, specifically around radical commons discourses and movements that seek to create alternatives away from the dominant society, but frequently with little to no reference to the structures of settler colonization that have made space for such experiments, and the ways that the reply such structures in ongoing fashion in the present. On this point in particular see Fortier (2017).

the case of settler colonialism, against [I]ndigenous peoples' not just '*without* them: the settler colonial polity cannot be amended by inclusion, because it is foundationally violent and dispossessory' (p. 298). The desire to re-create the society that one left, or was displaced from, is a core settler colonial logic to enhance settler power and displace Indigenous sovereignties and relationships to land.

According to Nichols (2020), these processes of dispossession need to be considered specifically in the settler colonial North American context:

> What makes the Anglo settler colonial world such a unique and important lens through which to study this, however, is that it was a space where state formation and market formation not only took place simultaneously -the emergence of a market in land—but also that this was done in explicit opposition to Indigenous forms of life that presented radically distinct and divergent visions of the relationship between human societies and the lands on which they lived. Thus, the structure of property in land that took hold in the Anglo settler world was systematically oriented toward the dispossession of Indigenous peoples in a unique and noncontingent manner. (p. 35)

There is a dual process of dispossession occurring here:

> Thus, we find less a colonization process driven by state demands for territorial sovereignty *or* economic drives for capital accumulation than a complex meeting of both. The two were interwoven since, much as government officials might complain of meddlesome squatters, settlers were the primary mechanism by which the state was able to convert frontier land from a threatening external wilderness to a fiscal resource and national asset. (Nichols, 2020, p. 42)

As a result, the state, capital, and colonization are directly and explicitly connected to furthering and expanding dispossession against Indigenous communities that offer stark

alternatives to the expanding capitalist/private property status. War and violence are a core language of settler colonial, state, and capitalist expansion.

War, whether against workers' revolts, or Indigenous populations to secure access to land, was/is foundational to the expansion of the state and capitalist primitive accumulation. As Tilly (1985) argues, states are able to expand their capacities of influence and control over territory and peoples through the use of war. It allows them access to resources to expand their armies and systems of repression against those who revolt. It also pushes them towards greater forms of accumulation, in order to secure their dominance. The creation of large militaries could then expand outward and seek the conquest of other territories like North America. States use war for the purpose of pacification, both internally and externally, and use their force in order to sell protection to others (Tilly, 1985, p. 175), which for my purposes here includes the various settler colonial capitalist enterprises that sought to expand resource extraction and markets into North America. 'Thus,' Tilly concludes, 'a state that successfully eradicates its internal rivals strengthens its ability to extract resources to wage war, and to protect its chief supporters' (p. 181). Internal repression or removal of radical threats was thus at the forefront of state concerns.

Like Tilly, Pierre Bourdieu (1994) identifies the 'capital of physical force' as a key exercise and maintainer of state power (p, 5).[115] Such physical force is trained against rival states 'in and through war for land (which led to the creation of powerful armies),' as well as internally against both 'rival powers' seeking to capture the state, and against dissident movements from below (p. 5). This, Bourdieu argues, results in the split of state physical force between external militaries and internal police forces.

Bourdieu (1994), however, suggests that Tilly does not go far enough to also consider the symbolic nature of state power (p. 5). While physical force is a core logic of the state, and a key manifestation of its power, Bourdieu argues for a consideration of symbolic forms of power as

[115] I turn to Bourdieu in great detail in the following chapter regarding habitus, field and capital, but a few words on his discussion of the state as a structuring structure are important here as well.

well. The state is both 'specific organizational structures and mechanisms' as well as the 'mental structures and categories of perceptions and thought' which structure institutions as a natural and common sense reality (p. 4). This includes a number of forms of capital, of which physical force is one, in addition to economic, cultural, informational, and symbolic forms (like those identified by Laursen, 2021, and Landauer, 1920/2010 above).

Economic forms comprise the 'unification of economic space (creation of national market)' (Bourdieu, 1994, p. 6) while cultural and informational forms 'concentrates, treats, and redistributes information and, most of all, effects a *theoretical unification'* that both unifies and codifies (p. 7). It is these systems of classification that 'molds *mental structures* and imposes common principles of vision and division' (p. 7). Finally, symbolic forms are those various forms of capital that are perceived and imbued with value, such as titles, honours, etc. that are regulated by the state, and which become symbolically recognized as having power. In this sense they are contextual and explicitly constructed by the state and social forms of recognition. The 'state establishes and inculcates common forms and categories of perception and appreciation, social frameworks of perceptions, of understanding or of memory, in short *state forms of classification'* that come to also be known as '(national) common sense' (Bourdieu, 1994, p. 13).

Bourdieu thus adds a further dynamic to understandings of state power. Not just as physical forms of force and coercion, but also as the mental and cognitive structures that legitimize and maintain the perceived necessity of state power and structure. This also creates a level of common sense about the necessity of the state, and the importance of physically defending the state against all those, internal and external, who would seek to challenge it or create alternatives.

As Tariq Khan (2023) notes in great detail, US state genocidal violence was applied to Indigenous peoples, and then systemically reoriented towards repression of anarchists and

generalized 'anti-communism' in a broad anti-Left sense.[116] The continually repressive nature of the US settler state (for example) is not a break from the context of European statehood (however American statists and colonists mythologize as such), but an extension and reconstruction of the state societies that settlers left. A 'European-style "fiscal military state," a state that is designed primarily for war, not just militarily but also economically and politically' (Khan, 2023, p. 2). He notes that the 'Internal repression against proletarian insurgency was colonialism turned inward: meaning the tactics, weapons, mythology, and ideology the state wielded to control the foreign, migrant, multiracial, multilingual, multiethnic urban "rabble" were developed and refined in the Indian wars and other outward imperialist invasions and occupations' (p. 3). The state, in the service of capitalism and white supremacy, continued to hone practices of repression in order to respond to recurrent threats to the dominant order.

In particular, persistent settler colonial violence was couched in discourses of savagery, uncleanliness, misogyny, foreignness, and inferiority, in addition to disdain for constructions of community and resistance to private property relations. The ways in which such discourses were mobilized first against Indigenous peoples, and then turned inward to anarchists and other left-radicals/abolitionists were not identical (given the fundamentally differential social, cultural, and racial locations of those targeted) but intentionally borrowed and translated to other contexts. 'The language of dirt, disease, and infestation,' Khan (2023) argues, in need of 'cleansing, removing, and purification, is the language of settler colonialism and genocide. Because settler colonialism was so formative to United States culture and politics, this language

[116] Khan employs 'anticommunism' as a general term that typically encompasses specifically anarchist and 'anarchist-adjacent' individuals and movements given similar end goals of the state as a structure for both anarchists and communists, and given the contradictory and often imprecise ways that such movements have been characterized by the state itself (p. xi). This also considers the general anarcho-communist orientation of many anarchists during the period under discussion. Importantly, however, much of Khan's account is specifically focused on self-defined anarchists directly, given their frequent exclusion from discussion of state repression and resistance to the violence of the state within Marxist/liberal labour histories (p. 4). As a result terminology employed in relation to such movements is not always exact, but does highlight the direct ways that such movements were targeted for repression, frequently despite their more nuanced radical forms of politics. On other aspects of repression of anarchists and responses to it see, for example, Bray (2022).

became the language of political repression in general, even when that repression was aimed inward' (p. 65).

The opening and clearing of frontiers, and the desired destruction of Indigenous peoples as a part of settler colonial warfare, were turned towards anarchists seeking to foment revolt in cities, supporting strikes, and in specific instances of police, state, and media characterizations of key revolutionary events like the Haymarket Affair or the Paris Commune. The state held, and continues to hold, a persistent anxiety regarding those peoples, cultures, bodies, and ideas that fundamentally contest its legitimacy and hegemony.

Khan (2023) argues that 'the multiracial, anticolonial, and anti-imperialist nature of the anarchist movement is part of the reason that the bourgeoisie employed colonialist counterinsurgency strategies against movements it perceived to be anarchist' (p. 23). These movements represented (and hopefully continue to represent) sustained challenges to the power of the state and hegemonic ideas about how to structure society, community and economy. As I noted in Chapter 2, 'the anarchist vision was an anticolonial vision' (Khan, 2023, p. 19), even if this can continue to find some more specific elaboration in anarchist cultures of resistance.

As a result, a process of 'imperial feedback' (Khan, 2023; referencing Go, 2020) continues the process of exchanging and expanding the repressive techniques of the state, and their use against resistant populations (p. 7). This is another way that settler colonialism as a structure, based on a logic of elimination, continues to persist and maintain itself. Khan argues that 'anti-anarchism was one of the main vehicles by which the state turned colonialism inward' (p. 4) and helps to shed light on the violent and repressive nature of settler colonialism not just against Indigenous peoples, but also others who seek to exist and resist outside of it.[117]

[117] This is a hefty claim, but Khan traces the extension of colonial forms of repression through their extension to radical left movements as a significant turning point towards 'internal' repression. It should be clarified that this does not mean that such forms are equal, in any way, to the profound violence and dispossession used to target Indigenous peoples. Rather, Khan seeks to mark a significant expansion of settler colonial violence towards those that structurally, as settler/immigrant populations, also benefit from settler colonialism.

Khan notes in particular that both the violence against Indigenous nations and left-wing militants is firmly constituent of the war orientation of the state, and neither can be seen as exceptions or abominations. Genocidal and colonial violence—within and without—is constituent of the state both historically and into the present.[118] The repression of workers and communities who resisted enclosures was a first step in the construction of state forms of repression that were then expanded into North America, to protect and expand colonial capitalist interests through repression and dispossession of Indigenous nations, and which were then turned against dissident settler immigrant populations as well. Such a process of feedback continues today.

Federici too (2004) argues that both colonization and the slave trade served as test runs and experimental sites for the repression of labour unrest, and highlights the gendered nature of repression and domination (p. 105). Her work suggests a similar interplay between the management of labour/class relations in the metropoles and those in the 'New World.' Enclosure at home led to labour unrest, which then promoted enclosure abroad and further unrest, and shared techniques of repression across the board.

The witch hunts, Federici (2004) argues, were specific sites for testing and refining repression against unrest in Europe, exporting techniques to the New World to aid in the dispossession of Indigenous peoples. These tools of repression associated spirituality with paganism or devil worship, constructed Indigenous peoples as savage and in need of forced deliverance from their heathen ways, equated healing practices with magic or witchcraft, and condemned Indigenous sexuality and reproductive practices. Those so accused were burned at the stake, raped, murdered, mutilated, and tortured as the authorities saw fit, despite the vague

[118] It seems crucial to note that these processes of testing technologies and techniques of repression on Indigenous and colonized populations are not simply historical (although historical iterations are important in order to understand the inherent nature of such violence). The targeting of direct action Indigenous land reclamation movements like #NODAPL or Wet'suwet'un anti-pipeline struggles serve as potent localized examples, while the ongoing brutality of the forces of empire backing the Israeli settler state in Palestine continues to serve as a laboratory for techniques and technologies of repression that are tested and then exported throughout the world for use by other states. In terms of considering Palestine as a 'laboratory' of repression techniques to be broadcast and taken up elsewhere see 'Gaza is an image of the future' by Sub.media (2024) and Loewenstein (2024).

definition of what might qualify as witchcraft, and the impossibility of proving such crimes. This permits, Federici argues, the maximum amount of terror, as any practice or form of protest could be repressed simply by associating it with witchcraft (p. 170).[119] This was a profound assault on social and collective forms of reproduction. As Nichols (2020) observes:

> Capitalism needs non-capitalist social strata as a market for its surplus value, as a source of supply for its means of production and as a reservoir of labour power for its wage system … Capitalism must therefore always and everywhere fight a battle of annihilation against every historical form of natural economy that it encounters. (pp. 64–65)

It was not just repression against people, but against whole alternative forms of life/production that stood in the way.

Queer and Two-Spirit identities, or any association with existences outside of permissible settler heteropatriarchal forms of sexuality, became 'marked for death,' as such populations were constructed as undesirable and disruptive to consolidations of settler power. 'Terrorizing violence marked Native peoples as sexually deviant populations to be subjected to a colonial education of desire,' (Morgensen, 2010, p. 110), and created a white heteronormative 'settler sexuality' to supersede Indigenous sexualities with the 'sexual modernity of settler subjects' (Morgensen, 2010, p. 106).

Rather than specific crimes or offenses it was the 'elimination of generalized forms of female [and so-called 'sexually deviant'] behavior' that were intolerable and had to be punished and policed (Federici, 2004, p. 170).[120] The terror of the witch hunts was more about psychological warfare and promoting obedience as a 'deliberate strategy to instill terror, destroy collective

---

[119] Federici notes a similar vagueness currently employed with the term 'terrorist' in the contemporary period as well (p. 170).

[120] While Federici is most focused on women as an identity category here, she notes a wider application of violence to any identities outside of the patriarchal norm. There is a wider process of gendered violence and enforcement against any peoples and identities that feel outside of heteropatriarchal norms and standards. This includes queer identities, Two-Spirit ways of being, and beyond. On this point, especially as a part of settler colonialism, see Arvin et al. (2013), Morgensen (2011), and Smith (2005)

resistance, silence entire communities, and turn their members against each other. It was also a strategy of enclosure (noted above), of 'land, bodies or social relations' (Federici, 2004, p. 220). The impacts have been far reaching; as capitalism expanded via colonization it ensured that 'persecution would be planted in the body of colonized societies, and, in time, would be carried out by the subjugated communities in their own names and against their own members' (Federici, 2004, p. 237).

'While the response to the population crisis in Europe was the subjugation of women to reproduction, in colonial America, where colonization destroyed ninety-five percent of the aboriginal population, the response was the slave trade which delivered to the European ruling class an immense quantity of labor-power' (Federici, 2004, p. 103). The system of plantations helped to fuel the Industrial revolution and the expansion of capitalism. Slavery, capitalism, the state, and colonization become inseparably linked.

'But,' as Federici (2004) argues,

> capitalism may not have even taken off without Europe's "Annexation of America," and the "blood and sweat" that for two centuries flowed to Europe from the plantations. This must be stressed as it helps us realize how essential slavery has been for the history of capitalism, and why, periodically, but systematically, whenever the capitalist system is threatened by a major economic crisis, the capitalist class has to launch a process of "primitive accumulation," that is, a process of large-scale colonization and enslavement. (pp. 103–104)[121]

[121] Hall (2010) makes a similar argument, suggesting the convergence of slavery and colonization for the purpose of pushing capitalist accumulation and expansion further. 'Indeed,' he suggests, 'the genesis of slavery and the history of Aboriginal dispossession were closely intertwined throughout much of the Americas as interrelated aspects of the same process of economic transformation' (p. 324). Slavery occurred in synonymous fashion with the conquest of Indigenous lands, which makes the ongoing consideration of its legacy all the more necessary when we assess settler colonialism and its particular constructions of identity.

This process, she argues, is well under way today, as capitalism faces further crises. To return to my discussion above, this also indicates the persistent rationale for continued primitive accumulation, as capitalism continually seeks to abate crises.

There is a continuity in the processes of repression that were employed: 'In both cases we have the forcible removal of entire communities from their land, large-scale impoverishment, the launching of "Christianizing" campaigns destroying people's autonomy and communal relations. We also have a constant cross-fertilization whereby forms of repression that had been developed in the Old World were transported to the New and then re-imported to Europe' (Federici, 2004, p. 219). Following Khan (2023) above, such repressive techniques were shared across contexts, and such a process continues today. Primitive accumulation and dispossession are not isolated in narrow contexts, but are continually linked through shared violence and repression.

The use of brutal repression and terror then, despite the unjustified claims of colonizers seeking to repress devil-worship, sexual deviance, or justifying their response in terms of the perceived brutality of Indigenous cultural practices, 'must be seen as a response inherent to the logic of colonization that inevitably must dehumanize and fear those it wants to enslave' (Federici, 2004, p. 222). Federici's observation has clear resonance with the logic of elimination under settler colonialism. Primitive accumulation shows how these processes were undertaken and indicates expansion and dispossession of people from lands is at the heart of connected structures of capitalism, colonialism, slavery, and the state. The ways that dispossession, elimination, and primitive accumulation play out have profound implications for the ways that identities become specifically structured under settler colonialism.

Structures of Identity

In this section I detail some of the complexities of the term 'settler' and its relationship to Indigeneity, Blackness, and more recent migrant categories. Given attempts at the assimilation of Indigenous peoples, and the displacement from view and analysis of settler identities, Wolfe (1999) argues, 'positionality is not just central to the issues—it *is* the issue' (p. 3). Identity

dictates how we engage with the structure, how it affects our lives, the privileges and benefits that we might gain from it, and the ways we are situated to resist and reimagine. This demands a closer look at the ways in which settler identities are understood, but also the ways that Indigenous peoples and 'others' are defined in relation.

'Settler,' as an identity and structural location, produces a relationship of complicity to colonial structures, and benefits from such a location and alliance with structures of power and domination. As Alfred and Corntassel (2005) argue, settler colonialism is a 'narrative in which the Settler's power is the fundamental reference and assumption, inherently limiting Indigenous freedom and imposing a view of the world that is but an outcome or perspective on that power' (p. 601).[122]

Mar and Edmonds (2010) argue:

> In simplest terms, settler colonists went, and go, to new lands to appropriate them and to establish new and improved replicas of the societies they left. As a result Indigenous peoples have found an ever-decreasing space for themselves in settler colonies as changing demographics enabled ever more extensive dispossession. Settlers, in the end, tended not to assimilate into Indigenous societies, but rather emigrated to replace them. (p. 2)

This understanding takes a long view of settler colonialism and marks the relationship between Indigenous nations and the earliest settlers, but also the continued expansion of structures of dispossession. Settler migration was directly linked to dispossession and Indigenous displacement. Settler colonialism has continued to take up an expansionist logic, ever pushing the structural frontiers of its claims and dominion. Settlers seek to reconstruct the societies

[122] 'Limiting' but importantly not entirely dominating or foreclosing. As I have stated repeatedly, but which cannot be overstated, Indigenous freedom and resistance persists, refuting any possibility of totalizing settler colonial power and structure.

they left in ‘new’ lands, and also form and defend structures of power for their own collective benefit.

Settler forms of identity are also ‘racially, politically, and economically flexible’ and can ‘shapeshift,’ ‘accommodating different social practices and informing a variety of at times contradictory subsets of Settler identity’ (Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015, p. 70). ‘Settler’ denotes a colonial complicity in dispossession and land theft, but is also not fixed or singular. Taking a cue from intersectional analysis of systems of domination, settler identity is also further embedded in these systems and structures, and cannot be considered outside the broader relations at play. But there is an element of protracted settler conflict with Indigenous existence, as settlers occupy Indigenous land, and stand at the forefront of colonial expansion (Englert, 2022, p. 6). ‘Settlers settle. In doing so they also dispossess’ (Englert, 2022, p. 79).

By contrast, following Alfred and Corntassel (2005), ‘Indigenous peoples’ encapsulate the following, directly against settler imperatives:

> The communities, clans, nations and tribes we call *Indigenous peoples* are just that: Indigenous to the lands they inhabit, in contrast to and in contention with the colonial societies and states that have spread out from Europe and other centres of empire. It is this place-based existence, along with the consciousness of being in struggle against the dispossessing and demeaning fact of colonization by foreign peoples, that fundamentally distinguishes Indigenous peoples from other peoples of the world. (p. 597)

Both of these definitions point to the underlying dispossessive nature of settler colonialism, and persistent Indigenous struggles against it. ‘Indigenous’ serves as marker for what settlers are not: Settlers are not indigenous to the particular lands they inhabit, although they might be indigenous to somewhere else and have their own relationships to land. This is but one definition, but it is important for marking both resistance to colonization and connection to land. Such a definition also refuses the dominant state discourses around Indigenous identity that employ legal definitions of ‘Indians,’ ‘Aboriginals,’ ‘Native Americans’ etc. As Alfred (1999)

points out, these are constructed by the state for the purposes of control, assimilation, and further dispossession.[123] As such, Indigenous identity needs to be carefully considered on Indigenous terms in direct reference to the specific peoples in the context of lands with which we are concerned. Simply offering definitions of settler and Indigenous identity categories does not, however, fully encompass the ways that various groups and peoples are situated within settler colonial structures.

A binarist approach, however, maintains that these two categories are the dominant ones, where 'settler' is inclusive of all non-Indigenous peoples, with the understanding that there is a greater deal of complexity/hierarchy/stratification within the non-Indigenous/settler category (see, for example, Lawrence & Dua, 2005; Lawrence & Amadahy, 2010; Wolfe, 2013, among others).[124] Lawrence and Dua (2005) suggest that the primary reason that 'exogenous others' (those neither Indigenous nor white settler) ought to be understood as settlers is that they are invited to participate in the settler colonial project, against Indigenous peoples (p. 133). They are not just a third category in equal relation to settlers and Indigenous peoples, but effectively bolster settler claims to land, and might then be better understood as settlers themselves. There is an implicit argument that such 'others' are more settler than Indigenous and thus ought to be effectively collapsed within the settler category.

Revisiting this discussion, Lawrence and Amadahy (2010) suggest a specific framing of people of colour as settlers, with specific emphasis on slave descendent peoples, but acknowledge the differential terms on which this occurs: 'The reality then is that Black peoples have not been quintessential "settlers" in the White supremacist nature of the word; nevertheless, they have,

---

[123] Regarding these processes in Canada, and most specifically the gendered nature of such control, see Lawrence (2004).

[124] Faragher (2014) does point to a *tenary* relationship that occurs in the initial stages of settler colonial settlement, where there are 'metropole elites, colonial settlers, and aboriginal peoples' as a sort of settler colonial 'ideal type' (pp. 181–182). This *tenary* however can be seen to change, as the settler colony more firmly establishes itself and moves towards state independence. The metropole elites no longer factor into the new polity and thus the binary is born. This binary is also reflective of the frontier that pushes settler colonial control into Indigenous territory (Faragher, 2014). This underscores the shifting nature of settler colonial relations that need attention to specific historical contexts, not just wide ranging ideal types or generalizations (Schayegh, 2024).

as free people, been involved in some form of settlement process' (p. 107). The same is often applied to refugees and others who frequently arrive not of their own free will: the point is that all peoples who are not Indigenous participate in, and benefit from, Indigenous dispossession. Indigeneity becomes a marker against which all others might be defined. And to some degree rightly so, as Indigenous peoples are the foremost targets of settler colonization, and need also to be at the forefront of resistance and resurgence efforts.

Anticipating and responding to the criticism of a homogenizing binary, Patrick Wolfe (2013) refers to the structural relationship within settler colonialism. It is not whether immigration/settlement is a result of voluntary action, in this case, but of the participation in settler colonial structures. This includes upholding multiculturalism or educational systems that glaze over Indigenous history and histories of colonization, participation in resource extractive economies and industries that destroy Indigenous lands, or participation and support of the military or police that occupy Indigenous communities and seek to supress resistance. It is not an 'effect of the will,' as historical relations of settler colonialism precede more recent settlers, and migration of peoples does not 'alter the structural fact that their presence, however involuntary, was [and is] part of the process of Native dispossession' (Wolfe, 2013, p. 263).

The danger of upholding such a binary is that a greater contextualization of various groups' respective relationship to both settler and Indigenous identity categories is elided.[125] There is a tacit acknowledgement in Lawrence and Amadahy of the differential structural location of many peoples as a result of white supremacy (for example), despite their use of a generalized non-Indigenous identity. Coombes (2006), for example, suggests that such a wide use of the term settler serves only to mask the violence of colonialism, by creating a large settler category that obscures the 'primarily white British settler communities' that were integral to initial acts

[125] For one example of this see Sharma and Wright (2008–2009) who argue that affirming a settler/Indigenous binary is to take up a 'neo-racist' politics of exclusion, and instead advocate for moving towards a cosmopolitan 'global commons' where we can all get along. I turn to the question of 'commons' briefly in later chapters. On Sharma and Wright, see Wolfe (2013, p. 265). Despite their refutation of the binary approach Sharma and Wright trade it for a discourse that denies the specificity of Indigenous struggles and Indigenous resurgence politics.

of colonialization and which continue to be primary beneficiaries (p. 2). Coombes suggests rather a turn to 'political and cultural institutions and practices' in order to glean insights about the particular aspects of the settler colonial situation and for creating ways to resist it.

While the settler-Indigenous binary aims to refuse the kind of liberal democratic pluralism (Wolfe, 1994) that casts all actors on an equal playing field and as equal political participants in the state, this is not the only way to do so, as the disruptive approaches to Blackness highlighted below attest (p. 98). The binarist approach needs also to be challenged for 'flatten[ing] differences between non-Indigenous peoples' and only being used in a performative sense (Snelgrove in Snelgrove et al., 2014, p. 16). The utility for using the term settler might therefore depend on the context.

There is still a utility in naming 'settler' to denote colonial culpability, that also doesn't need to inherently mobilize a flattening effect that suggests 'we are all the same' or 'we are all equal'. The use of the term settler as the colonial counter to Indigenous names the logic of elimination and dispossession that settlers continue to benefit from. As Jeff Corntassel suggests, it might be most productively used in a disruptive sense, where settlers are most resistant to it (in Snelgrove et al., 2014, p. 16). It can still challenge the ways that processes of settlement have been normalized, especially for white European descendants. It is a still a 'dualism' that marks a specific relationship between Indigenous and settler peoples as part of settler colonial structures, especially in relation to land (Battell Lowman & Barker, 2015, p. 18).

As Battell Lowman and Barker (2015) argue:

> We say Settler because it's a place from which we can determine how we live on these lands. We say Settler to signal that we're ready to do the work. We say Settler because we believe ethical and exciting decolonial futures are possible. We say Settler because we have seen the identification shake how people feel about themselves and their belonging, and how it has been the start of decolonizing awareness and action. We say Settler because it is who we are. We say Settler because it is not everything we could be. (p. 123)

While relations created by settler colonialism have a foremost and significant set of impacts on Indigenous peoples, and provide a wide range of privileges to settlers, neither settlers nor Indigenous peoples are entirely reducible to settler colonialism, (Bell, 2014, p. 10). Settlers have previous histories, before they or their ancestors migrated, or were forced to move. They have their own cultures, and in many ways are 'indigenous' to somewhere themselves. Indigenous peoples have existences that predate contact with settlers, and cultural traditions and ways of being that while impacted by colonization are not entirely mediated by colonization itself.

Naming the colonial dynamic at play and placing settlers squarely in relation to structures of dispossession of Indigenous peoples is important and disruptive.[126] As Corey Snelgrove cautions (in Snelgrove et al., 2014), though, there is a danger is seeing settler identity itself 'as event rather than structure—where we are perhaps overly focused on the question of "who" at the expense of the "how"' (p. 22). He continues: 'If we don't understand how settlers are produced we run the risk of representing settlers as some sort of transhistorical subject with transhistorical practices' (p. 22). This observation challenges us to further understand the structural nature of settler colonialism, and how it produces different experiences for different locations.

The danger of any approach re-entrenching relations of domination is always a concern, as peoples are pushed apart from and into conflict with one another for the benefit of the state and capitalism. As the ongoing climate of reconciliation and recognition attests, simply acknowledging oneself as a settler does little to actively disrupt and destroy the structure itself.

---

[126] I haven't discussed in the complexities of many peoples having mixed heritage, which complicates the politics of identity. It further complicates the 'exogenous others' category discussed next, as well. It raises specifically the question of Métis peoples. This might point to the degree to which mixed identity peoples are more so connected to a particular part of their identity. Can they exist in society primarily as settlers and thus uphold settler colonialism and gain its benefits? Or do histories of violence and dispossession, or connections to community and culture, outweigh settler legacies? Or both? Depending on the person, any of these question might be more or less accurate. My discussion of the specific experiences of slave-descendant peoples touches on this question briefly, but the experiences and location of mixed peoples does require greater discussion (on mixed identities in general, see Lawrence, 2004, and on Métis peoples specifically, see Andersen, 2015). I write mostly in relation to predominantly white settler anarchist communities, and white settler communities writ large, where naming settler colonialism and considering complicity is most important.

But in this case perhaps there is something more at stake. For example, one of the key means of 'transfer'/dispossession/removal of Indigenous peoples has been through the regulation of identity, where a specific bar is set in order to determine 'authentic' Indigeneity, usually at the hands of the state. One of the necessary means of resisting assimilation for Indigenous communities has been to revitalize and affirm identity. In this sense, following Wolfe (2013), moving in another direction to collapse Indigenous and settler categories together would only further attempts at Indigenous assimilation, and remove the specificity of Indigenous sovereignty, which continues to stand in opposition to imposed settler sovereignties (p. 266).

The other view, prominent in the settler colonial studies literature, suggests three categories: Indigenous peoples, settlers and 'exogenous others.' According to Veracini (2010), other immigrants/refugees/descendants fall into the 'exogenous others' category because they do not come seeking to establish their own politically sovereign order, but as a result of myriad other factors (p. 17–18; not the least of which could be slavery, indentured labour, or forced migration, see Schayegh [2024]). Although 'exogenous others' do often buy into and benefit from settler colonialism, they are still compared, along with Indigenous peoples, to a normative white settler subject. Settler power is still the primary reference point. 'Exogenous others' becomes quite an expansive category, as it includes non-White migration across a range of centuries, for a range of structural, political, or economic reasons. Forced labour in the 1800s becomes lumped with histories of African slavery, and with contemporary refugees/migrants. While this moves beyond a binary, the level of generalization continues to be problematic.

Tuck and Yang (2012) propose a settler-native-slave triad, to mark slavery as a key founding logic of the settler state, particularly in the US (echoing Olson, 2009), while Battell Lowman and Barker (2015) refer to it as a 'trialectic.' Blackness is differentially structured to both settler and Indigenous locations. Battel Lowman and Barker find this a 'useful way of thinking about who constitutes *us* and what sort of problematic differences require management to make that perception true' (p. 29). A trialectic is not an 'actual relationship,' they argue, as it cannot capture the dynamic and shifting nature of structures of power and domination, inclusion and exclusion (p. 28). One aspect that is important to remember is that the ideal goal of settler

colonialism is the reduction down to one category, a state of settler totality that has successfully eliminated all challenges (p. 29). Elimination applies to populations beyond Indigenous peoples as well.[127]

This process of dispossession happens to 'other' populations, through enduring processes of racism that are explicitly tied to the state, capitalism, and the furtherance of settler colonialism. In particular Englert's (2022) third chapter on 'Racism as Social Control' links racism 'as the ideological justification for the global process of accumulation, based on the dispossession of colonised land across the (settler) colonial world, and the exploitation, enslavement and/or elimination of the colonised' (p. 119). Thus, the processes of dispossession and elimination, as core settler colonial logics, are linked in their targeting of Indigenous populations, but also other colonized/Black populations as well. As such, it is important to distinguish between settlers and exogenous/colonized/racialized (etc.) others, and refuse falling back to a binary. Settlers are not simply immigrants: 'Immigrants are beholden to the Indigenous laws and epistemologies of the lands they migrate to. Settlers become the law, supplanting Indigenous laws and epistemologies. Therefore settler nations are not immigrant nations' (Tuck & Yang, 2012, pp. 6–7).The ability to 'opt in' or become white, in order to be a full member of the settler colonial class is impossible, even if becoming a 'subordinate settler' might be (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 18). The result, then, is not simply *non-Indigenous = settler* on one side of the settler-Indigenous binary, but a much more complex set of relations that (re)frame identities in relation to structures. Framings of identity are not simply theoretical—they are matters of life and death.

While it is necessary to mark the specifics of settler colonial structures and settler identity itself, a binarist approach does little to make sense of the structures at play in relation to Blackness

[127] I must admit there is some trepidation on my own account for wading into the complexities of this debate as a white settler, but it also seems necessary to underscore the complexities and dangers of subsuming various and ongoing histories of race-based elimination and dispossession within a settler identity category on the sole basis that such peoples are not-Indigenous to the current lands that they (under coercion) currently inhabit. A binarist approach creates too much equivocation (to borrow from Tuck and Yang, 2012) that can be used to water down the primary complexities of whiteness with the settler colonial project.

(let alone more complex immigrant/refugee/mixed-race considerations [Schayegh, 2024]). The operation of dispossession, domination, racial violence, and the structuring of identity looks different in specific contexts. This is one of the dangers of engaging settler colonial theory at a macro level—the geographic and historically specific aspects of place are lost, in favour of generalized characteristics.[128]

One approach, as Jeff Corntassel suggests (in Snelgrove et al., 2014), might include seeking out terms that are based in Indigenous languages and thought, to further contextualize relationships and histories in particular contexts, but also looking at terms that capture the possible positive changes in the structural relationship (p. 17).[129] The ultimate turn must be towards Indigenous thought and perspectives first and foremost, in conjunction with Black abolitionist perspectives, to go beyond more narrow framings from white settler dominated Settler Colonial Studies. The theoretical binary, or even triad, falls apart as soon as more specific contexts and time periods are considered. There is more nuance, accountability, and complicity with Indigenous resurgence/resistance required. The focus needs to be towards the disruption of settler dominant forms of power and dismantling settler colonialism.

A Black abolitionist, anti-state view adds much to this understanding and needs to be considered more directly, to disrupt the simple binary view of identity, and articulate a more complex and disruptive view of location under settler colonial structures.

---

[128] As Schayegh (2024) notes this this perhaps one of the reasons why Wolfe, writing in the context of Australia, has been inclined to lean so heavily on the binarist approach (p. 480). The context of Australia has a different set of racial/immigrant relations than say Canada or the United States. Intersections of anti-Blackness and Indigeneity play out differently as well. As a result we need to carefully consider the applicability of the general aspects of settler colonialism suggested by Wolfe that in fact arise from his study of a very particular context.

[129] I will admit that I am working at a certain level of generalization abstraction here, in order to capture the necessary aspects of understanding settler colonialism as a structure. This, however, only gets us so far, and there needs to be more concerted moves to understand the specific operation of settler colonialism and its connected logics within specific contexts. On this point most directly see Schayegh (2024).

Black and Abolitionist Interventions

As was suggested in the previous chapter to argue for a concerted turn towards Black and Indigenous anarchisms, the complexities of settlement, slavery, and Blackness require greater forms of consideration. Samudzi and Anderson (2018) argue that

> Because Africans were forcibly removed from the continent and trafficked to the United States and did not largely participate in the European process of domination, … Black people cannot be considered as settlers in the United States. Though we may participate in ongoing settler processes and ultimately benefit from the elimination of Indigenous people and the expropriation of their land, we are not settlers. But championing the creation of a Black majoritarian nation-state, where the fate of Indigenous people is ambiguous at best, is an idea rooted in settler logic. Is settler adjacency what a truly intersectional framework and multifaceted approach to Black liberation entails? (p. 28)

This highlights the necessity of Black resistance to settler colonialism and struggle alongside Indigenous resistance, but also the particularities of considering Blackness on its own terms. Settler adjacency here denotes an uncritical acceptance of the settler colonial logics of dispossession and elimination for the purposes of hastening Black incorporation into the settler state fabric, with Black peoples, movements, and aspirations aligning with structures of settlement, rather than 'through dialogue and co-conspiratorial work with Native communities and a shared understanding of land use outside of capitalistic models of ownership' (Samudzi & Anderson, 2018, p. 31). These concerns run in similar directions for anarchist movements as well—if they do not attend to their own complicity with settler colonial structures and dispossession, and seek to create their own alternatives with a similarly ambiguous attention to Indigenous land use and resurgence.

Work on the anarchy and statelessness of Blackness suggests an altogether different orientation to settler colonial structures, and away from the construction of similarly colonial

'majoritarian' state structures. Blackness is structurally oppositional to the state. And while this does not mean, as per Lawrence and Amadahy above, that Black peoples cannot participate in settler colonial dynamics (which Anderson [2021] underscores with the problematic upholding of nation and state with Black liberation movements), there is a fundamental differential structuring of identity vis-a-vis the state compared to Euro-descendent settler populations. Lumping Blackness in with more normative white settler identity ignores the fundamental differences in the ways that populations targeted by the state and opposed to the state are situated.

As Nichols (2020) notes, in relation to the recursive nature of dispossession and property discussed above, there is a similar process at play in relation to Blackness. Rather than dispossession from land (although dispossessed from land through slavery and forced transit across the Atlantic away from ancestral lands), dispossession from 'self' is a core logic of enslavement. A similar dynamic of theft becoming property occurs here as well: 'For those who have historically been rendered objects of another's property, the violence of this objectification generates contradictory desires in the form of a simultaneous *disavowal of oneself as property* and *avowal of oneself as (self) proprietor*' (p. 131).

A similar dispossessive tension is generated, and certainly one that settlers do not have to contend with. A similar structural logic of dispossession is applied both to Indigenous peoples and lands, as well as formerly enslaved peoples. As something/someone is stolen, the original autonomy or 'ownership' is refused in favour of a colonial staking of claim. This further illustrates a series of complexities that need to be attended to in the relations between colonization, dispossession, and Blackness that are wholly missed in a binarist model. Upholding the binary in such a context becomes a dismissive sleight of hand and may even move in such a way to further anti-Blackness, or at very least to dismiss the potency of dispossession and enslavement on Black populations and their relationships to colonization, capitalism, and the state.

Against the 'settled' and desired permanence of occupation and dispossession of settler colonialism Anderson (2021) conceptualizes the necessity of 'flight' for Blackness: 'the only

place to run is nowhere' where 'understanding "nowhere" means comprehending statelessness (p. 140). If the state offers no home to Black people, why not reject it as a concept wholeheartedly?' He continues:

> Far from a burden, there is something immediately liberating about admitting to ourselves that we are not part of this country and that we shouldn't commit ourselves to protecting a fantasy that has had centuries to prove it's anything more than that. We must fight against the state, not ourselves. We are not the state, just as people around the world are not state apparatuses that draw borders around them. (p. 141)

Settlers, I would argue, have been fundamentally part of drawing such borders, of expanding and defending frontiers, and entrenching them further to preserve territories gained through dispossession and primitive accumulation. They quite literally 'possess' the structure of the state itself, to make it in their own image. Settler identity is a bordering, enclosing, and state constructing one—diametrically opposed to the anti-state, disruptive and 'ruining' nature of Blackness. Anderson's (2021) notion of ruination, to revisit again, is one that seeks destruction and dismantling, it is 'the *opposite* of seeking inclusion and reform' and puts forth an enduring commitment to abolition (p. 160). This accords in many ways with Tuck and Yang's (2012) notion of incommensurability, which 'requires a change in the order of the world,' following Fanon, that is both anti-colonial and abolitionist (p. 31). Settler identity contains no such liberatory aims, but is rather based in an enduring commitment to expansion and dispossession.

Blackness (in similar ways to Indigeneity; Simpson, 2017) necessitates an ending of the state, and continual friction and conflict in the process of doing so. Settler identity, on the other hand, in many ways requires the state—it is protected and upheld by it, and the does same back in upholding the state as the cornerstone of settler colonial structure. Adding this analysis suggests a fundamental difference in the ways that Black populations are structured via the settler colonial, capitalist, state form. This compels us to a greater intersectional understanding

of the ways that structures situate peoples and identities, but also how they are resistant to it. This is a crucial anti-state analysis of the dynamics of settler colonialism that could find more engagement within anarchism to deepen our anti-colonial value-practices.[130]

Myths of Settlement and Indigeneity

In order to understand reasons why settlers in particular continue to uphold structures of settlement and frequently refuse to break from ongoing dynamics of dispossession, the myths that justify the occupation of Indigenous lands must be examined.[131] Settlers construct themselves as seeking both to break away from the authority or sovereignty of their previous colonial metropoles (i.e., settlers in what is now known as Canada seeking to become independent from Britain), while also creating their own sovereign spaces. Settlers see themselves as founders of the societies they create, but also interpret their actions as part of an 'inherent sovereign claim that travels with them,' 'autonomous from the colonising metropole' (Veracini, 2010, p. 53). There is a 'regenerative' aspect of settler colonialism, where settlers imagine themselves creating anew in a 'new' land: 'As they move towards what amounts to a representation of their world, as they transform the land into their image, they settle another place without really moving' (Veracini, 2010, p. 98).

As Bateman and Pilkington (2011) argue, 'such colonial settlements mask their annihilating drive by drawing on the societal structures and culture of the homeland and renaming territory after familiar places or figureheads' (p. 1). 'The language is that of the homeland,' and narrates the construction of settler colonial society (p. 1). This assertion of a 'vacant and free' land is the classic settler strategy of asserting *terra nullius* that constructs land as 'empty' and without

[130] It should be clarified, again, that this doesn't mean all Black and Indigenous peoples hold such anti-state politics, or all settlers base their existence on a self-conscious lust for continual dispossession. But the ways that such identities are constructed, through their location in particular structures, and the relationships they have to each other, is categorically different, and needs specific consideration. Acknowledging the structural relationship of settler colonialism, alongside Black abolitionist analysis, refutes a solely settler-Indigenous binary.
[131] As briefly touched on above, Mackey (2016) assesses these dynamics in great detail.

moral considerations of those who are already there. This continues to factor into settler polities as a founding myth of the settler colonial state.

Further, settlers can assert that their own projects are about seeking to escape violence and repression. This includes the justification of socialist/radical collective experiments on stolen lands (Veracini, 2021), while displacing the inherent violence of settlement that is inflicted on Indigenous communities. Settlers therefore don't have violence of their own, and are only seeking to return to a previous existence without violence, or even for a better, more 'just,' world. This results in various anxieties and psychopathologies, as Veracini (2010) argues, and demands creating a settler polity represented in an idyllic/idealistic, non-violent way (p. 77). This also arises as settler colonial states portray themselves as less/non-violent compared to other settler colonial neighbours. This is commonly asserted by the 'benevolent' Canadian state against the 'violent' US state, what Paulette Regan (2010) refers to as the 'peacemaker' myth.

This peacemaking myth of the settler polity also reframes violence directed against Indigenous peoples (when it can't be made invisible) as a 'defensive battle ensuring the continued survival of the settler community and never as founding violence *per se'* (Veracini, 2010, p. 78). Settlers recast themselves as the 'indigenous' inhabitants who are defending their rightful land against Indigenous 'invaders'. This renders Indigenous peoples as nomadic, encroaching on settler sovereignty, and 'unsettled' in comparison to settled and 'indigenous' settlers (Veracini, 2010, p. 79). Settlers reinsert themselves 'as *the* people of the land, to become Indigenous themselves' (Bell, 2014, p. 7). Settlers disavow any structure of settler colonialism or invasion in favour of their own assertion of longstanding occupation and indigeneity.

Mackey (2016) identifies such settler 'fantasies of possession' and 'fantasies of entitlement' as 'structures of feeling' embedded socially and unconsciously that reaffirm relationships and justifications for land occupation.[132] They then procure hatred, anger, and defensive postures

[132] These elements also link up with Warburton's (2021) pointed critique to the 'structures of settlement' introduced in Chapter 1 and expanded upon in the later chapters, that persist within contemporary anarchist movements in the ways that settler colonial history and context remain largely unexamined within contemporary anarchism. These are not just 'settler attitudes' but rather structural forms of settlement that persist and are more

when settler entitlements to land are challenged by Indigenous sovereignties. Settler colonialism seeks 'certainty' in its occupation of land and settler relationships to it, but is thrown into 'uncertainty'[133] through Indigenous assertions of relationships to land and challenges to settler colonial structures. Entitlement to land is one of settler colonialism's 'foundational epistemological logics' (Mackey, 2016, p. 13) that maintains settler colonial attitudes in the everyday, and comes to inform a key element of 'settler common sense' (p. 73) discussed below.

Settler attempts to reassert rights to land are encompassed by Tuck and Yang's (2012) 'settler moves to innocence': strategies 'that attempt to relieve the settler of feelings of guilt or responsibility without giving up land or power or privilege…they only serve the settler' (p. 10). Such moves cover up settler colonialism's structure and seek to justify it as a reality that has always existed. They also line up settlers with social attitudes that run counter to the claims of Indigenous autonomy and attention to violent colonial history. In conjunction with settler common sense, discussed below, settler moves to innocence displace settler colonialism, and render it invisible. They disconnect individual settlers from responsibilities to act against settler colonialism or account for histories of dispossession that they benefit from.

'Settler Common Sense' and Everyday forms of Settler Colonialism

More insidiously, perhaps, are the ways that everyday actions contribute to the maintenance of settler colonialism as a structure. This is often observed in nationalist discourses of pride and strength of the nation. This also comes through in the promotion of multicultural discourses that invisiblize histories of settler colonialism (see, for example, Mackey, 2002; Day, 2000). Mark Rifkin (2013) names these everyday, often unconscious, ways of upholding settler colonialism, 'settler common sense.'

---

deeply engrained. This has direct connection to the sorts of habitus discussed by Bourdieu, which I take up in the following chapter.

[133] Embracing uncertainly, in a ways that disrupt fantasies about entitlements to land, is one of the ways that Mackey (2016) suggests could continue to destabilize allegiances to settler colonial structures, and prompt critical solidarities with Indigenous resurgence/resistance struggles, in addition to settlers own new relationships to land.

Settler common sense 'suggests the ways the legal and political structures that enable non-Native access to Indigenous territories come to be lived as given, as simply the unmarked, generic conditions of possibility for occupancy, association, history and personhood' (Rifkin, 2013, pp. 322–323). Settler colonialism fades to the background, as something that need not be named or discussed, but is always present.[134] Indigenous sovereignties are crucial in examining settler colonialism, but there may need to be a further digging up, exposing, naming and making plain, these sorts of insidious settler sovereignties. The ways that non-Native authority over Native lives continues to be enacted in such a way as 'not necessarily present to settlers as a set of political propositions or as a specifically imperial project of dispossession' (Rifkin, 2013, p. 323) also needs to be interrogated.

Settler common sense is cultivated through the normalization of official government practices and legal initiatives that give Indigenous peoples and communities 'no place' in which to exist, re-inscribing elements of *terra nullius*. Rifkin (2013) points to

> the assertion of US control over the space claimed as internal to the nation; the carving of that space into nested jurisdictional hierarchies; the enactment of privatizing forms of property-law materialized through practices of documentation, surveying, and sale; and the sequestration and regulation of particular plots of land as protected or "public" cumulatively contribute to the construction and experience of an environment on which Indigenous peoples have no place. (p. 327)

To most people (read settlers) these are simply just the functions of the state carried out objectively to serve the population. Settler common sense creates an inability to see how day to day state processes of governance and management are connected to histories, and continued attempts, of Indigenous dispossession. State governance, alongside capitalist

[134] Avril Bell (2014) suggests a similar conception of the 'settler imaginary' that creates an 'implicit background' that provides legitimacy to the existence of settler colonial society, while still remaining unnamed (p. 11). One possibility for moving forward would be to cultivate what Bell calls a 'relational imaginary' (p. 12) of what coexistence between Indigenous nations and settler might look like.

expansion and accumulation, is taken as given, as the general framework for organizing and operating society. Settler colonialism as a structure is hidden from view, naturalized, invisible.

Settler common sense, though placed in the context of state narratives and structures, also has import for understanding the ways that 'structures of settlement,' following Warburton (2021), are maintained with anarchist movements specifically. It gives a further language to understanding the ways that settlement structures, processes, and assumptions are able to continue to dwell even within radical spaces and imaginaries through unquestioned everyday forms that maintain settler presence, terra nullius framings of land, dismissal of Indigenous sovereignties and movements, and unquestioned presumptions of creating radical futures on a blank slate. Settler common sense speaks to a normalized and un-interrogated persistence of settler colonial assumptions that are maintained not just in mainstream society, but also within radical spaces and movements as well. As I show using the work of Pierre Bourdieu, these forms of common sense are reflective of habitus, the unconscious practices, ways of being, that are socially reproduced. While anarchists oppose the forms of state governance that uphold such common sense, as I have discussed throughout this dissertation, settler colonial discourses around land and future are maintained, despite such forms of opposition.

The idea of settler common sense also raises the separate idea of appropriation—when settlers might have an interest in learning about Indigenous histories or land use, but are unwilling or unable to reach beyond a relationship of consumption of Indigenous histories and engage in self-critical analysis. I raise this in connection to settler common sense as such forms of appropriation effectively leave 'no place' for contemporary Indigenous peoples and nations, while taking up and internalizing Indigenous perspectives as their own. This happens largely when well-meaning settlers go to events, or read books, or listen to music by Indigenous peoples and communities, but leave their engagement with Indigenous culture and resurgence at these specific sites. They are not compelled to engage further with the broader structure of settler colonialism that is foundational to the existence of the state and how settler colonial processes lead to the very possibility of them even existing on these lands. Settler processes of consumption are disconnected from their structured forms of existence. There may be a macro-

acknowledgement of harm done, say by the government for wrongs committed against Indigenous peoples, but this is disconnected from the specific acts or attitudes of individual settlers. The term settler might not even be understood or used. In this way, then, settler common sense remains undisrupted in favour of the consumption of Indigenous culture/voice/perspective etc. and settlers are free to live their lives without an understanding of the ways that they too participate and continue to uphold colonization.[135]

Even when settler colonialism may be rendered invisible as part of the states assertion of hegemony, it may be used as a means to mark other populations outside the state for destruction. Settler colonial structure is rendered 'common sense' and invisible at home, while it is remobilized in the name of empire abroad. As Jodi Byrd (2011) argues, Indigeneity becomes a 'transit,' 'a site through which US empire orients and replicates itself by transforming those to be colonized into "Indians" through continual reiterations of pioneer logics' (p. xvii). In this sense 'other' populations abroad, whose destruction or colonization is sought by the state, are named as 'Indian' or their lands named as 'Indian country,' in need of pacification by the US military.

Settler colonialism at home is masked by the settler common sense that Rifkin (2013) highlights, but also through the process of 'cacophony' that Byrd identifies. Liberal multicultural inclusion 'creates a cacophony of moral claims that help to deflect progressive and transformative activism from dismantling the ongoing conditions of colonialism that continue to make the United States a desired state formation within which to be included' (Byrd, 2011, p. xvii). The cacophony of other struggles, she is suggesting, in seeking recognition and inclusion from the state, masks or drowns out struggles against settler colonialism.[136] This is what makes

[135] This occurs within anarchist movements as well, less so these days in terms of direct forms of cultural appropriation, but through the use of Indigenous militancy imagery, generic oppositions to colonialism, and disconnected histories of resistance that exclude ongoing Indigenous anti-colonial struggle (see Warburton, 2021). The specificity of settler colonialism needs greater interrogation and integration into anarchist theory and value-practices as part of an ongoing process of pushing anarchism further.

[136] The limits of recognition, and seeking inclusion and recognition from a libel multicultural state, foreclosing Indigenous autonomy, has been discussed in detail by Coulthard (2014).

the structural nature of settler colonialism fade to the background, neutralized by becoming common sense, a neutral backdrop upon which other claims for justice are articulated.

The ultimate result, Byrd (2011) argues, is as follows:

> That cacophony of competing struggles for hegemony within and outside institutions of power, no matter how those struggles might challenge the state through loci of race, class, gender and, sexuality, serves to misdirect and cloud attention from the underlying structures of settler colonialism that made the United States possible as oppressor in the first place. As a result, the cacophony produced through US colonialism and imperialism domestically and abroad often coerces struggles for social justice for queers, racial minorities, and immigrants into complicity with settler colonialism.[137] (p. xvii)

Cacophony can therefore work with settler common sense to mask the embedded structure of settler colonialism that is wrapped up in the state and capitalism.[138] It suggests a further need to critique and move beyond liberal struggles for inclusivity that leave structures of settler colonialism intact. This would include, as Coulthard (2014) argues, liberal Indigenous struggles that seek recognition and reconciliation (if not incorporation) with the state, without

---

[137] Part of the danger of this cacophony, Byrd argues, is that question of settler colonialism and Indigenous dispossession become subsumed under questions of race. This, she argues, 'obfuscate[s]' the important distinctions between colonialism and racism (Byrd, 2011, p. xxiii) and 'masks the territoriality of conquest' by subsuming it under race (p. xxiv). 'By foundationally accepting the general premise that racialization (along with the concomitant interlocking oppressions of class, gender, and sexuality) causes the primary violences of US politics in national and international arenas, multicultural liberalism has aligned itself with settler colonialism despite professing the goal to disrupt and intervene in global forms of dominance through investments in colourblind equality' (pp. xxv-xxvi). The risk is that struggles for social justice presume that settler colonialism is 'resolved' or 'redressed' (p. xxvi). This is precisely the danger of the generic 'against all oppression' attitude within anarchism without orientation to the particularities of context (see Ciccariello-Maher, 2011) that was discussed in Chapter 2, and demands specific attention to settler colonialism.

[138] This is not to say, of course, that intersectional struggles against racism, sexism, heteropatriarchy etc. are not important, are not connected to Indigenous struggles against settler colonialism, or do not have very brutal and violent material impacts on many people's daily lives. The point is that struggles that push for inclusion in the state directly push colonization aside. Inclusion trumps discussions of settler colonialism, refuses to see its centrality as a system of oppression and dispossession, further entrench it, and maintain Indigenous dispossession and elimination.

challenging its underlying assumptions. Radical resurgence and resistance then becomes the necessary mode of engaging the structural realities of settler colonialism.

Settler colonialism, is then, inherently about violence against Indigenous communities, and continues to structure the relations in settler colonies to this day. Restating Wolfe (2013) above, settler colonialism is a structure, it does not begin/end with a specific event, or point of contact; it continues insofar as settlers seek to maintain their sovereignties, as long as settlers stay, and as long as it is rendered invisible, commonsensical. Its ultimate goal is the dispossession and elimination of Indigenous peoples. As long as Indigenous peoples continue to exist and refuse to be 'transferred out' or eliminated, settler colonialism is continually resisted and perpetually incomplete. Given that settlers are unlikely to leave, and Indigenous peoples cannot and will not 'go,' the only way forward is to begin to imagine a fundamental transformation of the settler colonial context. Settler colonialism is not inevitable, or eternal, even if it carries a significant and deeply embedded structuring of society.

But is examining settler colonialism enough?

A number of theorists (Schayegh, 2024; Warrior, 2021; Kelley, 2017; Snelgove et al., 2014; Byrd, 2014; Macoun & Strakosch, 2013; among others) have expressed reservations about the new-found popularity of settler colonial studies, despite its strengths and potentials. They point to the dangers of reifying settler colonialism as an inevitable structure, over-focusing on the settler side of settler-Indigenous relations, lack of engagements with Indigenous theory, resistance, resurgence and agency, and having little to say on decolonization and possible transformation beyond settler colonialism. As Macoun and Strakosch (2013) argue, 'The particular challenge of SCT's [settler colonial theory's] analysis is that it does not give an account of such a transformed future, or the conditions for settler colonialism's demise' (p. 435). Snelgrove et al. (2014) argue further that

> Decontextualized conceptions of settler colonial studies, 'settler,' and solidarity risk further eschewing Indigenous peoples and thereby reifying the stolen land each of the above is founded upon. Perhaps, most centrally, this is done

> through de-centering Indigenous peoples own articulations of Indigenous—settler relations, their governance, legal, and diplomatic orders, and the transformative visions entailed within Indigenous political thought. (p. 26)

As Barker (2021) suggests, settler colonial theory itself needs to be understood within the context of Indigenous work against colonial structures and violence that has been persistent since contact (p. 10). It is perhaps a 'sub-discipline' of broader Indigenous studies largely developed 'through the analyses and critiques presented by Indigenous scholars and community leaders'. This understanding needs greater emphasis, in order to push back against the development of settler colonial studies as 'Anglo-biased' and guilty of a certain 'methodological settler nationalism' (Schayegh, 2024, p. 472), but also to account for the continued ways that Indigenous peoples, communities, and movements construct alternatives and existence beyond settler colonialism.

These limitations are particularly clear in aspects of Veracini's (2010) work where he suggests that there is 'no intuitive narrative of settler colonial decolonisation, and that narrative gap contributes crucially to the invisibility of anti-colonial struggles in settler colonial contexts' (p. 105). This difficulty, he argues, is in part because, unlike colonialism more generally (where settlers return, and sovereignty is negotiated 'between polities'), settler colonialism, with settlers so entrenched and unlikely to leave, means 'sovereignty needs to be negotiated *within* a polity' (p. 105).[139] Despite such difficulty, Veracini imagines three possible responses to settler colonialism: a) settlers leave and go back to their countries of initial departure; b) various processes of Indigenous-settler reconciliation take place; or c) settlers deny any need for reforming/destroying settler colonialism at all. Given that a) and c) seem either impossible or

[139] The anarchist in me would contest this even further: does it? Do we imagine a singular polity that is both settler (etc.) and Indigenous? Or is this a further failure of imagination and possibility as well? I turn to some of these aspects in Chapter 7 more directly.

continue a colonial status quo, b) appears as the only real option, with negotiation 'within a polity' (p. 105).[140]

This is reflected further in his later work, where Veracini (2021) considers aspects of displacement engaged by various movements in order to attempt to deal with various land-related questions, and attempts to 'turn the world upside down' as a revolutionary ethos. Rather, these political projects ultimately have a tendency to replay settler colonialism as 'the world turned inside out'– as attempts to create 'new' societies 'elsewhere,' i.e., on someone else's land if the present conditions are not favourable to revolution. These responses are variously tabled by both left and right movements, he suggests, spurned on further by the ongoing forms of crisis, both in capital and in ecology. There is little here, however, in terms of how Indigenous peoples, very specifically, are engaging with such realties or how contemporary forms of resurgence challenge and structure such responses. Veracini engages a pointed (and necessary) critique of (settler) socialist/radical movements and the ways that settler colonialism continues to be replayed within them, but offers little in terms of what we might do with that, or how it may be overcome, or whether there are still potentials to be found against structures like the state and capitalism.

Veracini (2021) suggests a dissolution of the settler polity, a refusal of the 'world turned inside out, towards an actual revolutionary moment of 'upside down' (Veracini, p. 298); a refusal of displacement, with even nominally radical premises, in favour of 'emplaced transformation—to changing the way we live without moving' (p. 25).[141] This recalls a similar tendency towards

---

[140] There is also a question of how to approach this outside of reifying a settler-Indigenous binary, given the wider identities and locations that are also involved. Hence the importance and radical and abolitionist Black perspectives.

[141] Veracini goes as far as to take Day's discussion of the 'newest social movements' that carry a strong commitment to prefiguration to task as well, as a further form of 'the world turned inside out,' as such movements 'recapitulate the difference between emplaced transformation and the politics of displacement' (p. 261). He seems to suggest that prefiguration is inherently committed to an 'elsewhere' spatially speaking, which seems to significantly overlook the commitments that anarchists have to the 'here and now' as an inherent part of prefigurative politics. This is not to say, of course (as I also argue here) that there aren't colonial dangers of such work, especially with inattention to context and structures of settlement. These are real and significant. But there are also potentials, especially when coupled and directly engaging with Indigenous forms of prefigurative politics

'negotiation within a polity' suggested by his earlier work above (Veracini, 2010). What does such a form of transformation look like? Settler colonialism has to go, and we shouldn't replay its logics (certainly!), but as the wider critique of settler colonial studies suggests, there is little attention given to the question of 'how' this might be done, especially in terms of Indigenous struggles.

Negotiation within the settler polity carries the danger of assuming the continuation of the state, and other logics of domination. The suggestion of negotiation within the polity[142] often accepts a particularly reformist orientation (with recognition as a common strategy; Coulthard, 2014) to somehow make the settler colonial state more 'inclusive' of Indigenous peoples, a la liberal multiculturalism. Even if this could occur on a nation-to-nation basis, it would still see Indigenous communities inside the settler state proper. Much liberal/progressive, even nominally 'anti-colonial,' work frequently leaves the state intact as a container for human relations, which flies in the face of enduring Indigenous alternatives and new worlds that are 'already here' and under construction (Simpson, 2017; Warburton, 2021). As Glen Coulthard (2014) argues 'colonial powers will only recognize the collective rights and identities of Indigenous peoples insofar as this recognition does not throw into question the background legal, political, and economic framework of the colonials relationship itself' (p. 41). Recognition is only permitted when the structures of settler colonialism and state power are left intact.

There are other forms of relations that are, and still could be, imagined. This is something that I hope a more concerted anti-colonial turn within anarchism might be interested in (and which I considered in Chapter 7). This requires a fundamental reshaping of the idea of settler community, away from the state. In fact, it would likely involve many more communities, rooted in local contexts and settings, with accountability and new relations being built between micro-level communities and specific Indigenous nations. The trick with settler colonial theory

---

based thoroughly in direct action and decolonial politics (Coulthard, 2014). So there is a greater depth and critical analysis needed in the ways that Veracini engages some elements of radical movements in the present.

[142] On the implications of 'polities' as a teleological definition of settler colonialism, see Schayegh, 2024).

is that there is little analysis of the state itself, which I think leaves settler colonial theory, most especially Veracini (2010, 2021), open to an unacknowledged continuation of the state as a settler institution, and as a continued structure of violence directed at Indigenous communities.

Without intentional discussion of the state as an associated structure, there is little likelihood of more necessary interconnected transformation. Never mind that this view does not even ask Indigenous nations how they might want to see settler colonialism altered/destroyed (doing so requires turning to and engaging Indigenous theory and practice directly), but it would keep the state, and perhaps even capitalism or other forms of oppression, intact. While settler colonial theory gives us a better view of the settler side of things, and the structural contours of dispossession, accumulation, and violence, (and needs greater attention and consideration within anarchism theory and value-practices directly) it does little to imagine their end, and does little to affirm or support Indigenous resurgence and Indigenous futures. Indigenous nations need to revitalize and resurge on their own terms, with their autonomy supported and respected.

Settler colonial studies is, in many ways, a (white) settler enterprise, which does present the possibility of better understanding our settler selves, and the dynamics and histories that structure our position vis a vis Indigenous communities (Macoun & Strakosch, 2013). In this sense, Snelgrove et al. (2014) argue, settler colonial studies might be better understood as a 'distinct emerging field of study (rather than a site of struggle already critiqued by Indigenous peoples' (p. 7; see also Barker, 2021, p. 10). Indigenous communities have existed, continue to exist, and continue to resist settler colonialism—they don't need a new field of study to do so. They have lived and encountered it firsthand. As Warrior (2021) argues, in challenging Veracini's tendency to centralize settler colonial studies, 'virtually all work in Indigenous Studies,' itself a broad and expansive approach that defies narrow categorization, 'can be seen as somehow responsive to the settler colonial context,' but not reducible to a singular, narrow perspective (p. 287). Works like Veracini's (2010, 2021) have little to say about Indigenous alternatives and possibilities and do not engage with Indigenous political theory, the dangers of which Snelgrove et al. (2014) point out above. Indigenous resurgence/resistance is *the*

reference point for detailing, deconstructing, and opposing settler colonialism; settler colonial studies is an addendum and could be a useful complement.

Conclusions and Implications for Centering Settler Colonialism

In this chapter I have argued that settler colonialism as a structure, closely linked to processes of primitive accumulation that have promoted the development and expansion of both capitalism and the state, is a fundamental framework for understanding the context of resistance in North America (and beyond). Settler colonialism is premised on the violent dispossession and elimination of Indigenous peoples, to permit access to lands for settlement and resource extraction, and to continually assert the hegemony of the state. A structural view of settler colonialism shows the ways that it continues to structure everyday relations.

In tracing the relationship between settler colonialism, capitalism and the state, primitive accumulation continues to be a potent lens for understanding the connections between such structures and the continual expansion of settler colonialism. The reframing of primitive accumulation by Coulthard (2014) and Federici (2004) continues to present a necessarily potent form of analysis. Dispossession is a crucial piece of this process.

Those in settler colonial contexts must recognize the complexities of settler identity and settler colonialism itself, in terms of where we situate ourselves, how we identify our complicity, and what we might do to reimagine a future set of relations. Settler colonialism is central to the oppressive and dominating order that we seek to create alternatives inside/against. Without attention to settler colonialism as a structure, linked to primitive accumulation, capitalism and the state, and the benefits accrued by settlers at the expense of Indigenous communities, we are likely to replicate processes of colonization, assimilation, and exclusion. In particular, the relationship of Blackness and other non-Indigenous but also non-settler identities, needs to be more carefully considered in the structural analysis of settler colonialism. All of these aspects aid in expanding understandings of settler colonialism.

Glen Coulthard (2014) suggests some of the implications for resistance movements in the present. He argues that there is a particular emphasis on capitalism (and the state, by

anarchists) when it comes to struggle. This often leaves aside the colonial underpinnings of such connected forms of oppression and domination. There is a crucial analysis of settler-colonialism missing. He suggests that

> by shifting our analytical frame to the colonial relation we might occupy a better angle from which to both anticipate and interrogate practices of settler-state dispossession justified under otherwise egalitarian principles and espoused with so-called "progressive" political agendas in mind. (p. 12)

Anarchism certainly at times fits into this 'progressive' set of political agendas, where colonization is relegated to the background in favour of more pressing forms of oppression, and recalls the discussion in the previous chapter on the overly general ways in which anarchist declarations of opposition to all forms of oppression and domination are often articulated.

As Leanne Simpson (2011) argues, 'western-based social movement theory has failed to recognize the broader contextualizations of resistance within Indigenous thought, while also ignoring the contestation of colonialism as a starting point' (p. 31; see also 2017).[143] In Coulthard's (2014) view, settler colonialism is not some 'primary locus' or 'base' of analysis but the 'inherited background field within which market, racist, patriarchal, and state relations *converge* to facilitate … the reproduction of hierarchical social relations that facilitate the dispossession of [Indigenous] lands and self-determining capacities' (p. 14–15). The implications of examining settler colonialism are far reaching, especially for those of the anarchist persuasion.

Part of my overall argument here has been for the need for greater attention to settler colonialism within anarchist theory and practice. This might come, first, from recognizing the strategic centrality (Olson, 2009) of settler colonialism amongst the cacophony of other struggles (Byrd, 2011) and frameworks of analysis. Settler colonial logics of elimination and

[143] Harsha Walia (2013) makes a similar point in noting the lack of attention to Indigenous dispossession and questions of land in anti-capitalism broadly speaking (p. 46).

dispossession have not only solidified the rise of the state and capitalism and continue to feed their expansion, but also created a structure of identities that privileges settlers above Indigenous peoples and all others.

This is the very reason that anarchists (and all those seeking a better world) need to pay particular attention to continuing structures of settler-colonialism here and now. The destruction of settler colonialism along with the destruction of capitalism and the state, through the resurgence of Indigenous nations is necessary, along with movement toward new sets of relationships, affinities, accountabilities, and social relations (see, for example, Saed, 2013). Indigenous grounded normativities present potent relationalities for contesting capitalist-colonial-statist structures of domination, and are continually under construction to (re)imagine ways of living on Indigenous terms.

As a philosophy and politics that values resistance to all forms of oppression and domination, anarchism needs to confront the challenge of settler colonialism, by first gaining a detailed understanding of what this thing 'settler colonialism' is and how it is different and significant, and then incorporating this into our analysis and resistance. Furthermore, looking at settler colonialism is not enough, and there must be an equal, if not more significant, turn to looking at Indigenous critiques of colonization, the state, and capitalism, as well as the important interventions from Black abolitionist struggles.

The implication of anarchism (or any social movement) refusing to engage with the particularities of settler colonialism is that the structure of settler colonialism will stay intact. Being unexamined, anarchists, the majority of who are settlers, will only serve to entrench or prop up settler colonialism at the expense of Indigenous nations. This is significant in terms of creating relationships of solidarity and support with those peoples who are at the forefront of challenging capitalism and the state.

Finally, a refusal to engage settler colonialism, and figure out what we can do about it in our particular context, means that anarchist attempts to create a new future society will occur on lands that Indigenous communities were dispossessed of as a result of settler colonialism.

Anarchist creations of a new society would continue a process of colonization. Settler colonialism remains untouched in favour of the creation of anarchist autonomy, with Indigenous autonomy foreclosed. These are significant implications that a more concerted turn towards structural understandings of settler colonialism, beyond simple declarations of opposition, can begin to attend to.

The three chapters detailed thus far have begun to set up the theoretical frameworks for my work here. I have established the contemporary aspects of anarchist value-practices, and the specific pitfalls of committing to resisting all forms of oppression and domination without attending to the particularities of settler colonialism that structure the context in which such declarations of opposition are made. This chapter has detailed such specific aspects of settler colonialism, as a structure, that can be useful for expanding anarchist analysis, and then resistance. With these aspects detailed and established, Chapter 4 engages the work of Pierre Bourdieu as a means to intervene in social movement studies of anarchism, and presents the utility of employing Bourdieu's field-habitus-capital triad for understanding anarchist anti-colonialism and the context of settler colonialism further (which I have alluded to here regarding settler common sense). Bourdieu's concepts provide important reference points for the understanding of anarchist culture, both its reproduction, and necessary disruption, towards greater anti-colonial ends.

Chapter 4 – Social Movements, Political Culture and Resistance: Considering Anarchist Habitus, Capital and Field

In this chapter I take up the work of Pierre Bourdieu to consider the interactions between anarchists and anarchist ideas, and the context of structures of settler colonialism. Bourdieu's theorization of habitus, capital, and field are useful for understanding the operation of social movement cultures, and how anarchist cultures of resistance dwell within structures of settler colonialism. By combining such concepts with Theresa Warburton's (2021) 'structures of settlement' that persist within anarchism, Bourdieu's work helps to account for how cultures of anarchism are structuring and structured, how ideas persist within contexts of power and domination (like structuring structures of settler colonialism), and how dynamics of crisis and disruption might prompt moves towards deeper forms of anti-colonial politics. I bring Bourdieu into a specifically social movement context, building on the work of those who have set to this task before, and push it further to consider anarchist movements embedded within ongoing structures of settler colonialism.

Movements have as their primary goals some element of change, which range from reformist liberal approaches, to militant and abolitionist anarchist ambitions, and reactionary fascist violence. They seek to (re)structure the world to expand their politics and visions, and at the same time are directly influenced by the systems and structures around them. Movements are placed within a structured and structuring set of relations. More in-depth and relational ways to understand this dynamic can be considered and put to use within movement spaces themselves. Bourdieu's perspective aids us in understanding the cultural dynamics of anarchist anti-colonialism, as well as the potentials and difficulties for further development and elaboration.

Bourdieu's core concepts of habitus, capital, and field help to account for the ways cultures of anarchism are constructed and reproduced, and how they inadequately reckon with the ongoing context of settler colonialism by failing to identify and address ongoing 'structures of settlement'. Such 'structures of settlement' identified by Warburton (2021) are 'structuring

structures' within contemporary anarchism, and can be further understood through Bourdieu's concepts. Anarchist habitus, as situated within the anarchist field and the subcultural (re)production of capital, structures how anarchists come to understand, act, reproduce, and think anarchist culture in ways that maintain residues of settler colonialism, while also carrying possibilities for undoing and resisting them. A 'crisis of habitus' might be one means to disrupt the common sense and unexamined aspects of anarchist culture and expand anarchist anti-colonial commitments that already exist.[144]

Bourdieu and Key Concepts for Consideration

Pierre Bourdieu's 'philosophy of action' is most concerned with the activity of people or 'agents' and the dynamics of their interactions. He moves beyond an affirmation or primacy of either structure or agent, common across a range of philosophical disciplines, and affirms 'the *primacy of relations'* between them (Wacquant, 1992, p. 15). Agents affect and are affected by the structures they are embedded *in relation* to, within particular contexts and histories—they are structured and structuring. The cornerstone of relations is the 'two-way relationship between objective structures (those of social fields) and incorporated structures (those of the habitus)' (Bourdieu, 1998, p. vii). Bourdieu considers the interplay of the unconscious and ingrained ways of being, thinking and acting (habitus), and their enhancement through the varying resources that one has (capital), within a specific context of interaction with others (field). These elements come together to structure the actions and activities of individuals, who then through their own actions, also structure these elements as well: [(habitus) (capital) + field = practice] (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 101).

[144] While I detail key elements of Bourdieu's work, I can't claim a comprehensive and exhaustive account of his philosophy and work. Still, I hope to go beyond general and 'in-passing' usages by delving into some of the complexities of his concepts, to focus on their utility for social movement study and the anarchist cultural 'field' of anti-colonial resistance in particular.

Habitus is ‘this generative and unifying principle which retranslates the intrinsic and relational characteristics of a position into a unitary lifestyle, that is, a unitary set of choices of persons, goods, practices’ (Bourdieu, 1998, p. 8). Further,

> Habitus are generative principles of distinct and distinctive practices - what the worker eats, and especially the way he eats it, the sport he practices and the way he practices it, his political opinions and the way he expresses them are systematically different from the industrial owner's corresponding activities. But habitus are also classificatory schemes, principles of classification, principles of vision and division, different tastes. (Bourdieu, 1998, p. 8)

Habitus, Bourdieu (1977) explains, is the ‘strategy-generating principle enabling agents to cope with unforeseen and ever-changing situations’ that is produced in part by past conditions (p. 72). It guides what is to be done and how it is to be done, ‘objectively organized as strategies without being the product of a genuine strategic intention – which would presuppose at least that they are perceived as one strategy among other possible strategies’ (p. 73). In this sense habitus is unconscious: ‘It is because subjects do not, strictly speaking, know what they are doing that what they do has more meaning than they know. The habitus is the universalizing mediation which causes an individual agent's practices, without either explicit reason or signifying intent, to be none the less "sensible" and "reasonable"’ (p. 78). Actors ‘produce and reproduce’. Habitus is not something that is perceptible, despite its ongoing influence on action and practice.[145] This suggests that we can never wholly grasp the ongoing influence, the ‘structuring’ that is happening to us, nor the way that we ‘structure’ as well.

[145] This seems to raise questions in terms of how we, as theorists, as social movement actors writing about social movement things, can also perceive and discuss this as well. We are not, and cannot, be outside of habitus ourselves, so the levels of perception available are always going to be limited in a strictly conscious level. Bourdieu’s work does, however, allow a consideration of the way that these various concepts interact, and helps to glean a general understanding of the staying power and ongoing influence of histories, cultures, tastes etc.

Bourdieu (1984) notes the ways in which habitus conditions particular tastes, which reflect social divisions in a particular context and influences the amount of capital that is derived from such expressions. As a 'product of the internalization of the structure of social space,' taste is

> the generator of practices adjusted to the regularities inherent in a condition. It continuously transforms necessities into strategies, constraints into preferences, and, without any mechanical determination, it generates the set of "choices" constituting life-styles, which derive their meaning, i.e., their value, from their position in a system of oppositions and correlations. (p. 175)

Habitus articulates tastes, which themselves create divisions and hierarchies within society.[146]

Habitus, then, 'is this kind of practical sense for what is to be done in a given situation – what is called in sport a "feel" for the game, that is, the art of *anticipating* the future of the game which is inscribed in the present state of play' (Bourdieu, 1998, p. 25). Habitus influences, or better *structures*, how people respond to particular situations and carries within it the assumptions inherent in their specific location and development as members of a collectivity. 'A mental structure … both individual and collective. It is a tacit law (nomos) of perception and practice that is at the basis of the consensus on the sense of the social world …, the basis of *common sense*' in a particular context of relations (Bourdieu, 1998, p. 66). Common sense becomes 'the harmonization of agents' experiences and the continuous reinforcement that each of them receives from the expression, individual or collective (in festivals, for example), improvised or programmed (commonplaces, sayings), of similar or identical experiences' (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 80).

Nomos denotes the 'shared principle of vision and division, identical or similar cognitive and evaluative structures' (Bourdieu, 1994, p. 14) This is often represented by the structures of the state, which 'establishes and inculcates common forms and categories of perception, in short

---

[146] It is the 'practice unifying and practice-generating principle,' which in his text *Distinction* on the class-based tastes that structure French society, form the 'internalized form of class condition and the conditionings it entails' (1984, p. 101).

state forms of classification' leading to 'immediate orchestration of habituses' that become (in this case) 'constitutive of (national) common sense' (Bourdieu, 1994, p. 14). These are the structures and logics that cultivate obedience to structures of power without the direct articulation of physical coercion. This is part of the unconscious operation and maintenance of habitus, in this case, through the construction of common sense and upholding the state. These are 'calls to order' that promote 'doxic submission' to structures of power (Bourdieu, 1994, p. 14).[147] This is the unconscious process that frames the specific logics and dynamics of fields and fields of power.

As a core Bourdieusian concept, habitus is useful for considering the particular actions of those within social movements and provides a framework to consider the ways that tastes, ideas, cultures, and value-practices are created and maintained, and the difficulty, in many instances, of altering them beyond more routinized practices.

Through the structures of society 'the social order is progressively inscribed in people's minds. Social divisions become principles of division, organizing the image of the social world' (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 471). The structurings of the world become 'doxa' when they 'are accepted as self-evident' (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 471). Doxa, Bourdieu (1998) argues, 'is a particular point of view, the point of view of the dominant, which presents and imposes itself as a universal point of view' (p.57).[148] Doxa are upheld and maintained by forces of power and authority, such as the state, but also by other conditioning forces (such as the gatekeeping and tastes of anarchist subcultures; see, for example, Portwood-Stacer, 2013) and therefore act as a sort of disciplining structure. Doxa are the 'unquestioned beliefs and assumptions that characterize fields' (Mayrl, 2013, p. 287).

---

[147] This adds further context and discussion in relation to the forms of settler common sense discussed in the previous chapter.

[148] In his discussion of the state as a specific form of consolidation and bureaucratic field, doxa is further 'the point of view of those who dominate by dominating the state and who have constituted their point of view as universal by constituting the state' (Bourdieu, 1998, p. 57). Something that is perhaps of interest to anarchists and warrants further consideration.

Bourdieu's (1992) 'field,' as a further necessary concept, 'may be defined as a network, or a configuration, of objective relations between positions,' and in 'highly differentiated societies' there are a number of these 'spaces of objective relations that are the site of a logic and a necessity that are *specific and irreducible* to those that regulate other fields' (p. 97). Each field is unique in its particular structure and relations. We can speak of economic, artistic, social movement, or anarchist fields where each contains specific logics and relations. Positions within the field are determined by the respective forms of capital, habitus, and 'rules of the game' that structure interactions. Fields find their limit 'at the point where the effects of the field cease' (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 100).[149]

Capital is not strictly economic (although it is that too) but also includes social, artistic, cultural, and symbolic forms, and its unequal distribution determines the structure of the field (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 246). Cultural capital is calibrated to the 'cultural competence' of actors in a specific field, takes time to accumulate, at personal cost, and cannot easily be transferred like economic forms. It appears often as symbolic, in the sense that it is not easily recognized as capital and rather as forms of 'legitimate competence' (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 245). Symbolic capital, especially in terms of the constructed 'recognized authority' of the state, is any form of capital, that is 'perceived by social agents' and 'which cause them to know it and recognize it, to give it value' (Bourdieu, 1994, p. 8). Symbolic capital is capital that comes from the value instilled in it, through social processes. Its importance is imposed and inculcated (Bourdieu, 1994, p. 9). Bourdieu (1994) further distinguishes between 'diffuse symbolic capital, resting solely on collective recognition, to an *objectified symbolic capital*, codified, delegated and guaranteed by the state, in a word *bureaucratized'* (p. 11).

---

[149] Further, in describing the 'global social space as a field' Bourdieu (1998) intends a dual meaning 'both as a field of forces, whose necessity is imposed on agents who are engaged in it, and as a field of struggles within which agents confront each other, with differentiated means and ends according to their position in the structure of the field of forces, thus contributing to conserving or transforming its structure' (p. 32). The field is both the forces and structures that affect those 'playing the game,' as well as the terrain of where the game is being played, or the contexts where struggle occur. This dual meaning can help to account for locations of movements and the actors within them, as well as the ways they are structured by systems of oppression and domination, like settler colonialism.

Social capital—'the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to a possession of a durable social network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition' (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 248) and dictated by breadth of one's network and the ability to mobilize other forms of capital (p. 249)—also requires accumulation and maintenance to persist and depends on the skills of maintaining such relations (p. 250).[150] Capital is a core element that influences the organization of relations between actors within fields, that is itself constructed by the specific logics of the field; and the specific forms of capital deemed important or desirable are influenced, and maintained, by the habitus.[151] These sorts of relations mean that what is valued in certain fields may not be in others.[152]

The 'specific logic of the field,' framed by nomos and doxa, influences which forms of capital are 'valid' within the particular context or 'game' and, 'in relationship with this field, function as specific capital—and, consequently, as a factor explaining practices' (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 113).[153] How people act is comprised of their histories and commonsensical approaches to the world, their relationships and interactions with other actors within a specific socio-cultural context,

[150] Possessing capital requires competence to harness particular resources within a specific social space. While economic capital is certainly important, given that we continue to live in a capitalist society that upholds and venerates the mass accumulation of material wealth, other forms may predominate in other fields. This is especially the case in social movement fields, let alone anarchist ones, where anti-capitalist values and ethics create drawbacks and social consequences for carrying too much economic capital, and where, as a result, other forms (such as resourcefulness, leadership skills, subcultural expressions, etc.) are upheld and provide forms of power, prestige and influence (Portwood-Stacer, 2013; Ibrahim, 2011, 2013). On anarchist capital specifically, see Williams (2017).

[151] Symbolic capital, in particular, Bourdieu (1998) identifies as 'an ordinary property (physical strength, wealth, warlike valor, etc.) which, perceived by social agents endowed with the categories of perception and appreciation permitting them to perceive, know and recognize it, becomes symbolically efficient, like a veritable magical power; a property which, because it responds to socially constituted collective expectations and beliefs, exercises a sort of action from a distance, without physical contact' (p. 102). It is contextual while also being relational. It is nothing without a particular set of people imbuing it with power within a specific field.

[152] In the case of an anarchist field, for example, excessive forms of monetary resources may make others suspicious, and thus reduce one's capital and power, whereas in many other areas of normative capitalist society greater wealth and resources is highly revered, see for ex, Portwood-Stacer (2013).

[153] Capital moves the 'games of society' beyond mere chance, and represents 'the immanent structure of the social world, i.e., The set of constraints … which govern its functioning in a durable way, determining the chances of success for practices' (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 242).

and the relative amounts of resources that can be mobilized to further one's position and influence.

Each of these respective elements come together to influence the actual practices of actors: [(habitus) (capital) + field = practice] (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 101). Practice, in Bourdieu's sense, 'refers to an individual's actions and behaviour, which result from the relations between one's dispositions (habitus) and one's position in a field (capital), within the current state of play of that social arena (field)' (Maton, 2012, as cited in Apps et al., 2019, p. 415). The interrelation of these factors is what leads people to act the way they do in particular contexts.

These ongoing forms of interaction occur with the context of crises and competition, both between actors and from external shocks and changes in context. Within fields, actors seek greater forms of power and influence through mobilizing their respective forms of capital in competition and contention with others. Conflict and contention may also be exacerbated or altered through significant moments of crisis and disruption:

> every field is inhabited by tensions and contradictions which are at the origin (basis) of conflicts; this means that it is simultaneously a field of struggles or competitions which generate change. In such fields, and in the struggles which take place in them, every agent acts according to his position (that is, according to the capital he or she possesses) and his habitus, related to his personal history. His actions, words, feelings, deeds, works, and so on, stem from the confrontation between dispositions and positions, which are more often than not mutually adjusted, but may be at odds, discrepant, divergent, even in some sense contradictory. (Bourdieu, 2005, p. 47)

This results in a 'dynamic friction' between habitus and field. When habitus and field become misaligned a 'crisis' occurs, allowing previously taken-for-granted and doxic beliefs to be brought into the 'sphere of discourse,' 'the undiscussed into discussion' (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 168). There is a 'drawing of the line between the field of opinion, of that which is explicitly

questioned, and the field of doxa, of that which is beyond question and which each agent tacitly accords by the mere fact of acting in accord with social convention' (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 169).

Doxa is the 'point of view of the dominant' that is presented and imposed 'as a universal point of view' (Bourdieu, 1994, p. 15):

> Social divisions become principles of division, organizing the image of the social world. Objective limits become a sense of limits, a practical anticipation of objective limits acquired by experience of objective limits, a 'sense of one's place' which leads one to exclude oneself from goods, persons, places and so forth from which one is excluded. (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 471)

Further, the '*sense* of limits implied *forgetting* the limits' which results in 'an adherence to relations of order which, because they structure the real world and the thought world, are accepted as self-evident' (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 471). They become doxa. In the context of class relations:

> The dominated classes have an interest in pushing back the limits of *doxa* and exposing the arbitrariness of the taken for granted; the dominant classes have an interest in defending the integrity of doxa or, short of this, of establishing in its place the necessarily imperfect substitute, *orthodoxy.* (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 169)

Orthodoxy, as the 'acceptable ways of thinking' and limited 'universe of possible discourse,' can be mobilized to limit the disruption of more deeply held doxa (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 169). Doxa, then, is also bound up with power relations, and therefore capital, as part of the dynamics of conflict and contention.[154]

---

[154] In particular this is one of the means of control that Bourdieu (1990) identifies as part of the state: 'Through the framing it imposes upon practices, the state establishes and inculcates common forms and categories of perception and appreciation, social frameworks of perceptions, of understanding or of memory, in short state forms of classification. It thereby creates the conditions for a kind of immediate orchestration of habitus which is itself the foundation of a consensus over this set of shared evidences constitutive of (national) common sense' (p.

Bourdieu introduces 'hysteresis' to account for the mismatch between habitus and field, when 'dispositions function out of phase and practices are objectively ill-adapted to the present conditions because they are objectively adjusted to conditions that no longer obtain' (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 62). Habitus becomes 'ill-adjusted' to the present conditions of the field, or as Fowler (2020) argues, such a 'maladjusted habitus' opens up potential for alteration and transformation (p. 458). Cultural forms of capital, in particular, can be marshalled to 'restructure that field,' in which they are situated, 'and to revalue its values' (p. 457). A 'hysteresis effect' challenges the durability of habitus, the terms of the field, and the fit between the two. It opens up a set of new potential possibilities and the potential for disruption of what was previously made to feel durable and inevitable.

Bourdieu (1990) notes that due to the durability (but again, not inevitability) of the dispositions of habitus, individual dispositions 'can outlive the economic and social conditions in which they were produced, can be the source of misadaptation as well as adaptation, revolt as well as resignation' (p.62). The conditions of the field often change at a greater pace than the dispositions of the actors within them. In other words, crisis and hysteresis can prompt a number of outcomes depending on the broader context and conditions at play, including possible radical potentials.[155]

He also points out that hysteresis is 'one explanation of the structural lag between opportunities and the dispositions to grasp them … the frequently observed incapacity to think historical crises in categories of perception and thought other than those of the past, however revolutionary)' (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 58). The 'durability' of habitus leads to a lag in responding to the change in the conditions of the field. While there is potential for disruption, alteration, even

---

54). The state is a source of doxic and orthodoxic beliefs and the cultivation of common sense. For my purposes here this connections specifically to Rifkin's (2013) previously mentioned discussion of settler common sense, with the state keen to maintain settler common sense.

[155] Bourdieu (1984, p. 133) points out that most individuals are likely to continue to encounter situations that confirm and support their current habitus, so there may be little potential for alteration and disruption. There is a likelihood to 'confirm habitus,' maybe even most of the time, at least until a moment of crisis makes such a continuation untenable, or until a level of 'socio-analysis' to awaken conscious and engage in 'self-work' is attained. This echoes the notion of radical reflexivity I turn to next.

revolution, in moments of crisis and hysteresis, the persistence of habitus, doxic beliefs, and durable ways of being in the world may mean that such moments of potential, such cracks in the façade, pass by. We may perceive that things are changing, but habitus, conditioned by the past, limits the formation of new ways of thinking and being in the present or future.

This is part of the contradictory, and certainly messy context in which relations and conflicts occur. Those 'who are put into question by structures (operating through the positions) are able to challenge the structure, sometimes to the point of remaking it,' when radical habitus combines with the field of confrontation to create moments of disruption (Bourdieu, 2005, p. 47). Therefore, 'Reflexivity and critical attitude is a precondition to discover, to question and finally to challenge the established power relations, categories and relations of production and reproduction within the (conflictive) social world' (Bourdieu, 2011, p. 229). This disrupts, and has the potential to alter, doxic beliefs and ultimately the habitus of those actors involved.

Doxic beliefs may have only gained their current status due to an erasure of previous crises that have occurred:

> What appears to us today as self-evident, as beneath consciousness and choice, has quite often been the stake of struggles and instituted only as the result of dogged confrontations between dominant and dominated groups. The major effect of historical evolution is to abolish history by relegating to the past, i.e., to the unconscious, the lateral possibles that it eliminated. (Bourdieu, 1994, p. 15)

Crisis is part of the process of altering what were previously doxic beliefs and ways of being and bringing forth new forms of habitus. This occurs, according to Bourdieu (1977), as 'practices are always liable to incur negative sanctions when the environment with which they are actually confronted is too distant from that to which they are objectively fitted' (p.78). Crises are one of the few moments when the legitimacy of structures and institutions are contestable (Bourdieu,

1994, p. 15), and therefore can present possibilities for greater shifts and changes.[156] These are moments when habitus might be altered, and where there are possible openings for new ways of being.

Habitus can be transformed, altered, through an 'awakening of consciousness' to get a handle on 'dispositions' and engage in 'self-work.' But its durability comes in the form of early formative events in the construction of one's dispositions and a likelihood that they will hold greater influence and resist change and alteration (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, pp. 133–134). This is part of my concern here, not just how habitus forms in terms of anarchist politics and its attention to ongoing realities of settler colonialism, but how it persists as structures of settlement, and what avenues may be available to awaken a further anti-colonial anarchist consciousness. It is a useful account of how relations in a particular context are structured, and points to some of the difficulties in pushing back, structuring back if you will, against the everyday common sense and 'feel for the game.'

The key elements of Bourdieu's vast body of work and wide ranging concepts discussed here, while non-exhaustive, provide a useful and compelling basis for understanding the structural and relational dynamics between actors, contexts, institutions, and structures. Moving forward, I apply these concepts and insights within social movement contexts, to aid in the understanding of the structured and structuring dynamics at play. Specifically, I consider how the dynamics of change in habitus, field, and capital can help to understand the dynamics of anarchist culture, why certain beliefs and practices continue to uphold dynamics of settler colonialism, and ultimately how they might be most forcefully disrupted. As the interviews in the subsequent three chapters show, anarchists are keen to enhance the potential to disrupt normative and persistent ways of being in order to open up potentials for deeper anti-colonial politics.

---

[156] According to Janoschka (2011) the ongoing influence of doxa and prevalent power relations can seek to foreclose the ability for disruption in a crisis, or 'crisis can also initialize a permanently radicalized reflexive consciousness that increasingly questions and challenges further doxic perceptions' (p. 229). The misalignment of habitus and the relations of the field prompts a further critical, if not radical and subversive, posture.

Bourdieu in Social Movements

Bourdieu's work has been used in a range of research and theory contexts in order to examine the dynamics of human action and activity. Crossley (2001, 2002, 2003), Kennelly (2008), Haluza-DeLay (2008), Ibrahim (2011, 2013), Mayrl (2013), Flesher Fominaya (2016) and Ancelovici (2019), amongst others, each note specific deficiencies in social movement theorization that can be improved by turning to Bourdieu's work, in particular the relationship between agents and structures. Bourdieu's work goes beyond seeing agents as strictly attempting to maximize utility or resources, and permits a view to the ways in which they 'play the game' within movements collectively, and in relation.[157] This turn to social theory, rather than strictly social movement theory, Flesher Fominaya (2014) argues, permits further insight into social movement dynamics and cultures.

Nick Crossley (2002) suggests that historic social movement approaches are unable to adequately account for the relationship between structure and agency, and tend to focus on 'strains,' 'political opportunity structures' or network theories to explain movement activity (p. 669). A move to Bourdieu can account for the range of actors that engage in the protest field (not just groups, but also police,[158] journalists, etc.); it can capture and account for the breadth of diversity of those who cohere around a specific framing; and can grasp the 'blurring' or overlap that can occur between different groups (p. 689). This can be further expanded to consider movements within the specific context of settler colonialism.

This approach can also engage with dynamics of conflict within the protest field space, as illuminated by Bourdieu's concepts, while recognizing that there is a 'co-constituting' and shared 'space of contention' (Crossley, 2002, p. 674). Fields, in this case, allow for a

---

[157] Ibrahim (2013) does caution, however, that we ought not to take Bourdieu's application to social movements as universal; in particular his work may be seen as most 'useful for analyzing symbolic struggles of political and ideological competition and conflict' and may have little utility in struggles where there is more solidarity and cooperation as he sees the field specifically as a place of conflict (p. 69). Within anarchism, in part I want to name a conflict in terms of a need for intentional and specific engagement with the context of settler colonialism and the frequent lack of such engagement within sectors of anarchist theory and practice.

[158] On police militarization and repression using Bourdieu, see Wood (2014).

consideration of the broader diversity and heterogeneity of the actors and groups involved. Crossley (2002) proposes an 'anti-corporate' protest field, with a dynamic mix of actors engaged variously in contention, cooperation, conflict, solidarity, and competition around a particular anti-corporate ideology, without requiring them to be part of a more singular unified movement. This permits a focus on social movement actors within a more specific ideological frame, as well as other key players that inhabit the terrain, and the dynamics between them.

Social movement actors within such a field

> stand in structured relations to one another and their actions mutually interfere with one another and interpenetrate, giving rise to an irreducible dynamic of interaction. Each responds and reacts to the actions of the others (or the effects of those actions) generating, in turn, situations, opportunities and provocations to which the others must respond. And as they do this they lure other agents and groups into the fray, indicating by their actions that 'this is where the action is'; that is to say, their actions and interactions create perceived opportunities for other groups and generate a general framework of meaning which suffices to incite other groups into action. (Crossley, 2002b, p. 674)

Part of this incitement and move to action comes from 'strains' that lead to friction between the habitus of those at play in the protest field and the social conditions of the world (Crossley, 2002b, p. 679).

These aspects of disruption and crisis, in relation to habitus, are a fruitful way to account for the 'learned activist know-how' that comes via movement participation (Crossley, 2003, p. 49). This helps to explain how movement knowledge and cultures are disseminated and maintained, but also how dynamics persist even as they are being challenged. Crossley (2003) argues that Bourdieu has a limited view of specifically radical forms of political activity (p. 45), and tends towards specific moments of crisis as the spaces where habitus can be disrupted, rather than more general possibilities for radical reflexivity. This fails to account for the relatively persistent

nature of crisis in modern society, as noted by broader social movement scholars. Crisis for Bourdieu, Crossley contends, is a relatively short-lived moment, rather than something more constituent of the realities in which we live day-to-day (p. 49). Contemporary capitalism, in particular, thrives on crisis, for ongoing forms of expansion and recuperation. Despite these hesitations, Crossley ultimately argues that Bourdieu's concepts still possess theoretical potency to detail the forms of interaction that occur within movements.

As a key study on the dynamics of contention and disruption within movement spaces, Ibrahim (2011) accounts for an anti-capitalist field in order to trace the political distinction that occurs between competing anarchist and socialist perspectives in the UK Global Justice movement. 'Anti-capitalist' becomes 'an ideological prefix' that 'offers clarity on one's political vision, goals, and practices' (p. 320).[159] There is not a 'singular habitus;' 'patterns of political distinction and practice' need greater discussion, if not separation, between actors, to account for the different political perspectives at play (p. 331). A general form of activist habitus, discussed above, is too limited to understand the specific political perspectives, tastes, and forms of conflict and competition that are at play within movement fields.

Ibrahim (2011, 2013) expands on Crossley's work to specify an anti-capitalist sub-field that gives greater consideration to radical movements and actors, and shifts focus to those engaged in resistance, and ideological contention between them, rather than the wider 'protest' scale of actors that Crossley considers. Ibrahim (2013,)[160] argues that Bourdieu's concepts 'better capture the political motivations and interaction' between various actors in a specifically anti-capitalist field, 'beyond the rational and economistic treatment of political action as explained

[159] While Crossley and Haluza-Delay set up a direct engagement of Bourdieu's concepts with social movements, and give us more 'radical' forms of habitus to consider, this is quite broad and doesn't have an ideological grounding in a specific collective value-practices. Value-practices are essential for understanding, differentiating, and bounding what we mean by the term anarchism, and what, conversely, we most certainly do not. The exclusion of so-called 'anarcho-capitalism' is a case in point where value-practices preclude its inclusion in the anarchist canon, despite ripping off a similar naming convention and perhaps even nominally drawing from some anarchist theorists. On the necessity of such exclusion see Baillargeon (2001, 2013) and Marshall (2010).

[160] Ibrahim's work is one of the few to consider anarchists directly within a Bourdieusian framework, though other works by Wood (2019), Williams (2017), and Jeppesen (2011) do to some degree as well.

by theorists from the resource mobilisation and the political process approaches' (p.68). 'Field' is a better fit to account for the 'game' behaviour between different groups that share some political principles, but also contend with each other, and have their status and capital challenged by others that newly emerge. Ibrahim notes the important fit of Bourdieu to assess actors that have very specific political and ideological reference points for their activity, and their symbolic struggles for dominance and influence within a specific political milieu. His framework helps to look at dynamics not just between anarchists and other anti-capitalists, but between anarchists themselves.

Ibrahim (2011) details the 'competitive and conflictual' engagement within the UK anti-capitalist movement that forms a field, and a 'field of struggle' according to Bourdieu (p. 323). Political history and experience was a core indicator of 'ideological affinity' between actors to the form the broader movement and field itself, but also the specific forms of distinction between socialists and anarchists. Previous experience or engagements with anti-war and anti-globalization organizing were key influences, but also the specific 'action repertoires' and forms of organization employed (socialists more geared towards party affiliations and larger coalitions along an electoral basis, while anarchists favoured, similarly to the value-practices noted in Chapter 2, forms of decentralization, horizontalism, and confrontational direct action tactics). Each respective approach lead to particular manifestations of capital and feelings about how politics were to take place. He summarises: 'These groups are locked in an ideological dynamic because of their history and subsequent practice based on the acquisition of their preferred capital. Their habitus structures their political tastes and preferences, ultimately reproducing the conditions which give rise to the dynamic in first instance' (Ibrahim, 2011, p. 332).

Habitus is an important framework for understanding how actors come to specific politics, and also how politics and practices continue to maintain habitus as well. Through the political socialization that occurs within movement spaces, participants are able to develop certain 'collective repertoires' of action and organization:

> they gain and develop a "know-how" to protest which is deposited in their habitus in the form of cultural capital. Over time these habits become second nature. However, the actors are neither culturally dopey nor completely instrumental. The habitus concept was developed by Bourdieu to explain both an agent's will and the ability to act reflexively within certain objective structures (fields). Anti-capitalist actors within the anti-capitalist field accrue capital which will further their political agenda, and which fits with their political ideology. It is this acquisition of capital through continuous political practice that creates a distinction; over time this becomes routinized and reproduced. (Ibrahim, 2011, pp. 328–329)

Habitus develops over time, through participation in movement spaces, actions, debates and conflicts, and is maintained through continued participation. It is accentuated by the acquisition of greater forms of capital that can be used to broadcast political influence.

Ibrahim (2013) names an explicit conflict and challenge dynamic, that 'allows for an integrated analysis of how agents within a diverse social movement environment understand how to draw on their resources to further their political agenda, and why this might lead to competition and conflict as different groups struggle for dominance over their environment' (p. 78). The forms of conflict and contention between anarchists and socialists occur as different groups and formulations rise to prominence, win victories, and are able to assert influence over the anti-capitalist field. Contention comes via competing group tactics and strategies, but also through pointed critiques of others in communiques, movement publications, or books. In this case, socialist groups were able to gain capital and influence through support from more influential writers and direct public support (as opposed to often more diffuse and disruptive anarchist forms of tactics and organization). Conflict also arises due to forms of proximity—such as attendance at large mass mobilizations or summits—through direct contact in the field, while more parallel forms of organizing result in lesser contact and conflict.

Bourdieu's understanding of field, capital, and habitus provides a useful framework for understanding the interactions between actors in the same field who may even share relatively

similar politics and ideologies, but who are also in ongoing forms of conflict around forms of organization, types of action, or broader goals. [161] It is these sorts of distinctions that are crucial for not just understanding the range of actors in a broader 'social movement' or radical field, but also to account for a much more explicitly anarchist one as well.[162]

These notions of contention are important within the dynamics of anarchist politics, as there is much contention between anarchists and other movements/tendencies, between anarchists and broader systems of domination, and between anarchists themselves in the process of continually developing, specifying and expanding value-practices. This dynamic of contention aids in understanding the forms of contention that occur within and between anarchists around settler colonialism and anti-colonial politics.

Mayrl (2013) points out that one of the key aims of the prison abolitionists he studies is to influence other groups within the field as to the importance of prison abolitionist politics. Contention occurs regarding the importance of an abolitionist stance with regard to broader social justice or radical politics. While this might be an easier set of politics or ideological

[161] This move to fields, as Mayrl (2013) notes, allows the consideration of specific logic(s) that motivate particular organizations or groups within a more general social justice field, with a specific interest on prison abolitionist struggles (p. 294). How groups engage with the idea of social justice is part of what is under contention and competition within such a field, directed not just at forces of power, but at other groups within the field (p. 304). Mayrl brings a specific consideration of Bourdieu's concepts of doxa and illusio, to assess the persistence of 'taken for granted beliefs' (p. 290), as well as the frequent pursuit of recognition of particular politics, such as an abolitionist stance, within a wider social justice field. Still, a broad social justice, or even specifically anti-capitalist, field is quite broad, and only able to account for broad forms of habitus and capital given the range of actors. There may be some shared similarities between groups, organizations, and individuals who participate in such a space, but the breadth of diversity, say between anarchists and fundamentalist right wing Christians means that some further clarification and focus is required.

[162] Mathieu (2021) uses Bourdieu in a similar way to lay out a framework of a 'space of social movements' where habitus is developed and maintained through participation and socialization, and social and symbolic forms of movement capital are accrued. He suggests three levels of analysis: 'the micro-level of the individual dispositions and skills that enable to protest practice; the meso-level of the mutual relations between movements; and the macro-level of the situation of the space of social movements within a differentiated social world' (p. 204). While Mathieu acknowledges the debt to Bourdieu, this 'new' 'space of social movements' doesn't add much overall, and still resonates at a fairly general 'macro' level of a range of actors, ideologically undifferentiated. The three levels of analysis seem to be more in line with habitus in the micro, field in the meso, and in relation to fields of power in the macro. Perhaps a good reminder of the utility of Bourdieu, even if it doesn't seem to advance our frameworks much further.

commitment to foreground within an anti-capitalist field, this is going to be harder to consider and see the impact of in a broader social justice field.[163]

Crossley (2003) expands his discussion of Bourdieu and social movement politics to think through a radical form of habitus,[164] where 'protest presupposes learned activist know how … rooted in habitus' (p. 49). The radical habitus 'creates a disposition towards further political activism' (p. 50) that is importantly 'durable' and an 'acquired disposition' ('formed through participation in that [activist] practice') (p. 51); 'It is both structured and a structuring structure' (p. 61).

Activist habitus helps us consider why some may be predisposed to participate in activism Kennelly (2009) suggests that a white middle-class activist family upbringing creates a habitus of youth activism with a 'sense of ease' for young people to get involved with activism (p. 263). Not all those participants in youth activism carry such an activist habitus from the beginning; others undergo a sort of 'habitus shift' that departs from the previously formed habitus (such as a right wing or conservative upbringing) and comes to align with the doxa of a left wing activist habitus. As per above, a change in field, such as a move into activist subcultural space, creates friction with previous forms of habitus. Her use of Bourdieu suggests a utility for understanding why some groups of people move towards radical forms of activism in ways that are unconscious and how prior habits, dispositions, and 'tastes' inform the possibilities for participation in movements. She also considers the dynamics of alteration of habitus and doxa that are disrupted as different fields and contexts are encountered.

Haluza-DeLay (2008) argues that movements themselves are specifically oriented towards forms of cultural change, not only narrowly political aims. He studies the development or

---

[163] This isn't to say that such an investigation wouldn't be worthwhile. The diffusion and spread of specific forms of politics, forms of action or organization is itself an important task, one that Wood (2012) engages directly with her study of the anti-globalization movement and the Direct Action Network in particular. My point here is to keep the breadth of fields under consideration, especially if we want to try and grasp the more specific aspect of habitus.

[164] Crossley (2003) argues that, generally speaking, Bourdieu has little to say about social movements, let alone radical ones, throughout the majority of his work. Here, I think, is where we can take up the work to bring Bourdieu more directly into these specific radical social movement considerations.

alteration of an ecological habitus through practices of learning, as one means of considering the sorts of radical reflexivity that Bourdieu proposes. In this case, 'a Bourdieusian approach suggests that, while it is not easy to break with prior habitus, social movements can be the field within which habituations consistent with the alternative reality prefigured by movement framing can form and be maintained' (p. 206). Considering these 'communities of practice,' which go beyond only piecemeal forms of lifestyle or structural policy change, helps attend to the relations at play between habitus and field (p. 213). This prefigurative possibility is a core anarchist value-practice, and its connection to habitus I argue is what presents a greater possibility for expanding anti-colonial politics.

Haluza-Delay (2008) notes the ways that habitus and sense of place, in an ecological sense, are influenced by the ways that we live within a specific context. Habitus and field help to account for the 'knowledge-creating' and 'reality-making' aspects of social movements that are 'engaged with the often-unreflexive aspect of social fields that reinforce existing reality constructions' (p. 216). In other words, why certain types of politics and practices persist, often without being questioned or challenged directly in their specific context and application. Haluza-Delay argues for a 'pedagogical role' within social movements to aid participants in the understanding of how 'the existing order co-creates their experiences (via their habitus) and to help them internalize new dispositions' (p. 214). Movements, in this view, can be understood as 'communities of practice' and such practices are elaborated, and habitus developed and altered, through everyday movement experiences. Routinized movement activity helps in the solidification of habitus, but can also limit its change and alteration.

As Mayrl (2013) observes, Bourdieu's field allows for a greater accounting of 'diffusion and spillover' that may stem from, but also encourage, a change in habitus—'not as incidental by products of interaction, but as a result of deliberate efforts to alter the stakes of a field' (p. 304). Movements here can prompt change in more generalized doxic belief systems. They can, and often do, disrupt the broader fields of power they come up against. This is often the direct intention of movements, to facilitate change in politics and structures, even if they aren't thinking in Bourdieusian terms directly at all. By bringing in Bourdieu, we can more directly

understand the difficulties of engaging such forms of change, why certain politics and perspectives tend to persist, and the more concerted attention that might need to be brought to developing value-practices further.

Conflict and crisis, as noted by Bourdieu, is often a result of a mismatch between habitus and field. As conditions and contexts change, friction occurs between the terms of the field and those who are acting within it. Crises in protest movements also arise 'when protest grows beyond its normal, small, and sectional position, when more (but perhaps not "anything") seems possible' (Crossley, 2003, p. 62) and where 'the critical impulse generated in moments of crisis sediments, in some cases, as a durable disposition (habitus) towards further protest, thus revitalizing and re-staffing the very fields of protest and contention that eased the crisis into being' (p. 64). Crisis facilitates a further disposition to protest, politics and the possibilities of change. Crossley (2003) argues that Bourdieu seems to suggest that 'radical reflexivity and critique' can only occur during times of crisis, where there is a sort of temporary suspension of habitus that allows for alteration of doxa. Rather, Crossley suggests that only a partial suspension of doxic beliefs and 'the allocation of issues to the doxic and discursive' is what changes (p. 48). Current doxa can fall away, while other discursive issues can become doxic.

This can result in a sort of 'habitus shift' when 'an individual's social position within a *field* of interactions, and the means by which the relationships within that field permit that individual to take actions that might otherwise be inconceivable' (Kennelly, 2009, p. 263). In other words, as a result of crisis, an individual's exposure or location within a field that does not match their habitus can lead to actions, and ways of being, that are out of place and seemingly 'inconceivable' given their previous habitus, exacerbated by the ongoing processes of conflict and contention within the field. Such movement can be perhaps 'educated' in the sense of Haluza-Delay (2008) noted above, but also continues to be an unconscious process.

In her study of interactions within and between global justice movement actors in Madrid, Flesher Fominaya (2016) notes the ways that movement subcultures and forms of habitus within different organizing cultures limited organizing meetings, and coming to effective decisions. In particular 'a lack of reflexivity about differences between autonomous organizing

cultures (embodied in activist habitus) impeded the ability to build an effective network, despite the initial enthusiasm of the activists who had travelled to the meeting' (Flesher Fominaya, p. 163). This occurred directly around differing interpretations and practices of consensus decision making. Flesher Fominaya notes that in such instances there may be 'ideological agreement' but the cultural context of language, delivery, and process led to significant conflict and clash (p. 164). A form of 'radical reflexivity' was not present, and perhaps there was an element of collective 'habitus,' to put things into Bourdieu's terminology directly, that was incorrectly assumed. In other words, simply having the 'same' politics is insufficient to assume a shared habitus—a shared way of being and doing in the world.

Flesher Fominaya (2016) adds the emotional implications of clashes and conflicts, where actors

> experience a sense of discomfort and being "out of place". Most people, therefore, will auto-exclude themselves from environments in which they feel that they do not understand the "rules of the game", where they are unable to enact a role successfully or observe the proper rituals and where the meanings, symbols and codes are unclear to them. When actors are in spaces or fields that are consistent with their habitus they will not subject their routine practices to scrutiny or critical reflection. In fields that are misaligned with their habitus they are not likely to feel a shared sense of belonging, making it much more difficult to create a shared sense of collective identity (or mutual solidarity) that research suggests is necessary for the effective creation of transnational activist networks. (pp. 156–157)

Flesher-Fominaya (2016) concludes that 'activist habitus prevented a process of reflection, even in the midst of transnational encounters rife with culture clashes' (p. 167). This prevented further forms of interaction, while foreclosing possibilities 'to establish mutual solidarity and shared commitments to a political project' (p. 163). Perhaps too much clash, in a way that pushes actors to move away from a field in which they feel little to no resonance, is a way that also might limit engagement that could generate alteration of habitus. There still needs to be

enough similarity and connection, or 'fit' in order to maintain relations within a specific field. Looking at habitus provides a window to not just conflict based on practices, but also related to the unconscious and persistent aspects that actors carry with them, and which can be frequently assumed as being similar, but ultimately limit productive forms of engagement.

There does seem to be some suggestion here as to the more focused and mouldable nature of habitus that can be generated through the pedagogical and active practices of social movements. While I think it would be fair to say that movements (or any actor for that matter) carry some sense of the structured and structuring dynamics of the relations that they are embedded in, our ability to directly or measurably mold habitus seems much more difficult to definitively assess. While Bourdieu's work provides a framework that usefully aids the discussion of how politics, practices, and relations come about—and how they become unconsciously durable—their very unconscious and repetitive nature seems harder to directly pinpoint.

When we speak about the disruption or alteration of habitus (such as the generation of a greater anti-colonial political orientation) any sort of 'direct' cultivation can only go so far. The relationship of unconscious practices and relations, and their relationship to the field in which we find ourselves, can only be understood in limited ways. Much like the assessment of historical beliefs that are enculturated within us since birth (a form of habitus in its own way), there is only so much that can be actively and intentionally done to alter these aspects. Much of this change, as I think Bourdieu would argue, happens unconsciously through our experience of the world, structures we run up against, other actors we engage with, and other elements that alter our previous modes of thought, practices, and ways of being. The aim might be, then, to cultivate greater moments of interaction, engagement, discussion, and disruption that can have potential effects on habitus and the ways that we see the world. This is precisely the desire that my interview participants articulated: that we need greater moments of writing, theorizing, discussion, and publication to work on deepening anarchist anti-colonial value-practices. We can still cultivate these moments with some degree of intention, even if we can't ever fully grasp their unconscious, or habitual, impacts.

My point then, is that Bourdieu's framework is important because it gives context to the more unconscious and less readily perceptible ways that politics, practices, and cultures are created and altered, and points to an inherent set of limitations that come from our more obvious and active attempts to engage with our world. This is not to say that we shouldn't be trying to engage in more cohesive and disruptive critique and practice, but rather that this can only go so far, and that the field—the context in which we operate—at a number of levels will continue to be affected by us, and affect us as well. Seeking out forms of disruption is likely to have ongoing conscious and unconscious impacts on our habitus and modes of practice. Such practices can continue to have an 'educative' effect to alter both habitus and the field in which actors engage (Haluza-Delay, 2008, p. 205).

Taking on Bourdieu's concepts of field, capital, and habitus allows a consideration of the ways that practices and beliefs are formed and persist within social movement spaces, how they are reproduced and enculturated in successive activists and organizers, but also how they come to be disrupted and altered. This provides a potent framework for considering anti-colonial politics within anarchist movements, and the possibilities to directly expand such politics.

Anarchist Field and Habitus

In this section I consider habitus, capital, and field in relation to cultures of anarchism within the context of settler colonialism in Southern Ontario. Anarchist habitus is not a singular definer, but is situated within a particular context, with particular forms of value-practices that are emphasized. Bourdieu (1977) acknowledges that while 'it is impossible for all members of the same class (or even two of them) to have had the same experiences, in the same order, it is certain that each member of the same class is more likely than any member of another class to have been confronted with the situations most frequent for the members of that class' (p. 85). Transposed to anarchists in particular, we could say that anarchists, as a 'class' with situated radical movement politics, and explicit connection to history and value-practices, share a sense of habitus, even if it will not, and perhaps cannot, be entirely identical. Habitus, in this sense, does not suggest a wholesale reality of uniformity, but rather a set of unifying 'durable dispositions' located within a particular field(s).

Flesher Fominaya (2014) argues that the global justice movement groups and movements she studies in Madrid can be conceived 'as a (sub)cultural field, where actors or members share sets of meanings and rituals across movement groups (with greater or lesser degrees of congruence), which are embedded in a wider cultural political framework that itself shapes interaction rituals and movement group practice' (p. 197). This element of congruence, allowing for a certain level of diversity or differentiation, helps to understand the ways that habitus, with capital, has an important unifying aspect that produces and reproduces actors (political) tendencies within movement spaces.

The specific expressions of anarchists represented by my interviews form a certain anarchist habitus, and the specific sites of research in Southern Ontario are a subcultural field. The anarchist actors share a number of instances that bring them together into a subcultural field. They are primarily united by the sorts of value-practices discussed in Chapter 2, which include a generalized opposition to all forms of oppression and domination, and a general opposition to settler colonialism and support for Indigenous resurgence. Secondly, they are connected to each other through social, political, and cultural forms of contact and exchange. There are continual and evolving modes of exchange between the players that link them together. This includes personal relationships, physical places of meeting and culture, attendance at events such as bookfairs and protest actions, the exchange of political ideas through contact points such as north-shore.info, the circulation of 'guerilla texts,' and the circulation of individuals and groups between cities and communities. Cultural, social, and political forms of capital maintain points of contact across a range of cities, and articulates a specific form of anarchist habitus that then interacts with other anarchist forms across the wider geographic area.

Southern Ontario can be understood as a specific anarchist subcultural field, within which there are specific subsets of anarchists. The field contains a range of anarchist actors that carry their own expressions of tastes, distinctions, and habitus. As noted in previous chapters, Southern Ontario anarchism has a strong history of anti-colonial and Indigenous solidarity politics, shared forms of organization and opposition to large scale events like the Olympics and G20 (which have solidified and expanded relations and connections between cities/communities even to

this day), and ongoing points of exchange, connection, deliberation, and contention that continue to bring actors into close relations with each other. These forms of engagement tend towards debates and discussions that are localized in such a way as to frame actors within a specific geographic, political, and cultural space. The individuals, groups, projects, and publications interact and create differentiated forms of capital (cultural, social, symbolic, and at times economic, depending on available resources and avenues for access and platforms of communication). Capital influences which perspectives and positions are most regarded and find the wider consideration and adoption within such a subcultural field.

Due in part to national/provincial borders, moving further out from the Southern Ontario corridor makes the debates and consideration in this area less relevant, less local, and less connected to an explicit context (in particular an anti-colonially-framed Indigenous resistance context that places a large, but not-exclusive, focused on Haudenosaunee land defence struggles). The field becomes bounded in such a way, per Bourdieu, that, outside of this corridor, the effects of the field (debates, issues, struggles, analysis, community, relationships, capital, etc.) start to fade.

As Chapter 2 noted, there is a wide range of anarchist positions, despite some generally shared value-practices. Jeppesen (2010) notes that 'we may map anarchist value-practices but there is no cultural or ideological system that is the same for everyone in anarchist culture; there is no single or even binary system of production to which everyone aspires or every text conforms' (p. 497). Many expressions of anarchist cultural value-practices exist, in particular contexts, at particular times, but do share some common threads. This is but one expression of the possible range of habitus' that might be expressed by anarchists. As such, the way that anarchist habitus might be formed within the subcultural field of Southern Ontario will be different in other locales and at different times. My work here points to a specific tendency and set of affinities within a group of actors that stretch across Southern Ontario, as a specific subset of anarchists who are specifically considering the anti-colonial implications of their value-practices within the context of settler colonialism. The whole of Southern Ontario is not home to one anarchist habitus, but multiple forms that engage in confrontation and competition.

Recalling my discussion in Chapter 1, Jeppesen et al. (2014) put forth the idea of an *anarchist commons* that is 'governed by anarchist norms,' particularly around an anti-capitalist ethic. 'The anarchist commons,' they argue, 'creates a political culture in organizational practices based on shared commitments to diverse political struggles, shared ethical principles, and alternative social norms' (p. 883). Particularly, norms of 'collective autonomy, self-determination, and self-organization' predominate within the culture of the anarchist commons. Such norms form the day-to-day practices of anarchists that become ingrained and habitual. The anarchist commons, then, helps to add structure to the cultures of anarchism, as a generalized set of commitments that persist across a range of anarchism expressions. The specific emphasis of particular value-practices forms the anarchist habitus that is expressed by specific anarchists.

Ibrahim (2011) distinguishes anarchist habitus from a more general socialist/anti-capitalist one based on differentiated political history, ideological perspective (p. 328), and specific repertories of action based on 'decentralized, non-hierarchical networks or loose organizational structures' (p. 329). The distinct political history of anarchism has been well established, from early writers like Proudhon, to the Marx-Bakunin split at the First International, to the Spanish Civil War, the rise of contemporary anarchism after Seattle, constellations informing the Occupy movement, and renewed interest in mutual aid, anti-fascist, and a range of land and community defense struggles. Anarchist habitus has shifted as the field(s) it is located in have also changed over time via various shocks, crisis, and revolutionary moments.

Engaging in so-called 'classical' and historical theoretical works introduces key anarchist themes and shows their early development and genesis. As various introductions to anarchism highlight (Kinna, 2009; Marshall, 2010; Milstein, 2010; Ward, 2004) there is a clear lineage to the classical forms of anarchism that continue to inform the present. These works continue to be a core component of anarchist literatures that are distributed in anarchist cultural spaces like bookfairs, infoshops, social centres, and events. As I discussed in Chapter 2, how such histories are constructed, and which influences are included (or not) is also a crucial matter of consideration. I argued that there is a greater critical perspective to be honed through the consideration of Black Abolitionist and Indigenous perspectives that disrupt an overly narrow,

and assumed universal, construction of anarchism. The context of struggles, the actors in the field, and their respective capital/potency of their ideas and interventions have brought a logic of contention to anarchist habitus.[165] The formation of anarchist habitus,' then, is influenced by how this history is engaged, what is understood to be included within it, how new ideas are disrupted and integrated, and how this informs the development of anarchist ideas.[166]

As Sandra Jeppesen (2010) argues:

> ancestral memories are one of the spaces to which anarchist texts connect, drawing from them as sources and producing them as current memories that will one day be ancestral. … With the principle of connection, the logic of anti-authoritarian culture finds the space to develop anti-oppressive socio-cultural relationships between heterogeneous groups and collectives and within them. (p. 484)

This sort of connection is a feature of anarchist culture that helps to maintain and continue specific forms of anarchist habitus. This also helps with the enculturation of new participants within the anarchist field. And, as I argue in Chapter 7, drawing from the strength of anarchist ancestors and connections is one way that we might further our own situation within settler colonial contexts and go about developing an even more committed set of prefigurative anti-colonial value-practices into the future.

A constituent part of anarchist ideology, and an element of distinction of habitus, are the forms of political action that anarchists take up. According to Ibrahim (2011, 2013), anarchists foreground direct action practices. Apoifis (2017) notes that the practices of solidarity and attack that take place during street protests 'offer a glue to bind activists,' despite tensions and

---

[165] This was part of my aim in Chapter 2, to detail core anarchist value-practices, but also disrupt and expand them, with wider perspectives that might inform them, in ways that could also have an effect on habitus as well.

[166] This is also a means of elevating one's anarchist capital with a good handle on the historical minutiae of the anarchist movement and its associated theories and personas. A fluency in anarchist theory, politic, style of dress, etc. is used as a form of capital that can both uphold and maintain subcultural expressions while also disciplining them. See Portwood-Stacer's (2013) interviews with various participants that touch on this theme explicitly.

disagreement within the anarchist field of actors (p. 148). 'Street-protest rituals, like performative violence,' he continues, 'act as forms of communication between activists, strengthening the bonds that link networks within the space,' build bonds of solidarity between those engaged in resistance, and serve as an outlet for emotions. Direct action is a significant part of the construction of anarchist identity (p. 148). These elements of practice help form specific habitus, through participation in specific types of action, but also as types of action being inherited or historically preferenced as points of distinction and disagreement between anarchists and within the broader anarchist field. There is also the ability to frame one's politics and commitments to action as most/more radical than others, which leads to social and cultural forms of capital (though also detrimental forms of rigid radicalism; Montgomery & bergman, 2017).

Radical events 'serve as sites for the cultivation of a distinctive "habitus" among participants in anarchist activisms' (Portwood-Stacer, 2013, p. 17). They aid in the articulation, spread, and normalization of anarchist cultural practices, but also their experimentation, combining with the anarchist ethic of prefiguration. They allow for trying out different forms of culture, lifestyle political expressions, and action before integrating them into daily life or practice (Portwood-Stacer, 2013, p. 18). These moments of practice, and their specific manifestations in particular contexts, impact the formation of habitus for particular anarchists. As participation intensifies, and one becomes more significantly embedded within the subculture the unconscious structuring of habitus intensifies, along with enculturation into arrangements of capital.

Lesley Wood (2019) examines the genesis and development of anarchist gatherings in North America from 1986–2017, and pushes social movement theorists to more carefully consider the importance of 'movement building' events such as gatherings, bookfairs, conferences, etc. These events serve as 'sources of meaning, ritual and relationship building' during low points and 'spaces for strategic thinking and capacity building (Taylor 1989)' during periods of upswing and momentum (Wood, 2019, p. 893; see also Cohn, 2014). Wood notes that many gatherings throughout the '80s and '90s had a much more 'within anarchism' focus, as this was a lower point of movement activity that led to greater internal movement work on tactics, strategies,

theories and forms of action, but contributed directly to later forms of expansion. Bookfairs, for example, came about during moments where the movement was starting to expand and gain momentum, and where event forms themselves were more expansive beyond strictly anarchists. These sorts of anarchist cultural events are places for the solidification and maintenance of anarchist habitus, as well as its alteration via confrontation and competition, as a wider array of anarchists come together and interact. Bookfairs in particular have been a significant cultural form across a range of cities in Southern Ontario since the late 2000s.

Everyday practices help keep anarchist cultures alive in low points and recessions. Portwood-Stacer's (2013) detailed account of anarchist lifestyle practices notes the ways that such expressions become the forms of distinction and boundaries that police and structure movement cultures (pp. 59–60). Within anarchist cultures there is an assumed 'relationship between ethics and style' or between politics and cultural forms of expression, that allows for an establishment of hierarchy (via cultural and social capital) for those who are seen to reflect both aspects (Portwood-Stacer, 2013, p. 61). Style becomes a key marker of the expression of anarchist tastes, or a lack thereof at odds with the dominant expression. Habitus and capital intersect to influence what anarchism comes to mean as style, content, and practice, but also create dynamics of hierarchy and discipline. Kadir (2016), for example, conceptualizes 'squatter capital' within radical squatters' movements in Amsterdam, gained both through assuming certain respected roles within the movement, as well as one's ability to define oneself against what is deemed as 'inauthentic' squatter practices (p. 94).[167] Style, politics, roles taken in actions, cultural and social capital, and asymmetrical forms of power held within the movement possess 'a habitus of emotional sovereignty'[168] that structure dynamics and create

[167] 'Squatter capital, specific skills, and the differential prestige that one gains by excelling in such skills, describes the unspoken value system of the internal social world of the squatters movement, what Bourdieu describes as understanding the subcategories of practice that pertain to distinctive properties of a field' (Kadir, 2016, p. 93).
[168] This is an 'asymmetrical relationship' whereby 'authority figures receive love and are needed by all members of the group but only require and express love for the total group collectivity rather than any single individual' (Kadir, 2016, p. 95).

asymmetrical relations of power and distinctions between actors and participants within the movement (p. 94).

Dana Williams (2017) points to social capital as a necessary concept for understanding the ways that 'people working in movements, organizations, groups and networks' are able to 'acquire the collective power that they would not possess as mere individuals' (p. 176). This links up with anarchist commitments to mutual aid, where movements with greater levels of mutual aid, trust, and connection are likely to have greater social capital, and therefore greater influence and ultimately success (p. 177). On an individual level, those in anarchist movements who facilitate connection set or uphold norms, or have the resources to travel and stay connected with others in intentional ways possess greater social capital. Anarchists have a tendency to extend social capital to those who are considered equals and limit its extension to those who wield power. Social capital can be bridged between anarchists through the development of trust, which is then likely to make such movements more successful in their spread and influence (Williams, 2017). Forms of capital, therefore, are entwined with the everyday acts and practices of anarchists.

Such everyday practices allow for a practice and maintenance of anarchist habitus and culture and 'account for the unity of style, which unites the practices and goods of a single unity of style, which unites the practices and goods of a single agent or class of agents' (Bourdieu, 1998, p. 8). Habitus is a 'generative and unifying principle which retranslates the intrinsic and relational characteristics of a position into a unitary lifestyle, that is, a unitary set of choices of persons, goods, practices' (Bourdieu, 1998, p. 8). In other words, habitus aids in the creation, maintenance, reproduction, and persistence of lifestyle politics and their expression as a particularly necessary, though perhaps not sufficient or required in and of itself, part of culture.

The 'sense of one's place' (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 466) given by habitus, and these expressions of lifestyle and capital, also operate to create a feeling of 'home' within anarchist cultural space that is welcoming, sustaining, and supportive (Portwood-Stacer, 2013, p. 89). A space where anarchists can truly be their anarchist selves with one another. We might think of this as a means of survival where anarchists can retreat to in time of repression or the low points of

political action that Wood discusses, but where anarchist politics are also maintained.[169] This also has some crucial considerations for the ways that structures of settlement persist within anarchist cultures, which I turn to in later chapters.

Anarchist cultural forms are important in creating forms of connection and a sense of place and home for anarchist habitus. We might see this as a way to consider the bounds of the anarchist field in a directly physical way—by the visual and art-related aspects that populate certain neighbourhoods or areas, or the media/cultural projects that attract anarchists from a certain range, and perhaps the relative reach of anarchist influence. As Bourdieu above notes, the bounds of the field start to take shape when its effects begin to dwindle. Here, at least partly, physical markers give some sense to this sort of boundary.[170]

The anarchist field is host to a wide range of perspectives on anarchism. Anarchists have much to agree on, but there continues to be disagreements as to how to organize or what aspects ought to be emphasized (exemplified by the different tendencies within anarchism, such as anarcho-syndicalism, anarcha-feminism, anarchism without adjectives, anarcho-primitivism, etc.). Further, anarchists employ a range of organizing perspectives, from those working within established community groups seeking to inflect their anarchist value-practices into a wider context, to those working on more directly anarchism-in-name projects to build anarchist culture and politics. This occurs at a range of scales as well, from small, tight-knit affinity groups and collectives, to larger network formations, and broad-based media projects. As I discussed in Chapter 2, there are capital/'big-A' forms of anarchism on the one hand, and 'small-a' forms on the other. These different tendencies, approaches, and emphases also shape habitus, as each

[169] Given the settler colonial context under discussion through these chapters, I would be remiss if I also did not also name the ways that this manifests as an aspect of settler habitus and settler common sense (Rifkin, 2013) as well. Battell Lowman and Barker (2015) and Mackey (2016) discuss similar elements of settler place and home-making that are rooted in Indigenous dispossession and settler supremacy, as well as settler moves to innocence that displace responsibility for histories of violence and their resultant benefits for settlers occupying Indigenous land.

[170] This aspect of anarchist or radical neighbourhoods has been noted as well by both Kadir (2016) in radical squatter movements in Amsterdam and Apoifis (2017) in the Greek anarchist movement.

has their own norms and 'rules of the game' that become internalized, and each mobilize and uphold different expressions of movement capital.

Summarizing the structuring of anarchist habitus, Portwood-Stacer (2013) states:

> After enough time and exposure to the social norms of anarchists, habits are reified to the point that they become naturalized ways of life for the individuals who claim identification with anarchism. The anarchist lifestyle or "habitus" (Bourdieu 1984) eventually appears to be second nature to those who have adopted it … The extensive discipline involved fades from notice for those who most easily pull off the performance, though newcomers, outsiders, and people who are less readily able to adopt the accepted lifestyle practices may be more cognizant of the substantial effort that goes into fulfilling standards of authentic anarchist identity. (p. 89)[171]

Habitus, in Bourdieu's formation, seems to go a bit beyond the framing of lifestyle suggested by Portwood-Stacer here. While lifestyle, and the sorts of tastes and expressions that come with it, certainly form a component of habitus, habitus also encompasses much more in terms of the specific ways that lifestyle practices become unconsciously incorporated and expressed, as part of broader histories, experiences, practices, and manifestations of capital within a specific field. Lifestyle can be one means of distinction, but also exclusion, as Portwood-Stacer forcefully shows, within a more specific field.

---

[171] This is one area of 'crisis' that occurs within anarchist cultures—where the outward cultural expressions of anarchism may come into conflict with its historical ethics and values. This can be expressed by those who don't feel affinity with anarchist modes of cultural dress, for example, and thus adopt other forms of expression. Portwood-Stacer notes a number of instances of this throughout her text, and the difficulty that some participants have in continuing to dwell in anarchist cultural space when their outward cultural appearance or lifestyle choices do not fit the dominant anarchist habitus and doxa. She concludes by suggesting that it is likely more fruitful to ask what lifestyle and cultural practices *do* or accomplish within anarchist cultural space, 'on the basis of their practicability and observable effects in particular contexts, rather than activists making a wholesale embrace or rejection of a given lifestyle or lifestyle practice' that can degenerate into further forms of 'puristic moralism' and hierarchy/division (Portwood-Stacer, 2013, p. 130).

Particular anarchist identities and expressions become 'dominant actors' within a field and 'try to exclude their opponents by imposing a particular definition of field membership and limit the advent of competition or subversive struggles by increasing the cost of entry into the field. The more the criteria for entry and membership are codified and institutionalized, the less the rules of the game are at stake and the more the position of dominants is consolidated' (Ancelovici, 2019, p. 6). There is a 'competition for recognition' in how participants present their ideas within the field and seek their broader uptake. For anarchists, this manifests as varying degrees of lifestyle politics, 'good' politics, 'rigid radicalism' (Montgomery & bergman, 2017; Lagalisse, 2016, 2019), and forms of capital that cement as a dominant/doxic habitus to narrate what a 'real' anarchist is and what sorts of ideas, analysis, strategy, and tactics are emphasized and valorized.

With some general consideration of anarchist habitus, capital, and field, in the following final section I consider some of the specific connections of Bourdieu's work in relation to understanding structures of settler colonialism. This can aid in understanding the ways that anarchist field, capital, and habitus continue to be structured by the settler colonial field of power, and suggests some implications for anti-colonial politics forming a greater part of anarchist value-practices.

The Settler Colonial Field of Power

In this section I turn to the other sense in which Bourdieu uses the term field—that of fields of power. He is certainly speaking, in several of his works, to the dominant cultural field (of art specifically, and its cultural tastes and expressions) or in terms of the dominant capitalist economic field. This approach, however, also has important resonance with approaches to settler colonialism and the habitus' that engage within it. This recalls the detailed discussion of settler colonialism in the previous chapter.

It is important to note that the seeds of Bourdieu's later, more popular, ideas around habitus, capital, and field stem from his early experiences and work in French colonial Algeria. Bourdieu was a conscripted solider in the French army stationed in Algeria, and later taught there,

forming a number of relationships with Algerian intellectuals and people who influenced him. His early work employed ethnographic methods to study Kabyle society in Algeria and spawned his first book—*The Algerians* (1958/1961). This early work and context, as Puwar (2009) argues, requires we approach Bourdieu not only as a theorist of class relations, but as fundamentally emerging and theorizing from colonial relations, even if this was not his primary focus in later work. As White (2022), Go (2013), Loyal (2009) and Puwar (2009, amongst others) argue, Bourdieu's early work contains the initial grounds for the development of his later ideas, even as his core concepts are not yet named.[172] It is important to consider briefly the ways that analysis of colonialism come up in Bourdieu's earlier work to set the stage for considering his later concepts within further (settler) colonial contexts.

As Barclay, Chopin, and Evans (2018) detail, Algeria exemplified core settler colonial relations of dispossession, logics of elimination, a dynamic and expanding structure, settler desires to re-create the societies they left, as well as 'attempts to "transfer" the indigenous population, the elaboration of an enduring "pioneer myth", the insistence on the distinct cultural—or racial—character of the settler community, and a drive towards a form of pluralistic settler sovereignty' (p. 116). The Algerian case has its own specific settler history, identity categories, and relations across different levels of governmental power. Algeria is also significant given the mass exodus of settlers and the fall of the colonial regime after Algerian independence struggles.[173]

In his characterization of Algeria, Bourdieu (1958/1961) speaks of the 'colonial system' centred and upheld around violence, racism and domination, 'whose internal necessity and logic it is

[172] As these authors detail, Bourdieu was also engaged in broader debates and discussion around the nature of colonialism and anti-colonial resistance with those such as Frantz Fanon, Albert Memmi, and John Paul Sartre.
[173] As Barclay et al. (2018) argue, this reality ought to prompt more specific attention to the Algerian case within settler colonial studies that can problematize Anglocentric accounts of settler colonialism, incorporate specific insights from this case study and its own exceptional circumstances, and enrich settler colonial studies more broadly. They also highlight a specific dynamic of 'settler ambivalence': 'Caught between a desire to be recognised by the French of the metropole, and a desire to be recognised as different from the French of the metropole, the settler community at once loved and rejected its imperial guardian' (p. 119). There is certainly more to the specific case of Algeria, but this is beyond the current scope of my study here.

important to understand, because it is the context which gives meaning to all forms of behavior, particularly to the relations between the two ethnic communities' (p. 120). Further:

> One of the main consequences of the colonial situation is that the exercise of the power of choice, which theoretically belongs to those societies that confront one another, has not been granted to the dominated society; the mere fact that the dominant power should have been able to impose its own judicial and administrative standards, in defiance of the social realities and in contempt of the resistance offered by the dominated society, was sufficient to bring about a breakdown in the social structures of the dominated society. (p. 120)

The Algerian war of independence and struggle against French settler colonialism 'plainly revealed the true basis for the colonial order: the relation, backed by force, which allows the dominant caste to keep the dominated caste in a position of inferiority' (Bourdieu, 1958/1961, p. 146). Revolution was the primary means of throwing off colonialism—directed less so at the individual colonists than at the system itself (Bourdieu, 1958/1961, p. 147). Such a change in situation fundamentally 'awakened a political conscience' and 'a new attitude toward society and toward the future' (Bourdieu, 1958/1961, pp. 188–189).

Bourdieu (1958/1961) notes dispossession as a core relation of the colonial dynamic, where people are separated and displaced from their lands and pushed towards private property and wage-labour relations (p. 121). He notes a fundamental process of primitive accumulation for the purposes of expanding colonial power, backed by violence. He advocates for looking at European colonialism, not simply as 'an empire within an empire,' disconnected from the Indigenous inhabitants, but as a 'way of life peculiar to the Europeans' (p. 129), with early settlement seeking a better life that then gave way to more systemic capitalist expansion and domination. 'Thus the European gradually created an environment that reflected his own image and was a negation of the traditional order,' Bourdieu argues, 'a world in which he no longer

felt himself to be a stranger and in which, by a natural reversal, the Algerian was finally considered to be the stranger' (p. 131).

This is reflective of a larger set of cultural changes, and interactions, within the colonial context (Go, 2013, p. 59). Bourdieu (1958/1961) observes that 'colonial traditionalism had come to replace the traditionalism of the traditional society. As a result, ways of behavior which in appearance had remained unchanged were really endowed with a very different meaning and function, because of the fact that they were now set in relation to a totally new frame of reference' (p. 156).

Such 'contradictions affect the inner nature of "the man between two worlds"' (Bourdieu, 1958/1961, p. 142):

> Constantly being faced with alternative ways of behavior by reason of the intrusion of new values, and therefore compelled to make a conscious examination of the implicit premises or the unconscious patterns of his own tradition, this man, cast between two worlds and rejected by both, lives a sort of double inner life, is a prey to frustration and inner conflict, with the result that he is constantly being tempted to adopt either an attitude of uneasy overidentification or one of rebellious negativism. (p. 144)

Colonialism fundamentally altered the relations and terms of identity on which people interacted with each other, but also with their own previous and persistent dispositions.

The habitus of 'peasants' is also fundamentally altered, where

> The peasant can exist only when rooted to his land, the land where he was born, which he received from his parents and to which he is attached by his habits and memories. Once he has been uprooted there is a good chance that he will cease to exist as a peasant, that the instinctive and irrational passion

> which binds him to his peasant existence will die within him. (Bourdieu, 1958/1961, p. 172)

This speaks to a fundamental crisis of habitus, as the settler colonial field displaces the 'traditional' social and cultural fabric, resulting in 'the overthrow of a vital order and the collapse of a whole world of values' (Bourdieu, 1958/1961, p. 144). 'The traditional peasant faces a modern wage economy but cannot easily cast off his or her prior socialization in the field of so-called traditional traditionalism. In other words, the peasant cannot easily cast off his or her habitus' (Go, 2013, p. 62).

Overall, Bourdieu is thinking, then, of colonialism not as a specific event, but as a broader system of relations, a 'constitutive force' (Go, 2013, p. 55), a structure that structures social relations between settlers and Indigenous peoples, but which is also structured by each respective groups' practices. Settlers seek to distinguish themselves from the metropole, even as they make their colonial society in its image. Indigenous peoples' worlds and relations to land are fundamentally altered by colonial violence and dispossession, but their resistance pushes back and alters the broader colonial structure as well.

'Bourdieu's theorization of colonialism as a "relationship of domination" ultimately grounded in naked coercion—and having its own distinct logics-,' Go (2013) argues, 'was more explicit as a *theory of colonialism*' (pp. 56–57). Although he doesn't yet use the term, Bourdieu's notion of 'the colonial situation' is 'like a field in that it shapes actors and their actions' (p. 64). Both colonists/settlers and Indigenous peoples/peasants/Natives 'act and react' in relation to one another because of the structured relationship between them (p. 64). Colonialism also has a persistent level of conflict and competition, a core element that characterizes relations within Bourdieu's fields (p. 64).

Bourdieu thus has a complex view of settler colonialism that predates his wider elaboration of the core elements of habitus, capital, and field that punctuate his later work discussed above. This examination draws greater connections between his concepts and their utility for considering anarchist movements within settler colonialism.

As mentioned in my discussion in Chapter 3, settler colonialism continues to influence and condition relations and ways of life into the present, and given its relative durability over time and space, needs to be seen as a 'structure not an event' (Wolfe, 1999, p. 2). Settler colonialism is a significant 'structuring structure' that is maintained through the ongoing processes of colonization, and conditions a form of colonial habitus (to varying degrees) within its subject populations,[174] and requires what Paulette Regan (2010) has termed the work of 'unsettling the settler within.' Like other structuring structures, it is not infinitely durable or unchangeable, but has behind it significant historical, material, violent, and psychic weight that makes forms of resistance difficult. One of the chief aims of settler colonialism is to foreclose other possible realities to cement its own permanence, in state of finality, where Indigenous peoples functionally cease to exist.

Settler colonialism seeks a continual process of expansion and dispossession into other lands, via primitive accumulation. This requires continual expansion of the field of power, bringing more and more actors into the specific logics of the field, in order to both control land and territory, but also peoples and cultures as well. Settler ways of being construct the world against Indigenous grounded normativities and lifeways, furthering the supremacy of doxic norms and values, and entrenching settler colonial/capitalist forms of capital. Key in this respect are the construction of relations to land and property, as detailed by Nichols (2022), where property and land are placed within a specifically European framework of ownership and possession. This is a fundamental narration of the settler colonial field that determines the relations between actors, the forms of capital that are valorized, and the desire for continual expansion. Population and identity are both significantly regulated through a lens focused on settler fantasies of land and space to shore up ongoing forms of possession and dispossession.

Settler colonialism is, then, both a 'field of power' and a 'space of conflict and competition' (Wacquant & Bourdieu, 1992, pp. 17–18) between players—settler/Indigenous, or anarchist/anti-colonial anarchist. Settlers aim to remake the societies that they left, but they

[174] On this point in general, see Eva Mackey's work (1998, 2016).

also create themselves anew beyond their colonial metropoles. There is a shift in both field and habitus: they come to new lands and create new selves. Settler colonialism (re)structures relations into an explicit hierarchy of power.[175] Indigenous peoples, while bearing the brunt of continual forms of colonial violence, also resist and persist, against settler colonial advances and the logic of elimination. They continue to alter the desired, but perpetually incomplete, finality desired by settler colonialism, and (re)shape settler forms of identity, at times towards anti-colonial ways of being.

Mark Rifkin's (2013) formulation of 'settler common sense,' mentioned in Chapter 3, illustrates the structural impact of settler colonialism on habitus and underlying doxic beliefs. These are the everyday and unconscious ways that settler colonialism is upheld and maintained, often through the structures of the state and capitalism:

> In order to conceptualize the mundane dynamics of settler colonialism, the quotidian feelings and tendencies through which it is continually reconstituted and experienced as the horizon of everyday potentiality, we may need to shift from an explicit attention to articulations of Native sovereignty and toward an exploration of the processes through which settler geographies are lived as ordinary, non-reflexive conditions of possibility. (p. 323)

Rifkin (2013) suggests, drawing from Raymond Williams, that settler colonialism may be considered as a 'structure of feeling' that is a constituent feature of day-to-day life but which is 'not necessarily present to settlers as a set of political propositions or as a specifically imperial project of dispossession' (p. 323). Settlement, dispossession, Indigenous erasure, and genocidal violence are normalized and invisiblized within day-to-day life as individual forms of habitus, and as wider common sense with the dominant culture. One need only to recall (then) Prime Minister Stephen Harper's assertion that Canada has 'no history of colonialism,' while also issuing an apology for the legacy of residential schools (O'Keefe, 2009). Such assertions both

[175] Though as I noted previously this is far from a simple settler/Indigenous binary, even if this is a core relation of division at play.

blur the historical legacies of colonialism (even as they are acknowledged in narrow and specific ways in another breath) and relegate them to the past, as irrelevant to the present. The harm was 'back then' rather than something that structures the present.

An unconscious, yet persistent, common sense is established, a set of doxic beliefs, that become habitual and can dictate one's relative capital (or lack thereof) depending on the ability to uphold colonial norms. To break this unconscious replication, Rifkin (2013) suggests a direct recognition of enduring forms of Indigenous resurgence and relationships to place, a disruption of the taken-for-granted forms of settler common sense, and 'relinquishing the notion of an autonomous, extra-political selfhood existing in a place apart' (p. 336). Or, more plainly, a recognition of settler colonial structures as part of the whole fabric of the context in which one lives and the benefits and capital that one wields, and not a history that continues to be separated. This process of 'unsettling' can prompt conflict and crisis to reorient the settler habitus, if not the whole of the settler colonial field of power. This recalls Bourdieu's framing of revolution against the whole of the colonial system to develop a 'new attitude.'

Indigenous grounded normativities stand outside the power of the settler colonial field, insofar as the effects of settler colonialism are diminished in such spaces, and limits of the field are reached. Indigenous resurgence and resistance are at times both outside the bounds of the settler colonial field, reconstructing other ways of being in the world, but also influence and are influenced by the settler colonial field as well. This is a complex set of relations that continues to hold potentials for disruption of both the settler colonial field of power, as well as settler forms of common sense and habitus. As Indigenous resurgence, direct action, and land defense struggles continue to (re)assert themselves in powerful ways they are likely to continue to prompt various crisis of settler power. This extends to the disruption of settler forms of habitus and structures of settlement that persist even in nominally radical spaces like the anarchist field. These forms of crisis and disruption, these 'other worlds that are already here' according to Warburton (2021), are crucial to considering the ways that greater anti-colonial politics can be developed within the anarchist habitus and field.

Settler colonialism is also what the anarchist field runs up against, and which anarchists specifically align against, and requires some further consideration.[176] Theresa Warburton, in *Other Worlds Here* (2021), argues in particular that this has found its way into anarchism very directly, as 'structures of settlement' and a form of 'settler anarchism.' She argues that contemporary anarchist movements in North America have given insufficient attention to the ways that settler colonial residues are maintained within their theory and practice. She argues that histories and mythologies around touchstone events within contemporary anarchism (such as the Haymarket Affair, the Zapatista Uprising in 1994, the 1999 Battle in Seattle, and Occupy) as well as anarchist relationships to place and Indigeneity, replay logics of settler colonialism, despite anarchist declarations of opposition to such structures. This results in a series of 'structures of settlement' that persist within contemporary anarchism, which remain significantly undertheorized and ill-addressed. Such events are memorialized and drawn upon as historical and cultural markers without an analysis of ongoing processes of settler colonialism and Indigenous dispossession, and ongoing forms of Indigenous resistance.[177]

Ultimately, 'contemporary anarchists in North America have not reckoned with the specific histories of settlement that live with the land on which we organize' (Warburton, 2021, p. 6). 'The invocation of anarchist stories without a grounding in both place-based and historical context, the flattening rather than reckoning with histories of conflict between Native and non-Native communities, and the attempt to assert inherent parallel relationships between anarchist movements and Native sovereignty' persist as three key structures of settlement (Warburton, 2021, p. 61). The result is a form of 'settler anarchism' that 'aligns itself with the settler colonial project both structurally and philosophically.' Such a term can be used 'to both

[176] While the overarching production of a settler habitus within the settler colonial field of power is beyond the scope of specific discussion in my work here, it is worthy of further consideration given Bourdieu's work summarized above, and as a useful departure for further work. Further to Mackey noted above see also Battell Lowman and Barker (2015) for a detailed examination of the dynamics of settler identity.

[177] I argue in the following chapters, especially Chapter 7, that these events might be reconfigured towards greater anti-colonial aims, as they both narrate important prefigurative anarchist value-practices, but also connect anarchists to their own ancestral cultures/histories/traditions that might help to reconfigure their own connections to land and orientations to possible radical futures within an explicit context of settler colonialism.

acknowledge and push beyond the argument that settlement is merely inherited in anarchist spaces, bleeding through into radical politics from the dominant social and political structures' (Warburton, 2021, pp. 33–34) and is rather an underlying structure within contemporary anarchism itself. Such settlement practices then, are not simply reducible to inherited doxa of the dominant culture and outside of anarchism, but are part of anarchist forms of habitus as well. These structures of settlement are enculturated and reproduced by anarchist movements and become the sort of common sense that Rifkin describes.[178] This is due partly to the fact that despite our anarchist declarations of opposition and separation from dominant society, we continue to be inculcated by structures of oppression and domination. This means, as well, that these elements that inform our habitus are also operating on an unconscious level.

As I show in the following chapters, many of my interviewees noted a number of tensions that persist within anarchism in terms of relations to Indigenous struggles and anti-colonial politics. Interview participants noted tensions in relation to affinities and relationships, leadership, spirituality, reckoning with specific histories of colonization on the lands where they reside, considering how we approach the future and implications on stolen lands, maintain committed politics, and generating and furthering specific anarchist anti-colonial value-practices. Many of them noted explicitly the need for greater anarchist reflection, discussion, and writing on themes related to colonization in order to push anarchist approaches further.

There is, as I argued in Chapter 2, a persistence in naming settler colonialism amongst a range of other structures of domination, as a key aspect of anarchist opposition. Anarchists are clear in their opposition to such historical and continued forms of domination and oppression. What is less clear, and in need of greater elaboration, are the specific ways that anarchists understand settler colonialism and situate it within their own anarchist worldview, and how they engage in critical, self-reflexive work to understand the ways that structures of settlement persist within anarchist culture, despite declarations of opposition, and how anti-colonial value-

[178] This relationship perhaps parallels anarchist engagements with heteropatriarchy and sexism; often dismissed as being outside of anarchist cultures, but continually raised as ongoing and significant issues that need attention, and otherwise limit anarchism's broader possibilities.

practices may be deepened and expanded intentionally. There may be individual articulations of settler identity and dynamics of complicity, but this has yet to be reckoned with on a collective basis. These are precisely the sorts of dynamics that Warburton (2021) names, as an initial step to confronting them on a broader basis, as elements that are more deeply embedded within anarchist movements and habitus. Being embedded in a settler colonial field of power means that both a conscious and unconscious set of influences continue to persist in settler colonialism as a structuring structure, and continue to affect anarchist habitus. Bourdieu's theorization of field, capital, and habitus is thus a useful set of tools to more carefully understand and pick apart the ongoing aspects of settlement that are unconsciously reproduced within anarchist movements, and beyond.

Overall, understanding settler colonialism as a field, and drawing from Bourdieu's insights more generally, provides an essential framework for better understanding the continual operation of power under settler colonialism, how this structures relations between all actors/identities in such a space, and why settler colonialism and settler common sense/logics continue to persist—but also how Indigenous resurgence carries a continued potential to fundamentally disrupt and reshape settler colonial field and habitus. While Wolfe's (1999) formation of settler colonialism as a structure is important and foundational, as argued in the previous chapter, it could also be modified, following Bourdieu, as a 'structuring structure' that articulates a specific field of power. Settler colonialism has a wide set of impacts but they are neither totalizing nor absolute given Indigenous resistance and anti-colonial movements. Settler colonialism is 'structured' by these influences as well. Framing settler colonialism as a structuring structure better captures this dynamic than simply structure alone. It not only affects, but is affected as well, and this renews a view of the agency and importance of Indigenous resurgence and resistance.

Conclusion

Settler colonialism is a fundamental structuring structure and field of power that narrates the context of resistance and resurgence movements in Southern Ontario and continues to be embedded within anarchism itself. Bourdieu's conceptual framework expands discussion from

settler colonialism as a structure, and shows the interactions between dominant fields and radical political alternatives while also placing radical alternatives within dominant oppressive and dominating fields. At this point, settler colonialism continues to be more 'structuring' as a structure, determining the logics and dynamics of relationships in this context, although Indigenous resurgence and resistance continue to pose a potent set of disruptions to its logics of elimination and dispossession and trouble its desire for inevitability and permanence. Bourdieu's work, and the point of my work here, helps to see how anarchist culture, field, capital, and habitus continue to be structured by settler colonialism. This approach identifies the structure, but also provides considerations for how to 'structure back'—how to alter the forms of anarchist habitus that allow for a continuance of 'structures of settlement,' how to build up the relative power of the anarchist field, and how to ultimately overturn and destroy the settler colonial field of power and its linked structures of the state and capitalism.

In a more general social movement context that illustrates some of the difficulties with altering or disrupting a radical form of habitus, Flesher Fominaya (2014) details how a certain form of habitus can limit the ability to constructively examine practices and why conflict arises when in contention with others who have formed a different habitus.[179] Activist habitus formed in different contexts with different ways of being and doing, despite shared politics, ultimately generated conflict that was not constructive and halted activists ability to come together within the same field. Flesher Fominaya notes that in this particular case 'activists were by and large deeply shaped by their organizing habitus and experienced strong discomfort when outside their own cultural field' and suggests that this sort of discomfort and conflict generated by the unconscious differences in habitus is a dynamic that warrants study within other social

[179] She examines a meeting of activists from different locations that sought to further networks of solidarity and connection with shared ideological commitments to values like autonomy, direct democracy and solidarity, but who were unable to see their own localized ways and means of engaging in political process. She notes 'that (a) activists were unconsciously reproducing a role and ritual they had learnt and that was resistant to change and (b) the existing practice was not actually in keeping with their professed values and ideology, but (c) was so taken for granted as to be unreflexively adopted time and again, rather than altered to provide an ostensibly more favourable outcome for the groups' (Flesher Fominaya, 2014, p. 198).

movement contexts (p. 202). Anarchist cultures of resistance are one such context that can benefit from this sort of analysis, often challenged by Indigenous resurgence politics.

Anarchists follow similar patterns identified by Flesher Fominaya (2014)—where they have difficulty reconciling politics, theory, and practice outside of the habitus in which they are most familiar. Given the relatively limited engagement of anarchism with the specific context of settler colonialism, this is a dynamic that is at play in 'structures of settlement' and 'settler anarchism.' This creates a clash and crisis with the anarchist habitus, eliciting resistance to change and greater radical reflexivity and forms of transformation. Considering habitus points to the broader dynamics that shape politics, theory and practice, and maintain their expressions, despite declarations of opposition that seem to suggest otherwise.

There are some broader implications at stake: My purpose here has not been to argue against a notion of culture that sees actors as strategic players who make conscious choices. Actors and activists clearly do engage in conscious, strategic action in social movement settings. But they also engage in a lot of action that is internalized, routinized, and not operating at the level of conscious reflection. The notion of habitus, broadly understood, points out the ways in which cultural practices are resistant to change despite the best intentions of the actors involved (Flesher Fominaya, 2014, p. 202), and how they continue to be influenced by broader histories, cultures, and structures of power.

This dynamic is perhaps expressed in a short anecdote that has lingered in my mind since it occurred. I was at an Indigenous solidarity rally in the late 2000s, probably 2010, which if I recall correctly was in support of Grassy Narrows First Nation and their opposition to ongoing clear-cut logging and mercury poisoning in their territories and home lands. I was carrying a Two Row Wampum flag, symbolized by two parallel purple lines on a white background. A simplified and generalized interpretation of this symbolization of the original wampum belt is of one line representing an Indigenous canoe and other a settler boat—they travel down the same river together, but their paths do not cross. This is said to symbolize peace, respect and friendship

guided by an ethic of non-interference and autonomy.[180] At the time, and still to this day, this flag is often used as a representation of solidarity with Indigenous struggles and the need for settlers to recognize, and work against, their own complicity with settler colonialism. At this particular event, an anarchist friend asked why I was carrying such a flag, as in his estimation anarchists were against all flags, no matter their meaning and solidaristic intent. The only flag that he deemed worth carrying was the anarchist black flag, to symbolize being against all other flags, a negation of other flags, or as the ultimate result of burning a flag. The overall implication here was that flags are a sign of nationalism and division and therefore ought to be opposed. A spirited back and forth ensued regarding the utility of expressing solidarity, especially in this particular action moment, and what the implications might be as an anarchist living on stolen land. The normative form of anarchist habitus, represented by a black flag, and only a black flag, against all other nationalisms, was challenged, and created both an opening for discussion, but also a persistence of previous constructed habitus. Crisis and contention created both and opening and a closure—one which, for me, has only furthered a desire to dig deeper into both anarchism's anti-colonial limitations and potentials.

This is something that has occurred a number of times since, where either Indigenous representations of nationhood have caught the ire of anarchists, or vice versa, where anarchist rejections of nationalistic symbolism were perceived as uncritical forms of dogmatic politics.[181] This brief example shows how deeply embedded various norms, values, practices, and politics

---

[180] It is important to consider that the Two Row is a Wampum belt, firmly situated within Indigenous cultural and knowledge systems. While historically it relates to relationship between Haudenosaunee (Six Nations) peoples and first Dutch, then British settlers, it has been used more generally as symbolic of Indigenous solidarity within the Southern Ontario context. This sort of generalization, which partly removes the symbolism from its original context requires some more deliberate discussion of its implications, but is beyond my scope here. On the Two Row as a framework of solidarity, see my discussion in Lewis (2012) and more directly Sedev (2010), Alfred (2008), and Day (2005). I consider the Two Row further as part of the relationship and affinity dynamics between anarchist and Indigenous struggles in Chapter 6.

[181] I discuss this point in greater detail in the subsequent chapters. Part of this frequent impasse seems to be a reflection of a failed translation of concepts—anarchists are most fundamentally concerned about the ways that nationalism leads to exclusion, oppression, and the seeking state forms of governance. Indigenous nationalism, understood within an Indigenous resurgence framework and explicit anti-colonial politics, expresses a fundamentally different orientation than Western discourses that see the state as the fundamental container for social relations.

are within anarchist habitus, such that there was little willingness, even outright rejection, of considering the wider implications of adopting such a politic within a settler colonial context, and especially within the context of a particular action where everyone was quite unequivocal in their support of Indigenous struggle. Habitus was challenged in a specific context, only to be reasserted and remobilized to preserve the previously unconscious and uncritically maintained position. A doxic belief was reasserted, limiting other possibilities.

This example illustrates the sorts of dynamics that Warburton highlights within the context of a specific movement moment. It speaks to the utility of engaging Bourdieusian concepts such as habitus, capital, and field in order to consider why particular forms of politics and practice persist, and why there is some resistance to changes in practices and politics, in particular contexts, despite values and ethics that suggest otherwise. We can thus look at these sorts of moments in order to better understand how structures of settlement ultimately persist within anarchism, despite a generalized commitment to resist colonialization alongside all other forms of oppression and domination.

Overall, anarchists understand settler colonialism as a system of oppression to be opposed within their value-practices but need to actualize this with a deeper set of nuances within a broader communication and development of theory and practice. Opposition to settler colonialism is ingrained within the anarchist habitus considered here, but only in a general way—often stated but less so developed. In other words, it has not yet become part of the everyday processes and taken-for-granted aspects of such an anarchist habitus to seek out and resist settler colonialism and its concomitant structures of settlement in a deeper collective sense. There continues to be a need for greater discussion, learning, and theorization to disrupt the persistence of ‘settler anarchism’ and ‘structures of settlement.’ These unconscious elements structure habitus within an ongoing settler colonial field of power. A necessary shift is required where anarchists can begin to see settler colonialism, following Bourdieu, as a structuring structure, continuing to profoundly influence their expressions of value-practices, beyond just general opposition.

The chapters that follow detail and discuss the current state of anarchist understandings of settler colonialism and the stumbling blocks and tensions that persist within anarchist structures of settlement. I note the ways that anarchists theorize settler colonialism, account for its structuring structures within their theoretical outlook, and identify the tensions with engaging such work within an anarchist political cultural context. Bourdieu's work on habitus, capital, and field, and the ways it has been brought into first social movement and then anarchist contexts discussed in this chapter, provides a framework to consider the ways that culture, as a 'structuring structure,' operates within anarchism. Further, Bourdieu's concepts are useful to account for the ways that structures of settlement are able to persist within anarchism and how we might go about resisting and changing them. This chapter has set the stage for greater and more detailed discussion of the particularities of cultures of anarchism within the context of settler colonialism in Southern Ontario, and opportunities to expand their possibilities for anti-colonial resistance into the future.

Chapter 5 – Cultures of Anarchism, Cultures of Resistance: Anarchist Culture and Value-Practices in Southern Ontario

This chapter introduces the key findings and insights that have been gathered from the interview data with anarchists in Southern Ontario through the lens of culture. While much of my discussion thus far has examined the theoretical framings, definitions, potentials, and pitfalls of contemporary anarchism in order to set up the context of broader anarchist discussions of settler colonialism, in this chapter, and those that follow, I bring the discussion down to the local and the specific. While Bourdieu's work, discussed in the previous chapter brings forth important theoretical frameworks for understanding the operation of culture as a structuring structure, and specific ways that anarchist habitus, field, and capital contribute to it, I now turn to the voices and reflections of those working and dwelling in such cultures and movements themselves.

The interviews show how anarchists themselves understand the context of culture in which they engage in resistance and organization, how this connects to broader structures of power, and how this manifests in value-practices. I aim to prioritize the voices and theorizations of those on the ground and embedded in day-to-day anarchist practices to build theory from the ground up. This sort of anarchist 'history from below' prioritizes voice, agency, care, accuracy, respect, responsibility, and democratization of everyday experience (Ferguson, 2022). As part of doing so I use key excerpts from the interviews to forefront the voices of those within movements.

As discussed in Chapter 1, participants in movements have the unique positioning of being within the grips of struggle, seeing how it develops and plays out on the ground, and how ideas, concepts, and possibilities are discussed on a day-to-day basis. It is imperative to look at these perspectives and reflections from movement participants in order to understand both how politics and culture are assembled and framed in lived practice, and the sorts of tensions, challenges and imaginative potentials that are encountered within movement space (Haiven & Khasnabish, 2014). This is also reflected in my own ongoing state of reflection throughout this

project, spanning many years, and continually being refined in the process of struggle, engagement, and change. Movement ideas (and habitus) are constantly undergoing processes of reproduction, alteration, and disruption. My own process of this is reflected throughout this work as my own form of prefigurative politics. Understanding the debates and tensions that often occur in isolation, and bringing them to a greater systemic level of discussion can aid in the further articulation and expansion of movement ideas. Anarchist anti-colonial politics, while widespread, can benefit from more specific and intentional discussion.

As I have argued so far, it is not that anarchists don't consider the colonial contexts in which they organize and resist, it that they have not yet intentionally and systematically addressed these contexts within broader narratives, discussions, and expressions of cultures within anarchism. Phrased differently, anti-colonial politics are central to many expressions of anarchist politics (as the interviews below show), but they have not been codified, theorized, or disseminated in the same ways as other key hallmarks (such as non-hierarchical organizing, rationalizations of insurrectionary or violent resistance, historical lineages and key figures, direct action, critiques of electoral politics and the state, etc.). There is an assumed and committed baseline anti-colonial politics within anarchism as part of opposition to all forms of oppression and domination (discussed in Chapter 2), but this rarely goes beyond generalist, and surface-level discussion and development.

I bring these forms of anti-colonial politics into sharper view here, to showcase some of the complex and important ways that anarchists are thinking anti-colonially, in the hope that this may catalyze a greater proliferation of anti-colonial theorization, discussion, and action. As my interview participants noted, there is an urgent need for both more intentional reflection and writing on these topics within anarchism. Participants expressed their appreciation for our conversations in getting them to reflect intentionally about these particular issues and intersections. I turn to the specifics of these conversations and their ability to richly inform anarchism below, and throughout the following two chapters.

This chapter considers the breadth of anarchist framings and perspectives of research participants, but also the similarities in expressing value-practices, a key lens with which to

understand contemporary anarchist politics and cultures. I introduce the research participants, and discuss specific elements of anarchist culture and its expression in Southern Ontario. In particular, I engage a critical discussion of the subcultural, insular, and at times narrowly political expressions of anarchism and consider ways of working through these tensions. There are a number of tensions around anti-colonial politics and practices within anarchism that I introduce here, and consider further in later chapters. I hope that engaging these tensions and bringing them to the fore can result in more direct, explicit, and evolving conversations at the movement level regarding anarchist culture and the potential for more effective forms of anti-colonial politics.

Narrating Participants and Their Affinities with Anarchism

The core of my research involved interviews with anarchists in Southern Ontario. Seventeen interview participants were selected in part for their specific history of engaging with anti-colonial politics, but also for their unique location and approach within anarchist movements and cultures. Participants were from a range of Southern Ontario communities (Kitchener, Hamilton, Guelph, Toronto, and Kingston), to move beyond the frequent and narrow 'big city'-centric focus of social movement studies, and to develop a keener sense of anarchist culture across a wider, but defined, region and field.

I sought to include a range of engagements with anarchism, from labour, community organizing, social infrastructure, migrant justice, and Indigenous solidarity organizing perspectives, as I detail more directly below. I reached out to participants given their own unique position and approach to anarchist politics, rather than seeking an explicit representativeness of the total range of anarchist positions. Participants were also considered for their relatively long-term participation in anarchist movements and cultures (anywhere from 10 to 30 years) to allow for greater depth of dialogue on starting points, tensions, lessons, and considerations from the future. Overall, I sought a diverse number of participants from geographic locations in Southern Ontario with unique histories of anarchist culture, diverse levels of engaging with anarchist politics in locations and approaches to organizing, and an

overall level of commitment to anti-colonial politics. I now turn to a brief snapshot of these individual participants to situate their context for theory and action.

AM introduced themselves as an anarchist from a racialized background who had started out in broadly anti-racist struggles, although recently they were largely working within union and labour struggles. Their approach, while typically not working with explicitly anarchist groups or organizations, focused on putting anarchist values into practice, especially in terms of organizational practices and prefigurative politics. They framed their involvement as within anarchist culture, but also bringing anarchist value-practices into their active union work through greater forms of democratic and horizontal participation.

Al, as a parent and organizer for over 10 years in Southern Ontario, was active in a broad range of labour, community, and campus-based forms of organizing across a number of cities in the region. Al identified with a specifically working-class framework as part of their position as a white settler organizer. Their work encompassed both explicit and implicit anarchist forms of organizing, working in broad spectrum campus social justice organizations, as well as platformist anarchist theory, education, and publication projects.

Willow, as a queer white settler witch, situated their organizing through an ecological and place-based approach rooted in a range of organizing experiences. They spoke of initially starting in campus anti-war and Indigenous solidarity organizing, then being involved in opposition to the 2010 Olympics and G20 and before finding some focus on local May Day and collective organizing to bring resistance and joy together.

Lila had a number of overlapping experiences with Willow, as a white settler identified queer witch, having been involved in similar struggles. They discussed experiences with prisoner support and abolitionist organizing across a range of cities in Southern Ontario. They talked about more recently being less directly involved in anarchist organizing but rather continuing to have anarchist cultures and social relationships within the fabric of their day-to-day life, and as part of their own spiritual approach to the world as a self-defined queer witch. This included ongoing mutual aid projects, and wider community events like May Day celebrations.

As a long-time organizer for over 20 years, Sophia carried a long list of experiences, from militant street confrontations against major summits, to disruptive support for Indigenous land defence struggles, and a long-standing connection to campus social justice organizing. As a white settler, they discussed being a participant in larger movements as an anarchist, in particular Indigenous resistance and resurgence movements, rather than within directly anarchist movements themselves.

Mac, a community organizer in poor people's and migrant justice movements, also discussed a long running theme of Indigenous solidarity and support work, spanning many years and across many cities and sites in North America, that had a profound influence on their identity as a white settler organizer. Active since the late 80s Mac discussed a wide range of experiences, both explicitly anarchist and more diffuse, that centred a commitment to direct action and collective resistance.

Bruno as well had been active and connected to anarchist movements and organizing for well over 20 years. They narrated their history as being closely connected to Anti-Racist Action work and the wider network that spans across North America. They had a wide range of experiences travelling to anarchist convergences and events beyond their long-time home in Southern Ontario. This brought them as well to a range of Indigenous land defence struggles, such as at Stoney Point, that developed their interrogation of white settler experiences and anti-colonial politics.

Cooper, on the other hand, suggested that they hadn't even really participated in directly anarchist struggles, but (like many others) sought to bring anarchist ethics to struggles for migrant justice and Indigenous sovereignty that they were actively in support of. They had a keen awareness of the experience of being a white settler on stolen land and talked directly about the important influences and mentorship they received through engaging in such a broad range of community-based struggles, and the necessity of approaching them with humility, learning, and imagination.

Lydia was one of the two Indigenous participants in my interviews, coming from a queer mixed Métis background. They specifically sought to fuse their Indigenous cultural background and personal resurgence with an anarchist politic in order to intervene actively in both communities. Their movement experiences covered a range of cites, and began in animal rights organizing before shifting into their own reclamation of culture and a more direct foray into environmental, anti-pipeline, and land defense struggles.

Violet, an Anishnaabekwe originally from a community in Northern Ontario, was one of the participants who defined less explicitly as an anarchist, and more directly framed their movement work through a lens of Indigenous resurgence and resistance. They highlighted the affinities and relationships that they had with anarchists, while working on land reclamation, alternative food systems, and earlier campus-based organizing projects. They discussed the important overlaps between their Indigenous cultural community, and the community of anarchists where they found affinity, support, and connection.

Sam articulated their anarchism as interested in anti-colonial land defense, linkages between urban and rural struggles, and communal spaces that support both healing and fighting. They had an ongoing history of engaging in anarchist infrastructure projects and expanding local forms of opposition to prisons and prison construction.

Brian, as well, had a long history of engaging in building both directly anarchist, and more generally radical, spaces in a number of different cities, as a means to bring newer people into contact with anarchist ideas. They were interested in expanding the potential for anarchist subcultural movements towards greater effective forms of resistance, through anti-poverty organizing, the Indigenous People's Solidarity Movement, and anti-colonial forms of direct action as a white settler anarchist.

Clare talked about their involvement through the experience of queer anarcha-feminist organizing, and the creation of physical spaces of anarchist culture. Their experience of more than 10 years involved a range of organizing from demonstrations, prison support committees, training and outreach events, bookfairs, and other explicit places of anarchist gathering. They

noted a mix of both issue-based and broader forms of organizing that characterized a wide-ranging approach to anarchism.

Across several decades of experience, OS located themselves as a white settler witch with a deep and reflexive commitment to Indigenous solidarity and support work. They were focused on how to bring an anarchist ethos into all of the varying spaces of organizing that they inhabited, in order to expand the possibilities of resistance and deep considerations of the context of settler colonialism in more widely progressive political spaces.

Anna inhabited both settler anarchist academic and organizing contexts, interested in anti-poverty, Indigenous solidarity, housing justice, and anarchist cultural forms of organizing. They framed their participation over the last 20-some-odd years as oscillating between both bringing an anarchist analysis to wider forms of organizing and a commitment to build anarchist cultural spaces like bookfairs and social infrastructures. They also carried experience from time in a number of different Southern Ontario cities, as well as radical organizing abroad, to their formation of anarchist politics.

Lee framed their anarchism as encompassing both artistic and organizer approaches. As an organizer they supported local grassroots tenant-lead organizations in their struggle against evictions, displacement, rent increases, and bad landlords. And as an artist, Lee materially supported frontline organizing efforts through writing and donating songs, leading fundraising efforts, and providing music and noise for demos. Their artistic work was a firm extension of their anarchist politics.

KR, as well, noted a strong relationship between art and resistance as part of their more than 20 years within community-based, anti-racist, Black, Indigenous and migrant liberation struggles. Their queer, racialized South Asian and immigrant lens foregrounded the importance of making supportive community for queer and trans kin, in the context of stolen land and Indigenous resurgence. KR spoke of anarchism as a resonant framework compatible with their own artistic forms of resistance.

As these brief character snapshots attest, interviewees brought a wide range of experiences and had experiences that were explicitly and directly involved in anarchist forms of organizing and resistance, as well as efforts to bring anarchist value-practices into broader constellations of radical/progressive movements. Most were keen to expand anarchist cultures locally and beyond, and engaged in work across several locations in Southern Ontario throughout their multi-decade organizing histories. Most participants had also lived in several cities in the region, drawing links between the different cities that I am focused on here. Importantly each participant spoke of their specific connection to Indigenous resurgence movements. While most of the participants identified as white settlers, they were keenly aware of the colonial dynamics implicit in such a location and invested in problematizing such histories and actively working towards greater alliances and affinities with Indigenous struggles.

In addition to their own personal histories and identities each participant brought their own approach and emphasis of anarchism, and anti-colonial politics, to our discussion, although they expressed similar identifications of tensions, problems, and places for enhancing theory and practice.[182] These approaches influenced the ways in which they talked about settler colonialism and its broader intersections with anarchism, guided their overall thinking, and served as a reference point for their politics. While no two participants took up (exactly) the same approach, they did tend to highlight a broad congruency of anarchist value-practices. And while anarchist value-practices are not fixed, and are open to alteration and change, there is a level of consistency here that helps anarchist culture to coalesce, and articulate affinities and

[182] The diversity of approaches that each participant took was somewhat surprising to me. I expected a much more narrow and consistent discussion of anarchist politics, while anticipating a range of views of the cultural and anti-colonial specifics. Perhaps this was a function of the sort of assumed baseline of anarchist politics that I discussed in Chapter 2 also creeping into my own presumption of anarchist politics as well. Almost none of those I interviewed took on a specifically sectarian view of anarchism, which is often prone to very specific hyphenations and labels (anarcha-feminist, anarcho-communist, insurrectionary, individualist, primitivist, etc.). The specific approaches that I discuss below demonstrated a wide range of perspectives that anarchists use to ground their politics. They also oriented their specific anti-colonial perspectives, which moved beyond a generalized opposition, towards a specific integration of anti-colonial thinking within their respective individual anarchist groundings.

connections between different definitions of anarchism. Such values and practices are also the key elements that make up anarchist habitus in this particular context.[183]

Anarchist Value-Practices in Southern Ontario

As Chapter 2 noted, value-practices are the glue that holds contemporary anarchism together and provide a shared basis of resistance and action. They form what Jeppesen (2010) calls 'a plane of consistency' in which a broader range of anarchist cultures cohere, but which are also always under construction (p. 479). 'There is no cultural or ideological system that is the same for everyone in anarchist culture,' Jeppesen argues (p. 477), and thus we can only tease out or 'map' significant expressions of values and practices in particular places at particular times, rather than a singular rigid or fixed definition. The approaches that my interviewees employed speak to this ongoing diversity and the overall richness of anarchist cultures where multiple viewpoints and perspectives relate and find affinity with one another. Affinity is both a key means of articulating connection between anarchist identities and forms of habitus, as well as the central means of relating to Indigenous struggle for resurgence and resistance. Affinity is a key part of my discussion in Chapter 6.

Participants embodied common anti-capitalist and anti-state politics that are at the core of anarchist definitions, coupled with a necessary resistance to all forms of oppression and domination, as well as other common hallmarks such as voluntary association, mutual aid, direct action, prefigurative politics, subcultural elements, and the importance of relationships. These hallmarks and 'value-practices' form part of the general anarchist baseline, but participants also took these ideas further. Differentiation occurred based on the participant's individual positioning of their anarchist politics and approaches. These individual positionings account for both the context in which participants engage with anarchist politics, the elements that are most centrally emphasized, and their overall approach to anti-colonialism and

[183] Practices discussed here recall the notion of practice in Bourdieu discussed in the previous chapter, 'an individual's actions and behaviour' in relation to capital, habitus and field.

Indigenous resurgence.[184] They narrate and exemplify the breadth of anarchist views of the world and individual points of engagement, and speak to the diverse standpoints with which anarchist cultures cohere. They exemplify how anarchists self-identify, and how habitus is oriented in specific ways.

AM, for example, framed anarchism as 'as more of a practice rather than necessarily like a deep rooted ideology in which we're anticipating some kind of revolution where we smash the state.' They emphasized trying to 'see anti-authoritarian discourses and practices and methods of organizing' and employ them in both 'everyday life' and academic work. As Cooper stated, anarchism is an 'ongoing a set of foundational principles,' and the 'practice that I attempt to live by.' This brings anarchism firmly into the realm of everyday life and practice.

Willow similarly stressed aspects of anarchism that inform everyday life: 'To me being part of anarchist movements, like it's great when it looks like formalized and everybody together in the streets and stuff like that.' But also emphasized the 'smaller wedges that we make in our everyday life, which I think is like a kind of movement that you carry with you.' They suggested keeping 'certain tenets in your mind,' like mutual aid or voluntary association. But 'also like kindness and stuff like that, at the forefront of my actions and how I'm engaging in my everyday life in the kind of care that I think helps me move about the world with.' A politics of everyday life is a core way that value-practices are lived and maintained.

AM named their inspiration for anarchist politics in 'applying those modes of organization, like, that's really the emphasis on what I guess would be called prefigurative politics, into my everyday organizing.' They suggested prefigurative politics as 'if you envision a world in which you want to have the most democratically organized society, equal or equity based, no

[184] Although important in their individual constructions and orientations to the core elements of anarchism, the differential approaches could be understood as potential sources of friction, potentially even to the point of crisis of habitus, for movement participants. While there were no general claims of dissention or dismissiveness to other anarchist perspectives in my interviews, several participants noted the insular and divisive purity politics that has seeped into anarchist cultures. As Lila explained, this is often phased as someone having 'bad politics,' and used as a dismissal of their perspective and efforts, if not their place within anarchist movements in general. This accords with the discussions by Portwood-Stacer (2013) noted in Chapter 4. I turn to this in greater detail below.

hierarchies, then you need to be able to learn and practice those things in your everyday organizing. And that acts as kind of like, this is going to sound academic, but like a *practice of being*, like of learning, or of unlearning, actually, if anything. And that's probably a better way to put it.' A 'practice of being' gets at the heart of anarchist emphasis on ongoing, every-day, embodied values and practices in the here and now, not a theoretical abstraction or a future way to live.[185] This reflects Bourdieu's notion of habitus, and the practices that are carried forward within movement cultures.

Prefiguration is a key thread, as I noted in Chapter 2, which narrates anarchist perceptions of the world, how value-practices are enacted, and how they interact with the future. This is extended into my own approach to research, writing, and reflection here as well, as a means to begin to prefigure a deepened anti-colonial approach within my own anarchist practice. In Chapter 7 I return to prefiguration as a key element in considering ways to progress towards greater anti-colonial futures. Still, prefiguration is a core means of enacting anarchist value-practices in intentional ways in the everyday, to start the work of constructing a (new) alternative society in the here and now.

Brian and Clare both spoke about the importance of physical forms of anarchist infrastructure, and how visibility can be strategic for the spread of anarchist politics. Brian noted the sustaining work that physical spaces do and their importance for outreach but also maintaining ongoing cultures of resistance. This further strengthening of social and political ties can be further extended into relations of solidarity and support for Indigenous struggles. Clare emphasized the 'work in progress' aspects of continually building prefigurative anarchist possibilities into the future, of which physical infrastructures play a crucial part. They encouraged a view of anarchism and relationships through the lens of shared struggle beyond simply solidarity, and

[185] AM further framed anarchism as 'a set of guiding ethos' that can encompass a range of material practices and strategies, noting 'there are different understandings of that. Again, I'm going to quote David Graeber, he has a really good thing about anarchism. It's like Marxists organized around the theorist, the person. Anarchists organized around their modes of practice.' Both practice and values are paramount reference points for anarchists.

the specification of drawing militant forms of inspiration from local and not strictly anarchist contexts.

Anti-capitalism is a classical point of opposition for anarchists. Al employed a 'working-class' framework for analysis, relationships to structures of oppression and resistance, and drew specific links between capitalism and colonialism and the ways that this has continued to oppress and divide working people. Al argued that to fight back against settler colonialism and capitalism, 'First, we need actual working-class organizations. I think that's the big missing part, is that right now we have so little to bring, for the most part, because we're so disempowered as a settler working class.' Al firmly located both anarchism and the potentials for anti-colonial resistance within the realm of working-class politics, to bring settler working class power to anti-colonial and anti-capitalist goals. This raises classical anarchist concerns, but also directly links them to anti-colonial struggle.

As part of the baseline opposition to all forms of oppression and domination discussed in Chapter 2, Bruno specified opposition to domination as a key anarchist practice: 'I was interested in anarchism as a movement, I guess if you want to use that word, because—sure it's a movement, because there's a whole bunch of us— … mostly because of its liberatory [ideals] and its ideas against domination.'[186] They continue: 'For me, the biggest thing that I was really excited about was this current of thought that had at its very base this idea of critiquing domination of other human beings.'

[186] There is an ongoing discussion as to whether anarchism could, or should, be defined as a movement. It was evident from my interviews that participants generally consider anarchism as such and used this terminology as a result. One exception was Al, who said 'I don't consider anarchism a social movement in Canada. I think we're a network, a political network or a network of certain politics. But we're at the level of a network of scenes and individuals and organizations. I think Indigenous struggles in this country are at the level of a social movement. We're talking like something with institutions, with memory, with organizations on a massive scale, with resources.' They raise the bar for movement considerations to have more structural and organized elements (on anarchism in this regard directly, see Williams, 2017). In contrast, Indigenous struggles are movements, as they have attained a higher level of organization, institutionalization, and impact. The debate over anarchism being a movement or not also speaks to the utility of Bourdieu's conception of field as a broader and perhaps less formally defined area in which anarchist politics are articulated and contested.

Mac noted the expansiveness of anarchist politics and the ability to attend to a multitude of forms of oppression at once from another angle: 'I actually think the beauty of anarchism, I mean, anarchism is one of the only movements that can bring together like anti-patriarchy, environmental justice, anti-colonialism, anti-capitalism, all in the same room without having a pissing match about which one's more important.' Although one of the few participants to specify their anarchism as anarcho-communist, Mac captured the broader opposition to all forms of oppression and domination that characterizes contemporary anarchism. This can be connected to their work across community organizations and reflections regarding the complexities of engaging such work beyond strictly anarchist politics.

Practices include the relationships that anarchists have to larger anarchist movement events, but also struggles that don't inherently define along strictly anarchist lines. AM pointed to the 'development of the anti-globalization movement' and movements like Occupy as genealogically coming 'from a lot of, like, early 20th century anarchist movements.' Anarchism doesn't need to be front and centre. Expanding these movements 'doesn't require 'big-A' anarchism if we're challenging white supremacy and, you know, capitalism and settler colonialism, we don't necessarily need an alternative to be anarchy when you just need the alternative to be something that is not those things.' So, while anarchism is a crucial influence here, it isn't necessary as a strict label in order to influence broader practices and movements. As Wood (2012) notes, there are important aspects of diffusion that carry values and practices to new locations, to be translated, altered and taken in up in multiple ways. 'It seems like anarchist practice and politics creeped into everything without it being a larger kind of thing in and of itself' (AM).

Sophia noted the 'flat, non-hierarchical, everything is by consensus' forms of anarchist organization that are filtered 'through an anti-oppression lens,' and which 'has kind of seeped into all the organizing [formal anarchist and generally social justice] and now it just feels normal, like "of course, this is how we organize".' This diffusion of anarchist politics and ways of organizing illustrates the everyday aspects of anarchist values and practices as the cornerstone of anarchist cultures, and their ongoing reference points for participants. Sophia noted this in

terms of their work to bring an anarchist position, analysis, and set of practices into larger left/radical movement spaces. They framed this as a 'common experience that lots people have because obviously most movements, maybe they have little bits and pieces of anarchist values, but they're not, we don't seem to have like very anarchist specific movements.' This highlights the broader impact, influence, and diffusion of anarchist politics into wider movement struggles.

Relationships, relationality, and even more so affinity, are key ways to understand the dynamics of contemporary anarchist culture. More importantly, many of the tensions raised in my interviews can be helpfully considered, discussed, and worked on through the lens of relationality and affinity. This means, therefore, that they are tensions that are also not going to be worked out individually, or singularly, but demand greater collective thought and engagement.

This sort of relationship-based lens was articulated by Lila and narrated their overall engagements with anarchism, pointing to a broader relationship framework of affinity: 'I feel pretty deeply rooted in what I consider anarchist culture and social relationships that sort of both embrace anarchy and anarchist practices, and ... I feel like some of the ideas and principles and philosophies of anarchism are really woven into relationship.' Lila's involvement in local May Day, harm reduction, and abolitionist forms of organizing tied their anarchist politics to the importance of relationships, including those related to the loss of their own anarchist/settler traditions, stories, and practices. They pointed to sustained, grounded, healing, and accountable relationships that hold space to process trauma, grief and loss, and the possibilities of cultivating anarchist spiritualties and rituals.

Part of anarchist value-practices is also the importance of imagination, deep learning, and reflection within ongoing relationships. Throughout our conversation Cooper embodied a living practice of relationality, articulating their accountability with those they have learned from across a wide range of social movement experiences, with deep appreciation for the relationships that continue to influence their politics. Their approach includes fundamental lessons

> learned from Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee peoples, … Black and POC women particularly, and feminism in particular, intersectional feminism. It includes incredible work that queer folks have put forward around the futures that we can envision together. And it involves also these dreams that that we can value people for the differences in our abilities, our skills, our emotional intuitiveness or intellect and so on, so forth, that all have affinity with, I think, the general philosophies of anarchist thought, but that that don't necessarily fit well in sort of 'big-A' anarchist spaces.

Anarchist theory, as Anna argued, is fundamentally carried within the collective constellation of individual anarchists and movements, not strictly big names or figureheads. It is a part of lived and ongoing practices, and this ongoing process informs habitus. This reinforces my own approach here, not just through an academic framework, but as part of my own ongoing and lived anarchism as well.

While anarchist culture is important on its own terms, there are wider affinities and connections to be cultivated through value-practices. And while nearly all (15 of 17) participants explicitly defined as anarchist, and used the term directly, they tended to leave their identifications more along the lines of an 'anarchism without adjectives' or 'small-a' approach (discussed in Chapter 2) that eschews rigid forms of ideological specification (Graeber and Grubacic, 2004, Milstein, 2010), and coheres more generally around value-practices.

While there was a reluctance to overly define anarchism along sectarian lines, there was an overall deep commitment to being anarchists and living anarchist values regardless of the location of organizing work. OS expressed an essential place for being anarchists wherever we find ourselves and used the frame of 'branding' to consider the dynamics of being out and proud anarchists in the world, an unapologetic and intentionally named anarchist ethic of intervening and fighting where we are. This raises tactical and strategic questions regarding the promotion of anarchism in name, vs. as values and practices that are diffused outward. Contemporary articulations of anarchism go beyond strictly classical, or 'big-A' forms of

anarchism, and seek to engage in solidarity, learning, and affinity with a wider range of radical influences.

Indigenous resurgence is a key reference point highlighted by interviewees for contemporary forms of anarchism and the considerations for expanding anarchism politics into the future. Violet and Lydia noted the resonance and compatibility of anarchism with their own Indigenous resurgence politics and pointed to relationships and proximity as crucial ingredients for expanding affinities, while also promoting internal critique of anarchist theory and practice. While affinities were important, they both stressed the additional and continuous work required of anarchists to further cement anti-colonial politics not just in support of Indigenous struggles but also for themselves and their own relationships to place and land. This the crucial focus of the following chapters.

Lydia further argued for taking risks in staying committed and unequivocal in one's anarchist politics, even when working in other areas or issues with non-anarchists. This notion of 'committed politics,' living them in all spaces that anarchists inhabit, was a core theme that persisted throughout the interviews, and which provides a framework for discussing and expanding anarchist anti-colonial politics specifically. Lydia framed their own perspective as continually evolving, refining, and expanding, which can be extended as a set of goals for anarchist anti-colonial politics more generally. They raised a dual tension of bringing greater anarchism to Indigenous resurgence efforts,[187] and greater anti-colonialism to anarchist efforts.

Moving towards a deeper form of committed politics requires greater attention to the forms of anti-colonial anarchism that already exist, but also the significant ways that these sorts of politics could be furthered and expanded. Anna added a consideration of anarchist relationships to both property and geography. They raised questions regarding anarchist desires for autonomy in the context of stolen land and the frequent reference to national

[187] While this element is beyond my scope here, and frankly beyond my own work as a white settler anarchist, this is something that is gaining further ground within Indigenous resurgence politics. In particular, see the general work of anarcha-Indigenism discussed above (in my previous MA thesis: Lewis, 2012a), but most directly and importantly, the work of the late Klee Benally (2021, 2023), and Tawinikay (2018, 2021) both discussed below.

borders when speaking about different anarchist tendencies, locales, projects, and theories. Sam emphasized the need to take our anarchist ideas seriously, while seeking to foster informal, sustained, and active forms of relationship. They spoke about the complexities, but also the potentials, that rural forms of organizing can bring to anti-colonial forms of politics within settler colonial contexts.[188]

Willow brought up 'placemaking' as an overarching theme that speaks to the localized and everyday forms of anarchism, but also their connection to place, land, and anti-colonial politics. I return to their notion of placemaking in Chapter 7 as one of the ways that anarchists locate themselves within anti-colonial politics, and one where tensions with Indigenous resurgence often arise. This denotes relationships and relationality, and collective care, as further key hallmarks of contemporary anarchism (Routledge, 2009).

As this brief discussion suggests, through their unique articulations of identity, context, values, and practices, interviewees illustrated a wide range of engagements with anarchism. There is no one way to 'be' an anarchist, nor one narrow way to define anarchist politics. Their frames suggest rather a wide-ranging set of influences, considerations, and possibilities that are continually at play. Participants used similar themes of maintaining explicit and committed politics, the essential nature of anarchist value-practices for the expression and maintenance of anarchist culture, the importance of collective forms of resistance and deepening relationships, articulating affinities and solidarities with other struggles (in particular Indigenous struggles), and an overall need for greater forms of writing, discussion, and engagement to expand all facets of anarchist political relevance to current struggles, and in explicit relation to the further development of anarchist anti-colonialism. These key themes narrate the core of my discussions regarding anarchism and culture, anarchist affinities and relationships with settler

[188] While I turn to some of these rural-urban considerations below this is an important tension within anarchism, and anti-colonialism more broadly, that could use further attention. On the complexities of living rurally as anarchists in intentional communities and intersections with anti-colonial politics, see Adamiak (2018). On rural anarchist youth cultures see Malenfant (2018). On organizing in smaller urban environments see the zine 'Anarchy in a Small Pond' (613 Anarchy, 2018) written by anarchists in Kingston.

colonialism and Indigenous resurgence, and the tensions that occur in attending to these elements while building prefigurative radical futures. They shape the remainder of this chapter and the two that follow. Overall, anarchists are well aware of the potentials of their politics, the importance of continually working to sharpen and expand them, and the necessity that this work will never be complete.

Defining Anarchist Culture from the Ground Up

Throughout our discussions, participants defined key value-practices and hallmarks of anarchist culture that form the core of anarchist ways of being in the world. Al pointed to ‘a particular set of values, aesthetics, even slogans, ways of communicating politics that sort of tend to coalesce around a specific set of anarchist politics.’ Clare noted ‘sets of, like, practices and norms’ but also ‘aesthetics’ that ‘you can see across different anarchist spaces and projects.’ While located in different contexts and histories, there are shared cultural aspects that are recognizable. Participants noted the persistence of anti-authoritarian, anti-hierarchical, prefigurative, mutual aid, collective and all around liberatory forms of politics and practices that span anarchist contexts. Value-practices are a significant glue and durable form of cohesion that make up anarchist cultures and habitus.

These are often portrayed through ‘certain signifiers’ of anarchist culture: ‘the circle-A,’ 'FTP' (Fuck the Police) but also, according to Lila, ‘a pretty big focus on books and ideas’ as ‘pretty integral to anarchist culture. It often seems a lot more cerebral, like we're talking about ideas. And I think that there have been pushes to have things be more rooted and in our lived experiences to render that as something that counts rather than being on this theoretical level.’ This requires a constant questioning of ‘how are we actually acting these things out and how are we challenging domination and oppression and our in our day-to-day lives and in our relationships.’ This emphasizes both ongoing and everyday acts and expressions of anarchism, but also the centrality of relationships and community within anarchist culture, and their connection to theory.

Lila framed anarchist culture as ‘about transitioning’:

> It's a transition from a love of politics and those ideas to a love of people, a love of our friends. And I think for me, for sure there are parts of anarchist culture, subculture, these pockets that I found really toxic. But I think at its best, how I've experienced it is how we, it sounds super cheesy, but it's how we love each other. It's how we show up for each other in our lives. And it's like how we strive to do the things that help us to feel more free in this world or something. It's helping your pals out. It's mutual aid.

Relationships, and support and accountability, are foundational components of anarchist culture that come to influence how anarchists engage with each other and the wider world. And these everyday elements continue to be connected more theoretical manifestations of anarchist value-practices.

Anarchist culture also persists in a multitude of forms. While it is easy to speak of culture in a singular sense, the breadth of anarchist value-practices and orientations suggest a plurality of ways that anarchists engage with culture. In other words, according to AM, 'There are anarchist cultures. I think there's an 's' … there are multiple kinds of practices of anarchism. But I think they all have the kind of similar ethical orientations or principles that they're all shared. But the envisionment of how that could look like could be different amongst activist to activist, so to speak, if they even have a larger picture of what could come in the future.' Despite the plurality and multiplicity of different, and localized, forms of anarchist culture, Lydia argued that these 'overarching similarities' across anarchists serve as 'tying influences,' keep anarchists linked to one another, and serve as a baseline for articulating politics and affinities. This was continually emphasized by those I interviewed. No participant was interested in constructing a narrow or superior form of anarchism at the expense of other ways of being, thinking, and doing as

anarchists in the world. There was intentional space left for a plurality of anarchist perspectives, though still united by a baseline set of value-practices.[189]

Many cultures of anarchism share an affinity for confrontation with the forces of domination, and the resultant imagery. Direct action, militant, and confrontational forms of resistance are no strangers to anarchism, ranging from historical targeted assassinations and armed labour struggles, to Black Bloc street tactics and contemporary arsons, property destruction and confrontations with police. One need look no further than anarchist media projects like Sub.media, It's Going Down, or Crimethinc and the proliferation of militant images and 'riot porn'[190] to see the deep affinity for confrontation. Anarchist cultural images, styles of dress, and aesthetics proliferate such frames of confrontation, alongside, and sometimes at the expense of, more collective, alternative-building, prefigurative, radically imaginative options. Anarchist bookfairs and physical spaces, too, are rife with the images of street confrontation.[191]

Militancy is a concept directly associated with street confrontation and revolutionary desires, but often fraught with unclear or contested meanings. In *Joyful Militancy,* Montgomery and bergman (2017) argue that there is a danger of reducing militancy to authoritarian forms of discipline, which is fundamentally counter to anarchist value-practices. Instead, they argue for a

---

[189] This means, as well, that although there are a range of anarchist cultures, baseline value-practices permit translation, mutual understanding, debate, and engagement across different forms of politics emphasized by anarchists.

[190] See sub.media.tv, crimethinc.com, itsgoingdown.org. Razsa (2014) frames riot porn as militant forms of video and image that showcase physical confrontations, with participants not as hapless victims but as unruly, or insubordinate resisters of structures of power and domination. Such materials are frequently collected, broadcast, and re-watched 'to facilitate emotional relationships with activists elsewhere, to steel themselves for physical confrontation and to cultivate new desires and therefore new political subjects' (p. 497). Razsa discusses the aesthetics, affect, gender dimensions and overall impact of such materials on social movement cultures and action. He notes the specifically 'sensory' impact that such materials have on militants—visceral and bodily responses- and the particular cultures that they foster, with ongoing anxieties around inclusion, gender politics, and attention to particularities of context, but ultimately 'making possible emergent forms of political intimacy, even love' (p. 518). As such, these forms of image, video, and experience are an important part of the aesthetics and diffusion of both cultures of militancy, and militant tactics themselves. On Sub.media, in particular regarding Indigenous resurgence, see Crosswell (2024).

[191] While this was the persistent case for cultures of anarchism in Southern Ontario, is important to note, along the lines of plurality, that there are a range of explicitly non-violent or pacifist strains of anarchism as well. In my experience this tends towards more 'small-a' expressions of anarchist values practices, away from the more explicit anarchism in name.

form of militancy that is emergent, coming from deeply constructed relationships (p. 71) that upholds collective processes of intention and transformation while expanding comfort zones into other spaces of possibility. There is an element of imagination involved here: 'With joyful militancy we want to get at what it means to enliven struggle *and* care, combativeness *and* tenderness, hand in hand' (p. 68). This idea brings together the aspects of anarchism that my interview participants named—militant and oppositional, but also interested in the radical possibilities of forms of relating, deepening relationships, and future imaginative possibilities through prefigurative politics here and now.

Despite both the destructive (oppositional) and creative (prefigurative) tendencies of anarchism, there has been a tendency to define (and reduce) movement participants based on the tactics they use, rather than the broader politics or values that they might hold. As Mac observed, regarding North American anarchists:

> Whether you're willing to go into a demonstration and fight it out with the cops is what your politics are. Most movements, in most of the world, identify by their politics and then pick their tactics based on what they're trying to accomplish. We tend to put tactics first and then what we're trying to accomplish second. And we are very judgmental about those who don't share our tactics. … in most movements in the world, you could be going around serving soup one day and then when things have gotten to a certain point, setting up barricades and carrying guns. Whereas we tend to go straight to one or the other. And then we judge each other if we're not willing to serve soup, or if we want to serve soup rather than carry guns.

This kind of judgement reflects what Montgomery and bergman (2017) have called rigid radicalism—the 'monolithic notion of the right way to be radical, hostile, and suspicious to other ways of being'—and 'forces out the messiness of relationships and everyday life in favour of clear lines between good/bad and radical/reactionary' (p. 173). Rigid radicalism has a disciplining and chilling affect within movements, promotes a furtherance of insular and elitist

subcultures (Portwood-Stacer, 2013) and limits the possible further development and expansion of anarchist value-practices. In Bourdieu's terms discussed in the previous chapter, it creates and enforces a form of doxa, making modifications and developments of politics all the more difficult.[192]

These forms of rigid radicalism also foreclose the more expansive potentials of anarchist habitus. They are employed as a form of capital and currency, in order to maintain a specific posture or positioning of anarchism, a specific doxa and narrow expression of habitus. Those who perform and mimic radicalism to the most intense degree, articulate the most cohesive 'good politics' or most extensive mastery of theory, or can detailed the most historical knowledge are granted forms of social and movement capital. This limits the ability to engage and contest the bounds of anarchist value-practices, but also creates moments of discipline and conflict.

Militancy is an important aspect of cultures of resistance, as Montgomery and bergman (2017) argue, but there needs to be nuance and reflection in the ways it is expressed and the limits of rigid forms. Anarchists seek to catalyze greater forms of militancy and raise the prospect of what such forms of politics could look like in the current context of resistance. However, as Clare discussed, there can sometimes be limited forms of reflection on the sources of militant inspiration, indicative of a limited view of anarchist forms of political imagination:

> There's lots to be inspired about and learn from elsewhere. And I, like, personally I really, really love that. But also I don't think anarchists have, like, a monopoly on militancy or that the only examples or things that we could take

[192] This was most evident to me during the organizing against 2010 Olympics and Toronto G20 in 2010, where movements relived and agonized and antagonized over debates around 'diversity of tactics' and between dogmatic nonviolence and dogmatic militancy. Much like Mac observes, tactics became the central aspects of definition and division at the expense of values. These debates have not gone away, either. Every few years they rise to the surface again, playing out repetitions of previous discussions, antagonisms and dismissals. This has happened with the 2012 Occupy Movement and Quebec student strikes, Black Lives Matter militancy in Ferguson and after the murder of George Floyd, the general climate of resistance to creeping fascism, and most recently the Palestine solidarity struggles and encampments. Tactics continue to be a significant movement-building stumbling block.

> inspiration from are, like, other anarchists. So, like, yeah, you can look at Europe and look at all those things and take inspiration. But there are histories of militancy where we are. But there might not be, you know, explicitly, like, anarchists. You know, you've got really intense militant history, like in the US with the Black liberation movement or even the Puerto Rico independence movement or different things like that. And in Canada, like, the most militant actions that happen are almost exclusively Indigenous led.

This includes, as Clare and others noted in their interviews, an over emphasis on European/Western histories of anarchism and touchstone examples, such as the Paris Commune, the Spanish Civil War, or the Haymarket Affair. Although not exclusively, introductory works on anarchism tend to nearly always mention these particular historical examples of anarchism, in part due to their general historical notoriety, but also their status as 'successes' or victories in putting anarchism into practice on a larger scale. They are important touchstones, but tend to overshadow other important reference points for anarchist values-practices and modes of resistance.

Such a narrow view limits the articulation of deeper and more perceptive theoretical and practical insights. It also influences the willingness for some movement participants to identify explicitly with the anarchist label given the fraught media and public perceptions of anarchism that rely exclusively on images of confrontation and narratives of violence. The historic image of the anarchist bomb thrower has perhaps been supplanted by the contemporary image of the Black Bloc anarchist lobbing a molotov cocktail towards police lines or a bank. Such images, while they delineate and emphasize cultures of confrontation that are foundational to anarchism, also come at the expense of a richer view of anarchist culture and its potentials.

Clare noted this, reflecting on the dynamics of contemporary anarchist imagery:

> I think it's both the historical images that we draw on, and even, like, the contemporary images that we draw on. Like, It's Going Down is probably the most popular anarchist news site in North America, and ... I just noticed they

> had changed their main banner on the page. And I was just really struck by the specific image that they chose. That was, like, nothing necessarily wrong with it. But I think it was very emblematic of sort of what I'm talking about. And the image they chose was clearly a man, in Adidas, throwing a molotov cocktail. And I don't know where the image was took, but it very much looks like a classic, like, European-man-riot image that, like, one, represents a particular body or whatever. But also it's just, like, not even really a common sort of aesthetic or thing that you'd associate with North America.

They argue that such imagery is perhaps symptomatic of an 'over prioritization of European histories or certain views of what the anarchist revolutionary looks like' from the 'faces or, like, bodies that you'll see on posters or on book covers or zine covers, sometimes, like, sharing a bit of a limited representation,' raising the question of overly Western influence on what constitutes and informs anarchist theory and practice. This also creates further forms of capital, as anarchists employ or perform similar forms of imagery in their own aesthetics and style, and some are valorized for their more 'authentic' cultural representations of anarchism (see in particular Portwood-Stacer, 2013, and the forms of exclusion that materially result from the policing of aesthetics and cultural expression within anarchist cultures).

There are many expressions of anarchist culture that expand from a baseline of value-practices. Interviewees noted values, practices, norms, 'signifiers,' 'tying influences,' and affinities that help to establish and cohere cultures of resistance. These are the crucial elements that frame anarchist cultures, the forms of capital employed by participants in anarchist movements, and the persistence and maintenance of anarchist habitus. While participants noted the plurality of cultural expressions of anarchism, aesthetic, visual, and historical dimensions often led to tensions around overly rigid expressions of politics. This is one of the instances where greater forms of discussion and dialogue could enhance anarchist cultural expression and influence, but also problematize rigid forms of politics that limit greater attention to the ongoing context of resistance that I take up in the following chapter. There is greater space for considering means to expand and critique anarchist ways of being in the world with a little more intention.

Infrastructures of Culture and Resistance

While definitions of culture encompass value-practices, imagery, aesthetics, forms of subcultural capital, and historical reference points, physical forms of anarchist infrastructure also figure prominently, owing in part to anarchist desires for alternative and prefigurative futures that need to be built in the here and now. The 'physical anarchist spaces' that have existed over the years stand as important 'sites of anarchist activity' and culture (Al). Anarchism is communicated as a form of politics, but also has physical parameters, emphasized through a focus on 'gathering' within anarchist culture, highlighted by Sophia. This has manifested through both the permanent and fleeting forms of gathering that Wood (2019) discusses, and directly through a number of anarchist spaces within the Southern Ontario anarchist scene, including *Who's Emma* and *Uprising* in Toronto, the *Kitchener-Waterloo Centre for Social Justice (KWCCSJ)* in Kitchener, *AKA* in Kingston, *The Square* in Guelph, and *The Tower* and *Black Oak* in Hamilton.[193] Both Brian and Clare noted a central importance of physical anarchist infrastructures to bring out new people and further extend the reach of anarchist ideas and practices.

Physical locations, as key manifestations of anarchist politics and culture, are what Shantz (2010) terms 'infrastructures of resistance,' and are the 'means by which people can sustain radical social change both before, during and after insurrectionary periods' (p. 172). They are 'transfer cultures'—'the agglomeration of ideas and practices that guide people in making the trip from the society here to the society there in the future' (Ehrlich, 1996a, p. 329). Such 'free spaces' as Polletta (1999) highlights, have a specifically cultural dimension that maintains values, practices, movement knowledge, and future organizing prospects, even in times of downturn, and as a 'collective record of resistance' (p. 6). Most significant for my purposes here are the prefigurative aims of spaces, which seek to create new relations in the present, and which are explicitly political and oppositional, and can provide 'launching pads' for future projects and groups. They are the movement building locations and moments that help sustain

[193] On the archiving and legacy of some of these spaces see Antliff (2004).

movements during low points or cycles of downturn, as noted by Wood (2019), discussed in Chapter 4, and serve to cement anarchist habitus, enhance subcultural capital, and delineate the anarchist field.

Importantly, Polletta (1999) identifies relationships that are created and sustained through such spaces, beyond the physicality of space itself, which are crucial drivers of mobilization and resistance, and which push back against reducing culture to structure (pp. 11–12). Rather, 'oppositional culture' can be understood as a specific driver and creator of 'political opportunities.' According to Polletta, culture exists in both formal forms of political ideology, as well as specific relationship ties and connections (p. 13), echoing the notion of 'tying influences' raised above. It is the 'beliefs, values, and symbols institutionalized in a specific setting' (p. 20) that most directly influence the possibilities or likelihood of political mobilization, not the existence of separated or independent forms of free space. We return, again, to value-practices as essential for understanding anarchist forms of culture and resistance, as well as relationships, 'ties,' and connections that are central to the maintenance of cultures of resistance. Anarchist spaces are an important point of coherence, expression, and maintenance of values-practices, and bring these into the physical world both for anarchists and beyond. This goes beyond simply theoretical politics and finds significance and importance in the everyday.

O'Connor (1999) notes the role of such spaces in building an 'oppositional culture' and learning and practicing political skills. Ferguson (2010) notes that, historically, such physical places of meeting and organizing were foundational to developing anarchist 'counterpublics' shaped by 'political ideologies, symbolic communities, and embodied practices' (p. 193). The presence of physical, durable, and persistent spaces (to varying degrees) creates places for cultures of resistance to cohere and ongoing points of contact that can build stronger movement cultures. They become moments of engagement, contention, and deliberation between anarchists within movements, and important sites for the reproduction of habitus and deployment of capital.

Even more transitory and fleeting physical locations of anarchist culture come in the form of one-off events and gatherings, like anarchist bookfairs and May Day celebrations. These serve

as physical gathering places for extended anarchist networks (a sort of anarchist family reunion), points of connection between disparate anarchist scenes and communities, and also, importantly, as forms of communication and expansion of anarchist value-practices. They are spaces (to recall the Bourdieusian concepts of Chapter 4), that comprise and delimit the bounds of the anarchist field and also seek to expand it; and places where forms of subcultural capital are deployed, performed, and contested, but also often reaching beyond those who are only within the subculture as well (as curious others attend and engage). They also indicate which value-practices are most emphasized and broadcast, and what type of anarchism is constructed for wider, even narrowly, public consumption.

This is captured in the mission statement of the Toronto Anarchist Bookfair Collective (2020):

> By creating a space to meet each other, share ideas and skills, and have conversations about anarchism and how it applies to our struggles, we hope to build a more connected, resilient movement in so-called Southern Ontario and beyond. The Bookfair collective aims to prioritize marginalized communities' access to the space and make this event as accessible as possible.

The Hamilton Anarchist Bookfair Collective (2018) takes a similar approach:

> Our hope with this weekend is to contribute to rebuilding a sense of regional cohesion among various anarchist tendencies, to meet each other, share information about our contexts and projects, and find ways to work together to push back the smothering blanket of Canadian progressive democracy to lay bare the antagonisms that contained in capitalism and the State here and everywhere. (para. 1)

Bookfairs aim to be meeting points of learning, exchange, and deepening of relationships across local anarchist contexts. In this sense, despite their sometimes fleeting and inconsistent occurrence, (though some like the Montreal Anarchist Bookfair have been going on nearly annually since 2000), bookfairs and other similar anarchist gathering events serve as important

cultural 'autonomous zones.' As Allan Antliff (2004) asks, in his documentary anthology *Only A Beginning,* regarding the ongoing emergence and potency of anarchist analysis and action;

> How, then, did the anarchism in Canada sustain itself before this historic sea change, and why does it continue to expand today? The answer lies in the political cultural documented in this anthology. Over the last quarter century anarchists have fostered their own press, internet sites, communes, book stores, free schools, and other cooperative ventures, creating communities of resistance right across the country. This is a compelling instance of politics by example, proving anarchism is not only possible, but can be actualized in everyday life. (p. 7)

As participants noted, events and physical meeting places, however temporary, are crucial aspects for the formation, maintenance, and spread of anarchist culture and value-practices, and by extension, capital and habitus. They are also a useful reference point to take stock of the current nature of anarchist debates and challenges of theory and practice, and the key ideas being circulated and discussed. They form nodes in the physical circulation of anarchist ephemera, such as books, zines, t-shirts, stickers, etc., and operate as spaces of cultural exchange. Kathy Ferguson (2010) suggests 'anarchists were a people of the book' engaged in the proliferation of print cultures as part of classical anarchist counterpublics to spread their ideas (p. 205). All aspects of the process 'were a happening of anarchism' (p. 204) that constructed and maintained the movement. This continues today.

Jeppesen (2010) argues that these forms of cultural production are a mainstay of the lived aspects of anarchist culture. This recalls her previously discussed 'guerilla texts'—those 'irregular non-uniform anti-authoritarian texts' that push back against the dominant capitalist/authoritarian culture, but which also 'struggle to be true to an entire range of anti-authoritarian principles and values' (p. 473). Such texts communicate and reinforce anarchist value-practices, while also foregrounding a 'process of empowerment through collective production' (p. 475). These cultural aspects, then, are as much about benefitting anarchists

themselves as they are about spreading and propagandizing their ideas. This reiterates the importance of anarchist gatherings as a form of culture and cultural maintenance, and the ways that such events help to expand the scope and influence of anarchism more generally.

Lila noted a tension between, on the one hand, efforts 'for our own purposes of building anarchist culture, of doing things that are interesting for us. And we like watching whatever Sub.media, we like bookfairs, it meets a lot of our own needs.' On the other, however, 'there are times where I feel like it is much more strategic for us to sacrifice ourselves to attend city hall or their council meetings. But it does feel like a sacrifice because none of us are politically inspired by being there.' OS further echoed this sentiment, to consider how being an anarchist can creep into and influence the spaces we inhabit day to day. Anarchists construct culture for ourselves, but perhaps at the expense of other forms of organizing and agitation.

Lila also questioned whether such self-serving forms of anarchist culture are actually *organizing*, in terms of ways to bring about social change or revolution, and why when we think of anarchist organizing it is things like bookfairs and spaces that first come to mind.[194] There is a tension both in terms of who such projects primarily serve and the sorts of organizing that is privileged when they are taken up. The often impermanent and transitory nature of such projects also sometimes limit their ongoing staying power—often there are moments of intense activity that can lead to burnout and even departure from radical movement spaces (an all too common occurrence flagged by Montgomery and bergman, 2017, amongst others). While physical spaces and infrastructures (rather than gatherings/events), like the ones that have existed across various cities over many years, provide some level of permanence, they also require large amounts of intense focus and activity, and tend to persist for only a few years

[194] This is likely partially on account of the visibility of such anarchist projects whereas, on account on security culture and repression considerations, much anarchist activity is intentionally hidden or less public. There is also something here in terms of the often more informal forms of organization that are taken up by anarchists. While there may be a certain formality in terms of a specific collective that often does a bookfair, this is likely to be reserved for such a specific project or event, at a specific time of year, rather than something that necessarily is maintained on a regular basis. These sorts of more informal or project-specific forms of organization, in addition to the anarchist commitment to voluntary association and suspicion of top-down and authoritarian forms of organization, are likely factors that contribute to such a more impermanent quality of anarchist cultural forms.

before the forces of capitalism, gentrification, repression, or burnout cause them to fizzle or transition. While they can be a catalyst for movement activities, and movement expansion and survival, they are rarely *the* movement themselves.

Clare and Brian underlined the larger work of maintaining infrastructures, in the form of paying rent, fundraising, and facilitating access to the space that comes at the expense of both anarchist-specific programming and other forms of organizing. Physical space projects were promoted as spaces where similarly aligned groups could also organize events, using anarchist infrastructure to facilitate other struggles, requiring significant collective labour to ensure it was staffed, open, and available for others. This openness is often an important focus of anarchist spaces, Brian argued, as a means to reach outward and allow for a broader level of engagement with the space beyond strictly anarchist politics:

> The way that we approached the social center … was that we just called it a social center and printshop without anarchist in the name. And then we had a page that was like about us and said that the collective was all anarchists and it was organized along anarchist principles and outlaid what anarchism was. But [it] was like "This is the social center for like political organizing and stuff, so, like, we have a few no-gos. But other than that, this space exists for this purpose."

There is a difference in framing here between spaces that are explicitly anarchist (like the Tower was), and those that employ a broader radical social centre tone (for example, the Square in Guelph). In either case, significant labour was required of organizers to maintain the space as a cultural location, with less effort spent on the facilitation and construction of more intentional anarchist programming.

Another side of this tension, as Clare noted, is that the Tower, as an explicitly anarchist infrastructure, also became symbolic of any and all anarchist related politics in the city.

> Clare: One of the things that I didn't expect when opening this space was how The Tower has [be]come ... like, it *is* a space, an infrastructure. But it is, like, it

> is very visible. It is like the most visible anarchist presence, like, in the city and maybe even in the area, like more broadly. [Interviewer: Possibly in Ontario.] Yeah. And like, what that has meant is, like, outside of sort of, like, anarchist circles The Tower is like, it's not [just] a space project. The Tower is *the* anarchists. So people will come in and be like, "Well, what do the anarchists do on this or what do the anarchists think about that?" Or like, if anything happens in the city, sometimes it doesn't even have to be, like, anarchists organizing it. But if people get mad at it, they'll be like, "It's The Tower's fault." Like even if, like, you know, Maoists organize some, like, anti-fascist thing, people get pissed about it.
>
> Interviewer: "Oh it's The Tower, at it again!"
>
> Clare: And we're going to deal with angry people coming in and it just becomes [a] very visible symbol that, like, people come to associate with so much more than it just being a piece of infrastructure, which has sometimes meant we've had to sort of change a little bit how we interact with it. So, it is still, like, primarily an infrastructure, but like, you know, in the past, The Tower as a project has released public statements on things because it became to be so, like, publicly associated with something or asked so many questions about something. So it's, like, sort of taken on that role. But in general, that's not, that's, like, incidental. That's never an explicit goal, but it's just how it's like come to grow and be.

Spaces like the Tower can become flashpoints or stand-ins of anarchist politics, in frustrating ways, but can also carry potential to further express anarchist analysis and politics. As Clare noted, this meant that there was perhaps an increased ability to get specific anarchist analysis, in the form of statements, into the broader public realm, and make the space more widely known to those who had a genuine interest in radical politics.

Spaces of infrastructure therefore have a movement or culture building element, where they can assist and inspire those in other areas to do their own infrastructure projects. In the case of the Tower:

> we routinely get like emails from, I dunno, people in like small cities or towns of different places in Ontario that are just like, 'Me and my friends are anarchists in [whatever] city. But I don't know if you have, like, any resources or, like, we don't know.' And just because there's not tons of, like, physical anarchist projects that people can just, like, reach out to, again, incidentally, The Tower in many cases has become that. And I always think that's, like, really great. And I enjoy responding to those e-mails. I think similarly, that means if people who are, like, really into anarchism or are anarchists and just, like, in the area will often come here. So I also get to meet other anarchists. (Clare)

Both this knowledge and experience sharing, as well as a physical point of contact in the city, cement, expand, and maintain anarchist cultural connections. New and deeper relationships can be cultivated through the physical operation and visibility of anarchist infrastructures.

As Brian notes, there was an intentional move to consider the building of localized anarchist cultures through infrastructure projects: 'the socializing, the friendships, the space for, like, getting to know each other as individuals so that we can develop trust and make connections, so that when someone shows up to a meeting with a group ... they might actually know a few people because they've met them at socials or whatever.' This has a relationship-building function as well as a security culture and anti-repression function as well. Spaces that are more public and open, as opposed to those more private (like people's homes), provide possibilities for outreach and cultivate relationships of familiarity that might blossom in deeper levels of affinity. Places of meeting and culture can become 'a part of people's life' to 'actually strengthen and increase commitments to struggle for people' (Brian).[195] They become places to

[195] Bookfairs and spaces often include policies or statements around sexual violence and harassment, safe(r) space, accountability, photography and police attendance, and more recently, COVID-19 and masking considerations.

reproduce and maintain anarchist forms of habitus. They are, however, not without their drawbacks, as I discuss below.

There is a tension that arises in such anarchist cultural spaces as to how to stoke new forms of engagement and analysis, while also being able to take current or long-term anarchist analysis further. Anna notes that often conversations at bookfairs tend to be at an introductory, 101, or 1.0 level, and that there has been a difficult balance between leaving space to introduce people to anarchist concepts, ideas and discussions, but also be able to take them to a higher level, a 201 or 5.0 level of discussion and get to the 'nitty gritty pieces.' Trying to achieve both levels of analysis and education meant that content was reframed for a wider audience at the expense of further developing theory and action.

This is one of the factors that I think has limited the greater development of anarchist anti-colonial politics, as much of the programming on this topic, or Indigenous resurgence in general, tends to be more introductory. This is important in terms of making specific connections for newcomers or those continuing to expand their radical politics, but it does mean that there is limited 2.0, let alone 5.0, content with which anarchist movements and cultures, as a collective whole, can build upon.

Bourdieu's notion of habitus, and to an extent capital, suggest in part that a durability of dispositions and ways of doing things means that we are likely to continue to engage in them in the ways that have been most employed up to this point. There is a persistence that comes through learned and 'educated' ways of being. Anarchists created spaces for ourselves in important ways, but these can also limit the expansion or critique of ways of being, given the energies required to sustain them and the wider reproduction of dominant forms of capital,

---

These, in many ways, indicate the importance of mutual aid and supportive and anti-oppressive values and practices that are promoted within anarchist space. They communicate directly aspects of the cultures that anarchists inhabit and are continually trying to build. This is reflected by Clare above, noting the ways that the Tower often put out specific anarchist analysis and statements on concerns connected to politics in Hamilton. Bookfairs and other anarchist events often place themselves within the local contexts of resistance and structures of domination. Such events begin to meld the promotion of anarchist values and practices with broader points of analysis and directions for resistance.

aesthetics, and approaches. And this is often why it is difficult to break out of commonly reproduced cultural modes. I turn to some of these aspects further below, to explore this tension of how, when, and why we 'name anarchism' in our embodied political work and how that comes into anti-colonial and Indigenous organizing.[196] Breaking out of persistent, but frequently limiting, modes of practice is one of the necessary considerations, and ultimate realities, required to move towards greater anti-colonial politics.

Overall, whether as physical social centres that form more consistent community meeting and outreach points, or more fleeting temporary events and gatherings, anarchist infrastructures are a key element for building, sustaining, and expanding anarchist culture. They are both spaces for anarchists themselves (especially in times of social movement decline or crisis) and a crucial means of reaching beyond strictly anarchist circles into wider communities of resistance and social change. In Southern Ontario, these spaces, while at times inconsistent, transient, and dynamic, have formed a series of important connections between anarchist scenes in different cities. They are a crucial glue that helps to cohere, reproduce, and maintain an ongoing anarchist culture of resistance.

Anarchist Forms of Cultural Communication

One of the ways that anarchists broadcast value-practices and seek to expand cultural influence is through media and artistic projects that can go beyond localized audiences and scenes, a limitation of more physically present cultural spaces.[197] Websites like Sub.media.tv, It's Going Down (IGD; itsgoingdown.org), Crimethinc (Crimethinc.com),[198] NoCanada.info, and north-

[196] This relates back to Sophia's point in the preceding chapter that anarchists are often directly involved in political work on a range of issues, but rarely do so in terms of naming anarchism, or 'outing' themselves as anarchists, despite the explicit promotion of anarchist values and practices.

[197] There is admittedly a whole conversation to be had (and which has been had) regarding the relationship between music and anarchist culture that deserves at least a passing mention here. This is referenced by both KR and Lee in their interviews. I don't mean to discount this as a cultural form (it is after all a key transit to my own anarchism), but the connections between anarchism and music subcultures like punk is perhaps one of the more studied aspects of anarchist cultures and doesn't feel necessary to rehash here. It was also not a core element discussed in my interviews. On punk as an element of subculture, see Portwood-Stacer (2013) and Kadir (2016).

[198] On Crimethinc as a broader entity of anarchist cultural production and politics, see Jeppesen (2011).

shore.info serve as both clearing houses for anarchist action communiqués, and as publishing points for analysis and reflection.[199]

Communiques are a critical reference point for anarchist politics and analysis, and shed light on the 'collectively-constituted universe of ideas' in specific anarchist contexts, scenes, and milieus (Loadenthal, 2017, p. 12). They represent theory and content composed from within movements, and analysis of contemporary action, conditions, and contexts that are communicated through shared language and discourse (p. 68). IGD (n.d.), for example, aims 'to provide a resilient platform to publicize and promote revolutionary theory and action.' Sub.media adopts a similar approach as 'one of the most prolific producers of anarchist, anti-capitalist and anti-colonial propaganda in the world' (Sub.media, n.d., para. 2).

North-shore.info is particularly significant for my purposes here as it aims 'to provide a space for strategic reflection, engaged critique, and thoughtful debate from an anarchist and anti-authoritarian perspective in Southern Ontario' (para. 1). By 'creating a shared infrastructure for communication' the project aims to be 'a small step towards developing new ways of relating to each other and understanding our place on this land. In doing so, we hope to contribute to building a decentralized and creative force capable of meaningfully pushing back against the state and capital in this area' (North-shore.info, n.d., para. 3). North-shore is a key reference point for anarchist culture and analysis in Southern Ontario, specifically in terms of depth and breadth of anti-colonial analysis, politics and action, and as a space of potential for further expanding such analysis as well.

Brian argued that such projects, specifically Crimethinc, serve an important function of 'trying to present a world view from an anarchist perspective.' They are a means to solidify and construct cultures and analysis for anarchists themselves, but also to extend their viewpoints to others. They maintain a level of deliberation and contention across anarchist cultures and scenes, enhancing internal movement conversations and debates. They can also take

[199] On the importance of communiques in specifically insurrectionary contexts, and on the dynamics of insurrectionary anarchist tendencies in general, see Loadenthal (2017) and Apoifis (2017).

arguments that are often presented in internally focused anarchist language, and reframe them to become more directly relevant in broader spaces and places. They have a propaganda effect that extends across, and beyond, anarchist cultures.

Projects like this serve as more localized nodes within anarchist media cultures compared to broader forums like IGD and Sub.media. Although now defunct and offline, NoCanada.info (n.d.) was

> a collaborative project between anarchists and radicals across turtle island to counter celebrations of the 150th anniversary of the Canadian state taking place in 2017. Through a bilingual website, zine, mixtape, and country-wide print and social media promotional campaign, the project aims to disrupt the papering-over of Canada's history and current practices. (para. 2)

This project sought intentional cultivation of anarchist anti-colonial politics and the spread of such politics towards anti-colonial action. The anonymity of such spaces provides an avenue for posting about disruptive, illegal, and direct forms of action and analysis while avoiding forces of surveillance and repression, and also allows for analysis that can speak plainly to specific tensions, dynamics, or problems within movements themselves. In his exploration of insurrectionary communiques, Loadenthal (2017) argues that authorship in such instances is less important than the ability of such writings to create such a 'collectively constituted universe of ideas' (p. 12), and the typically anonymous nature allows the ideas or actions to speak on their own merits from within movements themselves,[200] echoing Jeppesen's (2010) guerilla texts discussed above. These spaces allow possibilities of cultural exchange and the development of anarchist analysis in a collective/collaborative sense. They also create a

[200] This is also one potential way to move beyond some of the limitations dictated by forms of capital. Anonymous writings, as Loadenthal argues, speak primarily from the standpoint of the ideas, rather than through an authority of personality. And while there are obviously a host of concerns related to accountability in terms of anonymous writings, and the dangers of 'call-outs,' there is an important utility to such forms of expression within anarchism in particular for theorizing and analysis.

collective sense of anarchism within a specific space or field, and aid in the structuring and maintenance of habitus.

Art and propaganda, as well, continue to be key aspects of anarchist culture. This is employed in online and digital anarchist spaces of culture, but also as physical markers, signals, and expressions of anarchist politics 'on the street.' Participants noted the important use of art for the communication of anarchist value-practices, but also the communication of solidarity with a variety of struggles. This is a common occurrence in the form of banner drops, and banners displayed at political events or protests. While anarchists are far from the only ones employing the use of banners as visual signifiers of politics and solidarity, they are perhaps some of their more frequent users. Unlike more formal organizations, anarchists tend to use banners and visual materials not to advertise their specific group, project, or publication, but to communicate politics and value-practices. This includes common and enduring anarchist symbolism such as black (or red and black) flags, the circle-A, and various slogans. Slogans range from 'Total Freedom' and 'Against Prisons and Their World' in prison abolition contexts, 'We Are Ungovernable' in militant street confrontations against gentrification,[201] 'Fuck This, Fuck Cops' in anti-repression and anti-police contexts, and those more specifically anti-colonial in tone like 'Shut Down KKKanada' or simply 'Anti-Capitalist. Anti-Colonial. Anti-State.' This form of visual political culture is present at demos and actions, but also in the form of stickers, posters, graffiti, murals or buttons. It forms a wider aspect of anarchist aesthetics.

Music and art were presented by participants in ways that contribute to the maintenance of anarchist culture, but which also serve as means to broadcast and expand such cultures and opposition to systems of oppression. Lee, as a performer and organizer, noted the importance of music and art in broadcasting radical ideas to cohere cultures of resistance. They noted the artist platform can be used to 'defend and explain pretty radical shit to people that aren't,' to

[201] As was the case in Hamilton after the 2018 Anarchist Bookfair, which ended in a number of arrests of anarchists after windows of gentrifying businesses were smashed and a cycle of police and legal repression swung into high gear. See 'Beyond Support: Compilation of texts on the Locke St events and the charges laid in connection with them' (2018) for a specific anarchist analysis of the Locke Street events.

‘explain why people do [particular radical forms of action], and to just help justify it as a political option, you know, explaining diversity of tactics to folks that might not get it.’ Artists give voice to anarchist politics and value-practices, as well as anti-colonial and Indigenous resurgence struggles—whether hosting Indigenous speakers and performers, raising funds through benefit shows or music compilations, or travelling to support front line resistance movements. Art, and the organizing that comes with it, can be a further catalyst for expanding relationships and affinities across communities and struggles, and a means to maintain, and possibly expand, habitus.

Lee’s ‘persona’ as an artist has afforded them unique opportunities for fostering solidarity relationships:

> to connect with movements all over the country, you know, which is fantastic. Like, I get to do a lot of, like, Indigenous solidarity stuff. You know, doing fundraisers, get to go visit frontline spots. We went to the Treaty Truck in Shubenacadie, I've been to Unist'tot'en, been to Secwepmec, I've been to, I'm trying to think, Grassy Narrows, Aamjiwnaang, you know. And to me, that's like some of the most crucial work that's going on in Canada. And to be able to sort of just take part and help. And that that thing that I do is seen as a form of help, is fantastic.

Lee links their artistic work explicitly to the support and cultivation of relationships with frontline Indigenous land defense and frames such struggles as imperative. In ways that evoke Bourdieu, Lee specifically considers the ways that their capital within movement culture as an artist can be a means to enliven debates around politics and help justify militant forms of action. In this sense, cultural workers and artists help to promote, expand, and structure anarchist culture through their deployment of capital.

KR noted further that ‘art was a tool to allow access’ and ‘healing’ in response to the ‘workaholic, ableist sort of frameworks’ that narrate movement spaces and politics. They frame artistic work as ‘trying to provide some sort of release. And so that's kind of the role that we've

tried to play [as artists].' They illustrated the importance of physical space and hubs, and the importance of cultivating deeper forms of relationships, solidarity, support and accountability that can aid in the creation and maintenance of cultures of resistance. Carving out spaces, both physical and fleeting, allow for such artistic communities to thrive and connect to other forms of political organizing and culture.

Willow echoed the value of community building and maintenance aims of anarchist culture:

> art and seeing those things [stickers, posters etc.] can do a couple of things. I think that it you can show that you're not alone and that you're part of, like, a bigger, broader movement and it breaks the isolation. … Certain posters and whatever are some of the ways that I was able, as a rural teen, to find what resonated with me and to find others and to find language for what I was feeling and to expand myself. So I think that it can really help with finding placemaking[202] in a very specific way.

Such forms signal the possibilities that exist for those newly exposed to anarchist politics, but also serve a maintenance and reminder role for those already attuned and committed. In this way these forms of visual culture are crucial to instigating, maintaining, and expanding anarchist culture. Further, following Bourdieu, they are also useful geographic markers that indicate the reach of anarchist culture and the parameters of the anarchist field.[203]

One final element of anarchist culture that deserves mention are the slogans employed by anarchists, appearing in visual culture, chanted at demonstrations, or adorned on the titles or covers of anarchist zines and writings. Slogans are also one of the ways that anarchist culture can be dismissed or misunderstood. As slogans are short and to the point they lack much of the

---

[202] I return to Willow's conception of placemaking in the following chapters, as a way to consider anarchist orientations towards land, Indigenous resurgence struggles, and the future.

[203] This has also been a similar cultural strategy used by anti-fascist organizers, who are also frequently, though not exclusively, anarchists. The use of visuals that declare 'anti-fascist neighbourhoods' where white supremacy and intolerance are not welcome is a further example of how the bounds and parameters of culture are communicated in social movement contexts, and how specific fields of affect are created and bounded. On anti-fascist strategy, see Bray (2017, especially Chapter 6).

necessary nuance and depth that informs the broader intricacy of anarchist politics and value-practices. From 'No Gods, No Masters' and 'No Borders, No Nations,' to 'Smash the State,' anarchists have a cultural love for punchy declarations of politics. In the interviews, I discussed this dynamic and the often reductionist view of anarchist politics that results.

Interview participants noted the resonance and delight of slogans, despite their obvious limitations as nuanced declarations of politics. AM reflected on placing such sloganeering in historical context:

> What smashing the state means is not the same thing that it meant a hundred years ago. And again, I don't have an answer [for] you because I still want to smash the state. But what does that mean has dramatically changed. And I think that anarchists need to be more reflective on what that means.

They noted that the both the structures of the state and considerations for smashing 'it' have changed greatly and require a specific incorporation of settler colonialism as part of the broader structure of domination that needs to be smashed. In a similar sense, following the notion of 'good politics' discussed above, there is a tendency to uphold slogans as a form of language and expression of a particular position and capital, rather than as reflective of a particular set of acts or practicalities that might actually make them a reality. Their employ is one means of showing a commitment or adeptness of engaging anarchist cultural forms, and therefore can contribute to building one's cultural/social/political capital.

What do we mean actually mean by 'smash the state' or 'the state' in general? As Lila reflected, this is often a common challenge issued to anarchists:

> "What do you mean and what does that mean?" And then when you're actually pushed to better, to actually articulate the ideas, it's almost, it's a challenge because we kind of have our little cultures of just being like, "Oh, yeah fuck cops, don't vote." There's all these things that we just kind of take for granted.

This leads to the persistence of oppositional politics as a sort of common sense (as part of anarchist habitus) that is often shallow and not directly elaborated.

Cooper put such slogans into an important relational context to reframe how we might engage with them:

> But the idea of the state being a set of relationships and that you can't just "fuck it" or "smash it" or, you know, break a window—not that I'm saying any of those things are bad to do in any given context. … But I am saying that, you know, recognizing our embeddedness in those relationships is important and recognizing that that doesn't end when we sign up to fight it.

Cooper here references Gustav Landauer's (1920/2010) classical formulation of the state, discussed Chapter 2: 'The state is a social relationship; a certain way of people relating to one another. It can be destroyed by creating new social relationships; i.e., by people relating to one another differently' (p. 214). Relations actually become 'the central struggle,' something Cooper has learned through their experiences in a range of intersecting organizing struggles. Anarchism, they argued, often takes on a focus that 'is either highly individual or highly structural. But the community and familial and relational is actually where the missing components can be. That middle part of the depth of relationship.' At the end of the day it is the relational, accountable, and collective work of prefiguring alternatives that is the harder task to go beyond declarations of opposition and the 'smashing' itself (although we need that too!).[204]

Such slogans often reduce anarchism to a politics of opposition/destruction and lose the creative, imaginative, and prefigurative element. 'No Gods, No Masters,' which I take up in my discussion of tensions around spirituality in the following chapter, has both an opposition to hierarchical and oppressive forms of religion and authoritarianism, and a dismissal of other spiritual groundings than can form a crucial part of constructing alternatives. There is a danger

[204] I return to the central aspects of relationships in the following chapter, most specifically in relation to affinity.

of rigidity here, and a potential offhand dismissal of historical and contextual groundings that can aid new form of anarchist politics in flourishing.[205] When talking with Lila, I wondered 'what we lose by continuing to focus on these … essentially narrow ways of expressing our politics at face value.' Something is potentially lost in the process of constant repetition. It maintains habitus, but also entrenches it further. It allows an ongoing coherence of opposition, but loses a greater nuance.

However, these forms of 'collective refusal,' part of what Dixon, (2014) calls the 'anti's' of anti-authoritarian politics, 'can help anchor and guide us, particularly when we are consistently told that there are no viable alternatives to what we see around us' (p.58). Refusal and opposition is a beginning and necessary clarification of what we oppose. It is the foundational aspect of the collective 'NO!' and the 'Ya Basta! [Enough!] of the Zapatistas that requires an intimately connected 'many yeses' (Khasnabish, 2011, p. 83) toward 'a world where many worlds fit' (Montgomery & bergman, 2017, p. 109). But the yeses, the positive affirmations, the radical imaginations (Haiven & Khasnabish, 2014) need intentional construction. Slogans help us get moving and add definition to cultures of opposition and habitus, but more explicit and committed forms of construction are needed. To use another common anti-globalization movement slogan, we need to move to 'another world is possible,' to prefiguration of a 'new world in the shell of the old,' as well. Such an orientation to prefiguration and the future is a crucial aspect of anarchist value-practices, and for expanding and developing anarchist anti-colonial politics specifically.

In many ways, both digital and physical forms of anarchist media, art, propaganda, slogans, and analysis represent contemporary formations of the sorts of counterpublics that Ferguson (2010) identifies in classical anarchist networks of publishing and exchange. Ferguson details the oppositional cultural practices of anarchists in the construction of their own cultural spaces and politics, but also the ways that they expand their influence beyond their own narrow scenes.

---

[205] Leaving aside as well (until the following chapter) the ways that slogans like 'No Gods, No Masters' or 'No Borders, No Nations' are also dismissive of both Indigenous spiritualties and Indigenous forms of resurgence that often take up quite explicitly different non-Western conceptions of border and nation.

They represent new forms of 'textual publics' forged in the context of struggle and agitation that are 'multiple, temporal sites of struggle, anchored in concrete material spaces, and capable of enhancing the lives of their participants through world-making practices of political struggle' (p. 198). The range of anarchist spaces and cultural forms, from physical infrastructures, to temporary events, to online forums, and signifiers of politics at the street level are crucial for the solidification and expression of anarchist culture and anarchist habitus. They also contain crucial prefigurative possibilities to bring radical imaginations into practice here and now. They are explicitly linked to anarchist movements and anarchist cultures of resistance, and serve as sites for the maintenance, reproduction, deliberation, and expansion of value-practices. Such infrastructures are crucial expressions of anarchism, as raised by interview participants, and offer potential for enhancing anarchist discussions of the context of settler colonialism.

Drawbacks and Pitfalls of Anarchist Cultural Forms

Despite the general importance and potentials of anarchist culture highlighted in this chapter there are some elements that require further critical discussion. The dynamic of subcultural insularity and exclusion is a recurrent issue for anarchist culture, if not for any scene that seeks to create alternatives to the dominant (statist, capitalist etc.) culture and society. Throughout our interview discussions, participants were keenly aware of the dangers associated with subcultural perception and exclusion.

As participants reflected, subcultures are frequently 'isolating' (AM) and anarchist cultures contain 'subculture elements you can't get away from' that contribute to insularity. AM suggested that this insularity is unavoidable:

> '[It's] inevitable in the kind of society that we live in, like this kind of like advanced capitalism where we define ourselves [against] things like that, which is not inherently bad. So, I think that does kind of like a little bit of an injustice to anarchism in the sense that but at the same time, maybe not. Maybe it kind of reflects the plurality or possibilities of anarchism as not being this one fixed thing.

This raises the question of how to maintain our own spaces of resistance and culture but also build further and beyond, capturing this dual element discussed above. As AM reflected, there is often a tension between these 'two worlds,' but the histories and practices of groups like NOII (No One Is Illegal) and OCAP (Ontario Coalition Against Poverty) provide fruitful examples of how to navigate such tension. These two groups in particular, no doubt due to their previous visibility in the Southern Ontario context, were frequently noted by participants as key reference points for community organizing and attempts to chart an anti-authoritarian path away from the limits of smaller scenes. AM noted that such groups turn away from 'strict ideological' forms of politics and rather embrace more diffuse 'anarchistic or socialistic' value-practices, and provide possible orientations beyond narrow and exclusionary subcultural forms of politics.

Bourdieu's discussion of capital is a central element here. Capital, especially in the social form, but also for anarchists very much the political form as well, intersects directly with the dynamics at play within subcultures that are quite insular. Capital is afforded to those who have competencies and a good handle on desired or 'correct' political stances, deep levels of visible commitment, participation in radical forms of action, visibility, and subcultural aesthetics. Anarchists in particular tend to put a great emphasis on the depth or quality of one's anarchist politics, and their level of theoretical sophistication. These dynamics fundamentally structure what is valorized within anarchist habitus, but also the types of voices or 'players' that are afforded disproportionate influence over who and what makes a 'good' anarchist. These aspects influence, and structure further, what become the key aspects of anarchist habitus.

There is an overarching tension around the efforts required to maintain anarchist cultures and infrastructures, and ultimately their effectiveness within a larger revolutionary and prefigurative anarchist political outlook that also takes seriously the possibility of radical futures. Joel Olson (2009) raises this critique with US-based anarchist movements and their specific inattention to race, where organizing is characterized between extremes of either 'infoshops' (cultural space) or insurrection (militant street confrontation), rather than organizing that furthers attention, understanding, solidarity, and action against complex

structures of race, colonialism, white supremacy, etc. His work suggests that it is often easier to defer to more insular, niche, and at times self-serving cultural expressions of politics, than to consider bigger questions of how to mount widespread and effective opposition to large-scale structures of domination. His work prompts reflection on why cultural spaces and events are frequently more visible than other forms of organizing. Why is there a certain emphasis on more temporary, and less long-term, goal-oriented forms of organization? What are the implications, in terms of long-term strategy and effectiveness, of frequently insular and subcultural forms of politics? What do they 'do' in terms of the construction of possible futures built on prefiguration, political possibility, or imagination? How does this affect the articulation and commitment to anti-colonial politics?

AM affirmed the 'beauty' of anarchism as an idea and practice 'to apply those principles in different ways.' There is a wealth of possibilities that come with leaning into the expansiveness of anarchism. AM elaborated: 'The anarchist promise is you can be an anarchist without being an Anarchist. You cannot be a Marxist without being Marxist,' which speaks to the promise of engaging anarchism beyond 'big-A' forms, and more towards lived value-practices. Anarchist value-practices do not always need anarchism in name, or explicit ideology, to find their home in radical movements. As interview participants discussed, there is both a diffusion of anarchist value-practices into wider struggles, and the participation of anarchists themselves. Anarchists do not only engage in 'big-A' anarchist struggle, but also frequently find themselves active across a whole range of movements. They bring their politics and value-practices with them, in ways that illustrate other ways of being and doing, even without direct reference to anarchism itself (though as OS and others argued, there is an importance to actually being more 'out' as anarchists in these spaces, to make a greater name for anarchist practices, but also perhaps to push back against much of the maligning of anarchism as well).

Cooper elaborated on this:

> [There is] a tendency, I think, to either do two things: One, to sort of try to shoehorn all these other people who have similar principles into that type of

> environment; or to really hold on to those spaces for their insularness and their sort of subculturalness, that I think is a real failure. It's a failure because I believe we're in a moment, and we've seen people—whether it be through Occupy or through Idle No More—we've seen people engage in struggles that have resonance with anarchism as a political practice that I think require us to recognize that resonance and not necessarily to just put a big 'A' on it and stamp it out, but ... also to be open to the multiple trajectories.

Cooper links back to the range of different identifications with anarchism. Even a more general 'anarchism without adjectives' can still lead to insular and exclusionary forms of being, and so anarchist diffusion can occur without anarchism in name, to focus on values and practices.

Subculture and insularity can be linked, as well, to a predominance of small friendship circles that often structure local anarchist movements (Brian). As Lydia noted, there are simply not that many anarchists, especially in smaller cities like Kitchener, Hamilton, or Guelph.[206] As I have observed throughout my participation and research there are usually a very small number of self-identified anarchists, linked to one another across geography, but also firmly connected other local, radical and less explicitly defined groups and projects. There is a tendency to be involved in both 'big-A' and 'little-a' forms.

The reality of this small number of anarchists who participate in anarchist culture means, according to Brian, that there is a certain point 'when you've made it' in a local anarchist scenes, 'when there's multiple social groupings. And I think as long as you're still just having the same group of friends, who are just trying to include more people in that same grouping of

[206] Williams (2017) takes up a much more quantitative assessment of anarchism on the global scale, noting the prevalence of anarchist forms of organization throughout the world based on a number of comparative data sets. While a hard numerical assessment of the actual number of individual anarchists is difficult (given the likelihood of many not participating in formal anarchist organizations, like many of my interview participants), Williams notes that even those explicitly defined organizations themselves can be quite variable, perhaps only being maintained by one or a handful of anarchists. In particular, he finds a lack of organizational 'carry-over' between 1983 and 2005 and points to the creation of more formal types of organizations that can help sustain anarchist movements over a longer period.

friends, it is a socially exhausting strategy for creating an anarchist culture.' While friendship, relationships and affinity are crucially important for movements and cultures of resistance (see Montgomery and bergman, 2017, and the following chapter), they also need to be coupled with strategies that extend politics beyond small-scale scenes.

As Al somewhat somberly reflected, dropout within movements is a constant problem. Levels of commitment and willingness to participate change over time and 'we get demoralized and drop out of movements when we don't feel that we're connected or we feel that what we're connected to just isn't all that substantial. You know, that it's, that it's fleeting' (Al). This is one place to further expand affinities, trust, and relationships; to combat the insularity and feelings of disconnect that persist under capitalism. Al reflected on the changing social processes of local scenes:

> I think it's maybe like me getting a bit older and needing more than a local scene. Feeling like time goes by quickly. You can easily spend ten years and look back and be like "Damn" like, you know? [Interviewer: What did we actually accomplish?]. That was a lot of sacrifice, a lot of time, a lot of energy. Is it going to go anywhere, you know, or did it even have the potential ... to go anywhere? Social movements are rare and important things. And I think in this case, we have one that's pretty substantial and so connecting to it, in that way, I think is important. It sustains us.

This speaks to the sustaining function of developing anarchist cultures, and the necessity of expanding networks of care and support. KR noted that ' there is a potential splintering and dividing that can occur within smaller political scenes, driven by capitalism and colonialism that 'particularly has done a really good job of divide and conquer,' and we need to pay direct attention to how this affects culture and the possibilities of movements:

> I don't think we're always aware of how divide and conquer really has impacted the way that we are in the world. And so, and the ego, there's so much ego in all these scenes. I'm just like, "Yo, if we just, like, cut that shit and

> understood that we have more in common than we do difference." That doesn't mean that we don't recognize that there's heavy anti-black racism or gendered violence or anti-Indigenous racism. But it means that if we actually work together to figure out how to do that, we're a force to be reckoned with. But the left just completely dismantled, the right doesn't have to do anything anymore. They don't have to do shit.

Conflict can be either a source of fracturing, in the vein of rigid radicalism and insular politics that drive others out or away, or it can be a means to strengthen and continue to develop our politics. Rigid radicalism and framings of good/bad politics often limit the possibilities of reflection, change, and growth. As many participants noted, there is a need for greater ability to actually work through conflict, whether political or personal. This could be an essential means of sustaining cultures of resistance, but also taking them further, expanding their reach and depth.

Conflict can occur for myriad reasons, from the frictions of close proximity, personal disagreements, and egos, to failures in conflict resolution and accountability and state repression. As Bourdieu notes, conflict is a constituent part of the relations between habitus, capital, and field as multiple actors engage one another within cultural and political space. Lila reflected on the role of political capital in interpersonal conflict:

> even if [conflict] is a difference of political opinion, I haven't always held the political views that I hold now. … And so it's always evolving and that's OK. It's actually kind of good. And maybe we can actually have more disagreements. Like maybe we can actually learn how to disagree and be in conflict with each other better, because I think that we generally suck at conflict and there's a lot of, almost like, shunning of people. It's just kind of there's some hard lines. And I'm like, "Why are we doing that?" How about we can be like, "I really disagree with what you're saying and like, let's talk about it" rather [than] "You're fucked and I'm not going to be around you."

Capital accrued from performing 'correct' or 'good' politics is a key source of conflict, contention, and exclusion within movements. But, as I argued in Chapter 4, conflict can also be a crucial moment of crisis, change, and potential to further elaborate and expand politics and break out of previously cemented and constraining ways of thinking and being. How we deal with conflict greatly determines the staying power and resilience of cultures, but also their ability to adapt, grow, and deepen.

Montgomery and bergman (2017) frame a large part of these forms of conflict as rigid radicalism, which adopts and imports many of the destructive, competitive, and divisive values of capitalism and authoritarianism into movements, leading to a 'monolithic notion of the right way to be radical, hostile, and suspicious to other ways of being … in favour of clear lines between good/bad and radical/reactionary' (p. 173). Rigid radicalism results in '*a fixed way of being* and *a way of fixing*. It fixes in the sense of attempting to repair, seeing emergent movements as inherently flawed. To fix is to *see lack everywhere*, and treat struggles and projects as broken and insufficient. It also fixes in the sense of fastening or making permanent, converting fluid practices into set ways of being, stagnating their transformative potential' (p. 169). This doubling down on previously held ways of thinking, doing, and being limits and forecloses other potentials. It is also likely to maintain the capital, privilege, and power of those who already hold it within movement spaces.

A key element of this is the valuation of 'good politics'.[207] This is a form of constant comparison and absolutism, where one's ability to stake out a correct position leaves little room for greater deliberation, learning, and discussion regarding the content of political positions. As a result, politics 'becomes *something a person has*, *rather than something people do* together, as a shared practice' (Montgomery & bergman, 2017, p. 179) and which further entrenches divisions, hierarchies, and rigid radicalism. This is one manifestation of insularity, subcultural narrowness, and rigidity that causes many to leave or burn out of radical political spaces.[208] This

[207] For an in-depth discussion of this movement dynamic, see Lagalisse (2016).
[208] While I don't have the space to discuss burnout in depth here, it is a persistent issue within radical scenes and movements, and needs greater attention in terms of how to combat the forms of rigidity discussed here that lead

is also one means of distribution of the kinds of cultural capital that Bourdieu discusses, which can be a cover for other forms of privilege or division, and which further uplifts those who are able to play this particular game—with correct lines expressed in words, rather than actions (Lagalisse, 2019, pp. 98–99). 'Good politics' becomes currency as cultural/social/political capital.

Insularity, smallness, and subculture are all factors (in addition to the generalized weight of the violence and oppression of the structures in which we live) that influence the longevity of social movement and political cultural participation. Subcultures can be understood as forms of 'abeyance structures' (Taylor, 1989) where 'a social movement organization uses internally oriented activities to build a structure through which it can maintain its identity, ideals, and political vision' (p. 772). The collective forms of identity 'that it constructs and maintains within a shared political community can become an important symbolic resource for subsequent mobilizations.' These are 'holding patterns' of sorts that help to maintain movements in times of downturn. This framework links with the durability and persistence of Bourdieu's habitus, as a means of holding, educating, and maintaining ways of being within specific cultural spaces. The persistence, in this case, of value-practices helps to maintain anarchist cultures of resistance, but also maintains their tensions, conflicts, and limitations as well.

Anarchist cultures can therefore, according to Willow, help us to 'move about the world' in the context of dominant structures:

> [They form a] kind of niche connection to broader things that are happening in the world. But there is also a sense of isolation. … And so I think it's like moving about the world and wanting that culture of anarchism to be with you and

---

to it, but also the failings of broader cultures of care and support within movement spaces. Montgomery and bergman discuss burnout more directly in Chapter 4 of *Joyful Militancy* (2017). 'What depletes us is not just long hours,' they write, 'but the tendencies of shame, anxiety, mistrust, competition, and perfectionism. It is the way in which these tendencies stifle joy: they prevent the capacity for collective creativity, experimentation, and transformation. Often, saying one is burnt out is the safest way to disappear, to take a break, to take care of oneself and get away from these dynamics' (p. 175).

> guide your conversations with people and guide like how you connect with people.

Willow's discussion reflects Bourdieu's concept of habitus as an overarching means of making sense, connecting to, and structuring the world around us, using a particular lens, in a particular context. They note the limitations and smallness of anarchist subcultural forms but also return us to the overarching potentials of anarchist cultures to guide and connect. Further, the importance of relationships and relationality are raised here, a crucial element I discuss in more detail below.

Francesca Polletta (2022), in her study of relationship schemas and the importation of friendship as a reference point for implementing alternative forms of organizing radical politics, notes the ways that alternative cultures tend to draw on familiar reference points to construct their internal logics. Alternative cultures take up friendship as a reference point for organizing beyond hierarchical or rigid forms, and as a way to further closeness and connection within movements. A similar framework for developing trust, closeness, and accountability within radical contexts has been suggested by Montgomery and bergman (2017) as part of their formation of 'relational ethics'. Both 'expansive' and 'specific,' such ethics bring together 'friends, chosen family, and other kin, intimately connected in a web of mutual support' (p. 93) and suggest deeper levels of connection, affinity, solidarity, and trust that can broaden the possibilities for radical forms of relating. They suggest a crucial shift in movement cultures and the sorts of connection raised by Willow.[209]

The danger, however, that Polletta (2022) notes, in drawing from such an immediate relationship schema such as friendship, is that it furthers forms of exclusivity and intimacy, reiterating the drawbacks of insular subcultures noted above. While friendship builds closeness and trust in certain ways, it might be inappropriate or ill-fitting in a wider movement context. The closeness that is initially established can lead to the exclusion of new actors seeking to

[209] Along similar militant and radical lines is the work of The Invisible Committee in *To Our Friends* (2015).

integrate into already established cultures down the line. A different form of capital is created that begins to further structure social relations. There comes a tension between the use of a relationship schema like friendship from one context (small social groupings) and transposing it into another (radical political organizing), where resistance to modifying its parameters may limit contextualizing it and transposing it effectively into a movement context (i.e., in order to maintain equitable, horizontal, expanding forms of groups process and integration) (Polletta, 2022, p. 15).

There is a further danger, as Portwood-Stacer (2013) notes, that these factors, and the discipline (aka rigid radicalism) that comes with them, can fracture, divide and destabilize movements. This is not to undercut the importance of cultures that help to maintain movements, especially in times of regression or repression. But failing to attend to the limitations of subculture, insularity, and rigid radicalism is likely to constrain the ability to expand movements, keep people involved in sustained and committed ways, and actually live up to the prefigurative and imaginative values that are held so dear.

In this sense, drawing on friendship or close relationship schemas within anarchist culture reveals the ways that such cultures can continue to be insular and exclusive, and may limit their ability to expand and become more politically effective. This is not to say that friendship as a deeper form of relating is not important, given its strengths in developing intimacy, trust, solidarity, mutual aid, etc. (and according to interview participants, can deepen affinities and connections, especially anarchist-Indigenous complicities). But friendships can also fall short when they foreclose wider forms of relating across movements and cultures and reinforce insularity and forms of capital that exclude and divide.

This, I think, speaks to the need for greater discussions of the ways that anarchist cultures are constructed and how they are reproduced and maintained. In Bourdieusian terms, we can consider how they become habitual and structured, sometimes to our detriment, how forms of capital contribute to insularity and exclusion, but also the possible opportunities for alteration, development, and expansion that exist as well.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have discussed the ways that anarchist value-practices are crucial for understanding the varied expressions of culture that hold anarchism together in particular contexts. Counterpublics and oppositional cultures are created and expressed through physical spaces, fleeting events/gatherings, online places of news and analysis, art, zines, books and slogans. Anarchists deploy a range of cultural forms to both assert their politics more broadly, and to create cultures of survival where their politics can flourish and grow, creating greater affinities and relationships within movements as well. As the context of Southern Ontario and my specific interviews reveal, anarchists have a committed view of culture as something that is necessary for the maintenance, and potential expansion, of anarchist politics. Anarchists' individual frames of their politics help to understand the range of anarchist positions, but also the generalized value-practices that persist across them. These individual approaches also provide reference points regarding the specific ways that individual anarchists engage with the specific context of resistance in which they find themselves. I turn to the anti-colonial particularities of this in the following two chapters.

Further, I noted some of the implications of insular expressions of subculture, rigid radicalism, constraining definitions of 'good politics,' and the narrowness of anarchist slogans and expressions. Despite such drawbacks of subcultural insularity, movement conflict, and devolutions into rigid radicalism, anarchist cultures continue to be a crucial grounding point for the expression, maintenance and expansion of anarchist value-practices. Bourdieu's concepts help to understand why particular forms of 'good,' 'rigid,' or insular politics persist, despite their drawbacks, and the ways that they become structured as forms of habitus. Capital is an important concept that helps to understand why certain perspectives and forms of politics rise to prominence and persist, despite others that contend with them.

The remaining two chapters are preoccupied with how these cultures specifically come to understand and theorize the settler colonial context in which they find themselves, how they engage Indigenous resurgence struggles, and how such an anti-colonial expression of politics can shape radical visions of the future. As this chapter on culture has suggested, relationships

and affinities are a crucial way to understand the expressions of anarchist—and specifically anarchist anti-colonial—politics. I turn to these themes in the following chapter, as a means to narrate and understand anarchist relationships to anti-colonial politics and Indigenous resurgence movements.

Chapter 6 – Opposition, Relationships, Solidarity: Anarchist Articulations of Settler Colonial Context and Affinities with Indigenous Resurgence

The previous chapter detailed the general context of anarchist cultures of resistance in Southern Ontario. Such a study of culture allows for a glimpse into the day-to-day world of anarchists, and the spaces where anti-colonial politics are developed, elaborated, and expressed as part of anarchist habitus. Looking at anarchist culture helps us to understand the structuring structures of anarchist habitus connected to capital and field, and the ways that anarchists articulate their core value-practices.

This chapter turns to the ways that anarchist culture in Southern Ontario engages with the context of settler colonialism and ongoing Indigenous resurgence/resistance, and the implications of such approaches. Drawn directly from the research data, I build a theory of anarchist culture in a settler colonial context, focus on the ways that this has been considered in anarchist practices, and critically engage the ongoing potentials for further anti-colonial politics and resistance. I argue that affinity and relationships built on accountability and trust are important value-practices for the ways that anarchists engage with settler colonialism, ongoing Indigenous resurgence movements, and anti-colonial politics. Interrogating the tensions and lessons of anarchist approaches to affinity, solidarity, and accountability, reveals possibilities for expanding anti-colonial habitus going forward and into the future.

Each of the expressions of anarchist culture discussed in the preceding chapter contains some element of anti-colonial value-practices. They are key sites for the dissemination of anarchist analyses of settler colonialism and are reference points with which to assess the current state and depth of anarchist anti-colonialism. I first consider the reflections of interview participants and anarchist cultural expressions to understand anarchist analysis of settler colonialism as a foundational part of value-practices. I then discuss the specific ways that anarchists articulate connections and affinities with Indigenous resurgence and resistance politics, and work through

a number of tensions stemming from solidarity, allyship, 'taking direction,' and maintaining a 'committed politics.' I end with a discussion of further possibilities for affinities and relations as accomplices and co-conspirators in anti-colonial struggle, both in our own communities and in relation to Indigenous resurgence. Each section considers a key element in the deepening and expansion of anti-colonial value-practices as part of anarchist habitus.

Anarchist Analyses of Settler Colonialism in Culture

Every interview participant noted that opposition to settler colonialism is a foundational part of anarchist culture within the context of Southern Ontario, filtered through each participant's unique position, location, connections, and frame of reference, (as per the individual sketches above). Opposition to settler colonialism is both part of the baseline opposition to all forms of oppression and domination, and part of evolving value-practices that are given shape in the world through prefigurative politics. Interviewees argued directly that settler colonialism needs to be a focal point for understanding the context in which we operate, and the ways that we live our politics. As a concept, it requires a certain level of immediate attention, but also integration into wider theory and practice.

Settler colonialism is a central and consistent concern of the anarchists under discussion here and how they understand the context in which they are situated.[210] Mac, for example, argued that settler colonialism is 'a centre point,' 'a key thing,' and 'the base,' given the context in which we are situated. 'It is primary,' as Sam articulated, and needs more than simple 'consideration' in anarchist politics; it is 'a fundamental problem that anarchists should grapple with. And also means that the anarchism that we imagine and spread has to have answers to

[210] As I hope it is clear, this is a relatively small subset of anarchists, and there is a danger of generalizing this foundational aspect of settler colonialism to all anarchists. From my participation, reflection, and research in Southern Ontario, there is a general anti-colonial streak within contemporary anarchism (as noted by Dixon, 2014), but there are certainly anarchists whom I have met who are much closer to the sorts of class-centric perspectives noted in Chapter 2 that are frequently emphasized at the expense of direct engagement with anti-colonial context. There can also be a tendency to consider anti-colonialism as a concern for 'after the revolution,' presuming a blank slate for future revolutionary perspectives that do not attend to historical and ongoing context (see, for example, Warburton, 2021, and Lewis, 2016).

the question of stolen land and displacement and genocide that goes beyond lip service' and 'should be at the forefront of any, like, imagined future for anarchists.' Anti-colonial politics are both a source of opposition as well as a crucially contextual element when conceiving of prefigurative politics (Lewis, 2016). As Anna explained, 'I think if you live in Ontario, if you live in Canada, it has to be … like a foundational piece of how we look at our work, because it's a system that informs everything that happens here, just like capitalism [does]. And so to ignore it is to not be able to do any effective work.'

Cooper argued that 'settler colonialism is foundational to the making of this political space' as 'the ongoing project of creating and recreating this entity called Canada, which, whether we are anti-state or not, which we are enveloped by, right?' This recalls Barker's (2021) discussion of the spatial dimensions of settler colonialism in Chapter 3. Here analysis and resistance to settler colonialism are tied explicitly to the effectiveness of one's anarchism and one's location in a specific context.[211] It is foundational and essential, and suggests necessary considerations for anarchism more generally in such contexts.

The centrality of settler colonialism to anarchist concerns prompted an understanding of the key aspects of settler colonialism as a structuring structure. KR characterized settler colonialism as 'an attempt to control, at any means necessary almost' through both violence and binary forms of exclusion (between Indigenous peoples and 'others,' discussed in Chapter 3). Settler colonialism is fundamentally about domination, linking directly to more general anarchist concerns (Bruno). Cooper pointed to global aspects of dispossession (a key facet of settler colonialism) that recall the discussion of settler colonialism, dispossession, and primitive accumulation. They highlighted 'dispossession not just of people's territories, which is what's happening for many Indigenous people and ongoing, but also dispossessing, you know, people

[211] Interestingly, for their own development of understanding settler colonialism, Anna noted an awareness of settler colonialism in Palestine first, before developing a more sustained and explicit understanding in the 'Canadian' context. This is certainly an important connection point for solidarity and support between Indigenous struggles in more local contexts and the Palestinian liberation struggle across the globe. On this point directly, see Krebs and Olwan (2012). And especially given the surge in action and resistance against the ongoing genocidal destruction by Israel in Palestine in recent years, of which anarchists have played a part.

who have fought for at least livable jobs, right, of those jobs so that another can be exploited, their labor can be exploited at a higher rate. And that we're interconnected.' As Lila framed it, settler colonialism continues as, 'ongoing cultural genocide.' Anarchists understand settler colonialism as a persistent structure linked to ongoing domination, rather than a singular event.

Anarchist cultural spaces, as well, regularly have anti-colonial and Indigenous solidarity politics 'very prominent in the kinds of events, the kind of posters up on walls and the kind of struggles that are remembered and celebrated' (Al). This is represented materially, as well, through the zines, books, and texts that circulate within anarchist culture. Physical anarchist spaces and events are important as places where anti-colonial dialogues happen and where anarchist ideas are broadcast. They are a useful gauge for what and how key ideas and points of emphasis circulate within anarchist culture. Anti-colonial workshops are a frequent theme of anarchist bookfairs, and colonial context is a frequent mention of anarchist land acknowledgements.

Further, as Clare and others noted, a general anti-colonial aesthetic is commonly found in anarchist spaces and promoted literatures. Images of Indigenous resurgence and resistance—such as iconic photos from the resistance at Kanehsatà:ke (Oka) in 1990, with armed Warriors facing off against the police and military, or the art work of Indigenous anarchist Gord Hill (aka Zig Zag; see Clancy, 2019)—adorn anarchists and anarchist spaces. The prevalence of such images within anarchist culture highlights both the importance of Indigenous resurgence oppositions to the state, their ongoing militancy, and the overall inspiration for anarchists. This highlights strong affinities that anarchists see between Indigenous direct action and prefigurative politics (Coulthard, 2014) and their own militant anti-state value-practices. Image and aesthetic are in part why anarchists are drawn to frontline Indigenous struggle and their enduring imagery.[212]

[212] This is an important dimension of why anarchists are drawn to Indigenous struggles, and how they situate and 'perform' their anti-colonial politics. This presents grounds for further forms of in-depth research on anarchist-Indigenous affinities.

These sorts of militant images persist alongside more conventional, classical, or narrow expressions of anarchism. While 'classical' anarchist texts continue to be a mainstay of the dissemination and cultivation of anarchist culture (Ferguson, 2010),[213] important for their historical value, connecting to previous movements, personalities and events, and as a touchstone for value-practices, they need to be (re)considered from a particularly anti-colonial standpoint. As I discussed in previous chapters, there is little discussion of colonialism in more mainstream or generalized accounts of anarchism beyond the inclusion within an opposition to all forms of oppression and domination. This results in a significant disconnect between such general accounts and the specific ways that interviewees discussed anarchism and the settler colonial context, as well as between dominant anarchist texts and the prevalence of Indigenous resistance imagery and aesthetics across North American anarchist cultures.

Clare described this disconnect where anarchist draw inspiration that often doesn't fit within the cultural or political context where they are located:

> people will be inspired by some of the, like, classical anarchist texts or to look at different things that, you know, maybe anarchist stuff that happens in different places, in like Europe or elsewhere, [but] also, like, the context that we find ourselves in [in] Canada is unique. And I think, like, that has to be fundamental to understanding even some of those like traditional anarchist concepts or like critiques.

There is translation work that needs to be done to make these classical works more useful in the current moment, to situate anarchist value-practices within settler colonial context, with the additional work of finding forms of inspiration where we are There is still much to be done to raise the profile of anti-colonial works that speak directly to the context of settler colonialism

[213] Many of those referenced in Chapter 2 were directly obtained by myself through anarchist networks and cultural events. It is common place to find the writings of Goldman, Bakunin, Malatesta, or Kropotkin predominantly displayed at major cultural events like bookfairs or anarchist lending libraries. Their faces and quotations also adorn other sorts of anarchist cultural ephemera, from t-shirts to stickers and patches.

in which anarchists resist, going beyond the use of images and aesthetics.[214] How can we read classical texts anti-colonially (Knight, 2012), while at the same time expanding the range of anti-colonial texts that reflect on current conditions, problems, tensions, and possibilities? This is some of the work still to be done, despite identifications of anti-colonialism as foundational value-practice.

Anarchist cultural programming, such as bookfairs and other events, reveals a great deal regarding the depth and content of anarchist culture, and engagement with anti-colonial politics.[215] It has become customary for some time to not just have a bookfair program that details event schedules, but which also details policies, considerations, and positions more directly. For example, most anarchist bookfair programs have some element of a land acknowledgement and positioning of the organizers in terms of the colonial context they inhabit. As a number of my interviewees noted, this is something that was often emphasized within anarchist cultural space early on, long before the more recent liberalization, recuperation, and recognition politics that inform land acknowledgments by university, government, and corporate entities.[216] Such acknowledgements and statements not only frame the contexts in which anarchist cultural space occurs but also give a sense of anarchists' analysis of the structural dimensions of the places and lands that they inhabit. They commonly reference the Indigenous nations who have previously, and continuously, inhabited particular

[214] For the sake of clarity, I do not mean to suggest that no such work has been done in this regard. The range of anarchist subjects addressed in texts continues to expand and develop. My point is that given the prominence of the settler colonial conditions in which anarchists engage in resistance, there is a disproportionate lack of texts that address such conditions. This, I think, continues to also contribute to a lack of additional writing and theorization on the subject, as the key touchstones are few and far between, and less publically visible.

[215] While I highlight a few examples here, this is an area of anarchist culture that is ripe for a more specific and intentional analysis on its own.

[216] As a result, there has certainly been an 'emptying' of the radical impulse that originally framed such acknowledgements, declarations, and anti-colonial analyses that were put forth by anarchists. While it may be difficult to suggest that anarchists were *the* first to take up such anti-colonial contextual framings (as such acknowledgment, grounding, and respect have long, if not always, been hallmarks of Indigenous grounded normativities and orientations to space and place), it has been evident over the course of my participation in anarchist movements for more than 15 years that anarchists were some of the early settler/non-Indigenous adopters of such dialogues with context, long before the current 'reconciliation era' advanced by the (Canadian) State.

areas, as well as other relationships of land use, treaty or wampum agreements, and moments of resistance.

The 2020 Toronto Anarchist Bookfair collective, for example, framed the event in typical anarchist fashion, as 'taking place on Anishinaabe, Haudenosaunee, and Huron-Wendat territories' and noting that they 'recognize the harm done by the ongoing occupation and colonization of these territories. As anarchists, it is imperative to challenge the existence of the Canadian state, and to work towards decolonization. It is also critical that we centre Indigenous voices in our work.' The Montreal Anarchist Bookfair (2023) echoes similar sentiments, encouraging 'everyone participating in the Bookfair to get informed and educated, and to actively resist colonialism and neo-colonialism in the many forms it takes, and in the diversity of forms that resistance can take too.' Events like KW May Day (2019) add a further specification of the local and immediate conditions, where 'Colonization, and the ongoing resistance to it, must be at the forefront of understanding and working within our local context, our desire to strengthen our relations with Indigenous peoples and communities, and how we live out our values and desires for better futures.'

In each case, there are elements of historical and contemporary acknowledgement, but also the need for ongoing action and an intentional incorporation of anti-colonial and Indigenous solidarity considerations as anarchist value-practices. These types of events, and the analyses that they often forefront, have been crucial sites for spreading these considerations within anarchist culture. Acknowledgement, however, is not necessarily indicative of action, as Warburton's (2017) work on 'structures of settlement' shows.

Southern Ontario anarchist bookfairs have featured the following topics: "Unsettling Oppression: Towards an Anti-Colonial Anarchism" (2014 KW), "Food Sovereignty on Stolen Land" (2018 Hamilton), and "Reclaiming Indigenous Places: Embodied Knowledge and Direct Action" (2020 Toronto).[217] There are workshops or programming on similar themes at most

[217] Interestingly, the facilitator of two of these workshops is the same Indigenous anarchist, perhaps a function of my choosing recent examples across a few different cities, but also perhaps a reflection of the small number of

bookfairs in Southern Ontario, and beyond. Anna, a long-time organizer of anarchist bookfairs and similar events, observed: 'I see there's like an interaction between anarchism and settler colonialism as a conversation in, like, most spaces that have occupied anarchist organizing in Ontario. In the sense that, at anarchist bookfairs, there is a number of conversations about Indigenous sovereignty, settler colonialism, allyship, all of those pieces are just, like, an important theme within these conversations.'

Lydia, as one of the few Indigenous anarchists involved in organizing in their city, flagged that despite the general anti-colonial commitment of anarchist spaces, Indigenous and anti-colonial programming often fell to them specifically. While anti-colonialism was 'front and center when we talk about all the big problems in the world and like all this stuff, I don't see people actually like engaging with it in a daily way.' There is a theoretical, structural, and contextual acknowledgement of settler colonial structures, but how these are engaged, theorized, and resisted on a more day-to-day basis is limited.

Cooper expanded this idea further, noting the interconnections between capitalism and settler colonialism that persist:

> Even settler colonialism only exists because it is backed up by those other structures. If those other structures begin to disintegrate, then presumably they would only be successful if they were attuned to the fact that our relationality with the land requires that we recognize sovereignty, and Indigenous sovereignties in the ways in which Indigenous people construct their sovereignties outside of the Westphalian model, as being foundational to any sort of place-based activism. And that's what we do.

---

self-identified Indigenous anarchists as well. They are not the only person doing such work, or self-identified as such, but it is crucial to acknowledge the important work of this small number of organizers. This is discussed at length by Lydia, in their interview, as part of their own work.

Despite the importance of these interconnections, and a generalized anti-colonial politic within anarchism, Cooper describes being 'shocked' at the failure of others in 'normative anarchist spaces' to make those connections:

> They don't grasp that. Right, that like private property didn't just emerge. It's not like a magical thing. It emerged from the dispossession, whether it be in Europe or in the Americas or anywhere else in the world, but from the dispossession of not just people from their lands, but people's relationship to their lands. And that relationality matters.

Cooper's reflections on movements exemplify the work that still needs to be done, and also highlights relationality as a key aspect animating anarchist engagements with settler colonialism and the anti-colonial politics of solidarity (which I discuss below).

Like Anna's discussion in Chapter 5 regarding bookfairs, there is often a tension between the need for introductory conversations and the ability to continually develop anarchist analysis and understandings. Unfortunately, as Anna noted, this continues to be unresolved, and a rather awkward middle ground that attempts to do both often results. As these conversations often occur at these larger anarchist culture events, in workshop lengths of 30–90 minutes, there is limited ability to both build knowledge and then extend deeper. The small number of distributed anarchist publications that deal with anti-colonial themes is perhaps an even stronger testament (given that these aren't subject to the same time constraints) to the limitations of these kinds of anti-colonial commitments, their limited development, and the work still to be done.[218]

---

[218] Looking at the circulation of texts over the course of attending anarchist bookfairs and other events over the last roughly 15 years, there has been a limited and consistent number of titles related to anti-colonialism that are circulated. Gord Hill's (2010) '500 Years of Indigenous Resistance' is a historic mainstay first as a zine, and then as a book, and is still a commonly distributed title, even if no others in the specific space touch directly on anti-colonial themes. Anti-colonial anarchist texts are small in number, and as I noted more generally in Chapter 2, they often don't come into more general accounts of anarchist values-practices. This is, however, changing, in part given online resources like IGD, and north-shore, and an expansion of more recent anti-colonial anarchist writing, such as the work of Aragorn! (2018) or Dupuis-Déri and Pillet (2023), which offer greater spaces of movement

These events and publications tend to stand on their own, rather than as a wider anti-colonial aspect becoming integrated into general anarchist analysis and perspective. Engaging anti-colonial politics, in more public and intentional forums, with the ability to take them further into more nuanced and complex understandings, is a necessary task, and can rectify the sort of disconnect that Cooper identifies within movement spaces.

Overall, my research shows that many anarchists have a baseline analysis of settler colonialism as a specific structure, which helps to guide their opposition in their local contexts. This is part of anarchist value-practices expressed as part of habitus. The limitation, however, is that these are often analyses that are held by anarchists themselves, as individuals and as a general aspect of anarchist habitus, but which find little room for greater discussion, development, and expansion within wider collective culture. More collective conversation, disruption, and critique around anti-colonial politics has the potential to further disrupt anarchist habitus and increase the space these politics occupy within anarchist culture and value-practices.

Common anarchist commitments to oppose all forms of oppression, domination and authoritarianism perhaps predispose anarchists and anarchism towards opposition to settler colonialism and its connection to other key sites of opposition like the state and capitalism. This intersectional understanding of structures, Violet argued, is what makes space for key points of resonance between anarchists and Indigenous resistance/resurgence. As noted in Chapter 1, this resonance has been a crucial impetus for the construction of anarcha-Indigenism as an explicitly intersectional anti-colonial politics, and suggests fruitful possibilities of alliance and resistance going forward. Baseline anarchist analysis of settler colonialism importantly assists in both the impetus for, and anarchists' practice of, supporting Indigenous struggles. I turn to these connections and affinities next, as a means to understand both current anarchist understandings of such relations, and how to progress anti-colonial politics further.

---

theorization and discussion. And while I don't have the space here for a comprehensive analysis of all these specific texts this would be a worthwhile avenue for further research.

Anarchist-Indigenous Connections and Affinities

A core element of anarchists' analysis and resistance to settler colonialism is actualized in practices of solidarity with Indigenous struggles. Solidarity is a key anarchist value-practice and a means to support and draw connections with a range of struggles, and across anarchist scenes. Anarchists have frequently been on the frontlines of blockades, land defense struggles, and solidarity/support events to aid Indigenous resurgence efforts, as many of my interviewees noted. This is a way to put anti-colonial, Indigenous solidarity, and anti-authoritarian value-practices into action, and shows continued avenues for furthering affinities and relationships to build futures beyond the state, capitalism and colonialism. I discuss interviewees' connections between anarchist politics and Indigenous struggles, the tensions that come with them, and consider the ways to further deepen these connections. These tensions are a key place for the ongoing work of analysis, discussion, and expansion of anti-colonial politics that can inform and influence anarchist habitus and that I argue need more intentional consideration.

Violet, though she did not identify as an anarchist herself, articulated important personal connections to anarchism as an Indigenous person:

> When I first started learning about anarchism, I remember there's like this light bulb went off and I was like, we both want the same things. We both want this society that we're living in to be, like, destroyed, to make room for new things. And then I thought that that was, for me, one of the greatest things.

Violet pointed to Taiaiake Alfred's (2005) work on anarcha-Indigenism as a key touchstone for considering the affinities between anarchist and Indigenous struggles to confront colonial systems and put forth prefigurative possibilities for the future. Still, Violet argued, there is difference of position for many anarchist and Indigenous peoples that is important to keep in mind when considering affinities and relationships:

> An anarchist is trying to destroy this system because 'this is all that I know.' Whereas, like, for me, for example, I am working towards reviving my systems. So I think that in this way anarchists and Indigenous peoples can work together,

> because if I'm anti-colonial or I'm trying to decolonize, I would necessarily be trying to destroy colonialism. And how that is manifested as a government with systems like police, say. ... So we want that to be gone so there can be room for our systems to rejuvenate themselves.

There are similar points of opposition around which to construct affinities, but also some foundational differences in the impetus for opposing colonialism and oppressive systems. Violet is pointing to aspects of grounded normativity that fundamentally undergird Indigenous resurgence politics, and which carry a very different set of relations for most anarchists.[219] Lila suggested, though, that despite such differences, anarchists express a general importance and appreciation of 'possibilities for another way of being' that find parallels in Indigenous resurgence, and against dominant cultures committed to hierarchy, domination, and exploitation. There are affinities in the analysis of the current structures of domination, but also in a new or resurgent outlook to bring radical futures into play.

While Violet noted a particular culture of support within Southern Ontario anarchist communities, they also observed a culture of burnout. They felt hesitant to identify directly as an anarchist, given anarchist burnout, but felt affinity as an Indigenous person. They noted specifically the overwhelming support of Indigenous resurgence work by anarchists, which helped to articulate connections:

> I think the commonalities between anarchism and Indigenous resurgence are very similar. We have common goals in terms of what we want to see not here anymore. ... One [of] the main differences, however, is our end goal. Like what's the end goal for anarchism? I don't know. Versus Indigenous resurgence, there's, like, a very clear end goal.[220] I wouldn't say actually very

---

[219] I return to the concept of grounded normativities in the following chapter, to consider how anarchists might directly engage with this idea, and also find their own forms of deep, subaltern knowledges that can further animate anti-colonial value-practices and possibilities for the future.

[220] This could also be considered in terms of a difference of resistance vs. resurgence politics. Anarchists engage in resistance, but would need to more carefully consider what resurgence looks like in their (often settler) contexts.

> clear ... But I think in the end, everyone just wants to be living a free life. Everyone wants to be autonomous. You know, I think although we might have different tactics on how we get there, I think that's what creates the community. And I feel definitely a lot more comfortable within an anarchist community as an urban Indigenous person than any other community. …
>
> And I think that this is a part of Indigenous resurgence as well, right, is finding our roles within our communities. And I think what that looks like for anarchism, I think has sort of come about in terms of like mutual aid, for example. Right. The idea that we can depend on each other and that each of us has a skill set or each of us has like a certain thing that we can contribute to the greater good of the community. So I definitely see a lot of similarities. And I think that's why I've wanted to build community with anarchist folks.

Violet noted the connections with anarchism and Indigenous resurgence politics with similar values of autonomy, resistance, and commitment to struggle. This was reflected across the interviewees, and dialogues with broader theoretical work around anarcha-Indigenism and anarchist-Indigenous relations. Anarchists have a clear feeling of shared opposition to structures and systems of violence, like colonialism, capitalism, and the state that animate much of Indigenous resurgence movements.

These connections raised by Violet can be understood through the framework or logic of affinity and broader dynamics of relationships and relationality. As mentioned in Chapter 2, affinity is a useful way to characterize the current and ongoing moment of social movement activity, and is a key value-practice employed by anarchists. Affinity, 'shared ethico-political commitments' (Day, 2005, p. 186), frames the possibilities for connection and solidarity across a range of movements, and in particular between anarchist and Indigenous resistance movements. Affinity was a core element of my discussion of anarcha-Indigenist politics in

---

The next chapter, in looking at anarchist histories and possible grounded normativities, considers some of these aspects more directly.

previous work, and can productively bring anarchist and Indigenous frameworks together, through overlaps of values and practices (Lewis, 2012). Affinity, as a value-practice and lens of analysis, allows a greater understanding of the dynamics relationships between movements and struggles within settler colonial contexts, and means to expand this work going forward.

In *Joyful Militancy*, Nick Montgomery and carla bergman (2017) use affinity to consider the ways that relationships are constructed and practiced across movement cultures and provide an insightful view to the relationships between Indigenous resurgence and anarchism. Affinity suggests an orientation to 'what we *might be able to do* together rather than (only) *who* we are and what we *should* do;' it is about 'searching out connections and alliances through which we increase our power and capacities' (pp. 278–9). Montgomery and bergman centre relationships and relationality as the defining characteristics of social movement dynamics and cultures that can further practices of joy and militancy, as well as push back against the forms of rigid radicalism touched on briefly in the previous chapter. They frame affinity as an important way to understand relationships:

> It gets at the way forms of life can connect based in shared commitments or desires *without* erasing differences. We follow Day in suggesting that there is an "affinity for affinity" among currents of Indigenous, anti-racist, anti-colonial, migrant justice, anarchist, feminist, ecological, queer, and autonomist currents of thought and practice: a penchant for linking up and supporting others based on shared values and commitments without trampling on each other's autonomy. (pp. 108–109)

Again, we return to shared values as a core element of connection. Not only within anarchism itself, but also across struggles. This notion of affinity, then, 'speaks to emergent relationships and forms of organizing that are decentralized and flexible, but not flimsy' (Montgomery & bergman, 2017, p. 36). It promotes 'seeking out and nurturing relationships based in shared values, commitments, and passions, without trying to impose those on everyone else' and as a result allows relationships to be built beyond more rigid forms of ideology (p. 36). Autonomy is

a foundational aspect here, for maintaining respect for other struggles, and engaging with them on their terms. Affinity is one of the ways that forms of rigid radicalism can be broken down.

Montgomery and bergman (2017) extend this notion of affinity further still as a form of 'relational ethics': 'the willingness to nurture and defend relationships' (p. 90). Relational ethics is specifically embedded in context: 'what are we capable of here and now, together, at *this* time, in *this* place, amid the relations in which we are embedded?' (p. 91). It moves beyond individual points of connection towards an active, intentional, and accountable construction of broader forms of collective relationships and affinities. According to Barker (2021), affinity is a way of 'reconfiguring ways of relating, rather than founding them anew' that carries a prefigurative core element, where possible relations for the future are being made, and remade here and now (p. 241). As such, affinity also requires ongoing reconstruction, engagement, and development (p. 243). It is deeply relational as an active and activating process. It also requires ongoing discussions of the points of non-contact, the disagreements, tensions, and incompatibilities[221]—in other words, how forms of autonomy will be practiced directly, through 'continuous reflection on individual differences (uncommon ground) as part of the search for affinity (common ground)' (p. 243). Affinities are not simply declared political connection (although this is a starting point) but require accountability, solidarity, and complicity. This is a necessary expansion from a baseline of declared anti-colonial politics, towards actualizing new forms of relating and possibilities for the future. Affinity is a key value-practice for expanding anarchist forms of anti-colonialism.

I employ this framework of affinity and relationality to consider the connections that anarchists articulate with Indigenous struggles of resurgence and resistance. It is a lens through which I see my own connection to both anarchism and my anarchist commitments to anti-colonial struggle and support for Indigenous resurgence. It is not just theoretical, but activates commitments practically. While this is straightforward in terms of the specific affinities that

[221] As a result it is crucial that affinities are not overstated, and that there is also a determined effort to refuse a construction of 'equivalency' in relationships (Warburton, 2017), and actually sit with elements that are fundamentally at odds or are coming from different places, like grounded normativity.

anarchists discuss below, a framework of relationships and relationality also narrates the tensions that inhere in this work and practice as well. Each of these tensions, from spirituality, to solidarity, to land and place, can be understood to be rooted in relationships and relationality. Elaborating of more specific, accountable, and expanding relationships is necessary to begin to more concretely and intentionally work through such tensions. Affinity is a key value-practice that structures the ways that anarchists operate within the context of settler colonialism, engage with Indigenous resurgence movements, and begin to construct opposition to it. It is a key element of anarchist habitus that frames anarchist approaches to a wide range of other struggles. As a result, affinity and solidarity are key value-practices that can help cultivate greater anti-colonial practices and politics within anarchist habitus.

Understanding Anarchist-Indigenous Relations

, Lydia noted that bringing Indigenous resurgence and anarchism together has not always been easy and comes with an inherent element of tension. They reflected that this was not always an easy self-definition and required their own processes of discovery and affirmation of identity. They also mentioned hesitance around the idea that these two aspects ought to be separate:

> And I think it really only became any sort of question on my mind when I was starting to struggle with the idea that, like, I didn't want those two things to be separate. And I felt like they're very separate. And it felt like, you know, I knew a lot of anarchists who were fine with spirituality stuff and a lot of them that were like, 'Fuck that.' And I was like, 'No, I think these two things do fit together. I just like, don't exactly know how.' And so I've been like playing around those ideas for a while.

Part of this tension (which I explore more directly in the following chapter) is around the interactions that anarchist politics, often atheistic, have with spirituality. Spirituality is a foundational aspect of Indigenous worldviews, resurgence, and relationships to land. It articulates grounded normativities. Tensions related to spirituality, which came up throughout

my interviews, are one limit to developing closer connections between anarchism and Indigenous resurgence.

Lydia's Indigenous anarchism is about intervening in both anarchist and Indigenous spaces, towards a greater anti-colonial politics within anarchism, but also for an anti-state, militant politics within Indigenous spaces as well. Brian made a similar observation of the dual work that Indigenous anarchists take on to push in both directions. This is one way that settler or non-Indigenous anarchists can also support greater forms of anti-colonial anarchist analysis and practice, by furthering relationships with explicitly Indigenous anarchists.[222]

Lydia argued that 'anarchism is really the only parallel system of social organization that [they] think would really complement and work well alongside communities of Indigenous folks who have like taken back their sovereignty.' Violet made a similar point, where 'fighting back, and then how they're organizing themselves into groups, I think is what makes anarchism powerful. Because there's a lot of, you know, dignified rage … a youthful energy, like people who are really dedicated to creating or destroying these systems that are so powerful and oppressive.'

Hope for a better future, in Violet's view, is

> why a lot of these connections between Indigenous people and anarchism are happening, I feel, because whether anarchists are conscious about it or not, I really feel that deep down inside they're really seeking the sort of community that Indigenous peoples have or are seeking to recreate. And I feel that at this time it is unconscious a lot of times, like folks are almost, like, pulled towards Indigenous communities.

[222] This can't, however, be the only narrow form of relating. As there are still quite a small number of Indigenous anarchists, to only focus on them here would be to unduly limit the greater possibilities of relationships, but also possibilities of learning and cultivating greater affinities. This recalled Ciccariello-Maher's (2011) caution around 'anarchist imperialism' in Chapter 2. It has long been a danger that anarchists place too much emphasis on narrow definitions of anarchism in name, rather than seeking the greater forms of relating that can come through wider affinities in values and practices.

Settlers, or non-Indigenous peoples, who have lost their own connections to land, place, and ancestry often look to Indigenous communities that centre the reclamation and resurgence of connections as inspiration. As Violet observed, this kind of inspiration is often an impetus for greater forms of action and resistance, though it carries dangers of appropriation, domination, or 'settler Indigenization' fantasies (among other settler moves to innocence; see Tuck &Yang, 2012). Even so, the desire to reclaim radical settler histories of connection and resistance can serve as an important impetus for anti-colonial work, and unlearn or 'unsettle' (Regan, 2010) colonial dynamics. There is something useful in the consideration of how anarchists could rebuild our own specific histories to land in ways that are accountable, reciprocal, and spurring of greater action. I consider some of these potentials in the following chapter.

Lee made a similar point in terms of the openness that anarchist politics have to Indigenous relations to land and place beyond the state form. It is one of the few political perspectives that can uphold and support Indigenous forms of resurgence and autonomy, as opposed to other radical perspectives that would likely reassert or reform state forms of governance that come at the expense of Indigenous autonomies. Lydia was very direct in this critique of other systems that often seek to reconcile Indigenous resurgence with their own visions, and the specific implications for the future:

> Any reconciliatory narrative is really just the state reconciling with Indigenous nations, like, I'm not interested in that. And also I really have never heard any state communist give me any good explanation of how they would return land, like how that would work after the, like, Red Revolution. And I've just come to the conclusion that actually it would just be worse, like the same if not worse, for most Indigenous nations, should that happen. And that anarchism is really the only parallel system of social organization that I think would really complement and work well alongside communities of Indigenous folks who have like taken back their sovereignty or whatever.

Lee and other interviewees drew similar conclusions, that anarchist value-practices feel more open and compatible with Indigenous critiques of the state (and against state socialist systems of land control that are still based on Indigenous dispossession), and on the importance of land-based forms of autonomy.[223] We need to be careful, though, of the over determination or romanticization of the affinities between anarchism and Indigenous resurgence[224] and ward off an anarchist tendency to impose anarchist labels or an anarchist lens onto other anti-state struggles and practices. As AM noted, there is a fine line between imposition and constructing affinities. Affinities and solidarities are nothing without further upholding anarchist values of autonomy and self-determination regarding labels and identities. They also require the ongoing development of accountable relationships.

Al pointed to a certain hopefulness that attracts anarchists to supporting Indigenous resurgence, and might be channelled towards greater forms of relationship and struggle:

> But I think that the root of it is that these are ways of life and ways of thinking about the world that haven't been completely colonized by capital. And those of us who kind of feel alienated under capital can recognize that and can kind of recognize the importance and beauty of that. And I think that has an appeal and a power that I don't think other struggles have right now in Canada. Yeah, so broadly speaking, I'd say that there's hope for some kind of other movements, and not to be called 'anarchist' or 'communist' or whatever, but just broadly speaking, you know, kind of revolutionary worldviews and value systems, I mean, I think that's where the hope lies, probably.

---

[223] Al argued that affinities are inspirational: 'You could see the fundamental challenge that Indigenous struggles provide to the state in the service of Indigenous forms of sovereignty. Which also looked really exciting from an anarchist perspective. And that it seemed to me like these were, you know, non-state forms of Indigenous sovereignty, much more flexible and less rigid than, you know, say, like European ethnonationalist struggles for sovereignty.'

[224] Warburton (2021) has called this a form of colonial equivocation wherein anarchists, as resistant to the dominant society and state, cast themselves as the continuation of historical Indigenous resistance at the expense and acknowledgement of ongoing contemporary forms of Indigenous resurgence and resistance (p. 40).

Al also reflected on the prominence of Indigenous resurgence within anarchist culture:

> Indigenous solidarity seems to be strongest and very, very prominent in the kinds of events, the kind of posters up on walls and the kind of struggles that are remembered and celebrated. … And that gets translated into pretty consistent mobilizations and support of different struggles that connect with Indigenous struggles. Yeah, like, it seems to be, in general, that Indigenous struggles are a significant source of inspiration for anarchism, for anarchists in our spaces and in our social networks. Probably more so, I think, at this point than any other kind of set of struggles that I can think of.

There is a significant source of inspiration, but also, as Brian reflected, Indigenous opposition to major infrastructure and ecologically devastating development projects also aligns with the impacts that these projects have on communities that anarchists live in as well. They noted a shared basis of opposition, but also a shared commitment to direct action and disruption. How we channel this sort of inspiration, though, into a deepening of anti-colonial values and practices, requires much more concerted effort. It is present in the cultural aesthetics and imagery, as I discussed above, but how this might influence anarchist habitus more directly can be considered further.

Interview participants were ready, willing, and able to name and define settler colonialism as a necessary point of opposition for anarchists. There should be no question, at least in this context, as to the general anarchist commitment to anti-colonial politics. But as Theresa Warburton (2021) notes, acknowledgement of colonial history and relations to land, often in a very general sense, does not necessarily lead to the deeper and necessary articulations of solidarity and relationship building with Indigenous nations:

> Namely, if there is a correlation between the ethical commitments of anarchist and Native movements and ample discussion about how to develop an activist praxis that addresses settlement, why is there not a more concerted engagement with the question of how settlement has become normalized, or

> settled, in such movement spaces? In practice, the presumption of a natural affinity between anarchist and Native political movements obfuscates the problems that underlie the need for the restructuring of the relationships between Native and non-Native activists. (pp. 17–18).

Clare affirmed this:

> Keeping in mind sort of the colonial context of Canada and what it means to exist here as a settler is very important. But admittedly, I feel like the extent to which that influences projects and people's participation really does vary. I think often when there's projects or campaigns that are related to different sort of, like, land defense, environment stuff, there's often a stronger centering of those considerations in it.

In this sense, anarchist politics around settler colonialism, while present and articulating a fundamental connection, are inconsistent and need further attention. This recalls Lydia's point regarding the limited day-to-day effect that anti-colonial politics precipitate within anarchist culture.

Supporting my finding of a greater depth of discussion on anti-colonial politics in my interview participants than what is articulated at a more concerted movement or cultural level, OS observed a general tendency to name settler colonialism, but on an individual basis.:

> There is something about us as anarchists where we are naming settler colonialism. We own it as individuals. We haven't figured out how to talk about it as a collective. Like what is like anarchy's work or position on settler colonialism? And we haven't figured out how to live as individuals or as like smaller communities that are in relationship to each other in the nuance and contradictions that we have to live in under, like, late-stage capitalism and colonialism. And so there is something for me about, like, how can we get better at having the nuanced conversations of what kind of compromises need to be made in the system. To survive it and to build for a stronger fight another

> day. And I don't feel like that's a conversation that we're having enough, particularly within the framework of settler colonialism. And I do think that there is a piece about, like, what is our position, as an anarchist movement, around settler colonialism that we could do better. And in a more, like, popular education theory place.

Continuing, OS suggested that anarchists frequently do not see themselves as part of a specific community, likely stemming from a rejection of state/nation-based forms of social relations:

> But when we think about anarchy or the anarchist community in Ontario, we do not think of ourselves as part of the community. And therefore, participating in settler colonialism— like, anarchy doesn't need to have a position on settler colonialism because we are not a community of people. Whereas the migrant justice community—they are people. They are migrating here. They need to have a position on settler colonialism because they are actively participating in it. And anarchists are actively participating in it.
>
> And we're really good at taking individual responsibility for it, I think. I.e., we brought land acknowledgements in. …generally I don't feel a lot of resistance in my anarchist community from people being like 'I am a settler. I am benefiting from that. I am a part of that.' But we do not view ourselves as part of the society that for the most part we're rejecting. And so because we view ourselves as outsiders, we often don't talk about ourselves as a community that is inside a project like settler colonialism. And we're not called to, we're not asked 'what is the anarchist position on settler colonialism? How do you reconcile being an anarchist and being a settler?' Like that often isn't something that we are asked because we're not viewed as a community, as a group of people. We are viewed as individuals.

These excerpts from OS capture a core concern of this whole dissertation project. We, as anarchists, are ready and able to name and rationalize the necessity of our opposition to settler

colonialism, in theory, as part of value-practices, habitus, and cultures of opposition. But beyond abstract solidarities, individual assessments, and temporary events and resistance flashpoints, there has been little deep discussion of the broader implications and requirements of expanding anti-colonial politics. We don't tend to have a specifically anarchist position on settler colonialism that brings forth deeper and more nuanced theoretical analysis, and implications for action. The interview conversations I detail here are one means to bring in some of these nuances and complexities that anarchists tend to grapple with individually or piecemeal, and move them towards a broader movement/cultural level of consideration. Individual perspectives when brought together, with tensions raised and assumed baselines critiqued, provide an in-depth sense of how they relate to and inform collective habitus, and how engaging them more directly might also result in necessary forms of contention and disruption.

How do the complexities of identity within a settler colonial context inform our work on a collective level? How can we develop more specific anarchist orientations to settler colonialism? Not just *what* settler colonialism is, but *how it is* in anarchism as well. This can add further depth and complexity to anarchist analysis and the implementation of value-practices. As Bruno notes 'ultimately, our thoughts and our actions when it comes to settlers in a settler colonial state shouldn't be about promoting a people or a culture that we think might be more in line with European anarchist ideas.' Indigenous ideas, frameworks, and practices need to be considered on their own terms and in their own contexts. Anarchism can aid us in the formation of cultures and politics of resistance, but it can't replace or supplant more direct engagement with the complexities of settler colonialism and resurgence where we are.

Anarchists are hungry for greater conversation and analysis around settler colonial themes. This was echoed consistently across the interviews. They expressed both gratitude for the conversations that were brought up, and acknowledged the need for greater discussion, writing, and reflection. In the next section, I expand a number of key tensions from my interviews with anarchists to aid in developing a more complex anti-colonial perspective, and highlight places for productive disruption of baseline or normative approaches to politics and

possibilities. I consider tensions related to the politics of solidarity, articulating alliances, leadership, taking direction, and accountability. These tensions illustrate both the need for greater discussion within anarchism regarding anti-colonial politics and analysis of settler colonial structures, and starting points from which such discussions can expand.

Taking Up Tensions in Solidarity and Allyship

The tensions identified by anarchists are fruitful places for greater theorization and discussion, and showcase the key elements that anarchists are working with in more practical terms. The tensions that arise from within movements themselves permit both an inside view regarding the depth of anarchist anti-colonial politics, and elements that can be placed into conversation within anarchism more broadly. As they are worked on and embraced, through greater engagement, discussion, and theorization, they have the potential to alter the anti-colonial content of anarchist habitus, and the ways that it engages the field/structure of settler colonialism.

Anarchists discussed experiences of solidarity with Indigenous struggle, critiques of liberal allyship, the complexities of articulating affinities and accountabilities, and possibilities for expanding relations in the future. Each of these elements represent crucial considerations for anarchist anti-colonial politics, which are only just beginning to be engaged, considered, and theorized in more specific ways.

Cooper argued for the importance of relationships in resolving these tensions:

> I would say that … tensions, I think, are worked out through relationship. Tensions are worked out through mutual collective work with each other. And I think that we're not going to win unless we build relationships strong enough and build the skill sets necessary to be able to transform our society while we resist what's fucked up about it. And that is as anarchist as you can get, in my opinion. And I think it's something that people don't do because they're afraid.

Cooper captured both the importance of considering anti-colonial work in the context of settler colonialism from the standpoint of tensions to be worked on and worked out, but also the explicit connection to relationships. Tensions and relationships, I argue, capture the overall dynamics of anarchist anti-colonial value-practices, and serve as a useful lens not just to assess anarchist anti-colonialism, but as a specific approach to this type of work in practice.

While there is a great deal of work being done at the local movement level regarding anarchist engagement with settler colonial context, it is typically done in relative isolation from broader discussion, writing, and agitation that could further anti-colonial anarchist politics in culture and practice, and positively affect habitus. There is a need to raise such conversations to a broader level and a greater depth of discussion. As my participants argued, this is some of the crucial work that needs to be done within anarchist cultural spaces. More intentional dialogue, discussion and exchange of information is both lacking but also deeply necessary to further anti-colonial anarchist work. In Bourdieusian terms, opposition to settler colonialism as a value-practice exists at a surface level of anarchist habitus but has not yet become more potent and disruptive of persistent anarchist doxa that tends to view anti-colonialism within a laundry list of oppositions to all forms of domination. By looking at the theorizing of movement participants, and the tensions they name and grapple with, specific places of further anti-colonial work can be identified and expanded.[225]

My discussions with anarchists covered the complexities of articulating solidarity, what it means in practice, how anarchists see our role in relation to Indigenous struggles, difficulties in fostering relationships of accountability, and ways of building deeper and more sustained forms of relationship. I consider each of these elements here.

There is an ongoing discourse around allyship and relationships that narrates much Indigenous solidarity work (see, for example, Davis, Sinclair and Denis, 2020; Davis, 2010). This includes

[225] The reflections discussed here then have the potential to further enhance anti-colonial theory and practice within anarchism specifically, but also beyond, in solidarity movements that do not claim radical histories, lineages, values, and practices.

critiques of extractive, charity-based forms of relationships (in general see Spade, 2020a), to settler 'unsettling' (Battell Lowman &Barker, 2015; Regan, 2010), nation-to-nation treaty relationships (Asch, 2014), as well as questions related to shared land and autonomous future possibilities (Barker &Pickerill, 2012; Lewis, 2016).

Discourses of allyship can, at times, fall back to liberal forms of relation that call for uncritical and totalizing forms of support for any oppressed movement with even the most tepid progressive aims, while often leaving larger structures of domination unaddressed. They tend to remove the agency of those seeking to offer solidarity and put the emphasis on the 'most' oppressed identities to offer leadership. They also tend to uphold a focus on individual, rather than collective, responsibility for action that shifts focus away from the broader structures of power and violence that are interconnected, and which require interconnected collective forms of resistance (M., 2015).

Anarchists, through their frequent participation in a range of struggles outside of strictly anarchist terms, as many interviewees discussed and experienced, often come into contact with liberal allyship perspectives and continually push back against them (on a wide range of critiques of liberal identity politics, see various contributions in Milstein, 2015). This push-back often replaces working through what greater radical, militant, and accountable forms of relating might be possible. It is to these anarchist-specific framings of relations of solidarity that I turn to here.

Anarchists have long been engaged in the support of Indigenous resurgence and land defense struggles. The affinities between anarchist and Indigenous movements stem from some shared values, practices and critiques of structures of violence, and create an impetus for engaging in such forms of relating. OS pointed to the key role that anarchists in Southern Ontario played in setting up the framework for ongoing Indigenous solidarity efforts over the past 20 years. They pointed to early anarchist support of the blockades against clear-cut logging in Grassy Narrows beginning in 2002 that paved the way for anarchists building relationships with Indigenous land defense struggles that have now gained a wider political interest. Such early efforts also started the creation of Indigenous solidarity frameworks within anarchism that could be called upon to

support land reclamation struggles at Six Nations, wide-ranging opposition to pipeline projects (like #NODAPL), the rise of Idle No More, and more localized forms of resurgence (Lewis, 2017; Lewis, 2012; Day &Haberle, 2006).

These early efforts of a small number of anarchists paved the way for later forms of solidarity that have now moved beyond strictly anarchist sectors and have begun to enter more mainstream environmental politics.[226] Resistance to the Dakota Access Pipeline and the proliferation of 'Water is Life' as a rallying cry for solidarity with Indigenous struggle is but one potent example that has found support in more generally liberal and progressive movements (on #NODAPL, see Estes, 2019). As I argued in my previous master's work (Lewis, 2012), and as was noted by interview participants like Willow, opposition to the 2010 Olympics and G20 are important reference points for the specific formation of anti-colonial perspectives, specifically in the context of Southern Ontario, but across social movements more broadly.

As Lee observed, Indigenous solidarity has very much entered into the more mainstream quarters of progressive social movement politics, turning more people onto such struggles and bringing out support: 'Everyone's trying hard to support and to center their work, Indigenous work,' which 'the whole activist world in Canada is kind of getting more in tune with and waking up to. And I think part of that is, is that it's purely righteous work. You know, like, it's not just that it's the right thing, but it's actually practically the greatest hope we have, you know, is listening to these Indigenous folks.' There is a wider range of engagement with Indigenous struggles beyond strictly anarchist forms of solidarity.

OS pointed specifically to the ways that some Indigenous struggles have also been publicly framed. Grassy Narrows, for example, adopted a specific and intentional commitment to non-violent forms of civil disobedience that allowed for broader networks of support to develop across the range of left social movement positions. Other struggles, such as more militant and

[226] OS was quick to point out that it was never exclusively anarchists involved in supporting communities like Grassy. Other groups like Christian Peacemaker Teams, environmentalists, and other radical groups like No One Is Illegal or the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty were also involved early on and continue to be.

confrontational events at Six Nations, Tyendinaga, Elsipogtog, or Fairy Creek that have confronted both corporate and government processes of dispossession and destruction, as well as the systems of police repression, have been less supported by more mainstream left social movements groups and individuals. This is another place where a willingness to use more confrontational, if not disruptive and destructive tactics, finds affinity with anarchist politics.

Despite such a willingness to support more confrontational actions and sites, Clare considered that

> sometimes anarchists actually get like stuck into like a similar sort of like ally model that we're talking about. Sort of like more NGO world and just … will find, like, examples of anarchists working something that otherwise would be like very anti anarchist ideals or goals. But they'll just be like, "Well, I care about this struggle. So I'm doing this." Which I don't think is a good thing. It's complicated.

Clare notes the pragmatism of a broader ally politic that comes from anarchist feelings of obligation to make sure that struggles are supported even if they don't fully, or perhaps even usefully, align with broader anarchist aims. Anarchists thus have engaged in solidarity politics from the standpoint of affinity, as well as a broader sense of political obligation.

The politics of solidarity is always a fraught and complicated part of movement practices and will likely continue to be. For anarchists, however, there has long been a desire to step outside of liberal progressive frameworks of alliance building and seek deeper, radical forms of connection. In the context of struggle discussed here, this in part stems from the affinities between anarchist politics and elements of Indigenous resurgence. An affinity-based politics has the potential to alter the terms on which relationship-building occurs, and push it towards greater forms of commitment, support, and accountability.

Throughout my interviews, participants highlighted the importance of articulating solidarity and support of Indigenous struggles and were involved in such efforts in several ways. Given that anarchists understand settler colonialism as a foundational aspect of the context of resistance,

support of Indigenous resurgence efforts is a logical extension of anarchist orientations. All of those I interviewed had been involved in such support efforts at various times and highlighted their ongoing importance and impact on their anarchist politics.

In particular, given the research context of Southern Ontario, many had at least some connection to support for land reclamation efforts at Six Nations (see Hill, 2017; McCarthy, 2017). As Six Nations is the largest reserve community within the Canadian colonial state, and is a relatively short drive from Kitchener, London, Hamilton, Guelph, and Toronto, land reclamation efforts and opposition to development, police repression, and right-wing settler racism have frequently narrated the context of settler-Indigenous relationships within this area. The use of direct action, as well as (re)claiming and holding space, link with wider desires for prefigurative politics and ways of life outside the state. As such, the proximity to Six Nations foundationally shapes the articulation of anti-colonial politics in this area, in addition to other proximate and connected communities like Tyendinaga, Stoney Point, Ardoch Algonquin, or Grassy Narrows, also variously identified by those I interviewed. These ongoing sites are also significant moments of confrontation and direct action, especially outside dominant urban centres like Toronto that serve as wider contexts attracting anarchists. Historic, contemporary, and ongoing forms of Indigenous resurgence are foundational aspects of radical politics for many in this region. Looking at the reflections and actions of those interviewed shows the complex ways that anarchists are considering these tensions and possibilities in practice, and going forward.

The 'Who' of Solidarity

While I don't aim to rehash the complexities of the term 'solidarity' as a concept, it is important to consider how anarchists reflect on the complexities of these practices, how they are articulated, and what we can learn from them. A key question of the politics of solidarity is 'who' one is in solidarity with. As the interviews revealed, this was often an unclear, and at times difficult, question to answer.

Declarations of solidarity and support often come in the form of broad statements and quick, snappy slogans. ‘Solidarity with Six Nations.’ ‘In solidarity with Indigenous Land Defenders.’ ‘RCMP out of Wet’suwet’un.’ As discussed in the previous chapter regarding anarchist slogans, there is often quite a bit of nuance that is lost in these pragmatic but simplistic declarations. In the context of anti-colonial politics here, this also has a muddying and reductive influence on how solidarity politics and alliances are framed. Anarchists are seeking to work through this tension as part of their Indigenous solidarity practice.

Brian cited a specific example of this kind of reductive generalization that shows a typical manifestation of this tension:

> We did a blockade in Guelph … [with] a big banner that says like 'Solidarity with Tyendinaga,’ and just like 'Tyendinaga and everybody in the reserve.' What we meant is we were in solidarity with the Mohawk warriors who were blocking the quarry and saying, “fuck you cops,” and like asserting sovereignty and doing like popular social organizing in that rez. But the next day, the paper reported on it, got a quote from the band council chief who's like, “That's not what solidarity is, if that's what solidarity is, we don't want it. And we don't want these criminals on our reserve like fighting cops and shit either.” And it's just like, you know, that was the paper. It was just like, “Are these misguided activists? Sure looks like it. We talked to an Indigenous person from Tyendinaga and they said, fuck off.”

Such broader declarations, while aiming to signify support of ongoing struggles, can have an opposite effect, where they are easily dismissed because of their lack of nuance.

Sam presented a similar set of reflections, where they

> used to always frame things, prior to that, in terms of like 'Solidarity with Tyendinaga' or like 'We support Tyendinaga.' That's the kind of posters we put out. We could get a lot of people out to a demonstration that way … and like shut down a road or something like that. But it became very clear through this

> experience to everybody that Tyendinaga is not a monolithic thing. There's like loyalist Anglicans at Tyendinaga. There's like the band council. There's like two long houses and they both claim they're the authentic traditional longhouse. One of them is more Christian. One of them is more like Warrior, if that makes sense. [Interviewer: Right. Yeah.] And that's really hard to put on a poster and get people to come out.

Sam flagged here a pragmatic consideration of simply spreading the word and getting a broader range of people out to support struggles as they are immediately occurring. There is a certain utility in reaching beyond the narrower anarchist or radical sectors of movements, to mobilize liberal or progressive sectors as they become more attuned and willing to support these kinds of struggles.[227] But at the same time, such framings lose their radical political orientation and lack a direct clarification of which segments of a community one is actually standing with at that particular moment. As a result, anarchists have sought to alter, and learn from, these previous practices.

Brian captured a broader sentiment and learning process for those involved in Indigenous solidarity work:

> I feel like I realized long ago that there is no solidarity with Indigenous communities. There is solidarity with some people who are, like, radicals and revolutionaries in Indigenous communities. And there is solidarity with, like, the oppressed identity of the Indigenous person. And I think when conceptualizing things like that, I'm actually like, there's interesting things we could be doing. Like, we could be doing anti-prison work that is specifically focused on the disproportionate representation of Indigenous people and specifically Indigenous women. You know, we could be pushing and doing

[227] Importantly, this broad sector support—from unions, progressive cultural voices, sympathetic politicians on the left etc. etc.—can also be a means to stave off, or at least lessen, the frequent forms of violent state repression that target Indigenous land defense struggles.

> solidarity projects with that, and we could be doing things that are you know, setting up infrastructure for people when they're getting out and stuff like that. And, like, that is an interesting way of like presenting an abolitionist kind of, like, systemic critique and doing Indigenous solidarity work that is ... never going to get recuperated by, like, the Liberal government unless they change the composition of, like, class and colonialism in the country. Which would be hard to do.

Brian provides a critique and comment on the ways that declaring solidarity with communities often carries the effect of treating communities like monolithic entities. The support that is voiced is generalized and imprecise,[228] and as a result, can be more easily manipulated or dismissed, both from within communities, as Brian's reflection illustrates, and from without.[229]

Brian also raises a broader question of how we actually define solidarity work. Part of the background that leads to such imprecise declarations of support regards understandings of the politics of the communities involved. Lydia expressed that, while there is general understanding and opposition to settler colonialism by anarchists and other radicals (as discussed above), the specific aspects of local histories and struggles, such as those at Six Nations, are often less understood:

> And so [people expressing solidarity] don't feel very equipped to talk about it. And also, like, they don't really know that much about like what Indigenous people want or, like, how to support Indigenous struggle in a way that feels like it's what they're asking for. Because a lot of those voices coming out of

---

[228] This is also not wholly an issue within anarchist movements, but within the politics of solidarity in general. One need look no further than alliance politics within any struggle throughout the world. It is always 'Solidarity with Ukraine' or 'Support Palestine' (again, often pragmatically) but lacking more precise political qualifiers that could actually make a much more specific political standpoint and relationship evident.

[229] Importantly, though, Brian also reflected on the support for various anarchist/settler solidarity actions that came out of the more radical sectors of Tyendinaga as well, in ways that the community expressed the importance of outside solidarity actions to aid in their tactics of confrontation and escalation: 'There was solidarity blockades happening in Guelph and like people from Tyendinaga were like, "This is fucking awesome. And we're stoked to hear about it. And we're stoked, like, people were doing shit."'

> Indigenous communities are like very liberal voices, too. And so it gets confused as like a) “Who do we support within that community? Because I don't really support the loudest voices, but like I don't really know how to support the quieter voices without feeling like I'm meddling;’ or b) ‘” actually don't know enough about this to talk about it.’”

Moving beyond generalized and blanket declarations of support therefore requires more specific understandings of community dynamics, or factions, and means that one is moving in a direction of much more deliberately taking sides.

There is also a certain reluctance to make stronger assertions of solidarity and actually clarify positions and politics for fear of dismissal or ‘getting it wrong.’ The result, however, is a dilution of the more directly radical possibilities of alliance politics and a reluctance to affirm where one is coming from. As I discuss later in this chapter, this also means that accountability becomes more difficult when politics and political affiliations are generalized.

The tension persists, then, in terms of *whom* one aligns with in context of ongoing, and often immediate, struggle. Alliance politics are often framed in terms of who one ‘should’ organize with, rather than who one might actually have political affinity with. A number of interviewees expressed this sentiment, including Sophia, recalling the above discussion of the liberal influences on alliance politics:

> Maybe this is more complicated for anarchists because oftentimes the people that you should organize with is, like, the elders or the band council. Like, that's who people would be like, “these are legitimate representatives” in the eyes of the state or the general public. But oftentimes there's like young radical organizers who you are like, “Well, our affinity is way more with these folks and they're fighting their band council.” So I find that has been a very complicated thing to navigate. And I think that that probably wouldn't happen so much with like less radical organizations. They would feel quite comfortable going to the like, quote unquote, “legitimate power.”

Anarchists have a wariness of established, top-down and authoritarian structures, especially those connected to the state, and this comes into framings of solidarity and support.[230]

As Brian reflected, after the action that framed a generalized 'Solidarity with Tyendinaga':

> OK, we got to be more specific about who we're in solidarity with because, like, actually these communities are more fractured than we think. Or at least at the time, I might have thought. And also in me saying "Tyendinaga" I assume it means people in struggle in this area, the same way I'd be like "Solidarity with Oakland." But there is actually so many different ways in which, you know, saying that when it comes to like an Indigenous community is not just interpreted as solidarity with like the uprising in this location, you know?

Anarchists need to be aware that declarations of solidarity may be misinterpreted and therefore open to more easy dismissal, as Brian's example illustrates. How we frame our support and solidarity politics may be legible to other anarchists or those in radical milieus, those who share value-practices, habitus, field, or context, but can be lost in broadly progressive or media spaces. Therefore, as Brian and Sam suggested, there is a need for more explicit and direct articulations of politics and affinities. Anarchist value-practices can be mobilized directly, intentionally, and explicitly to better frame our approaches to solidarity. As participants noted, this was often a learning process, one that continues to develop, and where greater forms of discussion between and across anarchists are needed.

Sophia phrased this from another standpoint as well:

---

[230] There are a wide range of organizing and leadership structures within Indigenous communities (ranging from traditional, consensus-based, matriarchal, imposed-band council, etc.). My aim here is not to pass judgement on these forms and how Indigenous communities mobilize them with regard to resurgence and resistance. There is, however, a consideration of when anarchists find affinities with particular structures and not others. How are affinities expressed in ways that directly relate to anarchist value-practices? And when should our value-practices and commitments to affinity more directly guide who we choose to support? As my interviewees note, we are already choosing sides regardless of how diplomatic our alliances and affinities might seem. The point is to be expressly careful of how our own prioritization of affinity might impact the internal relations within communities. There is a self-critical element that is necessary to assess the relationships we are in and the wider implications.

> I think that maybe what's missing here is the interlinking of anarchism and Indigenous solidarity. So there is a lot of work happening around land defense, but I don't [know] if those people call themselves anarchists, many of them are, but they aren't doing like explicitly anti-state things. So they're very focused on resource extraction. They're not looking at prisons, they're not looking at cops, not looking at that stuff. …So I think that in a community where those things were more interlinked, then there's probably a lot more of these conversations, but as a whole, I also don't feel like I know a lot of anarchists who are just anarchists, you know, they're just anarchists doing other things anarchistically. But I think these are the conversations we should be having.

How anarchists frame their association with other struggles, and how they present their politics within them, further suggests a need for greater explicit naming and framing, where the impetus and analysis that informs action comes from within anarchist value-practices directly. Anarchists often participate in a range of other movements, and will certainly continue to do so (no doubt due to the relatively small size of anarchist scenes, as noted in previous chapters). But, as I argue below, a more explicit expression of anarchist politics carries both disruptive potentials for movements more broadly, and has the ability to more forcefully articulate affinities that present possibilities for deeper forms of alliance, as accomplices or co-conspirators. Anarchists can lean on their value-practices to articulate rationales and approaches to solidarity, but also as an essential piece of wider anti-colonial politics. This also brings anarchist approaches to solidarity, rather than just generally progressive or even radical ones, to the forefront, and makes them more legible for greater critique and discussion.

Leadership and Taking Direction

Leadership and taking direction are common refrains within general discussions of support and solidarity (Walia, 2013). Anarchists, with their anti-authoritarian value-practices, have difficulty with established systems of power and legitimate channels that often constrain and police radical movements. The same dynamics persist within radical sectors of Indigenous communities as well, and come into considerations of alliance politics, creating space for

affinities.[231] As Anna argued, there is a general desire to 'take the lead from Indigenous folks' who are most affected, but what this practically entails is context dependent and less clear. They shared how important it is to find political alignment when supporting Indigenous communities:

> One of the things that is really important for me as an anarchist is to know that the work we're doing is always intersectional. And so to encounter Indigenous folks who don't necessarily identify as anarchists, or maybe they do, but that have, like, not just the decolonizing lens, but also, like, an anti-oppression lens in general and a liberation lens, I think has been really encouraging.

Mac described seeing a similar desire to find such affinity as the basis of relationships:

> An anarchist community organizer would more seek out leaders within the communities who were already against police. [In] the decolonization struggles that I think some anarchists have community organized around, people are more likely to seek out leaders within Indigenous communities that are against development, are pro-sovereignty, are against the destruction of the environment, than seeking band council members who are getting government money and, you know, basically pushing around the community.

These reflections from Anna and Mac return to the ideas expressed earlier by Brian and others with the essential work of finding affinities with struggles against settler colonialism that have broader anti-authoritarian connections and elements of shared values. The process of finding affinity becomes more intentional, rather than just being left up to theoretical connections.

Sam phrased the importance of articulating affinities as a committed anarchist value-practice:

---

[231] This becomes further potent when the history of 'legitimate' forms of Indigenous governance like band councils have been variously imposed by the colonial state itself. The anarchist wariness does not spring from thin air but resides at the intersection of a general anarchist value-practices, fused with a commitment to affinity-based alliances, and general anti-colonial commitments.

> And so for me and my friends, we had to fall back on like 'We're anarchists, there's multiple [Indigenous] factions. We support this faction because of, like, political affinity and in recognition that what they're doing is like a form of decolonization and, like, resistance to state authority that we also believe in.' But that's, like, for our own reasons. And we couldn't, like, put that on other people or say that we're just following someone's leadership. Like, *we had to take responsibility for our ideas [emphasis added]*, which I think makes us a lot stronger and a lot more able to engage in authentic solidarity as a result. But it is tricky to do. And someone's calling you a racist and a colonizer, … They're an Indigenous person or they're friends with Indigenous people from that community. And I do think, of course, like, we should be cautious and sort of try to, like, understand the situation as well as we can when it is a somewhat internal conflict. And like, how do we want to impose or not impose ourselves in that situation? But that situation really raised those questions. That was a problematic that we had to work through.

Framing solidarity and support as intentional and based on affinity clarifies our own positions, but also signals a greater taking of responsibility, and creates a greater onus of accountability. There is a dynamic of give and take that can lead to discussion and critique across a shared basis of affinity.

Al suggested that owning our politics and committing to our ideas means using them in dialogue as well:

> Maybe we are too much sort of biting our tongues sometimes where I think, like Indigenous organizers can benefit from that kind of a dialogue as well. Sharpen their own ideas as they encounter ours. And it can be a back and forth thing. And that's OK. You know, it can even be tense and conflictual in terms of a debate of ideas. But I think as long as there's mutual respect there and not an imposition of anything, then...

Affinity permits a space and relationship of ongoing dialogue and discussion that can further radical possibilities when done as a respectful form of engagement. This, in some ways, is what is proposed by anarcha-Indigenism as a project that brings anarchist, Indigenous, and feminist politics together to engage each other,[232] which anarchists can draw inspiration from to expand the anti-colonial possibilities I am considering here.

Anarchists are likely to find some of their own ideas and beliefs challenged, especially those that continue as 'structures of settlement' or other forms of common sense that have been inherited, even subconsciously, from the wider dominant culture. This is a moment to lean in further, to embrace challenges and disruptions, in ways that will be transformative in the moment, but also could have lasting disruptions of forms of habitus as well.

AM phrased the core question related to solidarity as needing to consider:

> What are the best ways we can build bridges and build solidarity so that our interests and their interests are intertwined and we are mutually benefiting whatever projects that you're part of and these other communities, what they're trying to achieve? And that should be what the goal should be, the long-term goal and not 'let's make this entire space anarchist.'

Interviewees argued that owning one's politics, and expanding the possibilities for affinity-based mutual struggle is an important goal, but were also aware of the consistent need to critique any attempts to push anarchist politics onto others or force struggles into an anarchist mold. There is an importance in meeting communities where they are at, and on their terms of affinity (Al).

---

[232] As I argued in previous work (Lewis, 2012) this might form a 'third space' that opens up new possibilities for theory and action. It is, however, as important to ask, very intentionally and directly, what anarchism can offer to Indigenous resurgence. As Warburton (2016) argues, it is not likely to be a critique of the state form and forms of contemporary domination, which Indigenous peoples have theorized the world over through direct experience and ongoing forms of resistance.

Committing to deeper forms of affinity raises the stakes for relationships, but also makes connections more honest as well. Being direct with one's politics and allegiances would want to avoid internal community debates, conflicts and dynamics as best as possible, as this could have an effect of exacerbating tensions further and lead to greater community harm. The reality, however, is that communities themselves are not monolithic and the commitment to take sides inevitably will result in some element of tension.

Participants noted that articulations of solidarity could be dismissed as being further divisive for communities. This too often falls under the language of 'outside' agitators, used to dismiss disruptive, militant, and radical segments of communities who are engaged in resistance, challenging established structures of power, and building relationships with other militants.[233] While there 'will always be like call-outs for solidarity from marginalized communities and people [because] as long as those communities and people continue to be marginalized they will need solidarity from people who hold privilege,' OS argued, there will also be attempts to harness and control the terms of alliances, strategies, and tactics. This means that there will always be a need for external support of specific communities in resistance, but how this reality is responded to need not fall back to liberal forms of allyship. There are opportunities for greater complicities in struggle.

Lydia, engaging the tensions between their Indigeneity and anarchism, argued that being clear about anarchist politics means that the decisions made by those we are seeking to support don't need to be upheld automatically:

> It's like this thing where we've had these discussions before and meetings where someone's like, "Well, we just need to support whatever, take their lead

[233] This critique and dismissal essentially arises anytime disruptive, confrontational, or militant tactics are employed by resistance movements, and community and state sectors want to funnel movements into 'legitimate' avenues for change, or blunt their spontaneous and disruptive potentials. This has been especially potent in the Ferguson and George Floyd uprisings in order to discredit, police, and repress militant and confrontation movements and safeguard a certain level of liberal respectability politics. On this point in the Black liberation struggle directly, see Anderson (2021).

> on this" and then other people will be like, "Well no, like we make decisions all the time about who to support. Right now we're making decisions about who to support that's Indigenous because we're choosing to support Indigenous people who are opposing pipelines rather than the many Indigenous people who ... don't care about this or [they're] actively pro-pipeline."

Decisions are continually being made, even if they aren't phrased as such. Lydia continued to describe the nuances of forging a committed anarchist politics that doesn't shy away from being intentional about affinities:

> Because realistically, to be like, "Don't accept whatever crumbs the state throws at you," like, to call that treaty obsolete and then fight for your sovereignty or autonomy in like a more real way is like something that would need ... like, you would need to be so embedded in that community or like back it up so hard to feel like you have the right to tell them to do that or something or even counsel them to do that sort of thing. But then it's like, well then do you just ... offer endless solidarity and let those communities make those decisions for themselves, even when they're headed in more liberal directions? ... I think in pipeline and environmental stuff, it comes up a lot, not just as an anarchist, but whatever, people are just like "Indigenous solidarity is like backing Indigenous communities in, like, whatever they want to do." And I find that to be a terribly lacking and also sometimes toxic decision.

Further, sometimes the idea of taking direction can limit the use of the skills of those seeking alliances. Sophia discussed this in relation to ongoing movement efforts to support Indigenous land reclamation projects at Six Nations:

> One of the discussions that came up in that was like, you know, "why are all these like really solid organizers who know a lot of things about general organizing and like legal stuff and like all this stuff, like why are they washing dishes?" You know, like there's valued skills that are not being utilized. ... I

> think people were feeling that it was much more like "Hey, like we need somebody in the kitchen," you know? Which is like, maybe that's fine, but that's like tensions that I heard. And then also other sort of discussions that were happening were, you know, is it really useful to bring a busload of, you know, settlers from Toronto to do dishes here, or should people be in Caledonia,[234] right, talking to settlers and like having maybe like much more impact. Do people just want to be on the reserve because it's cool? [Interviewer: Right and at the blockade because that's where the action is.] Because at the blockade is cool.

There will always be a multitude of roles to be filled within the context of ongoing action and resistance, and evidently some of those outside communities will step up or be invited to take such roles. The tension here, for anarchists and other organizers, in how this fits into our broader politics and skill sets. As Sophia noted, there is the further tension of how resistance can also spread in other, namely settler, communities that might catalyze broader support for moments of resistance, and which involves another intentional form of work. Should anarchists be the ones to take up this specific kind of outreach? Again, this will be context dependent, and it is something certainly many anarchists have been involved in over the years in Southern Ontario. There is a tension or, perhaps more directly, a disconnect between framings and relationships that are based on differences of identity—settler/Indigenous—and those founded more directly on the basis of shared political affinity, across differences. This asks how more directly and concretely articulating an explicit anarchist politics could alter forms of relating, to deepen affinities and solidarities, but also create other avenues of struggle.

Tawinikay (2021), an important Indigenous anarchist writer in Southern Ontario, frames the pitfalls of liberal identity politics as such, speaking here in the context of settler claims to Indigeneity:

---

[234] The white-dominant settler community that borders the Six Nations reserve, and which has often bred racist forms of hostility to Indigenous peoples and movements.

> It is important to not let the logic of liberal identity politics dominate relationships between anarchists, or between anarchists and Native folks. This paves the other false path to settler redemption: the white-guilt-ridden settler who sees self-sacrifice as the way to cleanse their ancestor's crimes. Co-creating a culture of obedience to Indigenous people is a losing strategy, fostering not rebellious solidarity but an environment of scarcity. Not only does it put too much pressure on Indigenous people to make decisions for you, it robs us of one of our most important protections against repression—decentralized action. (p.22)

She continues, putting the dynamic of solidarity bluntly:

> Solidarity isn't about going along with someone else's project, it's about seeing a mutual and parallel cause between you and another community/crew and acting together towards a common goal. Most often that means you go your separate ways afterwards. Which is what the intention should be if you are a settler doing solidarity work. Because if you are showing up to the struggle in hopes of leaving settlerism behind and being accepted into Indigenous community, then turn around and go home. (Tawinikay, 2021, p. 23)

This dynamic can be understood as another potential way to move towards settler forms of innocence, that seek absolution for feelings of guilt and complicity (Tuck & Yang, 2012), rather than as a means to deepen affinities and complicities in struggle. As a result, anarchists have continually sought to align themselves with the more anti-authoritarian, militant, radical and confrontational segments of various struggles—from Indigenous resurgence, to Black liberation, or migrant justice—on the basis of affinity. However, following Brian's example above, this has not always been clear, and the lines of relating are likely to continue to change and shift. As Tawinikay argues, this may mean that moments of support and struggle are temporary and dynamic. This is not to suggest a lack of commitment, but to recognize moments of affinity and moments of disagreement, and being upfront about when these occur, or don't.

Tension arises in terms of taking direction vs. acting autonomously. Anarchists place a large emphasis on autonomy, voluntary association, and direct action as value-practices, acting on issues that affect our contexts and locations. Affinities create possibilities of connection and mutual or solidarity-based struggle, but the political element that prompts such affinities can, and should, itself, serve as an impetus for resistance. Anarchism, after all, is often framed as political practice, as a way of doing things 'in the world.' It seeks to prefigure alternative ways of being, which can happen in relationships and alliances, rather than falling back to forms that come from liberal reference points that are firmly situated in the values of the state, however democratic. These are tensions that can find further discussion and sharing between anarchists in order to continually work on them collectively.

Solidarity as Practice

Who anarchists are in solidarity with also comes with the related question of *how* to be in solidarity. As Al reflected, 'going back to your question about tensions …what about in cases like where that struggle is maybe more reformist, you know? Maybe more accommodating to capital and the state. How do we relate with our politics as anarchists in those kind of situations? Like, what's an appropriate kind of response that doesn't reproduce, you know, colonialism?' Al, in this case, didn't have a direct answer but raised the question as a crucial problem to be worked on through greater discussion.

Bruno made a similar point regarding the frequent difficulty of 'identifying which perspectives to listen to':

> Like, first of all, the hard part is often acknowledging that guidance needs to come from the people we're trying to support or do good things for. And that's hard enough. That's often lacking. And that's easily identified, and it's been identified forever, right. But identifying like who to take guidance from in a community ... like I mean, with Stoney Point, for example, there's a few times when, I don't know if we could have done anything different, but like, things got fucked up because we were taking guidance from somebody who, you

> know, we found out was kind of on their way out in the community and, like, eventually was driven out of the community.

The frequent ramping up of solidarity during flashpoint actions, reclamations, or repression also makes these kinds of relationship-building moments more difficult.

'Taking sides' often has direct implications for the broader sets of relations within communities. This is not to discourage the staking out of our politics more publicly, or being more upfront. But there is also an important consideration in how our articulation of alliances will be perceived, and that we can be ready for this. Al considered the danger of replicating colonial dynamics:

> I think a lot of it has to do with the relationship between you and your faction, that Indigenous faction, and what is the relationship there if it's one of like the settlers got all the resources, all the influence, that's going to probably end up bad pretty quick. But if it's one where it's based on mutual respect and taking the leadership and recognizing the autonomy of different groups, then maybe that can work out in practice, you know?

Al distinguished between a more paternalistic and hierarchical form of relating and one that is more firmly located in a politics of affinity. As Brian's discussion of expressing 'solidarity with Tyendinaga' revealed, being clearer about alliances and affinities is unlikely to avoid criticism from more institutional or liberal factions within communities. Anarchists should be prepared for this and consider ways to confidently and firmly express our political positions. Being explicit (while also being strategic) makes anarchist politics, forms of critique, and value-practices more visible, and creates potential opportunities to push political discourses in more radical directions. Owning one's politics stakes out clearer ground, both for ourselves, and in the spaces that we inhabit.

Lydia was very direct in discussing the dynamic of support/solidarity politics around resistance to pipelines:

> And people were, like, even to me people were, like, “You can't have a say in that community’s decisions” like “whatever they decide is right.” And I'm like, “No, I can say that I don't support the decisions they made.” Like, that is a fair thing. ... I think that people are already making decisions every day about which Indigenous people to support. And I think it's fine to be like more strict about that and be like, “I'm going to support projects, and communities and decisions that are aligned with my politics,” and not just have blanket support or whatever.

There is a difference between staying true to your own politics and not supporting every decision that another group or community makes based on some abstract construction of solidarity politics, or engaging in actions that may lead to greater divisions between communities. It seems necessary to always consider the broader impacts of the decisions we make. But as Lydia and others argued, it is a bit dishonest to suggest that we are ever *not* making decisions that have impacts, either. The point then, especially for anarchists who have a quite specific critique of established systems of power, is to be more direct and transparent in our articulations of politics and not shy away from them.

As an example, Mac pointed to the work of groups like OCAP (Ontario Coalition Against Poverty), who in their housing and anti-poverty work were very explicit about carrying their politics into their alliances. They wouldn’t for example, take up a community goal around advocating for increased security in the form of police, as this is counter to their broader radical politic:

> So even if the ... people we were meeting within the community said “we need more cops, more security,” which happens in housing projects all the time, we would not take that up because we don't feel that that leads to a revolutionary moment or leads towards revolution. The end of capitalism, end of colonialism.

Anarchists ought to seek out those leaders or organizers that they share political affinity with, whether against police, or in favour of Indigenous resurgence and autonomy against the state, capitalism, and colonialism:

> Interviewer: Because, I mean, it seems natural to seek solidarity with people who have political affinity and not with other structures that were already against like police, like top-down decision making structures, like, things that are tied to the colonial state, all that kind of thing.
>
> Mac: No, I agree. But then there's the counter position, which people say, "Well, it's racist, in the Indigenous solidarity and decolonization, for example, that it's racist for us to pick sides within the community, because we're not colonized," which I think, no offense, is complete bullshit. I think you work with your allies, just like you basically said, and that's how you build revolutionary movements.

Later in our discussion, Mac provided the following anecdote about alliances on the West Coast that indicates the possible depth of alliance politics:

> And so we did a lot of Indigenous solidarity and [it] was quite interesting because we actually married the Qwa-ba-diwa at one point. And it was us and the Ligwilda'xw, who were up from Campbell River area and dealt with terrible, terrible drug problems and sexual abuse on their reserve using traditional teaching and spiritual methods. And they married each other and we married them as well. And we had to have a flag because you couldn't get married without a flag. And so we had the black flag...

This framing of 'marrying,' linked to the kinship and relationship practices of the specific communities being worked with here, suggests a deeper element of relation, beyond arm's length or temporary solidarity. It suggests a deepening of ties, relations, and accountabilities that are embedded in both community and place.

Brian argued for deepening affinities and relationships through both clearly articulating and standing by our own anarchist politics and bringing more intention and commitment to the forms of relationships that we do take up:

> And so I think that when it comes to anarchist theory, or ways in which anarchists can engage with, like, anti-colonial movements and Indigenous communities in revolt, I think that, like, our best bet is to have that analysis important to the work that we're doing. I think it is reaching out and engaging in real ways with Indigenous people, Indigenous people in struggle and Indigenous people in our communities. I think it's actually being more hesitant than we currently are about giving up our own autonomy and like choosing how we act and when to act and like, you know, choosing struggles where we can struggle alongside people without necessarily giving up all of our autonomy to engage.

Brian captures here a number of elements that are represented throughout my discussions with anarchists that help to provide a framework for constructing affinities and solidarities, and deepening our political commitments. They highlight the importance of staying committed and direct regarding our anarchist politics, seeking to maintain value-practices of autonomy and voluntary association, and engaging in specific relationships on the basis of affinity. The need to maintain and uphold anarchist forms of analysis, while also expanding them in greater anti-colonial ways, is an ongoing necessary task for anarchist movements and cultures.[235]

---

[235] This sort of relationship building also breaks down the individual ways that groups and movements often go about political organizing or resistance. As Mac noted, this sort of individualization often limits some of the broader connections between movements: 'But individually we don't hold the keys to the revolution. Certainly we tend to, you know, really think about certain great thinkers in the past, whether that's Marx or Emma Goldman. And they certainly had a piece of the pie, well probably a much bigger piece of the pie than I did, I do. But none of us has the whole pie. So when you're working with other groups, you have to have a little bit of humility and realize that maybe you don't know the answer going in.' Humility is key to thinking about constructing relationships, but also the ways that we approach our radical imaginations for the future. We don't have it all figured out, and frankly don't want to. But this means engaging in relationships and collective processes with these sorts of values in mind.

This commitment to anarchist politics can also carry over into more specific and direct work to expand the anti-colonial potentials of non-Indigenous communities that are not immediately anarchist, but to which we are also connected. This requires unsettling work to 'challenge each other in our complicities and contradictions within asymmetric relations of power and oppression' (Walia, 2013, p. 275), and a wider collective responsibility to attend to the sorts of structures of settlement identified by Warburton (2021).

One approach suggests that anarchists can be more upfront about the experience and skills that they have and the ways that this can be both disruptive and generative of anti-colonial politics in wider movement spaces. Anarchists often insulate and isolate their politics from the broader struggles in which they are involved. OS pointed out that this often limits the forms of solidarity that may be extended to anarchists given that many people don't even know that we are anarchists! This is especially concerning as moments of repression arise, in part from militant, direct action tactics that often support Indigenous land defense struggles.

As mentioned briefly in Chapter 5, OS argued for 'branding ourselves as anarchists in a way where we are visible and known' to enhance the spread of politics and value-practices, but also so 'when shit hits the fan for us that we are cared for by the rest of the progressive community.' Anarchists often take on key logistical and organizing roles in a variety of non-anarchist struggles, injecting their practices into the work that they are involved in, but rarely assert their anarchism explicitly. There is then little understanding, and much misunderstanding, of what anarchism is and what anarchists actually do, even as the impact, influence, and diffusion of such practices is felt across a wider range of movements (as noted in Chapter 2).

The lack of explicit relationships and naming of anarchism as the bringer of specific value-practices, also limits the diffusion of anti-colonial experience as well. Greater discussion of the specific anti-colonial analysis and expressions of anarchists can contribute directly to wider anti-colonial struggle.

In the words of OS:

> I think that there's a lot of room for improvement within anarchist space and Indigenous solidarity to do more education within movement spaces. Like how do we as settlers talk to other settlers about Indigenous solidarity work? And again, that relates back to what I was saying earlier. And you have to have the relationships with people in other movements. We have to not isolate ourselves to the point where we've called everyone a sellout and burned every bridge but where they actually like— I would love it if, like other people in the movement felt like anarchist community had value added because they knew that we did have a ton of experience doing Indigenous solidarity work.

Willow stressed a similar set of considerations highlighted generally by interview participants, saying that 'it's great to do, like, solidarity actions. It's great to do stuff in line with folks. But in reflection ... I wish that— and I see this happening in other contexts as well, more specific relationship building and more specific friendship forming, more intentional long-term connection.' This can be both in our own communities, as well as with those we have affinity with. How can anti-colonial politics further disrupt both anarchist and broader settler/non-Indigenous communities?

As Klee Benally (2021) argues 'if solidarity matters, settler colonizers have to confront their hang-ups. This is not to argue that Indigenous Peoples should be considered solely as candidates for political alliance, this goes beyond solidarity, it is an assertion that any liberatory impulse on these lands must be built around the fire of Indigenous autonomy' (p. 15). Any movement seeking radical futures needs to have a direct and committed relationship to both undoing settler colonialism structurally, within their own spaces and cultures, and to directly support Indigenous resurgence and autonomy. Otherwise, there is a likelihood of continuing the structures of colonization. 'Settler colonialism by definition is involuntary association,' that should be antithetical to anarchist values and practices, but which is all too often maintained as a structure of domination (Benally, 2021, p. 13), or as 'settler anarchism' (Warburton, 2021). This is the essential process of ongoing disruption and development of anarchist anti-colonial

ideas—to take these essential critiques directly on board and fundamentally alter values and practices, and ultimately habitus, towards a deeper anti-colonial perspective.

As Al noted, there is a common criticism that there can be 'too much organizing in the form of Indigenous solidarity and not enough of actually building, you know, working class bases of power among the settler part of the working class that can then stand in solidarity in a very much more substantial way than just our network of organizers.' From Al's working-class perspective, 'we bring little power to that situation. To a land occupation or a struggle against a pipeline.'[236] Showing up in numbers and putting ourselves on the line is an important aspect, but anarchists can also 'step back from that and think more in terms of building working class power, but without falling in the trap of like, "Well, we're gonna build class power and then we're going to do Indigenous solidarity." Because I think it has to be integrated.' Engaging as anarchists with committed politics is one means to expand not only anarchist understandings, but intervene in the contexts in which we find ourselves to disrupt normative or liberal understandings of relationships and complicities, and provide greater possibilities for imagining radical forms of action.[237] There can be a greater affirmation and critical discussion of the previous anti-colonial work within anarchism, in order to integrate and expand anti-colonial

[236] Al's working class lens speaks to an analysis that brings together a wider range of identities and the ways they are oppressed under capitalism. In this sense we can speak about the ways that capitalism oppresses everyone, albeit in asymmetrical, disparate and often deeply contextual ways. The same may be said for settler colonialism. This returns to Cooper's point about the generalized aspects of dispossession that occur under settler colonialism—processes of primitive accumulation and dispossession often began in settler metropoles and homelands and have an ongoing effect on settlers as well. This might be another place to dig into non-Indigenous histories in ways that further understandings of complicities and benefits, but also promote further forms of action, as I discuss below.

[237] There is a caution here, Warburton (2016) notes, in terms of the desires that anarchists sometimes have to influence Indigenous struggles under the auspices of an 'exchange approach,' where anarchists have much to learn about anti-colonialism from Indigenous struggles, but Indigenous struggles have to learn from anarchist critiques of the state. Indigenous resurgence and radical perspectives have already formed these critiques, and have grounded them specifically in their own histories of struggle, which are directly speaking, more concretely contextualized to the lands that anarchists inhabit. There is not an equality of exchange here, and directly speaking, anarchists have much more to learn from Indigenous resurgence, in ways that can disrupt their politics and the 'structures of settlement' within them. This needs to also be a fundamental understanding for how the terms of relationships and complicities are constructed.

politics going forward. It is hard to move forward if we don't have a clear view of where we have been and what can be learned from the past.

Being more direct and upfront has a potentially dual importance of making anarchist politics and perspectives more widely known, and also allowing them to be discussed and developed more openly as well. This can only be a welcome potential for expanding anti-colonial value-practices as part of habitus. As Staudenmaier (2015) argues, reflecting on the history of popular resistance movements across North America, 'people in struggle disagree with each other, and those disagreements can change the world' (p. 9). Disagreement, discussion, and disruption of ideas, in the proximity of one another in the heat of struggle, opens up space for refinement of politics and practices. As the tradition of radical social movement research discussed in Chapter 1 shows, ideas and practices are experimented with, worked out, and remade in the course of struggle, on-the-ground, and by those doing day-to-day organizing work. This is not to say that later theorization, discussion, and debrief isn't important (we need more of this too!), but that isn't the only way that ideas are made and remade. The intimacies generated by struggle and affinity do much of this work, and require greater attention.

These processes of discussion, disagreement, reflection, learning, and refinement bring the scope and possibilities of anarchist value-practices into wider view. They create opportunities for greater expansion and depth, which can be transformative. As I have suggested thus far, this can have an immediate impact on the conscious practices and ways that we view the world, but can also have an ongoing influence on habitus, and the ways that we subconsciously reproduce our politics, values, and practices.

This means offering up analysis and perspective even if it isn't entirely fully formed, and embracing levels of tentativeness and experimentation. As the discussion of rigid radicalism in the previous chapter suggests, there is often a drive to have fully formed, perfect politics, which can limit our ability to be direct about our own nuanced positions, and the things that we are imperfectly wrestling with. This is also likely to maintain already existent politics, those that have capital in anarchist cultures, rather than making spaces for alternatives or greater nuances

that might put into question what we understand as the baseline of our politics, and actually lead to a shift or disruption of habitus.

A more direct articulation of value-practice, politics, and affinities can provide lessons for understandings of solidarity politics more broadly. It asks those in movements who are committed to solidarity and affinity to clearly lay out their own political perspectives and why they believe these connect or resonate with particular communities in struggle. This need not be a one-sided set of declarations, but part of an ongoing dialogue of relationship building and the construction of greater affinities. As Violet argued, as an Indigenous person they have found it easier to build community and accountability with anarchists because political affinities are more directly discussed. Initial possibilities of affinity based on common ground can serve as starting points to expand relations and complicities in the future, and engage them in critique and intentional process of learning and refining. It creates a more solid base for deeper levels of disagreement that can be generative, rather than debilitating.

Expanding Accountabilities

Clarifying and being more direct in our anarchist positions would likely go a long way to further affinities and accountabilities in the present. But it is also important to consider ways of relating in the future as well. Moving from allyship forms of solidarity towards greater complicities—as accomplices or co-conspirators—is one way that anarchists can begin to deepen their understandings, articulations, and practices of relationality towards anti-colonial ends.

In his interview with the authors of *Joyful Militancy*, Indigenous resurgence theorist Glen Coulthard affirms the importance of cultivating positive relationships, but with a caution:

> [The idea of a good relationship] is almost entirely co-opted by relationship-destroying structures that entrench violence, dispossession, disappearance, all these things, where we're always compelled to be productive. It's a compulsion that's insisted on and that is done asymmetrically across certain bodies. So it's a demand that's placed on us as Indigenous peoples, even in terms of having a conversation. (in Montgomery & bergman, 2017, p. 121)

Coulthard advocates for a greater drawing of lines, and commitments to affirm and uphold political values:

> Some relationships are just bullshit and we shouldn't be in them. We should actually draw lines in the sand more willingly, in order to avoid the kind of status quo outcome that's caused by the compulsion to always be in a positive relationship to others. Others might suck. We shouldn't be relating to them; we should be fighting them; we should be seeking to destroy them in some circumstances. Because their whole identity, their whole form of life is predicated on our negation. So that's why, in Canada, Canadians can't cease to exist in the sense that they understand themselves, because it's predicated on a genocidal relationship. And there can be no mutual recognition, there can be no mutual respect, because the relationship itself negates that possibility. And that's a pretty somber situation. It's not a joyful acknowledgement. (in Montgomery & bergman, 2017, p. 121)

Coulthard pointedly names the harsh reality of constructing solidarities and affinities as Indigenous peoples committed to radical forms of resurgence in the context of anti-colonial struggles against genocide—they require drawing stronger lines against those who would hold up the colonial, statist, capitalist status quo, and seeking new forms of relating elsewhere. The struggle, and greater work for anarchists, is to begin to construct these positive, affinity-based, accountable complicities in order to move from forms of relating that may put a drain on Indigenous resurgence movements, and which can still leave structural forms of settlement intact (Warburton, 2021).

Phrased differently, Leanne Simpson frames destructive forms of relating as those which are predicated on extractivism.

> I think when people extract things, they're taking and they're running and they're using it for just their own good. What's missing is the responsibility. If you're not developing relationships with the people, you're not giving back,

> you're not sticking around to see the impact of the extraction. You're moving to someplace else. The alternative is deep reciprocity. It's respect, it's relationship, it's responsibility, and it's local. (Simpson, 2013, cited in Montgomery & bergman, 2017, p. 145)

Simpson notes the importance of intentional and accountable forms of relating, that are tied to being in place and articulating relations within a specific space. A crucial piece, then, for the ongoing development of affinities between anarchist and Indigenous struggles is relationships and orientations towards land and place. I turn to the specific ways that interview participants engaged these issues in the next chapter.

As Craig Fortier (2017) surmises, through their conversations with anti-authoritarians on the complexities of decolonization and its relationship to radical commons discourses:

> Being co-conspirators means organizers from many disparate movements could see their struggles and lives as being intricately linked with those of others through the process of engaging in concrete actions predicated on an understanding of our social positions within the structures of white supremacy, heteropatriarchy, border imperialism, and settler colonialism. … [and] requires attempting to dismantle and challenge dominant systems by whatever means necessary, especially if you benefit from them. (pp. 64–65)

Becoming a co-conspirator suggests both a deeper level of relation and accountability, but also a much more intersectional and ongoing approach. It is not solidarity as abstracted, separate, and often paternalistic allyship wrought through the force of obligation and guilt, but a way to see our own stake in the dismantling of systems of power and violence. This approach carries a prefigurative impulse, to create new forms of relating in the here and now, rather than waiting for 'better' social or political conditions to do so. This is a useful framing to consider more specifically for anarchist engagements with Indigenous struggles, where affinity is the lens through which relationships are conceived.

Similarly, in a now widely distributed and discussed zine 'Accomplices Not Allies,' Indigenous Action (2015) argues that the 'work of an accomplice in anticolonial struggle is to attack colonial structures and ideas' not merely to support whatever Indigenous cause or action (p. 94). The aim is to go beyond and cast off paternalistic, coopting, and appropriative allyship forms of relating. 'Accomplices are realized through mutual consent and build trust. They don't just have our backs; they are at our side, or in their own spaces confronting and unsettling colonialism. As accomplices, we are compelled to become accountable and responsible to each other; that is the nature of trust' (p. 96). Complicity, like the relationship of a co-conspirator within legal frameworks, implies a different set of relationships and accountabilities than allyship.

Moving towards complicity asks anarchists, in this case, to frame our commitments to resistance both in terms of resisting alongside Indigenous struggles, and seeing the ways that we benefit and are harmed by structures and systems like settler colonialism with our own obligations and freedom to be gained from their destruction. It asks how resistance can occur within our own communities as well. Action and resistance that come from our own politics preserves agency and insists 'that the only way you can be accountable is by acting from your own desires while learning to understand and respond to the desires of other groups' (M., 2015, p. 75). This emphasizes the ongoing development of anti-colonial politics within anarchism, and a necessity of maintaining a committed politic.

Clare pointed to a particular sort of anarchist conceptualization of solidarity relationships that goes beyond

> this charity model just to, like, help somebody else or whatever, but, like, wanting to help people and support people … because we see a shared struggle and see our struggle as like intimately connected to those struggles, like it is definitely about others and is about collective things, but also like about us. And we don't see our lives like somehow as separate from that.

Anarchists articulate affinities, but also their own stake within broader struggles, as related to their own politics and political aspirations. The framing of shared struggle is important here, as

it is not strictly about supporting the struggles of someone else, but seeing the ways that we all might be implicated, to move to closer forms of complicity.

The accomplice framing, according to Clare, is 'more engaged' as 'a concept of understanding … how you're conceptualizing yourself and how you're relating to others or like seeing yourself and others. I think that is an apt and valuable distinction.' It suggests a deeper level of consideration, commitment, and positioning in the course of resistance:

> The accomplice thing is more about like supporting a struggle when it falls in line with the type of things that are in line with the world you want to create. And sometimes that might be like pulling back if the struggle takes like another direction. Not necessarily not to support it, but not in the same way. So like, you know, if something goes from a land defense project to something that's purely about trying to get like a new bill to go through the government, it might not be that people are like opposed to that, but might stop taking on an active role of trying to support that struggle when it moves over to that, it's just something like that doesn't make sense for the project that you're working on. It's like nothing bad about that. But not just sort of like following things, whatever. Because there's also like there's so many different opinions and like approaches like within Indigenous communities. There's never going to be like, you know, that one position that you can ally yourself with, or that even like exists. It doesn't.

There is an intentionally prefigurative element to relationships here. Clare illustrates both the dynamic and changing aspects of forms of relating and the reality that there will never be a singular position with which one can be in support of. Positions themselves change and adapt due to alterations in the terrain of struggle, analysis, terms of affinity, strategies, and tactics.

Brian captured the anarchist framework of engaging in collective struggle that illustrates specific desires for going beyond allyship towards greater forms of complicity:

> I think there's more interest in being like "We are comrades in struggle. We see that you are struggling and we see that reflected in our goals. But we actually will struggle where we are at." And I think that definitely anarchist struggle having Indigenous people participating in it, I think is important. I think Indigenous anarchists have incredibly insightful and interesting things to contribute to our conversations around colonialism in Canada. I think that we should struggle and have like a lens and an analysis around colonialism that's like central to the things that we are doing and the ways that we're organizing. But I think that the specific approach of "Solidarity means showing up. Solidarity means directing resources. Solidarity means like supporting all Indigenous people because they're right." And like, "Solidarity means taking a step back and, like, not doing things until you're told" is, like, a pretty debilitating, lacking of autonomy and lacking like an ability to present initiative or take an active role in a struggle.

Being an accomplice and co-conspirator suggests deeper levels of accountability, with deeper forms of commitment, relationality, and trust.

KR framed their relationships as political and deeply personal, where 'Building real trust takes time. And it means eating together. It means hanging out together. It means holding each other, not just in the moments of when we need to be political or we need to organize.'[238] Trust, as Montgomery and bergman argue (2017, p. 132), enables greater forms of complicity, and a deeper capacity and willingness to engage in struggle. It is 'emergent and relational' (p.

[238] I should note that trust is already a pretty fundamental aspect of anarchist cultures, due to the histories of repression, and the need for committed forms of security culture (see Crimethinc, 2004). This is very much a process that is internal to movements, and narrates their internal processes and protocols. It is worth specifying though, following Montgomery and bergman (2017), that trust can also be expanded much more externally, as element of how we conceive of affinities and complicities. The very notion of complicity and accomplices suggests a greater element of trust that occurs across struggles and movements, and therefore is a place to further elaborate how these forms of relating are constructed within anti-colonial frameworks.

279) and informs our capacities for engaging in politics, and expanding affinities. Trust engages deeper forms of relationships, and commitments to accountability that OS raises.

OS reflected at length on the lessons learned from several decades of solidarity work as an anarchist, in particular the frequent frontline blockade support roles that anarchists are involved in:

> I think that what I've seen play out a number of times is things are good until they're hard. And then once things are hard, that's when I often start getting questions from members of Indigenous communities about like, “So what community are you a part of? Who are you accountable to?” ... If something goes wrong or whatever, there are structures in place in the Indigenous community for accountability—flawed, problematic, not always great, sometimes unclear, like whatever—there's all the critiques, but there are in fact some things in place.
>
> If I go in to a community and say, "Yeah, yeah, yeah, I'll organize a fundraiser for you," as an anarchist in Toronto and I organize a fundraiser and then I steal all the money, there's no fucking accountability. Who the fuck do they talk to, like they call the anarchist hotline that doesn't exist?
>
> So one of the things that I've seen over and over again is anarchy in Southern Ontario is not rooted in "a" community, we're across a number of communities and ... there isn't an accountability structure that is transparent and understood and available to the people that we're in solidarity with, which I think perpetuates those communities feeling vulnerable. And like, we can fuck them over and there's nothing they can do about it.

The diffuse nature of anarchism, working from the standpoint of affinity-based, small scale, decentralized, autonomous politics, allows a certain level of flexibility when engaging in solidarity relationships. It also refuses the centralization and hierarchies that often come with larger, more established groups that often lead to increased forms of co-optation and dilution

of radical struggles. These are definite strengths that anarchists carry in terms of forwarding affinity-based forms of politics that also aim to prefigure different ways of doing relationships in the future. But as OS notes, relationships of accountably or feedback are very diffuse as well. The anarchist reluctance towards centralized or even formalized, forms of organization can create issues of accountability in the long term.[239] This speaks to the overall thread in my interviews regarding how we take our political positions as anarchists more seriously, being upfront and intentional in the ways we deploy our politics as we engage in relationships and affinities.

Given the diffuse nature of anarchist communities, and limited points of accountability, OS argues that there is further work to do:

> And so I would like to see us get a lot better about building, creating. And like I guess creating and building are the same thing. But like, I guess I'm sort of like envisioning and then creating and then being really transparent and upfront with what those accountability structures are when we're doing solidarity work. "These are the like 50 people from Guelph that are going to, in rotation, show up to your front line blockade. Here's the 10 people that are never going to go, that are just going to be here and available to deal with conflicts that arise, both internally between the Guelph anarchist community and Tyendinaga" or like fucking whoever it is right.
>
> But yeah, it often doesn't feel fair. I walk into an Indigenous community and I for the most part … I can go to an elder. I can go to the whatever if there is a problem. And [Indigenous communities are] like, "'I don't know. Do I call [so-

[239] By way of a slight aside, this sort of diffuse aspect of anarchist organizing, can be considered in the ways that anarchists oftentimes sign communiques regarding direct action, sabotage, or the articulation of politic analysis: 'some anarchists' or 'anarchists in [city]'. While anonymity has the benefit of limiting aspects of state repression, and giving voice to disruptive perspectives (as I noted above), while upholding anarchist commitments to autonomy and voluntary association, this kind of opaque association very much speaks to the broader critique around accountability voiced here by OS.

> and-so] 'cause she's the first person that introduced me to this other person?" And that, you know, like … It's informal and there is a lack of transparency and accountability. I think that's problematic.

This informal practice of relationship building and solidarity, as OS argued, is a problematic one. But there are ways to alter these practices towards greater forms of accountability and commitment.

While autonomy and decentralization are important hallmarks of anarchist political practice, if taken too far, they may limit the greater forms of accountability demanded of relationships that seek to go beyond mere support and allyship. A lack of formal structures, or perhaps better understood as structures of relating, within anarchism limits the ease at which critique, feedback and overall accountability can be easily passed on or directed. This has the potential for fracturing of relations when conflicts arise, and there are no mechanisms with which to deal with them across affinities and solidarities.

OS was very blunt about this aspect:

> there is a tyranny to the structurelessness[240] of the anarchist community that is hurting all of the Indigenous solidarity work and other causes that we want to do, because no one knows how to get hold of us. No one knows who we are. No one knows how to hold us accountable. No one knows what we've done or what our expertise is like. There's no branding. There's no website. There's no digital strategy ... we have to figure something out. It's too nebulous right now. And I think that that is like impacting our work.

While OS is careful not to suggest a turn towards liberal non-profit structures, the limited means of accountability need to be dealt with. This can, and should, form part of the writing,

[240] OS is referencing the 'tyranny of structurelessness,' a classic critique voiced by Jo Freeman (2002). This is an ongoing debate and tension between more formal structures, and those that seek to preserve anti-authoritarian and non-hierarchical values.

discussion, and reflection that is more intentionally needed within anarchist cultures of resistance, to increase forms of accountability within affinities and solidarities.

A formalization of group structures is perhaps one way forward, but is likely to run into internal anarchist debates around formality, permanence, hierarchy, and centralization. Experimentation regarding prefigurative organizational forms will be required on the part of anarchists to consider which forms can uphold both anarchist value-practices and the demands of conspiratorial complicities within anti-colonial struggle. Anarchists, as I discussed in Chapter 2, reject the preselection of blueprints regarding the future, and work in favour of imagining and experimenting with prefigurative politics in the here and now.

More localized projects like north-shore.info, while still an anonymous counter-information project that publishes regional forms of anarchist analysis and action (publishing and circulating critical, experimental, and even unfinished texts at bookfairs throughout anarchist cultures) could also serve as a more direct basis for explicit forms of exchange, discussion, and critique within a specific area. Such regional anarchist nodes could be places for greater contact between anarchists themselves, as a way to sharpen and better define our theory and practice, as well as a place to publish dialogues and criticism that is more external as well. This is still a mostly anonymous, if not disconnected process, but can leverage the importance that anarchists place on ideas and critique, rather than authoritative figures or writings. Anarchists have a range of cultural meeting points that can help to catalyze some of these moments of greater reflection and political development. This will be essential in terms of constructing the ways we relate and work within/alongside other struggles, and will need to be open to continual change and alteration as the contexts of struggle and relationships change. I consider some of these aspects further in the following chapter.

Becoming accomplices or co-conspirators suggests deepening forms of affinity and struggle. This, at its very root, requires greater levels of intimacy and trust where accountability is more likely to flourish. It requires a direct framing of which relationships and relations are going to be productive and creative of possibilities for greater forms of struggle and resistance. Such forms of relations carry the prospect of deeper levels of discussion, critique, and learning that can

both disrupt, but then expand anarchist value-practices and anti-colonial forms of habitus. Anarchists are already thinking through these complexities and tensions in how they approach anti-colonial work and solidarity, and experimenting with prefigurative forms in the here and now, but there is room to be both more publicly committed in our politics and how we discuss and reflect upon them. This is likely to create more moments of disruption and possibility. Adding clarity regarding who we are actually in support of and why, and forwarding a much more explicit and committed politics, draws clearer lines. Clearer lines indicate what sorts of accountabilities we actually care about and need to more intentionally act on. They also help to bring our own value-practices into sharper view so they can be further developed and expanded in the context of ongoing struggles.

Conclusion

This chapter has considered the ways that anarchists have articulated their orientation to settler colonialism, Indigenous resurgence, and anti-colonial politics through the lens of culture and value-practices. Settler colonialism is not simply a part of generalized opposition to all forms of oppression and domination, but is a foundational part of how anarchists understand the context in which they resist. Affinity is a key value-practice that narrates the ways that anarchists engage with anti-colonialism and Indigenous resurgence and orients the forms and depths of their connections. Affinity prompts a move towards greater forms of complicity and accountability, linked to foregrounding explicit and committed forms of anarchist value-practices in all aspects of struggle and alliances. This provides a necessary basis for expanding anti-colonial commitments, in prefigurative ways, and in ways that might inform and (re)structure anarchist habitus.

The reflections of anarchists committed to such work reveal a series of ongoing tensions that are continually considered and wrestled with around taking direction, leadership, committed forms of politics, and accountability. While a number of these are not new, and mirror more generalized discussions regarding the dynamics of settler-Indigenous solidarity (see, for example, the contributions to Davis, Sinclair, and Denis, 2020), they can find further specific discussion within cultures of anarchism that are intent on developing anti-colonial politics in

more intensive ways. The question of how we stay committed to the values and practices that we hold dear and ground us in our anarchism, while also expanding complicities and accountabilities, is a key area of further development that is needed. The often-times diffuse nature of anarchist organizational forms presents likely difficulties for developing sustained and long-term affinities and relationships, which will be necessary in order to assist in the movement towards the greater prefigurative radical futures I discuss below in Chapter 7.

While far from sorted or resolved, such tensions reveal areas for the ongoing work in developing anarchist anti-colonial politics. Particularly, becoming accomplices and co-conspirators prompts deeper levels of reflection regarding affinities, value-practices, and anti-colonial struggle. Expanding direct engagement, concerted critique, and productive moments of reflection makes space for the productive forms of 'crisis' and disruption that Bourdieu argues can open possibilities for change, development, and renewal of habitus. Circulating more texts, perspectives, and ideas might widen the window of discussion around anti-colonial politics, push back against dominant voices that have accrued capital from maintaining base-line, but also limited, ideas, and lead to greater prefigurative possibilities and more expansive imaginations for the future.

Naming tensions, and seeing the ways that anarchists are working through them on their own terms, provides a means for engaging them more intentionally in the future, and expanding forms of anarchist writing, discussion, and theorization that can move beyond the specific context of Southern Ontario. As my interviewees expressed, there is a crucial task of just bringing these issues and tensions to greater prominence so we can more actively work on them, and expand anarchist anti-colonial politics and forms of action. This chapter brings these tensions to the fore but also shows the ways that anarchists are already working on them, and drawing lessons from their ongoing anti-colonial practices.

In the next chapter, I look at the ways that greater forms of grounding and connection can aid in deepening anarchist value-practices for anti-colonial forms of relationships, the ways that we attend to the context of land as a key aspect of relationships with colonial contexts, and how this aids in prefiguring radical futures. These are reference points that can help to enhance the

anti-colonial content of anarchist habitus. I begin by looking at the ways that anarchists have engaged ideas of spirituality in terms of relationships with Indigenous struggles as well as their own spiritual traditions, and how the more general idea of traditions and embracing 'subaltern knowledges' and histories within anarchism might serve as key reference points to expand our anti-colonial political commitments, productively move through some of the tensions discussed here, and open up greater radical future possibilities.

Chapter 7 – Grounded Normativities and Subaltern Knowledges: Considering Anarchist Prefigurative Possibilities for the Future

The previous two chapters detailed the specific ways that anarchists narrate and define their politics and cultures of resistance and how this influences how they engage with the context of settler colonialism and enact affinities with Indigenous struggles. These 'value-practices' (Jeppesen, 2010) form the central aspects of anarchist culture, and the specific political perspective that persists as habitus. I then noted some of the drawbacks of the ways that anarchist culture is constructed and reproduced. Finally, I explored commitments to resist settler colonialism and articulate affinities with Indigenous struggles that carry potentials for greater forms of anti-colonial politics within anarchism. Such commitments are important points of resistance and action within anarchism, but they are limited, and require greater expansion in both theory and practice in order to actually generate a disruptive anarchist anti-colonialism.

Naming settler colonialism, however foundational, amongst other forms of domination to be opposed, without greater understanding and action, does not expand anti-colonial politics directly, or advance relationships to land and place within the desire to prefigure radical futures. This is the further work to be done. To return to Bourdieu, anti-colonial politics in the context of settler colonialism and Indigenous resistance has yet to form a significant component within wider anarchist habitus, beyond baseline declarations of opposition and generalized solidarity, and greater disruption is needed to deepen anti-colonial politics.

This final chapter extends the discussion on tensions and considers how spirituality, history, relationships to land and place, and prefigurative imaginations for the future interact with anarchist anti-colonialism. I begin with spirituality as a tension that is perhaps even less discussed amongst anarchists, but which intersects directly with Indigenous resurgence politics, given the centrality of Indigenous cosmologies, grounded normativities, and relationships to land. The limited anarchist approach to spirituality is a stumbling block for anarchist affinities with Indigenous struggles, as well as settler anarchist attempts to reorient our own connections to land and the sorts of grounded relationships to land that our ancestors once had. Considering spirituality allows anarchists to begin to think carefully about their own traditions, ancestors, and grounded connections. I argue that anarchist celebrations and traditions around May Day are potent examples to more carefully understand anarchist connections to the past and enact greater anti-colonial politics in the future.

The ways in which anarchists in Southern Ontario are orienting themselves to spirituality, history, and tradition suggest ways that anarchists might reconceive their relationships to land and Indigenous resurgence movements, and inform their relationships to the future. Anarchist orientations to the future emphasize prefigurative politics as a key value-practice that must be (re)considered, given the persistence of settler colonialism and Indigenous resurgence movements. Anarchists can draw strength from our own traditions and practices, as forms of 'subaltern knowledges,' to foster accountability, to land, place, and Indigenous resurgence movements, while refusing appropriation.

I argue for a greater expansion and articulation of committed anarchist anti-colonial politics, and for furthering our accountabilities and complicities with Indigenous resurgence to enact a greater commitment to radical imaginations and futures. Engaging with the tensions discussed above, putting them to work, and fostering wider collective consideration of them can create moments of contention and disruption to reconsider the structure of anarchist value-practices, and generate possibilities for (re)structuring, and transforming habitus. Anarchism holds a great many potentials, it is incumbent on us, as anarchists everywhere, to continue to realize them.

Spirituality, Ancestry, and Tradition

Spirituality is a tension that is intimately connected to relationships and the construction of anti-colonial possibilities. As Indigenous resurgence theorists like Glen Coulthard and Leanne Simpson (2016) argue, Indigenous grounded normativities reflect the 'ethical frameworks' and forms of relating provided by 'Indigenous place-based practices and associated forms of knowledge' (p. 254), firmly rooted in Indigenous worldviews. Any construction of affinities, relationships, and complicities with Indigenous resurgence need to consider and be accountable to these forms of relation. Spirituality prompts consideration of how anarchists can understand our own orientations to Indigenous struggle and the lands we inhabit, but also our relationship to our own traditions, ancestors, and histories.

Spirituality was a tension raised in early interviews, which often receives little discussion within anarchist culture, and prompted more direct discussion in later interviews. Spirituality finds tension between the recurrent atheism of anarchists and the culturally grounded spiritualties of Indigenous perspectives. These differing approaches to spirituality are more likely to be a place of lacking affinity, rather than an easy space to build upon it. The frequently dogmatic or dismissive position of anarchists and anarchism in general results in disagreements that limit the abilities for more pronounced relationships and alliances (see, for example, Sloan Morgan, 2016; Fortier, 2015). Those who discussed spirituality in my interviews, however, tended to adopt a critical view to such anarchist dismissals, and were beginning to consider the implications of such an approach, given the context of settler colonialism and Indigenous resurgence. This is a tension that needs greater unpacking, interrogation, and reformulation within anarchist culture if we are to expand anti-colonial anarchist politics and value-practices further.

Anarchists tend to have a very strong atheist critique of religion that runs from classical anarchism into the present. This is reflective of the hierarchy and authoritarianism within many of the dominant religions, namely hegemonic Christianity. Bakunin's *God and The State* (1916/2009) is one of the foundational works in this regard. He assesses the rise of the state alongside religious forms of domination, where the church and state mutually reinforce power

and domination. Emma Goldman's (1917/1969) summary of anarchism, and opposition to all forms of domination names religion as the first marker of domination: 'Anarchism really stands for the liberation of the human mind from the dominion of religion…' (p. 62).[241] This strong anti-religious sentiment runs through much of classical anarchism but continues into the present as well. The slogan 'No Gods, No Masters' captures this ongoing sentiment.

There have been, however, recent attempts to consider the affinities of anarchism with various religious perspectives, such as Christianity (Christoyannopoulos, 2010), Islam (Abdou, 2022), Daoism (Rapp, 2012), and Judaism (Hayyim, 2023), amongst others.[242] These approaches consider the connections between religious values, ethics, and practices and anarchist value-practices, to develop a specific anarchism (Christian anarchism for example) or to illustrate fruitful points of contact between religious perspectives and anarchist politics without consolidating them a singular position.

I am less interested in the dominant religious strands and how anarchist perspectives could find alliance, resonance, or incorporation into them (this is altogether another discussion that I don't have space for here). Rather, I want to consider how a generalized anarchist rejection of religion and spirituality forecloses opportunities for greater affinities within Indigenous struggles, how it may limit a greater understanding of the dynamics of settler colonization and dispossession, and how such rejections actually limit and marginalize the construction of specific forms of spirituality within anarchism.

Part of the difficulty is the collapsing of spirituality into dominant, authoritarian, and hierarchical forms of religion. While authoritarianism and domination frequently go together within the dominant strands of religion in the Western world, taking such a firm and inflexible view to other expressions of spirituality limits the construction of spiritualties and affinities

---

[241] While I don't have the space to deeply evidence and discuss the overall anarchist outlook on religion and the complexities that come with it, the general thread of rejecting religion holds a firm place within contemporary anarchist theory and practice, even if unconsciously.

[242] For broader considerations of anarchism and religion, see for example the collected contributions to Christoyannopoulos and Adams (2017) and Christoyannopoulos (2009).

outside the dominant forms (Lagalisse, 2011). In contrast to dominant Western religions, Indigenous grounded normativities and cosmologies are fundamental to Indigenous relationships to land and form deep reciprocal and accountable connections between the physical and metaphysical world. They fully inform resurgence politics and resultant oppositions to the state and capitalism, while also resisting domination by hegemonic forms of religion. Leanne Simpson (2011), for example, frames Nishnaabeg forms of storytelling as a central aspect of spirituality and resurgence,[243] as prefigurative, as a 'lens through which we can envision our way out of cognitive imperialism, where we can create models and mirrors where none existed, and where we can experience the spaces of freedom and justice' (p. 33).

Enacting affinities between and across anarchism and other perspectives requires working through this tension around spirituality. Erica Lagalisse (2011) asks 'how a secular worldview compromises anarchist activists' ability to engage in horizontal solidarity across difference' (p. 653). In her examination of solidarity organizing amongst anarchists in Montreal, Lagalisse considers the gendered implications of anarchist anti-colonial solidarity with Indigenous struggles and how such approaches often dismiss Indigenous spiritualties that ground resistance movements. These dismissals limit the deeper possibilities for both solidarity and the imagination of alternatives beyond the state and capitalism. She notes the historical specificity of anarchist forms of secularism and anti-religious sentiment and the adoption of a critique not only of organized forms of religion, but also of the sacred and spirituality more generally (p. 664). In other words, such a rejection has become a feature of anarchist habitus that persists in current movements, and limits forging closer relations with those perspectives that promote a

[243] Simpson argues that Creation stories are the 'theoretical framework' that 'give [Indigenous Peoples] the ontological context from within which we can interpret other stories, teachings and experiences' (p. 32).

'conscious re-enchantment of the world' (p. 664),[244] both within Indigenous spiritual traditions and within anarchism itself (such as pagan traditions[245]).

Lagalisse (2019) further points to the specifically gendered dimensions of anarchist dismissals of spirituality, noting

> It is not simply sexist reading habits that marginalize Indigenous women scholars' work but also the fact that their words, insofar as they draw links between politics and cosmology, are less easily recuperated within the European anarchist tradition, which has already decided that religion is bad, and whose model of oppressive power is the state. (p. 83)

Warburton (2021) highlights a comparable unwillingness by anarchists to engage with Indigenous women's writing in ways that should be transformative. She engages 'Native women's literatures to demonstrate that anarchists can no longer depend on a politics that looks at this place and assumes that there are no politics here; that such politics must be created to envision a world without the state and without capitalism' (p. 25). Indigenous grounded normativities are already enacting radical visions. Warburton's work calls for more intentional engagement of Indigenous perspectives, lifeways, and existences that persist

---

[244] On re-enchantment as a feminist reproductive process of resistance Federici (2019) suggests: 'Can we imagine reconstructing our lives around a communing of our relations with others, including animals, waters, plants, and mountains— which the large-scale construction of robots will certainly destroy? This is the horizon that the discourse and the politics of the commons opens for us today, not the promise of an impossible return to the past but the possibility of recovering the power of collectively deciding our fate on this earth. This is what I call re-enchanting the world' (p. 8). As I have suggested already as well, this notion of the commons (following Fortier, 2017), is also in need of anti-colonial problematization.

[245] As a specific example of this kind of work see the Gods and Radicals website and publishing project, https://abeautifulresistance.org/. Christopher Scott Thompson's (2016) 'What is Pagan Anarchism?' offers the following framework for spirituality: 'If you've never interacted with spirits and you perceive the world in purely mechanical terms, then you may see spirit practices as a form of superstition and an aid to various forms of oppression. If you interact with spirits and perceive the world as being filled with spirits, then you can form relationships with those spirits just as you can with human beings or animals. Pagan practices are simply ways of interacting with the spirits all around us, ways of being in relationship with them. This has political implications' (para. 28).

outside and against capitalism and the state, and which already offer transformative visions of the future.

Fortier (2015) makes a similar argument in their discussion of anti-authoritarian forms of decolonization, highlighting spirituality as a persistent sticking point for many radicals and anarchists, and something that needs more careful consideration when engaging Indigenous movements that foreground sacred relationships and responsibilities to land. In particular, if movements want to mobilize forms of radical imagination and prefigurative orientations to the future, they need to move towards a greater 'understanding and respect for the protocols of relating to the land and territories being shared with them by Indigenous peoples' (p. 324). This requires explicit forms of relationships and a commitment to anti-colonial struggle.

Anarchist perceptions of spirituality were raised in my interviews, both in general, and specifically in relation to anti-colonialism, solidarity, and Indigenous resurgence. Lila was very direct in their assessment of many anarchists' approaches: 'I think that anarchists are very spiritually impoverished.' Lila framed their approach to relationships in general through the lens of humility that prompts a critique of anarchism in general, and anarchist approaches to spirituality:

> I feel like there are many anarchists who their greatest love is politics. And then, like, that has no heart. That has no staying power. That does not sustain you through repression. That does not sustain you through any kind of crisis. It doesn't sustain you through grief. It doesn't sustain you through illness. It's, like, all on the level of intellect and thought. And I think that we are so much stronger and more powerful and more resilient and more fucking ferocious when there's a deeper connection. And I think that we do a pretty good job finding connection with each other. But I think that we would be, like, so much more deeply nourished, so much stronger, if we, you know, engage with spirit, and that can look like so many different things.

While politics will continue to be central to how anarchists articulate value-practices, Lila argues that this has its limitations in terms of 'deeper connection' and relationships. Relationships and relationality are a core aspect of how anarchists can think through culture and their affinities with Indigenous struggles. The emphasis on politics, as implicitly secular and non-religious, comes at the expense of the greater forms of spirituality and relationality that Lagalisse (2011) identifies.

Regarding Indigenous spiritualties, participants generally acknowledged their importance and significance, but suggested that anarchists rarely go further than a surface level of acceptance, or even mere tolerance. Interviewees raised questions of why we should understand Indigenous spiritualties and normativities as different and what that might mean. How does that challenge our own practices/perceptions, ways of engaging relationships, and orientations to the future?

Brian suggested that anarchists haven't quite figured out where Indigenous spirituality 'fits,' despite often acknowledging its importance:

> So my friends practicing Indigenous spirituality and stuff like that, I'm, like, very pro it. I'm happy that helps them in this world. I think it's a little weird to do it in our social gatherings and big things or whatever. I think there is space for it in events like the Anti-Colonial Thanksgiving Dinner or events where it's like centering Indigenous voices, if people want to bring forward their spirituality and [say], like, "this is central shit." … I think when some of the radicals who are traditionalists bring up, like, the Great Law and bring up specific worldviews and conceptions to describe why they engage in struggle and, like, what they want to get out of the world in the long term, I see that as, like, cool.

Anarchists recognize the importance and strength of spiritual grounding in resurgence and land defense struggles specifically, but perhaps haven't quite figured out how it might fit within—or disrupt—anarchism more broadly and allow anarchists to consider their *own* spiritual groundings. Such a process isn't entirely absent, however.

As Brian mentioned, the Anti-Colonial Thanksgiving Dinner in Guelph was a series of events organized with participation from anarchists, beginning in 2005, that created space 'to unlearn colonized ways of seeing each other, ourselves, and the land, and to heal relationships between Native and non-Native people' (Unsettling Guelph, 2019, para. 2). These events hosted a range of speakers from different Indigenous communities, like Six Nations and Tyendinaga, and connected resistance struggles, with the aim of forging new relations between communities, and expand the possibilities for wider anti-colonial and decolonial politics. These spaces of encounter might disrupt anarchist perceptions of spirituality, and its importance for Indigenous resurgence, while also providing new ways of rethinking anarchist forms of spirituality, and wider anti-colonial politics.

Violet again pointed to land as a specific relationship that we are all accountable to, and how there is some recognition by anarchists as to the more spiritual dimensions of resistance within this 'bigger context.' Violet stressed that, being an Indigenous person, their worldview as Anishinaabekwe,

> has to necessarily include settler colonial ideas because this is the society that I'm living in, right. So I've got the experience of like reclaiming my own worldviews and my own thought processes, but also being aware of and being immersed in settler colonial theories and practices.

This gave Violet direct insight into the spiritual dimensions of resistance, in ways that are not yet totally developed amongst anarchists in a broader sense. They suggested that in some ways anarchists are attracted to Indigenous resistance struggles, 'seeking the sort of community that Indigenous peoples have or are seeking to recreate' because they lack their own traditions, given their own (settler) histories of dispossession and loss of relationships to land and spirit.

Lila pointed to the ways that some anarchists, like other settlers, have looked to Indigenous communities, but often in ways that are for their own benefit and spiritual enlightenment, rather than as a process of forming new forms of relationships and complicity:

> And so I see more and more often in people who are engaging with colonization, who are wanting to learn more about Indigenous culture and spirituality, it's just like, "I want that now." And because it's like there is this legacy there, there are these roots that you can trace back. And there's so much power in that. And there's, like, so much potential for healing there. And I feel like as like a settler of Irish, English, and German Mennonite descent there is this kind of, like, cultural, spiritual impoverishment almost. Where it's like, "If I don't identify with the Bible, if I don't identify as a Christian, well, then what's mine?"

Many settlers have lost their own cultural and spiritual connections, in part due to other processes of colonization and dispossession, or moved away from them because of political incompatibilities, and see certain affinities with Indigenous spirituality that they are missing within their own communities and cultures. As Lila observed, 'one of the legacies of settler colonialism is that settlers are almost rootless, that I don't have my own meaningful traditions, I don't have a spiritual inheritance.' As the theoretical work on settler colonization in Chapter 3 indicated, colonial forms of dispossession happened to settlers as well, and continue to impact their forms of relating to land and place.

Violet and Lydia, both coming from perspectives that incorporated their Métis and Anishinaabe Indigenous heritage and elements of anarchism, observed the frequently dismissive anarchist attitude towards spirituality, and argued for the importance of engaging the spiritual from cultural and land-based perspectives. Violet reflected on the ways that Anishinaabe spirituality fundamentally grounds their work:

> I've had folks conflate spirituality with religion and that's been my biggest experience. But then within those close relationships that I have with people, I'm able to kind of have conversations about "why do you protect the land and water, if you don't believe that the land and water has a bigger purpose in our lives than being a resource?" And then one person in particular was like, "Yeah,

> you're right." And I was like, "You know why I don't get burnt out? … Because I love what I do, I love protecting the water and I love protecting the land. Because I know that it also protects me. So I have a relationship with the land and the water."

Relationships are central to Violet's approach to resistance and land defense and provides a basis to challenge others' lack of spiritual grounding:

> In terms of, like, finding a relationship, I don't think that spirituality is necessarily about like, I mean, religion in the sense of how the church is oppressive and violent. I think the same impacts have been had on Indigenous peoples in terms of, like, the church and the state working together, like residential schools for example. So I think that anarchism in that sense needs to, as well, take a look at how Indigenous peoples are certainly facing the same sorts of things, the same sorts of violences of, like, the church in that state, for example, and then to take more time to think about how spirituality and how our connection to the land and how our language and how our ceremonies were targeted by the church and the state. And I think that's essential because if we're looking at why colonialism happened and the reason, there's always a reason.

Violet concludes that there is a potential for engaging spirituality differently within anarchism but it requires specific work:

> I think the majority of anarchists that I've worked with are, like, incredibly intelligent and that if they apply this analysis to spirituality versus religion in the context of Indigenous oppression and genocide that there's a big key right there about understanding what we have in common and that not being generalizing about religion and spirituality and things like that, that there could be maybe more room for talking about utopia, how we're making these strides, where it's creating this space in society.

Engaging spirituality actually opens up greater possibilities for relationships, affinities, and radical futures. Lila expressed a similar sentiment, arguing that 'political theory isn't roots':

> I think that we grow roots, and many of us are rootless because many of us are settlers and don't know very much about our history or the history we do know can be horrifying, like knowing what our ancestors have done can be just really disheartening. And I feel like we need roots for nourishment and strength and resilience. And I think that we get that through, you know, developing rituals and traditions that make sense to us. And like it's about creating meaning, ultimately, in our lives and in our relationships. I do feel sad for us.

Both Violet and Lila considered how anarchist spiritual practices might help to nourish and sustain their day-to-day articulations of politics. Spiritual forms of practice might help in the maintenance of anarchist culture, and in expanding anti-colonial politics as well.

Lydia recalled the ways that anarchists accept the importance of land acknowledgements and Indigenous spiritual openings, as part of land defense work, but also continue to evidence a dismissive or paternalistic attitude in wider solidarity work. Lip-service or tolerance is often given to Indigenous forms of spirituality, but isn't taken seriously as a central grounding for resistance work. Spirituality is tolerated to access the direct action resurgence politics that anarchists are more readily willing to align with. This tacit acceptance is less about intentionally making space and upholding the importance of cultural and spiritual groundings, and more seen as a necessary compromise for engaging in affinity and solidarity.

Lydia framed their Métis grounding in Indigenous spirituality in the following way, which I think can help anarchists to understand how this pushes against dominant and normative understandings of religion and captures key elements of relationality, accountability and critique:

> The best way I've heard it described to me [by a friend] was like, "Well, I would just say that we're like Pantheists or whatever more than anything." You know, monotheism—one god, Polytheism—many, atheism—no god, pantheist is like

> everything is God. And so in that framework I actually think it is like a non-hierarchical thing. And so it's like, I am just as— not only, like, powerful, important, but also accountable and capable to actually do the good things in the world rather than asking God or something like that. And as like anybody else, really any other thing, everything has rights and everything has responsibilities. And that's kind of the way it's framed. And so I don't really see it as being a very hierarchical thing. And I think that, like with anything, those things can be exploited. And I think that like spiritual leaders and communities, whatever, can develop unhealthy patterns of relation. I just don't actually think it has to be that way. And I actually think that when it does end up that way it feels unnatural and not actually in line the teachings.

Lydia noted the dynamic nature of spirituality, as an ongoing set of relationships, but also in terms of how specific individuals, or leaders, engage with it in different ways.

Anarchists could consider what relational, accountable, and radical forms of spirituality could look like from their own perspectives, while refusing appropriation of Indigenous lifeways and attempts at 'settler Indigenization' (Tuck & Yang, 2012) that replay core dynamics of settler colonialism (Veracini, 2010).[246] There is a danger of becoming what Adam Barker (2021) calls 'settler bricoleurs,' who assert 'the power to select, preserve, and recontextualize elements of Indigenous cultures and histories in settler colonial space- including bodies, stories, artwork, names, and terms' and which 'extends to the creation of implicit meaning' (p. 106). There is a necessary vigilance required to ward off implicit re-colonizing desires to translate and remake everything on our own terms. Therefore, it is even more important for anarchists to consider what spirituality might mean in relation to our own histories, politics, and futures, even as we also support Indigenous forms.

---

[246] Tawinikay (2021) takes this topic of appropriation of Indigeneity within radical movements head on. As a further example of settler forms of Indigenization within radical contexts, see Morgensen's (2011) discussion of the Radical Faeries.

For Willow, Lila, KR, and OS, (in addition to Indigenous participants Violet and Lydia) spirituality formed a key component of their anarchist value-practices. But for most participants, while they occasionally referenced the importance of spirituality in terms of working with Indigenous struggles and requiring more careful and intentional anarchist thinking, it didn't shape their individual anarchist politics. While this doesn't definitively indicate a lack of general spiritual connection in anarchism, it's clear that spirituality doesn't form a core component of these anarchists' political and cultural frameworks. Spirituality, as a value-practice, is not so much a component of anarchist habitus; a more cut and dry atheism is typically much more present.

Anarchists do, however, often speak in very general terms of a 'spirit' of anarchism that runs from classical anarchist formations through to the present, which evokes concepts of commitment, faith, ritual, and ongoing practice (see Amster, 2012, pp. 3–5), albeit from a different standpoint. Emma Goldman (1917/1969) explained this 'anarchist spirit' as follows:

> Anarchism, the great leaven of thought, is today permeating every phase of human endeavor. Science, art, literature, the drama, the effort for economic betterment, in fact every individual and social opposition to the existing disorder of things, is illumined by the spiritual light of Anarchism. It is the philosophy of the sovereignty of the individual. It is the theory of social harmony. It is the great, surging, living truth that is reconstructing the world, and that will usher in the Dawn. (p. 67)

Goldman includes recurrent references to 'international spirit,' 'mass spirit,' 'spirit of revolt,' etc. throughout her explanation of anarchism. This is carried forth in similar ways into contemporary writings on anarchism. Cindy Milstein (2012) evokes the complex, messy, and dynamic nature of anarchism and spirit:

> At its core, anarchism is indeed a spirit—one that cries out against all that's wrong with present-day society, and boldly proclaims all that could be right under alternate forms of social organization. It is also precisely the quality of an airy free-spiritedness that gives anarchism its attraction. Anarchism playfully

> travels across the mists of time and space to borrow from the best of human innovations, to give body to the most lofty of ideals. It can be hauntingly beautiful. But it involves a difficulty as well: pinning down this ghostly figure, this "inhabitant of an unseen world," with any definition or substance, much less getting other people to believe in the utopian apparition called anarchism. (p. 11)

These are the impulses, the ways of being, the value-practices, the hopes for the world, and the radical imaginations that animate anarchist activities and evoke a spiritual grounding beyond the material. Spirit, in this sense, is 'a way of organizing and relating that opposes hierarchy and embraces direct democracy' (Sitrin, 2015, p. 84) within anarchism, but also within other horizontal and anti-authoritarian movements the world over, including Indigenous struggles.

As per Lila's discussion above, there is still a fundamental framing of 'spirit' in terms of politics as a primary reference point for anarchists. Anarchists have a general view of 'spirit' as an aspect of value-practices but the greater ramifications and more specific groundings that might come from this idea are less developed. As a result, the discussions with my participants still relate more so to spirituality in terms of connections to Indigenous practices, rather than as something that forms a core practice within anarchist culture itself. This indicates a further tension for anarchists to work on that has a direct impact on anti-colonial practice. Several of the interviewees suggest some possible ways forward.

Willow noted how their anarchism and spirit 'have always been really connected,' linked with nature and natural processes, and the 'magical' elements of their spirituality as a self-identified witch:

> I think that my spirit is alive, knowing that science, magic, like, life force that I feel. Like I wouldn't say that it's some God. It's like, if I have any master, it's the seeds, like, one hundred percent. And I don't think that's bad. I think if you're guided by something, the thing that, like, literally feeds you is not a bad thing. Right? And so for me it seems that I will defend that. … I believe in that feeling.

> I believe in the magic that is life, that is seeds in the soil. So I want to caretake the soil. I want to, like, pay attention to the moon. I want to pay attention to the rain. I want to honour the natural elements that sustain life. And I think that that connects me to this undying and unwavering belief in mutual aid, voluntary association, justice, like all of those things because they're under attack. The very essence of like my life and my spirit is under attack.

They framed the defense of natural processes and life-sustaining elements of the world as the very rationale for resistance against systems of domination and destruction:

> And I think that if I can spend time honoring that, it's, like, less isolating and less sad and like it's like, "Oh, I have a place in things and it's to, like, take care of seeds, it's to take care." And having that as a basis of, like, informing my politic. And my politic informing that, it's a whole cycle. I think to me that's, like, pretty important.

KR made a similar set of connections, using the framework of land and how it is understood in urban vs. rural spaces: 'For me ... when I talk about spirit, I talk about the energy of the land or the universe. But coupled with also science and technology and innovation.' In both urban and rural settings, 'the land is always there' and continues to ground relationships and being in the world.

While some anarchists are likely to rely on theory and politics to ground their day-to-day cultures of resistance, others like Willow point to further forms of relating and connection that inspire action and resistance. In both cases, relationships and connection are at the heart of anarchist cultures, values, and practices. How they are mobilized, interpreted, and imagined, however, is going to be different for different people. This makes the potential for a dynamic and enriching discussion of spirituality and its connection to politics even more interesting.

A dynamic, nuanced, grounded, and personally connected relationship to spirituality has yet to form a core element of anarchist habitus, but offers a starting point for anarchists to generate their own forms of relating and expanded anti-colonial politics. Indigenous spiritualties, rather

than becoming appropriated stand-ins for those lost by settlers, might encourage settlers and anarchists to consider their own relationships to spirituality, land, and the sacred (Fortier, 2015, p. 316). This should be a challenge to our own anarchist practices, rather than a solution to what we might have lost.

As Lagalisse (2019) surmises, regarding the broader literature making explicit connections between spirituality and politics, there is a 'synergistic relationship between spirituality, faith, and radical political movements, whether in present-day Latin America or eighteenth-century Europe, up to and including the nineteenth-century "New Age" movement itself, with which modern anarchism coevolved' that offers potentials for the future (p. 78). Peter Marshall (2009) argues this further:

> We can be spiritual without being a member of an authoritarian sect; religious without joining a hierarchical organisation; moral without obeying religious leaders or laws. We can be at one with God or the universe and at the same time work for the betterment of humanity and the well-being of the earth. We can read sacred texts and listen to the wise and still think, judge and act for ourselves. We can enjoy voluntary poverty, peace, fellowship and forgiveness in the garden of love. In short, we can be deeply spiritual and still profoundly anarchist, one strand enriching and enlarging the other in a widening circle of freedom. (p. xxi)

Spirituality, while likely to still be polarizing and contentious for some anarchists, can further anti-colonial politics and enhance radical forms of relationships and affinities. Re-engaging with spiritualties that consider relationships to land and place might help anarchists recognize 'that while it is important to learn from ancestral spiritual practices, we have a responsibility to re-imagine what a contemporary spirituality looks like given the long-standing traumas and histories that have transformed our relationships with each other, the land, and Indigenous peoples' (Fortier, 2015, p. 325). This is a collective but also deeply personal process. Bringing

greater intention into these practices can help to extend them further and contextualize them into a specifically anti-colonial relational framework.

As I reflected in my conversation with Brian, anarchists can consider

> what are some of those stories that we have, that like, we can use to frame our perceptions of the world and things like that. And maybe a bunch of it is just, like, kind of theory type stuff. But like maybe there are stories from, like, some of our own cultural reference points and like there's histories of struggle ... against the enclosures in Europe that, like, lots of anarchists had some connection to, or things like that.

There are histories and struggles that can inform renewed anarchist approaches to spirituality. Tawinikay (2021) argues that there is an importance in (re)connecting to ancestors for anarchists, but only if it is done outside of relationships of appropriation, power, status seeking, guilt, and shame:

> I believe that we push harder when we fight for our own freedom and existence. I believe we try harder to build community and relationship when we feel rooted in place. I believe that being motivated by a personal connection to and love for the land makes us better anarchists, and gives us the best possibility to create a new world less shitty than the old. I want all of my friends in struggle to find those things, on their own terms, from their own tradition (historic or invented). Let us not forget that all tradition, ceremony, and ritual is created by us to make meaning of the world around us and of our relationships to each other! (p. 29)

Rituals, celebrations and traditions are central to Indigenous forms of relating, but can also inform anarchist forms of connection, relationship, and affinity, and their more intentional construction. To be clear, these will be wholly different sets of relations and traditions that come from anarchist standpoints directly, and refuse the creeping forms of appropriation of

Indigenous practices already mentioned. These practices might also further motivate wider non-Indigenous people and settlers towards greater forms of anti-colonial action.

To disrupt the more atheistic, dismissive, if not appropriative, anarchist approaches to spirituality, we have to take seriously the challenges from Indigenous resurgence approaches to carefully and intentionally consider spiritual practices that have long been underway—and consider our own orientations to culture, tradition, land, and the sacred. Any anarchist habitus that upholds atheism at the expense of other ways of being in the world, and which derives capital by upholding rigid forms of politics, must be problematized. This opens up space to consider further other ways of being, the 'other worlds already here' (Warburton (2021), and other possibilities to (re)imagine relationships to land and the future.

Embracing Anarchist History and Tradition

Anarchists can consider reference points within their own histories and traditions to mobilize their own spiritual connections. In this section, I consider May Day as an example for how anarchists can (re)imagine the ways that they relate to historical events and celebrate their own cultural traditions. These points of reference resonate explicitly with anarchist value-practices, and can reveal other ways of being, and inform habitus in transformative ways. May Day is a potent example given its prominence in anarchist culture as a political reference point, and because of the intersections between struggles that it draws forth. May Day helps to imagine how we can connect anarchist histories and traditions to the present, and then actually start to think about our own spiritual and political groundings that might move us towards deeper forms of transformative anti-colonial politics.

May Day looms large in anarchist history, tradition, celebration, and culture. The original struggle for the eight-hour workday, the intersection with the Haymarket Affair of 1886, and the hanging of the Haymarket Martyrs, continues to be remembered and celebrated by anarchists with regular May Day parades, picnics, marches, and actions. Many of my interviewees had been involved in May Day organizing and referenced t as a key cultural moment in anarchist politics. As I discuss below, and as Warburton (2021) critiques, May Day

also has certain limits in the ways it is often considered within settler colonial contexts. The importance of May Day often persists within wider anarchist habitus at the expense of potential anti-colonial interventions that consider ongoing forms of Indigenous resistance. I argue that re-engaging May Day can serve as a disruption of this tendency to overlook settler colonial contexts and histories of Indigenous struggle, and instead can link together anarchist spiritualties, histories, cultures of resistance, subaltern knowledges, and prefigurative possibilities of the future towards more committed forms of anti-colonial politics. May Day is a touchstone for linkages between current forms of anarchist habitus, and future possibilities of anti-colonial habitus.

For Lila, organizing May Day celebrations was a way to take up greater engagements with anarchist histories, traditions, and spiritualties:

> I think that creating rituals and traditions is important. So, like, May Day is something where I think that that means something. For me the solstices and the equinoxes … I feel like I have my own practices, I have my own things that … have just slowly evolved, some that I've learned from my mom, some that I've been part of creating with people in my life, other friends and witches … you know, New Year's Eve [anti-prison] demos, and I really think it is important to have things through the year that can really build on themselves and build meaning.

Willow made their own specific connections between practices and rituals, pointing to May Day as a specific anarchist moment that connects spirit, place, and politics:

> But I think that a big thing that we're missing is like honoring what it actually is to be alive. And so that's where things like May Day become very exciting for me because I think part of my anarchist politics, is that … capitalism is interrupting our very ability to be alive in play and just live … let alone, like, evolve our ideas into greater capacities. It's interrupting the very essence of life and that will forever be terrifying. And … May Day is like an opportunity to

> meld those worlds, make space for play and honor that play can be resistance. And, like, play comes in because you're, like, you are at the whim of the seasons.

May Day has wide opportunities for considering new forms of relating and being in the world. Lila directly connected May Day to greater ways that anarchist spirituality might be considered:

> I feel like May Day is something that I want to celebrate, as an anarchist and as a witch, as someone who makes a conscious effort to be a little bit more engaged with the rhythms of the earth and the seasons and stuff like that. And it felt kind of cool to be like, this is important to me as an anarchist and as a witch. And that those are two really important parts of my identity and they feel like they really beautifully support and nourish each other. I feel like being an anarchist makes though like somehow just more sense to me. It feels more, somehow, balanced, more grounded. … I've really slowly over the years been like, "How do I also weave my spirituality into this? How do I nourish it and grow a spirituality that isn't based on power and hierarchy and some shitty fucking dude in the clouds being a prick?"

This sort of 'weaving' and 'grounding' suggests an ongoing and dynamic process of connecting anarchist value-practices to other forms of being in the world, and the need for conscious efforts to bring these connections into sharper view. May Day speaks to the larger potentials of celebration and ritual within anarchism, as a means to forge our own relationships with history, culture, and spirituality that can come from the sorts of anarchist gatherings highlighted by Wood (2012) and the broader sites of anarchist culture discussed in Chapter 5.[247]

[247] As the contributors to the zine 'Anarchy in a Small Pond' (613 Anarchy, 2018) contend, rituals around things like May Day have a certain importance and power in smaller cities and towns where there aren't likely to be large, rowdy confrontational demonstrations, but where these smaller events continue to maintain and further create elements of anarchist culture.

Peter Linebaugh's (2016) 'Incomplete, True, Authentic, and Wonderful History of May Day' speaks to some of the potentials of returning to May Day as not just a history of struggles (both red and green, he argues, proletarian and ecological, of both land and freedom) but as a set of interconnections that raise considerations for the present. Linebaugh engages 'history from below' connecting Haymarket and workers struggles to broader processes of dispossession and colonization, theft of lands and bodies, and the creation of capitalism and states.[248] He argues that 'May Day is about affirmation, the love of life, and the start of spring, so it has to be about the beginning of the end of the capitalist system of exploitation, oppression, war, and overall misery, toil, and moil. Besides full affirmation May Day requires denunciation; the denunciation of capitalism, of patriarchy, of homophobia, of white supremacy, of war' (pp. 8–9).

KW May Day (2018) presents a similar framing, linking analysis and resistance of domination and dispossession with broader hopes for the future:

> We see May Day as a space to continue building stronger and more transformative movements. We come from a range of perspectives, experiences and politics and seek to find strength in our diversity. In the face of continued forms of settler-colonial, white supremacist, state, capitalist, and heteropatriarchal violence it is imperative to integrate our modes of resistance. As systems of domination are connected, so too are our movements. We hope that this event will plant seeds for further engagement, discussion and collaboration between our communities.

Further, the 2018 Collective Statement highlights the explicit connections between May Day and struggles against settler colonialism:

---

[248] Ferguson (2022) takes up the work of Linebaugh, amongst others, to further consider what a specifically anarchist approach to writing history from below might look like, offering some important insights and considerations for anyone engaging in social movement theorization and writing. She suggests that 'The answer to the question 'below what?' that is implicitly raised by writing history from below is, in a word, power. Some threshold of power must be identified in order to work out the relations of individuals and groups to that power' (p. 24). Settler colonialism, in this case here, is a field of power that we orient our writing of history, and the possibilities of prefigurative transformation, against.

> Colonization, and the ongoing resistance to it, must be at the forefront of understanding and working within our local context, our desire to strengthen our relations with Indigenous peoples and communities, and how we live out our values and desires for better futures. This asks settlers to consider their place as occupiers and residents on lands that have been stolen but are increasingly being taken back. These are also among the struggles putting forth the most damning critiques of capitalism and reconciliation with the colonial state, and putting alternative futures into practice.

May Day is a lens that can aid in the interpretation and understanding of history, and anarchist linages that can traced, nurtured, and expanded. As a friend of mine once suggested, we might consider our anarchist ancestors, anarchist kin, who perished at both Haymarket and in so many struggles since, as a way to connect directly to the past and help us inform the present. I want to concede that this is a bit of poetic interpretation, not a literal identification of blood relative kin, but perhaps, following Goldman above, an approach to connecting to anarchist spirit.

May Day presents an opportunity to reimagine how we conceive of ancestry, kinship, and relationships, and how such re-imaginaries carry radical potential. May Day, and a broader affinity with anarchist relatives, might be one way to find some of our own (settler) anarchist traditions, in ways that refuse appropriation of Indigenous ones, and reaffirm our own connections to politics and spirit.[249] Seeking our own ancestors in struggle might actually expand our potentials for ongoing forms of political and anti-colonial action as this reorients our attention to history and spiritual forms of relating that can be contextualized to the lands

[249] There is a further potential of appropriation here as well that needs to be considered and attended to, but this is also not just a connection to blood relatives and more generalized histories, which often don't have a specific politics about them. It has become practice to acknowledge our own histories and their connections to settlement as a part of how we orient ourselves on these lands. I did this very thing in the acknowledgements above. But I think there is a further question here of what this does in terms of moving towards radical futures and opportunities. Confessions of this sort do not have an inherently radical politic attached to them. This is where notions of 'chosen kin,' in the form of anarchist/political ancestors, might carry some different potentials that are more inclined to action and resistance, rather than strictly confessions of culpability.

that we currently inhabit (alongside broader processes of constructing affinities, complicities, and accountabilities).

It is crucial, however, that these points of reference and inspiration don't also exclude or neglect criticism of our practices that can move us towards greater forms of anti-colonial politics. As Warburton (2021) argues, we need to contextualize such histories, but also uncover, and then resist, the structures of settlement that persist within them. For example, she discusses the ways that the Haymarket Riot (as the impetus for May Day), and other touchstone events in anarchist history (like Seattle in 1999), are narrated as significant moments of resistance, but exclude Indigenous resistance movements at the time, and since. Warburton highlights how the Haymarket Martyrs are often constructed as 'indigenous,' homegrown anarchist examples in ways that obfuscate the settler colonial context of Indigenous dispossession and the ways that immigrant, second-generation and 'native-born' anarchists are still embedded within settlement relations.[250] Anarchist narratives of transnationalism and migration leave out the ongoing nature of settler colonial dispossession and its associated structures, leaving them intact and maintained within anarchism itself, despite anti-colonial declarations (p. 167). This has profound implications for the ways that anarchists understand place and land (Warburton, 2020), which I turn to below.

Overall, there is room for a greater dynamic conversation within anarchism on how we collectively and culturally understand spirituality and connections to the past, and how these elements can inform anarchist value-practices in the present. This discussion and further development must be firmly placed within the settler colonial context in which we find ourselves. This means considering how holding up anarchist histories can be accountable to, and placed in context with, histories of Indigenous resistance and resurgence. Anarchist histories, spiritualties, and relations don't occur in isolation, and, as Warburton (2020, 2021) illustrates, need to consider intersections with structures of settlement. As my interviewees reflected, spiritualties, traditions, histories, and the broader relationships to other struggles are

[250] As an example of the 'indigenous'/'native' anarchists in America framing, see De Leon (1978).

continually under construction, but need greater discussion and development. The affinities that anarchists have already expressed with Indigenous struggles ought to prompt greater interrogation of our own constructions of culture within anarchism within the explicit context of settler colonialism and ongoing Indigenous resurgence.

Spirituality is one place where there can continue to be greater discussion and imagination on the part of anarchists. We can build out our own traditions and touchstones to further deepen anti-colonial value-practices on our town terms, related to the contexts and histories we inhabit, and towards the prefigurative radical futures that are so desperately needed. These are places to find greater forms of relating and connection, from which further action can spring. They place us into webs of relations that can challenge and disrupt forms of habitus that, while offering baseline forms of opposition, can be (re)oriented towards greater anti-colonial value-practices. A key element of this renewed orientation needs to consider the context of land, place, and then the future, if it is to attend to the structures of settlement raised by those like Warburton (2021).

Connection, Place, and Land

For anarchists to consider other ways of relating to the contexts that they inhabit, there are at least three options moving forward: a) settler forms of cultural appropriation and theft to substitute Indigenous lifeways for their own that are missing, that can progress to what Tuck and Yang (2012) refer to as settler forms of Indigenization; b) a continued dismissive stance to spirituality, in keeping with strands of militant atheism found within some anarchist quarters and popular cultural forms of non-religious practice; or c) asking deeper questions about the nature of relationships between land, peoples, histories, cultures, ancestors and traditions, and building these with humility and intention. Both a) and b) leave forms of habitus that are inattentive to structures of settlement intact, and are likely to maintain forms of capital for those who stay the course and articulate it in theoretically sophisticated ways. The third option, though, carries potential for new forms of relating, new forms of engagement, and new orientations to the future that can challenge habitus and disrupt what is often taken for granted.

Anarchists can begin to take more risks and commit to anti-colonial politics on their own terms and through their own forms of connection. Cultural reference points like May Day can be helpful to (re)construct anarchist traditions and consider the wider adoption of anti-colonial politics. Anarchists need to find ways to discuss and expand anti-colonial politics in committed and intentional ways, place themselves in a greater context of relationality to Indigenous struggles and resurgence and their own cultural contexts, and consider how settler colonialism as a context continues to shape their expressions of resistance and hopes for the future.

Lydia expressed this perspective directly, in a way that touches on the variety of themes I have discussed in this chapter so far:

> Yeah, that's kind of where I'm headed these days … trying to figure out how could settler anarchists find a bigger base of support for themselves on which to talk about those things. So it's like you're not just standing there as an ally and being like, "Indigenous people want this, Indigenous people want that." You're actually standing up there and being like, you know, "This is who I am, this is my place here. This is what I care about. This is a relationship I'm seeking to build. And because I want to build this relationship, I'm taking this action because I feel like this is like the actions that will lead me into better relations with those people." And so it's like taking a lot more responsibility for yourself and not just this like self-flagellating thing of like, "I'm so bad, my ancestors are so bad," but being like "I'm here, I have things I can do now. I'm obviously not going back to Europe. So like, what am I doing right now? And like, what are like concrete actions I can do?" Yeah, but coming from a place of, like, not guilt but of, I don't know, hope, futurity, something like that.

Taking responsibility, moving beyond allyship, and situating oneself are key places for greater anti-colonial work within anarchism. As Lydia continued, this is an ongoing process that requires consistency:

> If you want to build relationships with Indigenous people, you actually have to pick one spot and stay in that spot and commit to it. And I think that that's like, it's an important thing and it's an important thing for building trust. Like, you have to be in contact with those people. Not constant, like, sure you could be friends that'd be great. Like over the years, you have to consistently show up. You can't really show up one time and disappear for three years and show up again.

Lydia and I discussed the sometimes transitory nature of anarchist cultures, where certain cities like Montreal develop a reputation for anarchist activity and culture that draws in anarchists from other locales. While this allows for connection, cross pollination, and sharing between localized anarchist cultures, it can limit ongoing, committed, and accountable relations within a specific context. This points back to the issues of accountability highlighted earlier by OS.

Participants were quick to point out that some anarchists have begun this work already, and this can serve as a crucial reference point for expanding anarchist connections and complicities going forward.[251] Lydia specifically pointed to the anarchist project 'Knowing the Land is Resistance' (KLR) as a useful example. KLR is one of the few explicit, and localized, anarchist projects to engage with the realities of settler colonization, and in particular in the Southern Ontario area:

> We believe that by merging the place-based knowledge of naturalists with the systemic analysis of social justice movements, we can create opportunities to decolonize ourselves and better act in defense of the wild. This means learning to see the ways non-human life engages with the city space, to understand the

[251] Sloan Morgan (2016) also notes that anarchists themselves, in the classical work of Kropotkin and Proudhon, were fundamentally 'struggling for land, albeit in ontologically and culturally varied capacities, in response to capital driven structures' (pp. 178–179), and this is a place to further consider the 'complements between anarchic and anti-colonial thought and praxis' (p. 178). These sorts of previous land relations are a further place for anarchists to dig back into our own histories and cultures to aid in the ways that we approach the present (in addition to some necessary critique as well of the ways that our own histories have also by-passed Indigenous and anti-colonial challenges to land relations as well, see Warburton, 2021).

> ways this land is habitat. It means building a watershed-scale view of the health of the land, in which every piece of land, be it a parking lot or a conservation area, is just as important to the well-being of the whole system. We root our struggle locally, committing to listen to the land we live on and allying with wild spaces as they seek to heal from the carnage of settler occupation. (What Inspires KLR?, n.d.)

KLR presents a push for deeper forms of learning and relating in the spaces and places that we find ourselves, with specifically anti-colonial analysis. They name 'herbalists, midwives, land defenders, Indigenous warriors, and anti-colonial allies' as their sources of inspiration and seek to bring these influences into an anarchist framework of ecology and decolonial relations. Their most well-known zine 'Towards An Anarchist Ecology' (2014) spells out the task at hand:

> We are settlers on this land, raised in cities, rootless, and alienated from the ecosystems we can't help but be part of. But we want to unlearn what we have been taught by the dominant culture, and in the process, we want to re-learn joy, connection, and wonder, while embracing grief and loss in order to heal. We want to decolonize, and to do this, we need to build a new kind of relationship with the land. We want to take steps towards an anarchist ecology, towards a knowledge of the land that is anti-colonial and anti-authoritarian. (p. 3)

Later, they continue: 'In cultivating an anarchist ecology then, we begin by building a real relationship with the land,' one that is not separated between human and natural world, that puts '*trust in the authority of our own experience'* and *'*requires *engagement*, actively seeking to deepen our relationships' (p. 24). They promote intentional and relationship-based forms of engagement, cultivating joy and humility, deep listening and re-enchantment, to 'take time to heal and nourish the connection to the land that we are all born with' but which has been severed for many settlers (KLR, 2014, p. 38). They speak of a 'spirit of enchantment' that might

serve as a way to move back towards spiritual forms of relation and connection that have been lost, and so frequently maligned in many movement spaces.

Overall, KLR provides a number of avenues for anarchist engagements with anti-colonial politics and is a text well worth discussing across a wider basis. As Lydia summarized, these are anarchists who have put a great deal of thought and intention into their anti-colonial practice, and

> who have sought to create their own relationship with this land and then fight from that place so that when they're going to, like, a land defense struggle, they're not going in to 'show up for the Indigenous people who are defending the land and water,' they're, like, going in to stand beside someone who is defending land and water for a different reason than them, but they also have an internal motivation to protect that land because they know it. It's kind of like, if you're going to live here and be in solidarity, like, you actually have to form your own relationship to the land. And I really appreciate that. Like they kind of took, like, an anarchist ecology approach to it. And I thought it was really neat. It's a great project. And I think that is really valuable. So those approaches I like a lot.

KLR suggests how anarchists can engage in anti-colonial struggles to move beyond solidarity as a form of allyship, towards affinity and mutual struggle with an intentional orientation to space and place. My interviewees considered this as a crucial element that needs further consideration as part of anarchist cultures that aim to foreground anti-colonial politics. Lila returns us to the importance of relationships between ourselves and people, communities, political perspectives, cultural forms, spiritualties, and increasingly land and place:

> I think that, and I guess the most, what I feel anarchist culture has going for it is when it's at its best, is when there's that rootedness in relationships. And, like, how we love each other. And there is like kind of a collective strength that comes in that. But I feel that ... to struggle for the land, if you don't have a

> relationship with it, do you know what I mean, it's like the difference between being “Oh, I want there to be water for future generations ... ” I mean, actually, that's a pretty big deal. But if you have no connection, if you don't really know anyone young, if you don't really, like, actually give that much shit about future generations, that's just, like, kind of a thing that you say.

As Willow highlighted earlier, placemaking is one way to directly approach relationships to land and place within anarchist cultures of resistance, and anti-colonial commitments. They framed placemaking as ‘giving you a sense of having a place in the world generally’ that can occur at various levels—from neighbourhood, to city, to landbase. ‘It can be, like, anywhere that you feel at home,’ they stated, and is ‘important because it can really connect and ground in a responsibility to where you are.’ Placemaking requires embedding oneself in particular ecosystems:

> And more important because you're valuing ecosystems you're a part of, you're valuing the fact that, like, oh there's a lot of arbitrary borders. And so what are we saying about the place where we live. And who was here before us, who currently is here, who's been affected by our actions. It can contextualize or give space to language for talking about, like, settler responsibilities.

In Willow’s conception, placemaking connects explicitly to value-practices inherent in anarchism and promotes a greater awareness and commitment to connection and resistance within the context of settler colonialism. It evokes relationships, but also commitments to action.

When I inquired about Willow’s understanding of context, they argued that placemaking takes on a different, but perhaps more imaginative, as well as disruptive connotation:

> Whereas I feel like placemaking is like, “Oh, you're, like, making places here.” It's like … we're active, fully exchanging all the time and interacting in the world. So placemaking is like actually like acknowledging that you are part of making that place. You're not just part of a context.

Anarchists, Willow argued, often engage with placemaking and relationships to place in limited ways:

> [There are] some gaps sometimes there where folks will not value the place where they are. And what I mean by that is [they] glorify and talk dreamily of, like, the more hardcore anarchists in Spain or out there … [which] can be places of inspiration. But I don't think that lends itself to strong anarchist movements, necessarily, because we're not acknowledging and realizing and valuing the place where we actually physically are.

Inspiration and imagination are vitally important, and serve as means to maintain and spread anarchist culture. May Day is one such enduring point of inspiration. But they also need to be grounded and translated into appropriate contexts. Anarchists in Southern Ontario and beyond take inspiration from a range of places, but anarchist cultural forms, images, and points of reference often come from within a narrow framework of European militancy. This recalls Olson's (2009) argument regarding the dominant forms of anarchism within the US context as being either towards 'infoshops' or 'insurrection' rather than concerted opposition to the racial and white supremacist (and colonial) underpinnings of the state. Returning to anarchist histories and struggles that have come before us and exist throughout the world can be inspiration for further action but will always be limited if our own direct context is not explicitly understood and integrated.

Anarchists love and thrive on images of insurrection, rebellion, and contestation. But as Willow noted, this can sometimes detract from struggles that are happening closer to home 'because they don't look glorious, or because sometimes it's easier to be informed of the things that are further away than the things that are really close, in some respects, depending on what's happening in each of our lives.' Anarchists, Will argued, can think further about 'what we can do here in our context with the resources that we have … there's this other part where we can't always be doing it out there.' The possibilities for action can be placed within a specific local context that consider and engage understandings of where we are and why that matters.

There is a need to move toward finding 'that sense of place,' Willow argued, 'that sense of, like, really valuing and respecting and creating for ourselves what anarchism in our lives looks like in our specific place.' May Day is one example of how we might consider how anarchist politics can be locally grounded and intersectional, while also maintaining important connections to history and culture.

Willow highlighted May Day to tie these essential considerations together:

> I think that May Day and events like that are really good opportunities because you are really acknowledging, just going back also to that placemaking. You're really acknowledging the place where you live and you're also, like, connecting it to, like, historical working class history while also—because it also has kind of pagan notions and whatever—connecting it to an earth-based sort of thing. So that lends itself really well to inviting many voices to the table with a platform of resistance, because we're all kind of witnessing the harm that we're all receiving and engaged in under capitalism.

There are affinities and relationships to be built in a shared, though differential, context of resisting structures of settlement and dispossession.

Understanding the processes and structures that condition relationships to land in the present is a necessary starting point for (re)imagining how we relate to context, in ways that can be more widely transformative of value-practices and habitus. Cooper noted directly the ongoing aspects of global dispossession, and dangers of participating in these structures of settlement in damaging ways if we don't attend to their specific operation in our respective contexts:

> all of this takes place on these territories that are continuously in the process of being dispossessed. And not just like first time dispossessed, but like consistently by different people. Right. And … that's something I really realized, even in our struggles for justice, even in our most deep-hearted and righteous struggles for justice, we always follow the risk of redispossessing or recolonizing because the shift towards this territory is done without a

> recognition of the importance of relationality. And so I think that's a real context we're struggling in.

Cooper referenced ongoing forms of primitive accumulation that drive capitalist/colonial dispossession, and the interconnection of these structures with a wide range of struggles, to consider our location on stolen lands. KR took a slightly different approach, and noted the need to 'honour the framework of this territory,' in ways that are 'generational' and specifically connected to place:

> Being born on this land, for me, it's like I feel spiritually connected to this land because of that birth. And so I don't know what that is but I think I recognized somewhere in my mid 20s, like all this pain that I have in my body and all this, whatever I had, I always thought it was just like, "Oh, immigrant experience, racialized, being weird, being queer." And then at some point, when I started to have deeper relationships with Indigenous folks, I realized, "Oh, there's a lot of pain on this land and its people. So some of the pain that I'm feeling is not just my own. It's actually connected to this land." And I think sometimes we can forget that, you know?

KR noted the ways that trauma and pain are themselves intergenerational and are experienced by non-Indigenous and settler peoples as well, though in significantly different ways. As the formulation of primitive accumulation discussed in Chapter 3 makes clear, dispossession is an ongoing aspect of structures of capitalism and colonialism, and its expansion leaves domination, trauma and grief in its wake, most pointedly for Indigenous peoples, but also for all those embedded within settler colonialism.

Lila reflected on the loss of knowledge, traditions, and histories by many settlers as they were forced from their ancestral lands and put into the service of colonization elsewhere. Witch burnings (discussed by Federici [2004] in Chapter 3) were a personal way to understand and relate to dynamics of dispossession and importance of recovering settler forms of knowledge and traditions. Lila oriented reckoning with these histories of violence and trauma through the

lens of grief. And while I don't have the adequate space to delve into the enduring dynamics of intergenerational trauma and grief in a world persistently filled with death and destruction, I do want to make mention of Lila's profound framing of grief and its connection to affinities and relationships:

> Because what is beautiful about heartbreak is when we're so raw and vulnerable and we find connection. And what is so deeply painful about grief and suffering is when we're not able to find people, we're not able to connect. That can be the difference between experiencing something as painful, but ultimately that there can still be nourishment and beauty, versus, like, you wither and die.

We return to relationality, relationships, and affinities as an antidote to broader structures of dispossession and settlement, and their ongoing effects and affects.[252] This means, in a fundamental way, returning to connections and relationships to land. Such decolonization work, Mac argued, requires 'going deeper into a philosophy and an actual study of how we relate to the land. And then how, as part of that, we do or don't relate to the Indigenous people of this land.' Anarchists I interviewed raised relationships to land as a fundamental part of existing in a context of settler colonialism and dispossession, but also a central question for the future.

In a practical sense, Sam considered the implications of buying land and constructing anarchist community in a rural area. They mentioned the obvious colonial implications of engaging in capitalist forms of property relations, but also emphasized that this created a new impetus to consider 'what kind of relationship are we going to have both with, like, the land and the

[252] This feels like a continually potent consideration given the ongoing genocide against the Palestinian people, and the rampant destruction of lives, families, lands, and cultures.

territory around where we're moving and Indigenous people who were from there? And what kinds of shared struggles and communities can we, kind of like, create through that?'[253]

Anna raised similar questions and noted the complicated, if inconsistent, ways that anarchists deal with such a 'conundrum of private property, which is you can't live in capitalism without property' or access to it. Anarchists often default to two approaches in Anna's view—'a lot of us either own land and identify that if we were ever asked, we'd leave. And some of us promise that we'll never own land in order to not be complicit in settler colonialism in that exact way.' Lila questioned further:

> But then like what does it look like to engage in consenting reciprocal relationships where healing can happen? And I do feel like there's a huge fucking debt to be paid. Do you know what I mean? So like I don't want to leave my home. But also, I'm kind of like, I mean, it has to be part of the conversation ... maybe this is someone else's home. So maybe then I need to go somewhere else. But, I feel like most people are not really talking about it in terms of like, "go back to Europe"...'.

The actual implications of working through relationships to land and place are, for many anarchists, not yet 'settled.' And the problem is that many approaches don't actually necessarily lead to a construction of different forms of relations or closer affinities with Indigenous struggles. They opt instead for a wait-and-see approach, which leaves structures of settlement in place for the time being, defers their resolution to some future time, and ultimately does not alter or disrupt anarchist forms of habitus either. Greater discussion and

---

[253] Adamiak (2018) considers some similar colonial implications of rural land ownership and anarchism in her case study of anarchist intentional communities and finds that although there is a 'broad ideological commitment to Indigenous sovereignty' amongst anarchists as they seek to build community, there was little intentional discussion of the implications of such structures of settlement other than with passing regard to the specific land claims process in the area under study (p. 222). Adamiak notes the ways that framing of settler responsibilities and anti-colonial politics are filtered through property concerns (p. 232), rather than say some of the frameworks of affinity, accountability or complicity that I seek to highlight here. Her case study speaks to the general ways that anarchists articulate 'ideological commitments' against settler colonialism, but have yet to further consider the implications of such politics more directly.

theorization is needed to think through the implications of the structures of settlement that we are all bound up in, in ways that might alter the persistent forms of habitus that will otherwise continue.

Despite the difficulties and uncertainties of reconsidering relationships to land and place, Sam's rural anarchist project starts to get at some possible directions, as an 'experiment' that doesn't necessarily have clear roadmaps or outcomes, but which is committed to placing itself as a 'node of resistance' to foster connections between settler anarchist and Indigenous movements, as well as between rural and urban movements. This is very much in tune with the sorts of 'radical experimentation' Adam Barker (2010) advocates, seeking non-dominating forms of resistance and building alliances on 'new understandings of principles, rather than simply strategic commonality or shared interests' (p. 326). Rather than a singular way forward it suggests a multitude of practices, solutions, and possibilities. It mobilizes practice, as a means of concrete action, but also as a disruption that can invite wider dialogues and developments in anarchist approaches.

AM offered the following crucial reflection on the 'modes' of anarchist organizing that suggests a move towards the local and the specific in intentional ways:

> So what I've learned is that as anarchists, don't be fixed in an idea that one mode of organizing means it's more anarchist than another. There are different possibilities of modes. And it's the same thing with decolonization and practices of decolonization. What I mean by that is, in context decolonization could look like more of a lip service in a city here, in some whatever. But an hour away or like closer to another community, decolonization will look something like completely different, right? So you want to be able to take into consideration time, space, context, to be able to apply whatever it is that will achieve the goal of anti-authoritarianism or the goal of anti-hierarchy and the goal of, or the ongoing practice of these things.

This is an important reminder for engaging in projects of experimentation—they will likely not look the same in each context or location, and will likely be very much informed by the specific relationships and connections that are formed there, as well as value-practices. This reinforces the necessity of articulating and expanding affinities, complicities, and relationships with radical forms of Indigenous struggle.

Experimentation can be directly considered in the context of how anarchists envision their own place and prefigurative futures in the context of settler colonial land theft, and the radical possibilities of Indigenous resurgence. Sam pushed for greater attempts to actually conceive of possible radical futures that captures a dynamic of hesitancy and commitment on the part of anarchists, as well as a specific grounding in the sorts of relationships of affinity and complicity that I have been discussing here:

> While it is, you know, full of pitfalls, I think actual, like, attempts to imagine decolonized futures that come from anarchist perspectives, but that are, like, in dialogue with and sensitive to sort of Indigenous perspectives on the same question. I think that that's worthwhile to articulate, like, tentative ideas around how relationships could go and, like, what futures could look like. Not in terms of like creating blueprints. But in terms of giving ourselves goalposts or like compasses to, like, navigate how we move through our day to day lives and actions that we do. I think that those will come from relationships more than they'll come from actions. But I think we should be imaginative and experimental in how we do that. I think that's lacking. And I think people want to, people who are not anarchists but like have anti-colonial politics often want to just say, like, 'Indigenous people are going to decide.' And I think that's such a cop out. I think Indigenous people are not monolithic. There's tons of ideas out there. We're also people, like settlers are people who can have ideas and contribute things to those questions. I think it's more of a, like, we can't control those outcomes. We should not be in control of those outcomes. Or like, impose those outcomes. But like, that would not be anarchist to do anyway.

> Which is why I think resistance to settler colonialism and anarchy are, like, actually compatible.

Sam's discussion captures key themes of my overall work here—from seeking a greater committed anarchist politics around anti-colonialism, to the importance of affinities between Indigenous and anarchist struggle and the centrality of relationships, and the need to do some of the prefigurative 'future work' here and now in grounded and intentional ways. Anarchists are very much interested in the future, as the value-practice of prefiguration makes clear, but how we actually start to wade into such possibilities is often less clear and hasn't been given adequate time and discussion to advance such possibilities in material ways.

AM reflected on the challenges of imagining a decolonized world from an anarchist perspective:

> What are the sketches and possibilities of that? It's a very academic exercise, but it's also, like, you know, literally having that, writing about it, talking about it, writing—I guess we can talk about prefigurative alternatives all we want. But it's not going to be the same when it comes to challenging settler colonialism.

Again, AM names the need for greater intention in terms of how anarchists discuss, exchange, and develop our ideas about the future, but also settler colonialism as the fundamental context that will change how we go about engaging such conversations and their links to prefiguration as a value-practice. Here we can look to the sorts of anarchist theory and practice that I detailed early on in this dissertation, but there is going to be some translation work required, alongside the sorts of affinities, accountabilities, and complicities with Indigenous struggle that figure so prominently. As Cooper presented the task at hand: 'you have to be less about ideological purity and more about recognizing that any solutions we come to will be multiplicitous, will be transformative, will be dynamically changing, will be imperfect, and will always have to contend with other possible ways of organizing society.' Wading into the possibilities of change presents a crucial grounding for how to approach the construction of radical futures here and now, but also has the further effect of potentially altering the very

terms on which we understand anarchism. There is the potential for habitus—and our orientation to anarchism itself—to be altered towards greater anti-colonial possibilities.

Treaty, Wampum, and Radical Autonomies of the Future

As I have argued elsewhere (Lewis, 2015, 2016a, 2016b, 2017),[254] how we seek to imagine alternative worlds through prefigurative value-practices can carry a re/colonizing danger. I considered how movements and struggles positioned around common or autonomous space (like the Occupy movement) are often held up as important and generative prefigurative moments of anarchist value-practices in action, but fail to interrogate and respond directly to the settler colonial contexts and structures within which they occur (see also Warburton, 2021; Sloan Morgan, 2016; Barker, 2012; Grande, 2013; Yee, 2011). I argued that such moments present a caution for radical experimental and imaginative projects going forward, but also suggest a growing potential to directly confront settler colonial realities within anarchism here and now. This re-colonizing danger exists, despite anarchists' generalized opposition to settler colonialism. As I have been arguing here thus far, anarchism is disposed to anti-colonial politics and developing greater sustained affinities and complicities with Indigenous resurgence struggles, as part of habitus, but there is still much work to be done. Anti-colonial value-practices can be deepened and expanded beyond simple integration. My interviews showcase the ways that anarchists are thinking through such problems and realities and suggest ways to more concretely synthesize anti-colonial politics within anarchism and elaborate them further.

The ongoing context of relationships to land and place, considered through treaty relationships, wampum belts, and other imaginaries, suggests possible ways forward for the future. I consider how anarchists relate to the context of treaties (as connected to the state) and how this might

[254] My 2017 book chapter specifically addressed anarchist interventions in geography. As geography deals explicitly with questions of land, space, and territoriality this is a fruitful place that anarchists might draw from in order to inform a specifically land-based anti-colonial politics. Unfortunately, as my review of the literature on anarchist geographies attests, there is little direct discussion of the context of settler colonialism as a core problematic of analysis. I argue, as a result, for a direct and specific turn towards engaging Indigenous critiques of settler colonialism and the possibilities of resurgence in order to destabilize the colonial residues or blindspots that persist within this specific sector of anarchist thought.

influence radical possibilities for the future. I then consider the role of wampum, raised by Indigenous participants in my interviews, as perhaps a more anti-colonial and less state-centric way of conceiving affinities and relationships. Finally, I suggest some possible avenues for considering anarchism and its ongoing relationship to place into the future.

In general, there is a level of suspicion related to treaties on the part of anarchists, represented by those I interviewed, given their association within structures of the state. While the extensive history of treaty-making is beyond my current scope, it is worth noting the role of treaties in the expansion and solidification of settler colonial structures and dispossession.[255] As Peter Kulchyski (2007) argues, treaties and contemporary land claims processes that often spring from them can be understood as a form of 'violence of the letter': 'documents signed in back rooms by judges and negotiators and politicians, carrots on sticks that help construct elite Aboriginal leaders to manage the capital resources of their peoples by tying them to further destruction of their own lands (only now as investors)' (para. 10). Treaties and land claims processes are often maintained as tools of the state and are frequently upheld as key elements of reconciliation/recognition politics and a renewal of relationships with Indigenous peoples (Alfred, 2005, 2008).[256] Sloan Morgan (2016) discusses the use of land claims processes (particularly in British Columbia) to give the state certainty over access to land, and to entrench boundaries and borders at the expense of Indigenous autonomy and resurgence.

In the contemporary era of 'reconciliation,' the phrase 'we are all treaty people' has found currency in a variety of spaces, including within social movements,[257] but lacks nuance regarding the complexities of identity and history within settler colonial contexts (Battell

---

[255] On the complexities of treaty relationships, and their specific connection to generalized settler futures on stolen land, see Asch (2014).

[256] Coulthard (2014) and Simpson (2011, 2017) have put forth a detailed critique of the politics of recognition and reconciliation, as processes that firmly put power back in the hands of the state, and require participation on the terms of the state that leaves it, and associated structures like capitalism, intact. See also Tawinikay (2018).

[257] A deeper interrogation of such terminology reveals some of the complexities around what we understand identity to be within colonial contexts. How, for example, do Black and racialized or refugee peoples fit into a relationship that was originally constructed between settler dominant states and Indigenous nations? What does 'nation-to-nation' mean in the context in which we find ourselves? Further, what does this mean for anarchists? I consider this a bit further below. See also my discussion of identities under settler colonialism in Chapter 3.

Lowman & Barker, 2015, p. 66). As Battell Lowman and Barker note, treaties were often signed under a process of duress and coercion, and are frequently mis/re-interpreted to suit settler colonial aims.[258] They note that to be a 'respectful treaty person' one would have to 'throw out what they think they know about any given treaty and engage with the many potential other meanings beyond the "official" version' (Battell Lowman and Barker, 2015, p. 67).

Often a renewal of a 'nation-to-nation' relationship, taking up some of the original language and intention of some historic treaties, is upheld as a way of moving forward within contemporary settler societies: *If only Canada could relate to Indigenous nations on an equal level.* While such a sentiment captures an element of progress versus the outwardly assimilative aims of state discourses on Indigenous peoples, this falls back into recognition and reconciliation politics that are more about rehabilitating the power of the state vis-à-vis Indigenous challenges, rather than fundamentally altering the structural colonial relationship. Glen Coulthard (2014) argues against 'ushering in an era of peaceful coexistence grounded on the ideal of *reciprocity* or *mutual* recognition' where the 'politics of recognition in its contemporary liberal form promises to reproduce the very configurations of colonialist, racist, patriarchal state power that Indigenous peoples' demands for recognition have historically sought to transcend' (p. 3). Mutual recognition cannot fundamentally exist in a way that would alter the power of the state itself, Coulthard argues. What the state needs is 'land, labour and resources' (p. 40). Drawing from the work of Frantz Fanon, he concludes that 'colonial powers will only recognize the collective rights and identities of Indigenous peoples insofar as this recognition does not throw into question the background legal, political, and economic framework of the colonial relationship itself' (p. 41). As such, reconciliation is a dead-end, and only exists within the framework of the state, not beyond it. There are new permutations of

[258] Importantly, I am specifically speaking of the treaties signed between Indigenous nations, or their representatives, and the colonial crown/state, rather than between different Indigenous nations themselves. This is a fundamentally different set of relations (often closer to the discussion of wampum that I turn to below), and a set of relations that settlers/non-Indigenous peoples ought not to have any say in.

relationships that must necessarily be sought out, especially for those of us, both anarchist and Indigenous, who seek ways of life outside the state.[259]

Lila captured the tensions that my interviewees and other anarchists are considering:

> And so if we as anarchists want to destroy the state, we want to dismantle it, we don't want it to exist, what does that mean in terms of treaties and some of the politics around 'we are all treaty people' or that treaties are potentially one way to reimagine or reinterpret or go back to a different type of relationship between settlers and Indigenous peoples, or newcomers to these lands and the traditional inhabitants? What does that mean for anarchists? Because it feels like a bit unclear and murky and probably we're going to step on a bunch of people's toes. If we're like, 'Well, but fuck Canada, I don't want Canada to exist anymore,' but then what does that mean for Indigenous folks who also have agreements with [Canada] for benefits or land sharing or lands that, like, people were granted, a bunch of lands that they never got? And so if we just do away with the treaties, but then what are we also left with? And what does that mean as a colonial thing?

Anti-state politics are likely to lead to a rejection of the state-mediated forms of relating that Coulthard highlights. This could include treaties or land claims that have been formed and dictated by the state, but which could also have material gains for Indigenous struggles engaging in such processes. Often the settlement of such processes comes in the form of return of land and funds, which place Indigenous nations firmly within the bounds of state-mediated relationships, and capitalist property relations, and which take off the table recognition of Indigenous political rights (Coulthard, 2014). While there are potential material gains to be made (after many decades of drawn-out legal processes), engaging with the state on its own

[259] From a more directly movement perspective, see Tawinikay (2018) for her Indigenous-anarchist critique of reconciliation on similar lines, which also includes a critique of state communist/Marxist traditions that are likely further subsume Indigenous autonomy under their respective centralizing and authoritarian 'alternative' systems.

terms and within its frameworks is likely to be a fraught avenue for advancing radical and anti-colonial politics.

Brian considered that 'getting paid out for treaties' ... is potentially a strategy of crippling the Canadian economy. Or disrupting industry in such a way that capitalism can't function adequately and it forces a crisis situation that leads to a revolutionary situation.' This requires, however, 'popular grassroots support for a new way of living.' and a fundamental change to understand Indigenous autonomy is as counter to the continuance of state forms of governance. Perhaps this is something to leverage against the state, or to extract concessions in the move towards more radical futures. Treaties more so as strategy and tactic, rather than model for relationship.[260]

Despite these general perspectives on treaties, and the overall suspicion of any process that is connected to the state, anarchists have had limited direct engagement with the complexities of land use and land relations within colonial contexts. Interviewees considered some of the ways that anarchists are taking up these kinds of questions, even on their own, or privately, and suggest potential avenues to be pursued more intentionally in the future.

Cooper reframed treaties as a broader framework for considering relationships as a whole that also refuses only conceiving of them in state-centric terms:

> I think actually the principle of the treaty is a really good principle to have to build the type of society that I want to live in, right, which is that, like, you negotiate and ... we don't call it treaty, but you do this in your day-to-day life. If you're with a significant other, or a number of significant others, you create mini treaties every day … about how you want to negotiate your relationship. Otherwise, you don't stay in that relationship ... the relationship breaks down

[260] There is also an analogous case for reparations for slavery in the US, necessarily connected to Indigenous struggles that might be an instructive comparison for future consideration (on this point, see Samudzi and Anderson, 2018, p. 31).

> in some other way because you're not upholding your responsibilities to that treaty. So I want to affirm that.

In Cooper's framing, 'treaty' can be understood as a more general approach to doing relationships, always under constant maintenance and negotiation. It isn't inherently bound to a particular power relationship and has elements of development and change. They pointed to the ways that already negotiated treaties and agreements, like the Two Row Wampum, exist in some sense outside of a rigidly state framework. Signed between the Haudenosaunee Confederacy and Dutch settlers in 1613 and extended to the British in 1664, the Two Row is depicted by two parallel purple lines set across white background that 'symbolize two paths or two vessels, travelling down the same rivers together. One, a birch bark canoe, will be for the Indian people, their laws, their customs and their ways. The other, a ship, will be for the white people and their laws…We shall each travel the river together, side by side, but in our own boat. Neither of us will try and steer the other's vessel' (Mitchell, 1989, pp. 109–10, cited in Day, 2005, p. 194). The relationship is held together through a mutual commitment to peace, respect, friendship, and non-interference. Treaty, in this case, contains possibilities for cooperation and mutual aid that directly move away from dependence on authoritarian state structures, and can prompt anarchists to re-evaluate their own relationships to land and territory (Sloan Morgan, 2016, p. 191). As such, the Two Row presents one possible framework for living together in shared space (with some necessary cautions), and most directly in the context of Southern Ontario where much of the land is covered by this treaty relationship explicitly.

'In terms of the treaties negotiated,' Cooper suggested, engaging with these existing treaty frameworks and questioning their connections to the state opens up some wider potentials:

> We can be discerning about things and we can say, you know, for instance, the Two Row Wampum resulted as ... a treaty offer that was negotiated. That didn't emerge from a state-to-state relationship, but rather emerged because it was a longstanding protocol and way of treating people that the

> Haudenosaunee had already been engaged with and was offered to Europeans. That's really an important lesson to learn, [that], while it was negotiated with settlers it wasn't necessarily negotiated with the state. It was negotiated with the society of people who would come to settle.

There is a different potential that Cooper acknowledged: treaties need not be inherently tied to the state itself, and in many cases, originally weren't. It has been a more recent consolidation of the state 'responsibility' for Indigenous peoples and a centralization of the original specific and contextual relationships. As Barker (2021) argues, these sorts of treaties and wampum agreements, like the Two Row, 'are as much enduring reminders, as they are formalizations of positive, decolonizing relationships,' of potentially alternative and radical forms of relating that move beyond the state, that 'cannot be established without some evidence that both parties can fulfil the agreement, and therefore treaties constitute an enduring call to accountability, a call to do what we said we would do' (p. 44).

This framing points to understanding agreements as wampum, initiated within a specifically Indigenous set of epistemologies and grounded normativities, rather than in the legalistic treaty sense stressed by the state and the courts using comprehensive and specific land claims processes that do not fundamentally critique the establishment of the state or leave room for Indigenous autonomy. Violet drew a sharp distinction between numbered treaties and the sorts of wampum that were created between Indigenous nations, or with which they initiated relationships with settlers:

> So wampum is, I guess you would say the anti-colonial version of treaty, the way that I understand it. Versus treaty that's signed between, you know, a chief who was under duress and the state that had an invested interest in gaining access to all the land. I think that treaties have kind of come to be understood as these things that are deals between the government and Indigenous peoples, when actually it goes way further back. And I think that the biggest way to describe it is wampum and treaty. And I think that that's a good way to

> differentiate because wampum is like an ancestral memory device, like it's not written, it's not on paper. And I think using the materials that has made this wampum, I think speaks huge amounts of difference to how it's represented.

There is a stark distinction to be drawn between those agreements that come firmly from within Indigenous grounded normativities and those that have been manipulated, co-opted, and taken on to serve the state. This approach displaces emphasis on the state itself, while reaffirming the importance of engaging in explicit and intentional relationships with Indigenous resurgence and resistance. Sam framed their perspective as being 'more interested in talking about treaties that are about ... how relationships should be structured as opposed to treaties that are about the delineation of territory along borders.' Treaties, specified in anti-colonial terms as wampum, are being considered by anarchists as possible ways to engage anti-colonial futures and relationships.

One way of moving forward, perhaps, is to re-engage pre-existent forms of relating that have continued outside the dictates of the state. This returns us to the prefigurative, affirmative, and resistant forms of direct action and grounded normativity that Coulthard (2014) highlights as an integral part of contemporary Indigenous resurgence politics. For Benally (2021) '[Indigenous] culture is our prefiguration' (p. 17) with Indigenous teachings, rather than anarchist principles, as the cornerstone of ways forward. Wampum, as a specific form of agreement between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, often initiated and formulated directly by Indigenous nations, is one space to consider ongoing and future forms of relationship and ongoing affinity. It can also be considered given the specific wampum relationships that are already part of the histories of territories and communities.

This is another means for anarchists to engage much more directly with Indigenous grounded normativities and ways of being that can disrupt their immersion within state constructions (even if they oppose them on principle). Indigenous approaches can reframe ideas that might suggest there is only a forward-looking form of prefiguration and instead raises important connections to previous and ongoing ways to exist outside the state. This might prompt

alteration of habitus that nominally affirms anti-colonial opposition but lacks thorough engagement with past/future ways of being that are already persistent outside the state. This approach brings forms of relating and prefigurative desires into a much more specific context.

Violet pointed to the ongoing 'brilliance' of their ancestors and the very intentional ways those ancestors formulated and took up relationships, as encapsulated by wampum agreements:

> Being in tune to this greater spirituality that exists for our people, they understood that this [immigration into Indigenous lands] is something that was kind of irreversible. So that's why they created these treaties. Like, for example, the Dish with One Spoon and the Two Row Wampum, because I think my ancestors knew that this was a dynamic that was just going to grow rather than go away, so they created these structures. And it's really interesting because anarchism is so anti-structure, but this structure was created in order to guide our relationships together. And it's not so much that there's, like, hierarchy to it, but rather that we're doing it together. And I think a future on Turtle Island could be beautiful. But I think ... this will happen after a lot of destruction and after world changes, you know, and until then, it's going to be really messy. And I think it's going to be hard. And I think that there's going to be a lot of undoing.

Violet placed the relationship between Indigenous peoples and anarchists—whom she frames as those most likely to understand the dynamic of land theft and to recognize and honour Indigenous responses as central—within the framework of wampum. Such a relationship requires ongoing, nurturing, and intentional work. Cooper suggested a similar level of commitment:

> Something you need to honour as an organizer and as somebody who wants to see a new society. But at the same time, I don't think we need to be like this is the be-all and end-all. There's no reason why we can't re-engage in relationships and conversations. And people should be doing this.

Again, we return to the themes of humility, learning, commitment, and accountability that I highlighted in the previous chapter. There are potentials here for new/resurgent forms of relationships, but I want to also offer a few cautions as well.

It is crucial to look at the Two Row Wampum, as Violet suggested, in part because this is an agreement that directly narrates the context of land within the Southern Ontario field I have focused on here. The Two Row continues to be an instructive model for understanding autonomy, connection, relationships, and mutual aid in the context of engaging across difference. This remains something that anarchists (and necessarily all settlers) ought to learn about and consider in their own engagements with Indigenous resurgence.

The Two Row Wampum, like other forms of wampum that are distinct from the state orchestrated forms of treaty-making, is a specifically situated and grounded form of Indigenous knowledge and relationality that is tied to a particular place. It is situated in a specific field, as are grounded normativities, and considering them in such a way is likely to present moments where anarchists might feel out of sync with the ways that have previously understood their field. This creates further moments of 'crisis' and disruption that could be leaned into and learned from. It also suggests a decreasing level of potency as the 'effects' of the field, as narrated by the Two Row, start to fade. Removing it from the specific context is likely to limit the degree of accountability that is taken in considering such a relationship framework. So while this might be an appropriate reference point for Southern Ontario and the affinities being cultivated here, extending this as a more generalizable model loses the underlying specifics of context in which such a model for relating originally arose, and, more potently, such abstraction moves away from direct forms of localized accountability, affinity, and relationships that are deeply necessary.

In my previous work (Lewis, 2012, and with Day, 2013) I considered the Two Row as a sort of model for relationships, that could be extended further, as a sort of 'n-row' with infinite permutations of relationship and alignment. While there is a urgent need to consider how affinities and relationships can be structured moving forward, there is perhaps more caution needed when taking up something like the Two Row as a more generalized model, and moving

it outside of the specific context and grounded normativity of where it was conceived. The Two Row is still crucially important as a framework of relations in the context of Southern Ontario (amongst other treaty and wampum histories that need greater explication), but we need to be very careful not to appropriate it externally to other contexts, where the depth of the relationships and connections to land and histories is likely to be lost, and its relationship to the specific field is severed.

Further as Sloan Morgan (2016, pp. 177–178) highlights, citing Coulthard (2015), the context in which the Two Row arose no longer exists, given the development of contemporary state structures and the fundamentally asymmetric relations between settlers and Indigenous peoples, let alone the state. This also needs to be more centrally considered.

Over-generalizing specific treaty and wampum agreements takes the relationship framework out of specific grounded normativities. Anarchists should look to already existent forms of relationship and connection, but need to place them deliberately within the context in which they were conceived and continue to operate. We also need to be wary of appropriating Indigenous forms of knowledge, and culturally specific forms of forging relationships and the deeper implications of what that means, for our own radical purposes. There is a potential here, but also a necessary caution and requirement of accountability.[261]

It is important to consider such a wampum relationship within this specific context, and because of the relevant values-practices of co-operation, mutual aid, respect for autonomy, and possibilities that it still contains. Alongside these pre-existent and ongoing reference points for relationships, anarchists need to be intentional and committed to their own politics and also not shy away from putting forth their own alternatives within a spirit of further developing affinity, relationships, and complicities that echoes the broader theme of committed politics I have highlighted so far. As Lydia argued, there is a tendency to sometimes wait

[261] This also returns us to my discussions above regarding the complexities of accountability and leadership.

> to hear what Indigenous people want that relationship to look like. But then that's also disingenuous because I feel like what happens if Indigenous people come back and you don't say anything about what you want that relationship to look like. And they come back and the voices in their community have been dominated by these liberals and they come back with something that you're like not down with as an anarchist, you know. So it's like it's almost like if you want to imagine that hope is possible for like a new world at some point or like a new relationship or a world without the state, then you kind of have to be part of a conversation now, you can't just like wait until that happens and be like, "Oh, what do you want?" And I think there's still something to be said for like them being like "I want to be in solidarity with you, as Indigenous peoples and this is what I think this could look like, what do you think about it?" or something instead of just asking them to do other work.

There needs to a committed and explicit anarchist anti-colonial politics. Not in a way that seeks to override or subsume Indigenous resurgence and grounded normativity, but which is upfront about how and why we come to engage with such politics as anarchists. This can be done while also tempering any desires for 'certainty' and 'entitlement' to specific lands or specific futures, what Mackey (2016) argues are constituent settler colonial epistemologies which seek to foreclose Indigenous grounded normativities and prefigurative, resurgent possibilities. There is balance to be struck in the ways that we seek to build committed, intentional, radical, and resistant futures.

We can perhaps, then, see these sorts of anti-colonial treaty/wampum possibilities as 'not something to be agreed to and then forgotten about' but always in need of renewal and development, '*done* and done repeatedly. In this sense, treaty is kinetic. Put another way, it is more verb than a noun, more an action than a thing, and is always in the process of becoming' (Sehdev, 2010, p. 112). This notion of treaty as a verb, further highlighted by Mackey (2016), means that such commitments 'must be worked out in specific contexts, accounting for specific histories and trajectories of relationships,' 'tied to the careful nurturing of ongoing relationships

through time. Treaty is a participatory verb' (p. 141).[262] This returns to the importance of relationships, as actualized through the development of affinities, as means to attend to the ongoing and developing understanding of treaty. Such a conception requires constant forms of renewal, rather than only an initial signing or event. Treaty, understood here in a more expansive and intentionally anti-colonial sense, requires such long-term thinking and presents a form of consideration for moving forward. It invites forms of engagement that are likely to lead to transformation of participants in the process (and further possible changes in habitus).

Clare framed this as commitment to 'be a work in progress' where we are

> always acknowledging that we don't have everything figured out and we will mess up and we should always aim to be growing and trying to do things better and learning from where we are. And constantly actually not having this, like, one approach to how we engage with colonialism or think about colonialism, but constantly trying to rework that and integrate that into things we do. ... Rather than it just being like ... similar to the checklist with land recognitions: "OK, it's like you've done this, this and this. Check. That's done." But [instead] trying to always be thinking about that and learning from the things that we do to try and do it better.

Anna, as well, reinforced both a commitment to building our own ways of being in the world, while also explicitly and intentionally engaging Indigenous forms of resurgence.

---

[262] Mackey does note, in between these quoted passages, that sometimes this means that 'Even if you don't like the people you "treaty with," you have a responsibility to keep your word and fulfill your promises' (p. 141). This raises, again, the necessity of accountability, but also, I think, requires that we have specific intention in who we build relationships and complicities with. As participants like Lydia argued very explicitly, anarchists need to clearly articulate their alliances and relationships from a committed place of their own politics, not from a generic, if not liberalizing, position of taking direction from any and all Indigenous people. While Mackey is certainly writing for a perhaps a much more liberalized settler audience here, there is room to push a bit further for settlers/anarchists to commit to owning their own politics, as a means to cultivate both closer and more committed, but also more accountable forms of relationship. It also means that relationships (and therefore the agreements that arise from them) are not, and should not, be eternal and based on some essentialist framework of solidarity. There is a greater work to develop relationships and affinities that I argue is necessary here.

> So I still think that it's valuable to create spaces that are autonomous because arguably, if we meet this ultimate goal of creating something new in the shell of the old, we're gonna have these decentralized communities that can then enforce upholding treaties and Two Row Wampum requirements. If we get rid of a government that we don't want right now, if that's our goal, then we could start negotiating with the Indigenous people who have claim to this land about how to rightfully, like, restore those relationships and those entitlements or those rights. And …by understanding colonization then I think that we can inform those dreams to not be re-creating colonization.

They continued, placing such considerations alongside the realities of treaties:

> I don't really wanna hold my government, which I don't identify as my government, accountable for holding up treaties that I think shouldn't exist because they [government] shouldn't exist. So yeah, it's complicated. But, and this is where I think about the future versus right now is different, too. In the future, we would probably have treaties and it wouldn't be the same thing. We would have agreements about use. And I would like to think that as anarchists, we would find, like, non-hierarchical, autonomous ways of engaging in and sharing space and having agreements about that use of space.

These perspectives, as representative of my interview participants, show that there are anarchists who are considering the material realities of both treaties and relationships in the present, with a specific eye to how this must inform, but also not over-determine, how we might engage with the future. There is a need to cultivate specific and intentional forms of anarchist anti-colonial politics, while also maintaining commitments to relationships, accountabilities, and complicities with radical forms of Indigenous resurgence where we find affinity. We don’t have specific blueprints for the future (and as anarchists we tend to reject them on principle) but there are Indigenous forms of grounded normativity, such as the specific place-based articulations of wampum agreements, that present some possible avenues

forward, to stoke prefigurative affinities in the present. This ongoing process of intentional engagement and affinity-based work can inform anarchist forms of habitus towards greater anti-colonial ends. 'Doing the work,' so to speak, is likely to be both individually and collectively transformative.

Stepping Towards Radical Futures

Anarchists are quite aware of the need for ongoing discussions of anti-colonial politics. They voiced a range of tensions within anarchism that require greater concerted attention. As the term tension suggests, these are yet to be sorted or 'settled' in any definitive way. Tension, dwelling in between, embracing uncertainly, carries its own potentials for radical politics and futures. It creates spaces and openings to (re)imagine value-practices, disrupt rigid and habitual politics, and imagine different ways of being. In this final section, I suggest some possible avenues for deepening anarchism's anti-colonial potentials.

Affinity, complicity, committed politics, and prefigurative experiments are key value-practices that anarchists are engaging for anti-colonial work. They influence how anarchists move through the world, live their politics on a day-to-day basis, and construct cultures of resistance. They are elements structured by anarchist habitus, and working with or disrupting the ongoing points of tension that come with them might lead to necessary shifts and developments. These value-practices also inform anarchist anti-colonial politics and action, and how anarchists are likely to engage questions of the future.

This notion of grounding, as detailed above, is a key framework for Indigenous resurgence. Coulthard and Simpson (2016) argue that grounded normativity is a fundamental aspect of the ways that Indigenous nations connect to the land, structure their cultural frameworks, and then engage in resurgence/resistance work. As I noted above regarding May Day, Willow's discussion of placemaking, and the considerations for anarchist connection to the past, present, and future, there is something to be gained by specifically thinking about the lineages of anarchist value-practices that we draw from. Anarchists often speak of a 'spirit' of anarchism and might engage this idea more directly to think about their own traditions, spiritualties, ancestors, and

connections to politics and place. This is also, perhaps, one way that we can orient ourselves to the construction of radical futures, and their relationship to the context of settler colonialism and ongoing Indigenous resurgence.

In this sense, are there ways to construct anarchist forms of normativity and culture that are intentionally placed within anti-colonial commitments? How can we draw from the past in order to aid in the commitment to our ideas, affinities/relationships, and practices in the present and the future? How can this be placed within critical affinity and co-conspiracy with Indigenous resurgence? As I have illustrated, there are many facets of anarchist anti-colonial politics that are already under way. The need, however, is to take these in more intentional and committed directions, to create moments of disruption, and further expansion of the anti-colonial content of habitus.

Glen Coulthard (2017) makes the specific suggestion that settlers (and by extension, many anarchists), rather than relying strictly on Indigenous alternatives, need to consider their own ways of grounding politics and imaginations. He frames such considerations through the realm of relationships and affinities that need to be actively constructed, nurtured and expanded, much in the ways I examined above:

> I think it's a relationship question. It's a treaty question; not a conventional treaty relationship between Indigenous nations and these big hegemonic institutions of the state and capital but relationships between peoples and communities. These would be relationships that could draw critical insights from each other's practices and traditions but based on relationality and autonomy.[263] (p. 98)

[263] I haven't spoken much about autonomy throughout this work so far. It is one of the key value-practices employed by anarchists, and especially in terms of constructing, and defending, alternatives outside the state (see, for example, Day, 2005). This is also a further point of affinity with Indigenous struggles, and a key value-practice for engaging in relationships. This is perhaps an element that can be more thoroughly examined in future work.

This sort of 'relational autonomy' can draw inspiration, in the particular context of Southern Ontario, from Haudenosaunee frameworks like the Two Row Wampum (Mackey, 2016, p. 167, see also Day & Lewis, 2013). This suggests a need to think of relationships and affinities at a larger regional collective level, not just between individuals or smaller groups, but between larger self-organized and autonomous entities (which has long been a concern and focus for anarchist prefiguration). It is these sorts of relationships and the furthering of affinities, solidarities, and complicities that can pave the way for radical futures that specifically engage and resist the context of settler colonialism, but also forefront Indigenous resurgence. Taiaiake Alfred (2010) speaks of the possible connections between Indigenous grounded normativities and visions of the future and anarchism:

> There are many Indigenous visions for the future of this continent. I can speak of mine. I seek a return of our people to a place of dignity and strength and in repossession of our homelands, governed by our own laws, and recentered as human beings guided by the Original Teachings of our ancestors about how to live in peace together and in relation to the natural environment. As far as anarchists go, if your philosophy can help you to appreciate the justice of this vision and allow you to live humbly as a guest according to Indigenous North American laws, then you are welcome to my continent of the future! (para. 14)

In order to do so, and without falling into patterns of appropriation, Coulthard (2017) points to the breadth of 'subaltern knowledges' that can be used to construct radical forms of non-Indigenous subjectivity and normativity:

> Non-Indigenous people have a lot within their own histories, traditions, and practices that teach a different way, though many need to be modified too. For instance, there is a rich diversity within the anarchist or Marxist traditions. All sorts of subaltern knowledges have been stamped out through the hegemonic processes of neoliberal colonial capitalism. So it becomes important to rebuild those practices, insights, and traditions so that we can come together and meet

> in a relationship, rather than trying to create sameness through the appropriation model, and rather than turning entirely to oneself in the problematic navel-gazing settler-colonial sort of way. (p. 98)

Barker (2021) makes a similar connection, drawing directly from Jack Halberstam's (2011) work on queerness and 'low theory' that can reveal 'subjugated knowledges' which are 'either officially or popularly denied, submerged or supressed' (p. 21). Barker uses this conception to aid in 'exposing subjugated knowledges regarding how to be a non-Indigenous person on Turtle Island in an ethical way' through the lens of failure—failure to see complicities with settler colonialism, and failure to challenge them (p. 23). He argues that settlers need to stop upholding forms of settler colonialism and instead resist them 'without end and without the finality of success' (p. 218) as we pursue the construction of radical alternatives. The construction of alternatives is both a process of experimentation, as I noted earlier, but also never ending, or complete—it is perpetually failing.[264] This can expand anti-colonial politics and affinities with Indigenous resurgence by engaging with the sorts of tensions I have discussed above.

There is a potential here that anarchists can draw from their own subjugated knowledges that are connected to radical histories, spirits, and lineages, as a way to further ground themselves in an expanding committed politics and culture that understands that there is no finality to the work of anti-colonial resistance. This goes beyond the more general settler focus that Barker raises and asks for a deeper form of radical value-practices that can come to bear on anti-colonial resistance.

---

[264] He argues as well that ultimately 'that part of learning to suspend settler futurity is to learn that settlers do not matter to the ultimate success of Indigenous resurgence movements because Indigenous resurgence movements do not and have never needed external salvation' (Barker, 2021, p. 218). Indigenous resurgence stands on its own and should be considered as having a foundational autonomy. That said, as I have been suggesting here, there is a useful role that anarchists and those that share affinities, complicities, and relationships with Indigenous resurgence can play in supporting such struggles as part of our wider political goals and aims. This doesn't mean that we are needed, perhaps, but I want to be wary of feeling like we can be let of the hook in some way as well.

Montgomery and bergman (2017), in their conversation with Coulthard in *Joyful Militancy*, suggest that 'It seems like white settlers are the ones who've allowed their own grounded normativities to be destroyed, or they have been destroyed, at least mostly. And we've been invited to participate in the destruction of Indigenous peoples' grounded normativities' (p. 117). These processes, as I discussed in Chapter 3, are part and parcel of the expansion of capitalism and colonialism through primitive accumulation. Attending to the ways that structures of domination have developed, and how they are connected, provides a background to the ways that dispossession has occurred, for both settler and Indigenous populations, in different ways, with different implications. In any case, there is an element of reclaiming, re-orienting, and fostering resistance and alternatives that can be taken up.

In response, Coulthard (in Montgomery & bergman, 2017) highlights the role of hegemony:

> We're talking about hegemonies. So grounded normativities are being wiped out by a hegemonic system—a system of dominance. So when you say "the problem with settler life is that it's doing this," I would say, in my more generous moments, that the hegemonic settler form of life is destroying Indigenous forms of life, but settlers have a whole host of other grounded normativities that have themselves been violently ruled out of existence. Whether that's radical ecological stuff to anarchist stuff to Marxist stuff—whatever: they're subaltern knowledges and practices. And there are affinities between those that we can map out and explore. There's a lot within non-Indigenous settler traditions that have suffered their own erasure that might be brought back to the fore. And that's way better than the alternative, which is stealing what we've got. So what Foucault would refer to as a resurgence of subaltern knowledges. There's a rich history of overlap and affinities that I think need to be drawn on, and crucial to avoid the violences of cultural appropriation and "becoming Indigenous." (p. 117)

It is to these sorts of subaltern knowledges,[265] repressed traditions, and radical histories that anarchists can intentionally turn in order to ground our own capacities for resistance and relationship.[266] They can inform our value-practices and habitus, and move them towards more directly anti-colonial forms. May Day is one such anarchist moment that carries radical potentials from the past, into the present, and can inform the future through its orientation to dispossession, colonization, anarchist lineages, radical futures, and ongoing connections between struggles. These are grounding moments that we can engage on our own terms, without waiting for permission, correct forms of solidarity, or far-off futures.[267] They nourish our connections to history while also maintaining the anarchist spirit of resistance. May Day is already a key touchstone for anarchists, but it can be considered in more directly anti-colonial terms to add to its already significant cultural and prefigurative inspiration.

Al discussed that we haven't really taken the time to uncover some of these histories of 'instances where members of the settler working class rejected settler colonialism,' to 'draw

---

[265] On the topic of insurrectionary knowledge/power, see Luchies (2015). He argues for a combining of 'an ethics of relevance,' 'anti-oppressive ethics,' and 'prefigurative ethics' within radical social movement research contexts 'to expose and oppose exploitative, oppressive, and hierarchical modes of knowledge production. It is oriented towards collaborative and anti-oppressive forms of knowledge and anti-hierarchical regimes of truth. Social movement research should actively produce concrete and relevant knowledges useful for grass roots struggles for justice' (p. 534).

[266] This is some of the work that Black anarchists and radicals have been taking up as well (and have been as part of the enduring legacy of abolitionist struggle), in such works by Anderson (2021), Salmudzi and Anderson (2018) and Bey (2020). Each of these authors note the subaltern, unruly, and anarchic aspects of Blackness that unsettle and disrupt the colonial state and its technologies of oppression and repression. And have the potential to find affinities and relation with Indigenous struggles as well (on Black-Indigenous affinities see Robyn Maynard and Leanne Simpson's exchanges in *Rehearsals for Living* (2022). While I don't have the space to undertake a fulsome discussion of their work here, this is another area of affinity and relationship that settler anarchists need to consider. Abolition, according to Anderson (2021), must be firmly located in the anarchy of Blackness and its ungovernable nature (p. 38) that undoes and provokes 'ruin' within of the state (p. 160). This is another anarchic politics that has the power to disrupt, and help reimagine, anti-colonial anarchism more generally.

[267] Tariq Khan (2015) specifically discusses the ongoing forms of anarchist anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism that date to the classical period of anarchism, and persist to this day, through the lens of subaltern studies specifically. He discusses Maia Ramnath's (2011) *Decolonizing Anarchism* as a specific reference point for bringing anarchism under the framework of subaltern studies given anti-authoritarian and anti-colonial affinities. While I don't engage this specific aspect of subaltern studies literature here, which is beyond the scope of my present context and discussion, this is a possible avenue for further forms of research. Especially in terms of more broadly understood imperatives for 'decolonizing anarchism' and developing anti-colonialism across wider international contexts.

lessons from it and celebrate it' to give 'potential working models or inspirations to draw on.' Unravelling and sorting through these histories to extract lessons is one way to move forward. Digging into such histories, as I suggested in Chapter 3, can also reveal the forms of working class/settler complicity with the settler colonial project when seeking to escape repression at home (Veracini, 2021), in addition to ways to move away and against it. These structures of settlement were taken in by movements that were nominally left/progressive at 'home' in their attempts to create new alternatives in the lands that they settled. These histories, as Veracini (2021) details, show how radical forms of politics both interact, and act against, structures of settlement. Radical desires are conditioned by the settler colonial context in which they occur, resulting in a settler form of common sense that needs to be critiqued and disrupted to make way for new forms of anti-colonial habitus. They are structured and structuring.

There are prefigurative possibilities that exist in the here and now. As Coulthard argues in *Red Skin White Masks* (2014) decolonization is necessarily a prefigurative project, one that engages intentionally and directly with forms of knowledge that are pre-existent and ever resurgent. Following Estes (2019), Indigenous resistance 'draws from a long history, projecting itself backward and forward in time' (p. 18). Prefiguration, in such a specific sense, is not just 'building a new world in the shell of the old' but a re-examination of persistent, continued and ever-emergent alternatives, the radical imaginations that are always at once under construction and yet never finished. As Benally (2021) frames it, specifically 'dislocating' an Indigenous anarchism, 'Our culture is our prefiguration' (p. 17). Indigenous culture and grounded normativity frame the possibility of affinities between Indigeneity and anarchism that Benally explores, and the terms for constructing alternatives. This must inform anarchist prefigurative anti-colonial politics, even as we consider our own subaltern knowledges, histories, and accountabilities to Indigenous resurgence.

In this sense, Walia (2013) argues, there is a dismantling of structures of colonization while 'prefiguring societies based on equity, mutual aid and self-determination' (p. 249). This is not a new concept, but both a process and a goal that draws from the past and orients towards the future (p. 250). This suggests a necessary anti-colonial expansion of prefiguration, as part of

anarchist habitus, in both theory and practice. Prefiguration, when placed in the structural context of settler colonial dispossession, requires consideration of not just the present/future experiments in living otherwise, but also those that have come before and are coming back.

The beginning of such anti-colonial prefigurative projects, Estes (2019) argues, comes in the form of 'de-linking the community from the settler state,' and actualizing collective, community-based alternatives based in grounded normativities (p. 253). Estes points to the process undertaken during the First Palestinian Intifada, as well as the resistance to the Dakota Access Pipeline at Oceti Sakowin, and across resurgence movements (like Idle No More; see Coulthard, 2014), where the construction of alternatives on community terms, in community contexts becomes front and centre.

Prefiguration looms large in the anarchist imaginary as a key value-practice. But at times our radical imagination has been unduly narrow. To re-contextualize and unsettle dominant forms of anarchist prefigurative politics, there needs to be both a re-engagement with the histories, traditions, subaltern knowledges and grounded normativities that are present within anarchism itself; combined with direct and expanding affinities with Indigenous struggles and practices of resurgence. By re-engaging core anarchist value-practices in relation to the challenges and disruptions of Indigenous resurgence and more direct orientation to the context of settler colonialism, there may be greater opportunities to begin to enliven anarchism in new and productively disruptive ways and fundamentally alter the content of habitus in anti-colonial ways.

In contrast to structures of settlement that justify access to land and settler entitlement within normative and colonial societies and states (Mackey, 2017) and settler-dominated North American anarchist movements: 'Yes, another world is possible. One of the reasons we can even know this, though, even entertain this thought, is because there are other worlds here—if only we would honor them' (Warburton, 2021, p. 206). These are the movements, grounded normativities, and decolonial prefigurative projects foregrounded by Indigenous resurgence practitioners like Coulthard and Simpson—and the very ones that anarchists must look to with active, supportive, affinity-based forms of complicity.

Throughout my interviews, participants recognized the centrality of prefigurative politics for anarchism but questioned why there has been little intentional discussion of the anti-colonial implications of such politics. Al, for example, argued that most iterations of prefigurative politics within anarchism were quite abstract, and needed greater context-specific discussion:

> I don't think we've really explored the extent of how we could prefigure some kind of post-colonial arrangement between settlers and Indigenous folks. Like maybe there's a lot more we could do than what we've been doing. Maybe there's, you know, I don't know, economic relationships, cultural relationships, things that could be integrated much more in the here and now that we haven't thought about, haven't really explored. You know, because a lot of prefiguration or people thinking about lifestyle things like what do I eat, where do I shop.

Al's comments related back to the possibilities, but also the dangers, of overly focusing on lifestyle or cultural politics that I have discussed above. The intimate, every-day, and communal processes are necessary in their own right, as they help to maintain and reproduce movements and value-practices, but there needs to be greater intentional space made for thinking through the specific ways that anarchist prefiguration and anti-colonial politics come together.

My interviews reiterated the anarchist reluctance to put forth blueprints for the future, in part given the variations of context and conditions, but also the changing nature of politics and the desire to uphold value-practices like autonomy and self-determination. This impulse is a good one, and one that can be applied directly to settler colonial contexts where there needs to be some foundational relationship and affinity with Indigenous resurgence. Anna noted the reality of this ongoing tension, and the specific relationship to anarchist value-practices, that recalls Barker's conception of failure above:

> But I think that the tools that we have are a commitment to ongoing revisiting and self-reflection. And a refusal to believe in perfection. I think that we have a lot in anarchist theory that talks about relationship building as the key to

> creating healthy anti-oppressive spaces and communities. So I think, building on that, prefiguration for me feels like a really important theory that, again, like is complicated because it's like, how do you live? How do you live the world you want to see if you don't know what that world is going to look like, because you haven't yet built the relationships with Indigenous people to find out what that world is supposed to look like? ... I guess what I would say is that we have the theoretical tools and I think now we need to think more about how to apply them, those kinds of tools, like prefiguration, more explicitly.

Phrased differently, there is some difficulty in engaging in the future in a speculative fashion, given the number of unknowns and the anti-authoritarian impulse to refuse blueprints and prescriptions. There is a keen awareness of the ways that rigid forms of prescription foreclose radical possibilities, and tend towards a centralizing, if not authoritarian, unaccountable direction. We have tools that can be mobilized to wade into the tensions raised here and transform our approaches.

AM made this limitation with anarchism abundantly clear:

> We haven't been able to provide the language or imaginations as successfully as Marxist movements. And I'm not criticizing anarchists in the sense that it's a failure. It's just that I know in my mind that we can do it. We can envision it, we practice it.' [But] we need to, we have to, do all the critiquing that we do, we need to start doing more radical imagination work. We need to start doing, and prefigurative politics figures into this here as well. We have to start talking about how do we build these movements, or these communities and imaginations. We need to think about that imaginative aspect of it. And that's one thing I liked about anarchism that attracted to me, I love the radical imagination, the possibilities of radical imagination. And this is where I am become sympathetic to the utopian elements of anarchism. And it's like, we can do it, but we have to actively engage and talk about it and whatever. And I

> don't have an answer to all of these questions, obviously, but this is why I still gravitate towards anarchist politics.

There are potentials in anarchist approaches to the future. As Anna stated, we have a variety of tools at our disposal, it is a matter of putting them to appropriate use in the context in which we find ourselves. There is a need for greater spaces of imagination and discussion to bring such tools into practice.

One way forward, as I have suggested (Lewis, 2017), may be an element of delegated autonomy that could come to structure settler/anarchist-Indigenous relations. But this isn't our autonomy to 'give,' let alone 'take' (as some anarchist prefigurative projects desire), and might need to set aside some of our own desires as part of our relationships, affinities, and complicities. Attempts to lay claim to radical futures on stolen lands are likely to replay processes of *terra nullius*, settler colonization, and dispossession all over again (Lewis, 2017; Day, 2010). There is a re-colonizing danger. Even in my previous work that sought to bring to light the limitations of the anarchist prefigurative imagination and practice, I was left with limited proposals for alternatives. This is in part due to the relative absence of discussion across anarchist movements on the subject, and persistence of habitus that limits how we visualize and discuss approaches to the future.

As Barker (2021) argues, there needs to be an element of suspending our claims to 'settler futurity' as part of the process of failure that he outlines (p. 217). These forms of relating both suggest a commitment to support Indigenous resurgence efforts and take responsibility for our own politics and communities. We can, perhaps, engage some elements of construction on our own terms, but always with a specific eye to the ways that these engage directly and explicitly with Indigenous resurgence that is at the forefront. Sophia and Bruno, in particular, raised questions regarding how we might actually do some of that imagination work, and what possible models for the future could look like.

Sophia argued that this raises the question of how 'anarchists think of ourselves':

> [What are the] structures of organization that we see in the future? Like, is there going to be like a larger you know, people talk about federations and like, you know, intersected communities using like things like spokes council models and that kind of stuff, but like scaling it up.

Such a possible framework for the future is prefigured in part by forms of organization already present in value-practices and being refined by anarchists here and now. This is encompassed by the sorts of anarchist cultural constructions and infrastructures highlighted in Chapter 5. These are tools that can be critiqued, put into context, put into new sets of relations, and re-oriented.

AM's response was direct: 'I don't envision blueprints, but if you were to put a gun to my head, what would be that be? It would be multiple communities intertwined.' Sophia attempted to think through the specifics of the Southern Ontario context, but also ended with a number of ongoing questions:

> Maybe Southern Ontario is its own region that has, like, not a government, but some sort of governance, some sort of way of making decisions and coordinating things that need to be coordinated because obviously our society is very complex right now. And obviously the current society is probably not gonna exist the way it does now and just have an anarchist gloss on it. That wouldn't really make sense either I don't think. Yeah, that's the thing I wonder about is like, yeah, like, what could anarchists do within the bounds of this kind of, like, nation-to-nation relationship? And I guess what does it mean to want to be an anarchist who wants to build, you know, a different future society on stolen land? Like, what does that even look like and what [do] the relationships look like in there?

Relationships, again, are a constituent part of the ways that anarchists engage the future and prefiguration. Sophia's suggestion that 'there's maybe like an affinity there that would allow for cooperation with like Indigenous nations and anarchist federations' shows a certain attention

to the necessity of engaging in relation with Indigenous resurgence efforts, and even possibly engaging in experiments of mutual construction.

Bruno added yet another layer of considerations to the conversation: 'To what degree do we recognize somebody else's authority as anarchists? Because it's very hard for us to do. And I think that's actually one of the least or the hardest to reconcile—the least reconcilable part of being an "*anarchist*."' This gets back to the tensions discussed previously regarding leadership and relationships and accountabilities. How we structure our alliance politics matters and requires very explicit lines of connection.

Bruno then returned to the context of settler colonialism understood by anarchists discussed in Chapter 6 'as the most important thing that defines where we live. Even if it's not defining at the time, at the present time, individual interactions with people, you know, if we recognize this, it still needs to define like where we live and how we relate to that land.' But just because this is necessary, as I have discussed above, just because it might be a key aspect of our political analysis, that it structures our visions and practices isn't guaranteed. It might be part of individual approaches, but doesn't inherently resonate at the more collective level of habitus:

> And for most of us, it doesn't mean anything. Because we live in a theoretical settler— ... like we live in a settler colonial state, but we have these theoretical relationships to land, right, that we don't have to actually deal with day to day. Except all we have to care about, most of us, right now is the state that we pay taxes to or follow the rules of, to live on the land we live on. If in the future that changes, if it changes the way we want it to change, what does that mean? (Bruno)

The practicalities, and the immediacy of engaging such questions of the future, and grounding them within the settler colonial structures that are all around us (but differentially felt depending on our respective subject positions), remains a difficult starting point for moving forward. This contrasts with Indigenous grounded normativities that fundamentally consider questions of colonization, resistance, and resurgent possibilities on an ongoing and inherent

basis. This is, in part, why I argued early on for anarchists to engage directly with the body of theory around settler colonialism. This helps us better understand such structures, how they operate, and how they also become engrained in our own political work and habitus.[268] The work of discussing and analyzing for the future requires both integration of structural analysis and a greater development of the politics of affinity and relationships. These are dual areas (with many of their own respective moving parts and tensions) that lie as a crucial anti-colonial anarchist task moving forward.

Clare argued that, as anarchists, 'it is important for us to talk about ... the future to try to vision, like what we want or how we should orient ourselves. Otherwise it's hard to come up with any strategy of what you're doing now.' Conversations that get stuck in 'the day-to-day, respond[ing] to every crisis' are 'a bit of a dead end' and leave little room to consider the future:

> I've been thinking about the importance of those conversations and thinking them through. I haven't come to any answers. But that's definitely something that I've been having conversations with lots of friends, sort of the question of like the future and trying to, wanting to think bigger and try to have the things we do oriented more to specific things and not just like, you know, looking like tomorrow or the next week. But what does five years from now, 10 years from now. If you're going to be an anarchist for life and you're going to always do this, how can we think about that in a way that uses our time and efforts a bit better?

[268] There is an interesting element here that might warrant some future consideration. Anarchists do not have a common sense approach to the state and capitalism as structures that persist. Quite the opposite, as our opposition is direct and specific. However, such structures also still structure our day-to-day activities, as well as our frameworks for what is possible or desirable. We know we don't want the state, and that we want to prefigure something different, but we don't always have easy reference points for such imagining. May Day might be one such place to expand our imagination work, but at the same time there is little engagement with the persistent and ongoing Indigenous imaginations as well. So while anarchists intentionally reject state structures we aren't necessarily exempt from the similar ways that Indigenous alternatives are also sometimes dismissed or downplayed.

This echoes some of the provocations by Cindy Milstein (2022) to 'try anarchism for life' as a way to more intentionally orient ourselves towards the prefigurative moments that can begin to enact such a future. '*For life*' denotes a 'sacred obligation' towards better forms of relationship with all aspects of life, and '*try*' 'meaning to strive for wins such as upsurges of social solidarity, times-spaces of self-governance, and all other ephemeral yet joyous moments of everyday anarchism; meaning always, as both duty and pleasure, as (and for) life, to try, try, try again' (p. 6). Milstein notes the transformative aspects of anarchism, but also a need for greater commitments to more intentionally imagine and practice radical futures. There is an intentional experimental aspect here. 'For life' further suggests a personal commitment to anarchism, as well as a deep integration into habitus, as a way of structuring how we see the world and orient to the future. To this level of anarchist commitment, we might add an anti-colonial element, as I have been arguing here, for anti-colonial value-practices as a lifetime commitment within habitus.

Milstein (2022) provocatively asks 'Why, by and large, have we anarchists lost the art of storytelling?' and questions the implications that this has had on our ability to imagine alternative futures. 'Our anarchist ancestors … used to be so much better at finding a balance between the urge to critique and destroy *and* the urge to be visionary and create, which I'd contend is what makes anarchism so otherworldly marvelous' (p. 8). The depth of anarchist imagination was vast, and Milstein questions how we can return to this level of commitment to anarchism and the future—for anarchism as a part of life. Milstein's book presents a vision, a walking experiment in writing and anarchist culture, a commitment to movement, a series of poetic anarchist wanderings. Anarchism, in this sense, is a 'journey': 'It is the process of continually striving toward that place called *freedom,* vigilantly yet valiantly, by acting as if we're already there, and perpetually widening our understandings of what that "destination" could and should look like' (p. 5). This engagement with the everyday and cultural aspects of anarchism asks anarchists to more concretely commit to these processes of imagination and 'wandering' towards the future and link them with similar commitments to anti-colonial politics.

There is space to more fruitfully consider the intersections and possibilities of anarchist approaches to spirituality, history, ancestry, subaltern knowledge, and subjectivity. Each of these aspects exist in tension within anarchism, and in relation to value-practices and persistent forms of habitus, but also in relation to Indigenous resurgence and grounded normativities. May Day, an enduring anarchist 'moment,' is one point of intersection that can serve as an example of how we can more intentionally engage these aspects, and also put them more concretely towards the service of anti-colonial politics.

Towards Greater Dialogues and Imaginations

How do anarchists engage the necessity of expanding discussion that has been highlighted throughout this dissertation work? This has been an ongoing thread throughout my interviews with anarchists: We need to be in continual development of our anti-colonial theory and practice. This can be enhanced through greater dialogue and discussion across our movements, which can in turn influence the ways that we construct and define our value-practices and their influence on habitus. The evolution of our ideas, as Willow argued, comes from giving ourselves greater space to work on them, together:

> I feel like there's space to evolve these ideas. And I think in order to evolve these ideas we need to actually give ourselves time and space to reflect, talk about these ideas, and reflect on the state of the world. ... I feel like in days past it was like people would just do that sort of shit and, like, slow down and take time to observe and reflect. … I kind of want to get back to the business of being dangerous. Right. And I think that that is a confusing place because I want our ideas to be dangerous again in a way that's, like, effective. And I don't even know what— what does that even mean? I want to carve out space so that we can all have a more beautiful world and a beautiful life. And that's like, for me, a big part of anarchism, is that, like, "Shit, like the world is not just and a lot of people don't get to access beauty and basic needs because they can't access basic needs under this shit show." And I think that anarchist ideas

> remain important and remain exciting. And also there is some stuckness and this ready to evolve with the times that needs to adapt. But I think not just adapt, but I mean like continue to evolve.

Willow named both the potentials, commitments, and hurdles to be overcome: 'What goes deeper? What are we doing to deepen this struggle? Sometimes that seems hard to even bridge that conversation because it's like ... "we're barely starting any of this. There's so much baseline shit to do."' So the question is how we tend to the 'baseline shit,' which I think returns to the ongoing feeling of needing to respond to the crises of the world, while also maintaining the little slices of alternative culture that precariously exist and can generate opportunities for expanded politics and habitus. The fleeting nature of anarchist cultural infrastructures, and continual investment of resources just to keep such nodes of culture alive, speaks to this element of precarity. This means, though, that it feels like there is precious little time for going further, for the sort of deepening that Willow speaks of, which is crucially necessary.

OS named crisis, not just of the world, but within movements themselves as a key limiter of the potential for greater forms of discussion and imagination:

> I think one of the experiences that we hear reflected over and over again from different marginalized communities is that because of the oppression that they face, it is difficult to get together to have the bigger term conversations when they're constantly in crisis. And I would argue that *anarchists are pretty regularly in crisis*. I wouldn't argue that we are oppressed in the same way that other marginalized communities are. But like we have been in crisis after crisis after crisis of house arrest and the like and arrests and home raids and jail sentences and, like, the state works very hard to continue to keep us in crisis trauma mode. And like, that's super fucking real. And when someone's in trauma mode and then someone isn't healing—like actual neurological healing—from that trauma, how do we have those bigger, longer-term conversations?

This is necessary internal work to still be done within anarchist cultures. How we build such cultures, and our own internal processes of trust, accountability, care, and support are likely to have a specific bearing on our ability to engage in relationships beyond our closer scenes.

This echoes some of the conclusions of Haiven and Khasnabish (2014) in their discussion of the radical imagination. Through their research they seek to 'convoke' forms of radical imagination towards 'common imaginary landscapes' that are continually evolving and developing, rather than static. These convocations require 'careful consideration of the local circumstance, to create something novel: new zones of dialogue and debate, new forms of imagination and creativity' (pp. 67–68). This is an 'aspirational' push to bring 'possible futures "back" to work on the present, to inspire action and new forms of solidarity today' (p. 3). Through such processes of movement reproduction, they push for a shift from 'making space' to confront various forms of oppression (which mirrors liberal forms of inclusion without substantive structural change) towards 'making time.' Not as in 'finding time' but rather a commitment to reflect that:

> the work of anti-oppression, if it is to be effective, must take up time, must preoccupy movements that might believe they have "more important" work to attend to. It is precisely in the capacity of anti-oppression to impose, to delay and to make us impatient, that its transformative power lies. Making time for anti-oppression would mean an inherent understanding that this time is, in actuality, endless. (p. 191)

This framing can be specified to the structures of settlement and settler colonialism both within anarchist movements and as a subject of their prefigurative opposition and engagements with habitus. Such structures require eternal vigilance and ongoing resistance, and their dynamics may never be totally and entirely overcome. The question before us is how we can begin to more intentionally 'make time' as a constituent part of anarchist culture to further develop anarchist politics and value-practices. 'Making time' can reflect on the lessons from political practice, break through elements that have become unquestioned and routine, and lead to transformations of habitus.

Anna phrased this process of reflection and as a

> question of where we rest and where we stop and where we push harder. So I like that you're asking this question of like, “do we have a settler anarchist decolonizing theory or like, settler theory?” Because we don't. And maybe this is a piece where it's not okay for us to just be like “Ahhhh, it's fine. We'll just figure it out.” Like, maybe we actually need to put something on paper and deal with the aftermath. But at least have something to discuss.

Making time and enhancing a committed anti-colonial politics requires thinking through, sorting out, and putting forth ideas that provoke greater discussion, engagement and development:

> I think it's like this evolving theory that each of us carr[ies]. … It's like if we have a written engagement about it, then maybe we can go a bit further with it. Because I think these conversations are really great and really useful. But they are fragmented. (Anna)

Reflective of the broader sentiment of my interviewees, Anna promotes a desire to wade into the tensions at hand and details the ongoing theory work that is already underway. Anarchists engage with the realities of settler colonialism as part of habitus, but tend toward more individual, rather than collective approaches. By putting ideas out there, in more intentional ways, we can ‘make time’ to work on them collectively in more committed ways.

Further, both Brian and Lydia argued that anarchists need to engage possibilities for the future on their own terms, not waiting only to be told what to do by Indigenous communities, but to consider and commit to their own perspectives as part of an ongoing dialogue of relation. As Brian argued,

> When it comes to anarchist theory, or ways in which anarchists can engage with anti-colonial movements and Indigenous communities in revolt, I think that, like, our best bet is to have that analysis important to the work that we're doing. I think it is reaching out and engaging in real ways with Indigenous

> people, Indigenous people in struggle and Indigenous people in our communities. I think it's actually being more hesitant than we currently are about giving up our own autonomy and choosing how we act and when to act and you know, choosing struggles where we can struggle alongside people without necessarily giving up all of our autonomy to engage.

We can continue to be 'uncompromising in our rejection of the Canadian state,' according to Sam, in order to forward anarchist politics, but also to reject and attack a liberal politic that has no good answers to the ongoing structures of colonialism.

Anarchist spaces of culture can be critical sites of this ongoing work, through physical spaces for sharing ideas and hosting events, the networks/print cultures that distribute and spread writings and analysis, and more temporary and fleeting spaces of connection like bookfairs and May Day celebrations. These spaces are part of how we bring our values into explicit practice, how we survive in the present, how we move beyond dwelling in crisis towards greater practices of imagination and expand our collective capacities for prefigurative potentials of how to live differently. These are essential places for the greater discussion of anti-colonial possibilities.

Brian summarized this necessity as follows:

> I want people to be writing more things. I want there to be more materials at bookfairs and stuff like that. Either addressing this issue and putting forward, like, solidarity and analysis that centers like colonialism and the big fucking trap in like resource extraction capital in Canada. And I would really like to see, like, specifically people pushing this politic that is like asserting their autonomy. And us as actors and us as agents and us as, like, change-makers as settlers. And I think that, like, anybody's kind of big, big, big worldview or, you know, utopic visions or like manuals for how we're going to change into an anti-colonial state, I welcome that speculative fiction.

This notion of speculative fiction connects well to the sentiments of radical imagination—that there should be spaces to dream and imagine beyond the confines of dominant hegemonic society, and they can be cultivated through the expansion of anarchists own autonomy, all the while connected to movements for Indigenous resurgence.

Such cultural spaces and networks can also serve as a means of greater exchange amongst anarchists, not just in narrower localized contexts. These spaces of exchange can, Sam argued, collectivize ideas and approaches from a wider range of perspectives:

> Creating those conversations among people who live in similar contexts, I think would help us come up with more ideas. Because we don't have to come up with everything ourselves. Anarchism is, like, an imported idea. And it can be like retooled to like this context, I think. But yeah, I think there's, like, I don't hear much from, like, anarchists in Australia and South Africa and, you know, places like that. But I think that would be like an interesting project, a worthwhile project.

Spreading relationships and connections is a means to foment wider imagination and possibility. There are practical lessons, experiences, and experiments that can be considered from other contexts and translated and reformulated to reflect the more specific conditions here, in Southern Ontario. Broader processes of exchange, however, are required to make this happen. Overall, the already established infrastructures of anarchist culture can be used towards such ends. They can be places to further our collective understandings and experience of anarchist history, tradition, ritual, and grounded normativity. Anarchists themselves need to take more initiative, to actualize anti-colonial politics not just in theory, but more concretely in practice.

Theory is a helpful guide, and specific attention to anarchist analysis of settler colonialism and its relationship to other structures of domination, including structures of settlement within anarchism itself, is essential. But as OS argued, not every is going to read this analysis:

> look, lots of good shit comes out of theory. But like we said, how many people are going to read the theory? What's actually missing is spaces for, like whether it is toolkits or conversations, but like real life practical applications. “So you want to be an anarchist and you know, you're a settler and that's fucked up. What do you do? Like here's a bunch of things you're facing right now.” What are the conversations around that? What does that look like?

There are moments of ‘making time’ that need to be created by anarchists, for anarchists, to work on value-practices and anti-colonial commitments. ‘Employing an anarchic anti-colonial perspective, one critically attuned to the Eurocentric tendencies to co-opt and deductively view Indigenous stands for Nationhood,’ Sloan Morgan (2016) argues, ‘presents exciting opportunities to engage more deeply with state- and capital-sanctioned institutions’ and move towards more radical futures (pp. 197–8). Resistance to settler colonialism dwells within anarchist habitus as part of our committed baseline of opposition and value-practices, and as individual expressions and understandings, but must be collectivized further. Creating moments for habitus to be disrupted, altered, and remade in ways that might deepen the anti-colonial content of anarchism needs to move from both overly general theory and overly individual practice, towards collective value-practice. As anarchist commitments to prefigurative politics make clear, theory is only a guide that can help us bring the possibilities of practice into being. There is further work to be done.

Conclusion

Anarchists have many important reference points that can help to inform the ways we approach the future. It remains that we need more intentional and dedicated time and space, outside of regular forms of organizing and the maintenance of cultures of resistance, to more actively engage these possibilities going forward. Relationships loom large regarding practices of prefiguration and the future. Anarchists can lean into such relationships more, deepening affinities and complicities, and also assuaging some of our misgivings about building future visions on our own. Building relationships and deepening affinities can ensure that such future constructions will not be our blueprints or formulations alone, and will instead be forged in the

process of collective struggle, affinity, and complicity. These engagements put our own habitus and inherited ideas into question, and might lead to alteration, development, and possibilities we have yet to realize.

This final chapter has considered some of the specific ways that anarchists have oriented themselves towards radical futures on stolen land, and the essential work that is still to be done. I began with anarchist tensions around spirituality to highlight another aspect that needs more careful consideration by anarchists, but which also takes us into a more direct conversation regarding anarchist cultural and movement connections to history, tradition, land, and the future. Spirituality, with May Day as a specific anarchist reference point for history, ancestors, and wider possibilities, is a window to connect to the pressing need for greater anarchist engagements with Indigenous resurgence, and suggests starting points for anarchists to more intentionally unearth and draw connections to their own subaltern knowledges and politics. This provides both a further basis to construct relationships and affinities, to further anarchist value-practices, and to consider prefigurative future possibilities.

As my interviews show, in contrast to the limited aspects of such anti-colonial engagement within anarchist theory and writing, those within movements are beginning, in their own limited and incomplete ways, to engage the tensions that come along with understanding and opposing settler colonialism as a structure, developing relationships and affinities with Indigenous struggles, and seeking their own groundings with which to construct prefigurative cultures of resistance.

There is a fundamental baseline of anti-colonial politics within anarchist habitus, which might be disrupted, critiqued, and expanded as a result of more committed engagements with the context of settler colonialism, challenges from Indigenous resurgence perspectives and complicities, critical (re)orientations to our own anarchist histories and value-practices, and 'making time' to work on and work through the significant tensions I have discussed here. Habitus is not ours to fully or completely comprehend or create, but it might be altered through the ways we change the relationships we engage in, the ideas we prioritize, and the practices we continue to refine. The context of Southern Ontario anarchist culture shows that anarchists

are keen to discuss the issues at hand but need more outlets and reference points from which we can record, distribute, and expand such discussions. Anarchist cultural spaces are a means to ‘make time’ to develop our approaches even further, with greater intention, and greater potential.

Conclusion: Spaces of Possibility, Spaces of Potential

"Organize! Here's the rest of our lives! A tiny spark still deep inside…"

—Chumbawamba

This dissertation has covered a number of tensions related to the ways that affinities and solidarities between anarchism and Indigenous resistance have been framed and articulated. I argue that the ways that anarchists have understood these dynamics and tensions at the level of movement, action, and culture point to important ways to frame, and then extend, such considerations into anarchism in a broader sense. Theory that comes from the lived experience of anarchist practice provides a richness that can inform broader writing and discussion on the complexities of engaging in anti-colonial action within the context of settler colonialism.

There is a baseline acknowledgement of the importance of anti-colonial politics, resistance to settler colonialism, and support for Indigenous resurgence struggles within a more generalized anarchist habitus that holds resistance to all forms of oppression and domination as a key value-practice. This is important as a starting point, but also insufficient when brought to specific contexts of resistance. Anarchist approaches to anti-colonial politics need to be more widely understood, critiqued, and worked on in intentional ways. My interviews reveal the practical ways that anarchists are working with and through these tensions and questions.

My research shows that anarchists in the context of Southern Ontario are aware of the complexities of the anti-colonial work that they engage in and are keen to learn from, deliberate on, and expand such work. They called repeatedly for more, and more collective, dialogue and discussion on such issues, so they may be published, considered, and then worked on further within the context of anarchist movement and culture. Social movement research engages these conversations directly, to do some of this writing, synthesizing, and expanding work as a complement to movement process that are already under way. I offer my work here towards these goals, in the spirit of more expansive collective dialogue.

I have covered a lot of ground here, engaging bodies of work from anarchism, settler colonial studies, Pierre Bourdieu, Indigenous resurgence, and social movement research, to aid in the discussion of anarchist forms of anti-colonial politics. Each contributes to understanding how contemporary anarchist value-practices engage with the context of ongoing forms of settler colonialism and Indigenous resurgence, and what we can learn from the practical movement expressions of these politics.

I employed the work of Pierre Bourdieu as a useful theoretical and analytical perspective to help understand why certain forms of politics and practices persist and are resistant to change. Bourdieu's theorization of habitus, capital, and field helps social movements to understand the interaction between context, resources, movement participants, and ideas. Habitus, in the context of both the settler colonial field of power and the field of Southern Ontario, shows why a baseline opposition to oppression and domination within anarchism has continued to be a core value-practice. Bourdieu's work helps us to understand why settler colonialism, and general anti-colonial politics, have rarely gone beyond such a general baseline opposition. As a structuring structure, habitus maintains and reproduces the 'dispositions' of agents within a specific cultural context, and shapes why we do things the way we do in unconscious and persistent ways. Without disruptions or moments of crisis, ways of doing and thinking about the world maintain their course.

For anarchists, this occurs in the context of movement cultures, in specific times and places. There is no one anarchist habitus, but multiple, although a core set of value-practices continue to contribute to what 'anarchist' politics mean. Movement cultures reproduce themselves and enculturate those within them, as well as newcomers. They continue a commitment of opposition against all forms of oppression and domination, but also limit the adoption or expansion of 'new' ideas. Turning to individual anarchists engaged in a range of anti-colonial value-practices opens space for (re)thinking how anarchist anti-colonialism is understood within culture.

Using interviews, through the lens of ongoing reflective and prefigurative practice, starts to access some of the everyday aspects of anarchist culture and value-practices. My interviews

show the ways that anarchists are thinking about anarchist culture, anti-colonial politics, and connections with Indigenous resurgence struggles in complex and reflective ways. Anarchists forefront action and practice, but also reflect on expanding the value-practices that they bring to the world. They show a continuing commitment to live anarchist politics, whether in wider movement struggles, or within their own spaces of anarchist culture. I have taken up this process of reflection and prefiguration myself, through the ongoing construction of this dissertation.

Interview participants highlighted a need for expanded forms of discussion, theorizing, writing, and reflection by anarchists on questions of anti-colonial theory and practice. There is space to deepen what anti-colonialism means, and requires, within anarchism. By 'making time' to learn from past struggles, to sit with tensions and challenges, anti-colonialism as a key anarchist value-practice might be expanded. This, in turn, is likely to alter the terms on which anarchists engage with realities of colonialism and resurgence, and how anti-colonial politics are communicated within anarchist cultures. As anti-colonial value-practices deepen and become more widespread, the practices of anarchists are likely to alter the structures of habitus and the ways that anarchist value-practices are reproduced. This, in turn, further structures the cultures of anarchism itself.

There is room to expand anarchism's anti-colonial commitments, and anarchists themselves are keen to engage this work, even if we may not have ready solutions to the sorts of tensions I have raised here. The point is that there is an ongoing commitment to prefigurative practice that can move us forward.

There are practical considerations for this. How can anarchists catalyze these kinds of deeper engagement going forward? Anarchist cultural infrastructures are likely to be a key piece here, as spaces that maintain and transmit anarchist value-practices and habitus, and serve as spaces of encounter for anarchists, and for new and emerging ideas. More events, discussions, talks, provocations, and publications can circulate through anarchist cultural space as a means for collectively engaging anti-colonial value-practices in more intentional ways. There is potential in inward-facing conversations that can get at the heart and messiness of how anarchists

approach the sorts of tensions I have raised here, but also in wider forms of cultural communication and the ways that we seek to extend anarchist politics outward. This creates further moments for engaging the connections between anarchist value-practices and opposition to all forms of oppression and domination. We can consider how we want to conceptualize anti-colonialism within the more general communication of anarchist perspectives on the world, and the strengths and weaknesses that come with this. We can reflect, learn, critique, and reimagine our approaches to the world, and the effectiveness of committed forms of struggle and practice.

Anarchism is a window to how we might imagine both another world and other ways of being in the current one. Placing these transformative potentials in the context of settler colonialism and ongoing Indigenous resurgence constructs a committed, grounded, and prefigurative set of possibilities for anarchists in Southern Ontario—and creates possibilities for deepening anti-colonial value-practices and habitus.

There is room for renewed focus on the key themes I have raised throughout, to consider their practical manifestations and possibilities going forward. Affinity, solidarity, complicity, spirituality, ancestry, kinship, connections between struggles, prefigurative aspirations, and radical imaginaries are at the forefront of anarchist thinking and can guide our ongoing approaches going into the future. There is much to be done here. My work raises a number of these themes, and the ways that anarchists in Southern Ontario are thinking about them, and while this is admittedly a very small segment of the wider approaches of anarchists, how smaller and more diverse scenes, cultures, and communities are engaging this work has a wide-ranging richness that can contribute to these ongoing conversations.

But anarchism is only one perspective among many that might share a wider anti-authoritarian, anti-capitalist, and anti-colonial impulse. How might we further consider the intersections between these perspectives? What might they offer one another? How do they challenge and provoke anarchism in productive ways?

The context of this study is quite specific, which allowed for a focused glimpse of anarchist culture and practice within a specific field. Southern Ontario is an important site for considering anti-colonial forms of anarchism given the prevalence of Indigenous land reclamation and resurgence struggles, and wider movement solidarity with them. There continue to be active forms of Indigenous resistance and anarchist support for such work directly. Even so, there are other locales that might offer additional glimpses into anti-colonial anarchist value-practices.

Land defense and reclamation struggles in unceded 'British Columbia' at Fairy Creek and Wet'suwet'un, to highlight two prominent examples, offer additional moments where anarchists are involved in solidarity and complicity with Indigenous struggle. Indigenous resurgence continues to be an important force of opposition to state and capitalist extractivism across the whole of 'canada' and broader North America. These sites are further places where value-practices, and the lessons from their application, might be more widely considered. The wider North American context can be considered, both through smaller case studies of more localized fields, as well as wider comparative studies (like those of Fortier, 2015, or Dixon, 2014). Anti-colonial value-practices continue to be developed, remade, and expanded through the day-to-day practices of anarchists, and present a committed process of ongoing work and possibility.

As some interviewees noted, there are also ongoing forms of anti-colonial struggle in more distant locations as well, such as Australia, Aotearoa/New Zealand, and within the context of Palestinian solidarity and liberation struggles against Israeli settler colonialism. These are places that bring forth a much-needed internationalist view to questions of anti-colonial politics, and further specify the operation of settler colonial forms of power. They also consider widespread 'small-a' forms of practice that defy more explicit anarchist labels. There is space to draw connections and learn from struggles that might carry similar anti-authoritarian value-practices, but also bring forth their own unique and specific modes of theory and practice. The wider horizontalist movements in South America, for example, are one place where further connections to resurgence and anti-colonial resistance might be drawn.

I have also noted some wider intersections with Blackness and abolitionist struggles. These continue to be ground-breaking and significant forces of opposition to state violence, and efforts to bring into being radical re-imaginations of the world. Intersections, connections, disruptions, and challenges from Black struggle deserve significant attention going forward, especially in terms of their own articulated connections and complicities with Indigenous resurgence.

There is also work to be done to consider how anarchists are bringing value-practices to the more general struggles that many of them participate on an ongoing basis, and what they can also learn from these spaces and experiences. Anarchists participate in a wide range of movements, often under the radar, and can consider further the implications of being more explicit and direct in their politics and practices, and how, in doing so, they might influence wider movement value-practices and orientations to anti-colonial struggle and prefigurative futures.

Overall, the commitment to practice must be maintained. Anarchists are committed to being and doing, and anti-colonial value-practices can inform this further. This is especially the case with regard to prefigurative politics. As the provocations of Glen Coulthard, Leanne Simpson, Theresa Warburton, Klee Benally, and others attest, there is much work to be done with how we engage the ideas of the future from a radical imagination perspective, while also taking stock of the contexts and relations in which we are presently embedded. Prefiguration is a key value-practice that motivates and captivates our desires for 'new' futures, but can also look to the efforts of the past and present as well, to help us stay grounded and to focus our anti-colonial commitments. There is a translation into the contexts of Indigenous resurgence and grounded normativities that is essential for prefigurative politics going forward, so that we refuse to replay structures of settlement even as we seek the promise of radical futures where we are.

Indigenous resurgence perspectives keep us attuned to the context in which we resist, organize, and imagine. Without directed attention to the ongoing potency of these struggles, any anarchism is likely to continue to be fraught with structures of settlement, and risks

replaying and re-entrenching forms of colonization. Deepening forms of committed anarchist politics not only holds potential for reconceiving what anti-colonial anarchism could be, but also asks how we, as anarchists, can 'be' differently as well.

Grounded normativities fully inform Indigenous resurgence projects and possibilities. They reframe and trouble settler claims to land and settler forms of commonsense, as well as the notion that any sort of revolution would bring a blank slate where 'new' futures could be enacted without reference to the past. They speak to the specificities and particularities of place and place-based relations.

These grounded perspectives also raise questions of how anarchists (and settlers) might relate to the lands that they inhabit, in ways that mobilize value-practices of solidarity, affinity, complicity, and prefiguration, and start to escape re-colonizing tendencies or expectations. Following the provocations of Indigenous resurgence practitioners like Glen Coulthard, there is a potential for anarchists to tap into our own forms of subaltern knowledges and grounded normativity that place us within historical political lineages, their contemporary resonances, and radical imaginaries of the future. This is both a challenge and a set of possibilities. This approach asks what we can learn from the past, expand in the present, and then reorient for the future. This is an approach that asks for a form of politics and way of life that is committed to leaning into the tensions I have highlighted here, and to expanding our personal and collective capacities for engaging deeply with the context of the world around us.

May Day is a possible starting point for this work. May Day represents both a key historical reference point for anarchist politics, linked to the Haymarket Affair and the ensuing aftermath targeting anarchists, but also the continued tradition of celebration in the present. How, then, can we link our celebration and inspiration from past struggles and movements with the specific context of struggle in which we currently find ourselves? The broader value-practices that animate May Day are a reference point for anarchists to explore possible ways forward.

May Day has wider intersections beyond Haymarket. It mobilizes the connections between struggles, both for humanity and for the earth. It draws links with spiritual traditions that

resisted enclosure, witch burnings, and the stamping out of grounded normativities in Western Europe. May Day is evocative of broader forms of imagination and radical forms of relation, in ways that prompt reconsideration of our own connections to the earth, and even more so, the specific lands that we currently call home.

Engaging May Day and anarchist practices of affinity, solidarity, and complicity with Indigenous struggle might help to reimagine our own place in history, the present, and the future. May Day is a starting point, from which we can start to consider what other forms of tradition, spiritual practice, and wider connection might aid in developing our relational forms of anti-colonial value-practices.

Following Cindy Milstein (2022), what might it mean to 'try anarchism for life'? What does this sort of commitment reveal and demand of us? What opportunities does it open up? What forms of prefiguration and imagination does it invite? What does an orientation with intention to the long term and the long haul help us do in terms of practice? What does this mean in the context of anti-colonial commitments? How does this reframe our approaches to living on stolen land? How do we continue to keep the anarchist spirit alive, even as we attempt to attend to the horrors of the world? These are further questions to guide, reinvigorate, and inspire our attempts to figure out what it means to be where we are, where we came from, and where we might be able to go.

As Milstein (2022) suggests:

> To aspire to live in an anarchistic world means continually journeying toward the horizon. It will also never be easy. There is no going from point B to point A(narchism); there's no linear or smooth route, much less a map. It means forever running up against thorny obstacles along the way. …
>
> It is the beauty of anarchism that aids us in staying the course for life, as self-taught cartographers of myriad dreamscapes, and bringing more and more friends, neighbors, and other accomplices along with us. (p. 109)

Anarchist culture is a space to encounter these questions, tensions, and provocations over and over. These are spaces where we can find each other and come to work on the implications of our value-practices. These are spaces of encounter where we can reconsider what a committed anarchist practice might look like. They nourish us, support us, and provide havens in times of downturn and repression. They provide moments and containers for taking individual considerations of anti-colonial politics into collective forms of engagement. These are spaces to discuss, to circulate, to challenge, to refine, to reconsider, to re-enliven, and re-imagine. These are spaces of potential for finding new, and old, ways of imagining different possible worlds. May grief, hope, struggle, rage, and imagination continue to inflame our anarchist spirits and commitments for a better world.

Though presently convulsed with grief
I am at peace
Some days I'm scared I'm gonna die
Or even worse, I might survive
I try to keep these words in mind
"Nothing worth having comes without some kind of fight
Gotta kick at the darkness 'til it bleeds daylight"

—Propagandhi (channeling Bruce Cockburn), *At Peace*

References

613 anarchy. 2018. Anarchy in a Small Pond. <https://613anarchy.wordpress.com/zines/>.

ABC News. 2020. Transcript: Trump to mobilize federal resources to stop violence, restore security. ABC News, June 1, 2020. <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/transcript-trump-mobilize-federal-resources-stop-violence-restore/story?id=71008802>. [Accessed April 4, 2025]

Abdou, Mohamed. 2022. *Islam and Anarchism: Relationships and Resonances*. London: Pluto Press.

Adamiak, Joanna M. 2018. Back-to-the-Land: Analyzing Rural Anarchist Practice in Relation to Anarchist Theories of Community-Building: A Case Study of the Dragonfly and Black Fly Land Collectives. Doctoral Dissertation. York University. <https://yorkspace.library.yorku.ca/bitstream/10315/35553/2/Adamiak_Joanna_M_2018_PhD.pdf>.

African Anarchists on Imperialism. n.d. 6. Anti-Imperialism. flag.blackened.net. <http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/africa/wsfpp/imperialism6.html>. [Accessed September 9, 2015]

Aguilar, Ernesto. n.d. Interview with Ernesto Aguilar of the Anarchist People of Color (APOC). *Colours of Resistance Archive*. <http://www.coloursofresistance.org/596/interview-with-ernesto-aguilar-of-the-anarchist-people-of-color-apoc/>. [Accessed March 5, 2016]

Ahmed, Binesh. 2020. 'In Conversation with Haudenosaunee Land Defenders: 1492 Land Back Lane.' Upppingtheanti.org < https://uppingtheanti.org/blog/entry/in-conversation-with-haudenosaunee-land-defenders-1492–land-back-lane > [August 18, 2024]

Alfred, Taiaiake. 2008. *Peace, Power, Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Alfred, Taiaiake. 2005. *Wasase: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom*. Peterborough: Broadview.

Alfred, Taiaiake. 2010. What is Radical Imagination? Indigenous Struggles in Canada. *Affinities: A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture, and Action,* 4(2), 5–8.

Alfred, Taiaiake. 2010. Interview with Gerald Taiaiake Alfred about Anarchism and Indigenism in North America. *Alpine Anarchist Productions.* <https://www.alpineanarchist.org/r_i_indigenism_english.html>. [Accessed December 4, 2025.

Alfred, Taiaiake, and Jeff Corntassel. 2005. Being Indigenous: Resurgences Against Contemporary Colonialism. *Government and Opposition,* 40(4), 597–614.

Alston, Ashanti. 2002. Beyond Nationalism But Not Without It. *Colours of Resistance*. Spring. <http://www.coloursofresistance.org/572/beyond-nationalism-but-not-without-it/>. [Accessed September 23, 2015]

Amadahy, Zainab, and Bonita Lawrence. 2010. Indigenous Peoples and Black People in Canada: Settlers or Allies? In *Breaching the Colonial Contract: Anti-Colonialism in Canada and the US*, Edited by Arlo Kempf, 105–136. New York: Springer Science+Business Media.

Amster, Randall. 2012. *Anarchism Today*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Anarchist Federation. 2009. *Against Nationalism* [Pamphlet No. 20]. Anarchism Communist Editions.

Ancelovici, Marcos. 2021. Bourdieu in movement: toward a field theory of contentious politics. *Social Movement Studies*, 20:2, 155–173, DOI: 10.1080/14742837.2019.1637727

Anderson, Benedict. 2010. Preface. In *Anarchism and Syndicalism in the Colonial and Postcolonial World, 1870–1940*, by Steven Hirsch and Lucien van der Walt, xiii–xxix. Boston, MA: Brill.

Andersen, Chris. 2015. "*Métis": Race, Recognition, and the Struggle for Indigenous Peoplehood.* Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Antliff, Allan. 2004. *Only A Beginning: An Anarchist Anthology.* Vancouver, BC: Arsenal Pulp Press.

Apoifis, Nicholas. 2017. *Anarchy in Athens: an ethnography of militancy, emotions and violence*. Manchester University Press.

Apps, Tiffani., Karley Beckman, and Sue Bennett. 2019. Engaging with Bourdieu's theory of practice: an empirical tool for exploring school students' technology practice. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 28(4), 413–423. https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2019.1657934.

Aragorn! (ed.) 2018. *The Fight for Turtle Island*. San Francisco, CA: Ardent Press.

Aragorn! 2009. Locating an Indigenous Anarchism. *theanarchistlibrary.org.* <http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/aragorn-locating-an-indigenous-anarchism>. [Accessed June 13, 2015]

Aragorn! 2012. *Occupy Everything: Anarchists in the Occupy Movement 2009–2011*. Berkeley, CA: LBC Books.

Arthur, Stephen. 2007. 'Where License Reigns With All Impunity': An Anarchist Study of the Rotinonshón:ni Polity. *nefac.net.* 2 (14). <http://nefac.net/anarchiststudyofiroquois>. [Accessed October 25, 2015]

Arvin, Maile, Eve Tuck, and Angie Morrill. 2013. Decolonizing Feminism: Challenging Connections between Settler-Colonialism and Heteropatriarchy. *Feminist Formations* 25(1), 8–34. https://doi.org/10.1353/ff.2013.0006.

Asch, Michael. 2014. *On Being Here to Stay: Treaties and Aboriginal Rights in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Bakunin, Mikhail and Sam Dolgoff (ed.). 1972. *Bakunin on Anarchy*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Bakunin, Mikhail. 1916/2009. *God and the State*. Edmonton, AB: Black Cat Press.

Ballantyne, Erin. F. 2014. Dechinta Bush University: Mobilizing a knowledge economy of reciprocity, resurgence and decolonization. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 3*(3), 67–85.

Barclay, Fiona, Charlotte Ann Chopin, and Martin Evans. 2017. Introduction: Settler Colonialism and French Algeria. *Settler Colonial Studies,* 8(2), 115–30. doi:10.1080/2201473X.2016.1273862.

Barker, Adam J. 2021. *Making and Breaking Settler Space: Five Centuries of Colonization in North America*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Barker, Adam J. 2012. Already Occupied: Indigenous Peoples, Settler Colonialism and the Occupy Movements in North America. *Social Movement Studies: Journal of Social, Cultural and Political Protest,* 11(3–4), 327–334.

Barker, Adam J. 2010. From Adversaries to Allies: Forging Respectful Alliances Between Indigenous and Settler Peoples. In *Alliances: Re/Envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships*, Edited by Lynne Davis, 316–333. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Barker, Adam J., and Jenny Pickerill. 2012. Radicalizing Relationships To and Through Shared Geographies: Why Anarchists Need to Understand Indigenous Connections to Land and Place. *Antipode,* 44(5), 1705–1725.

Barker, Adam J. 2009. The contemporary reality of Canadian imperialism: Settler Colonialism and the hybrid colonial state. *American Indian Quarterly,* 33(3), 325–351.

Bateman, Fiona, and Lionel Pilkington. 2011. *Studies in Settler Colonialism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Battell Lowman, Emma and Adam J. Barker. 2015. S*ettler: identity and colonialism in 21st century Canada*. Fernwood Publishing.

Battiste, Marie. (ed.) 2002. *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Bell, Avril. 2014. *Relating Indigenous and Settler Identities: Beyond Domination*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Benally, Klee. 2023. *No Spiritual Surrender: Indigenous Anarchy in Defense of the Sacred*. Detritus Books.

Berkman, Alexander. 1929/2003. *What is Anarchism?* Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Bevington, Douglas, and Chris Dixon. 2005. Movement-relevant Theory: Rethinking Social Movement Scholarship and Activism. *Social Movement Studies,* 4(3), 185–208.

Biolsi, Thomas. 2005. Imagined Geographies: Sovereignty, Indigenous Space, and American Indian Struggle. *American Ethnologist,* 32(2), 239–259.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1998. *Practical Reason*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. The Forms of Capital. In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, edited by J. G. Richardson, 241–258. New York: Greenwood Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1994. Rethinking the State: Genesis and Structure of the Bureaucratic Field. *Sociological Theory*, 12(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.2307/202032.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2000. "The Politics of Protest (Interview)." *Socialist Review*, June, 18–20.

Bourdieu, Pierre, and Loic J. D. Wacquant 1992. *An invitation to reflexive sociology.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Branson, Scott. 2022. *Practical Anarchism: A Guide for Daily Life*. London: Pluto Press.

Bray, Mark. 2022. *The Anarchist Inquisition: Assassins, Activists, and Martyrs in Spain and France*. Chico, CA: AK Press.

Bray, Mark. 2017. *Antifa: The Anti-Fascist Handbook*. Brooklyn: Melville House Publishing.

Bray, Mark. 2013. *Translating Anarchy: The Anarchism of Occupy Wall Street*. Washington, WA: Zero Books.

Beyond Support: Update on Locke St Defendants and a Proposal for Beginning to Organize Solidarity. 2018, June 5. <https://north-shore.info/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/discussion-zine.pdf>. [Accessed March 21, 2024]

Butler, Judith. 2013. Palestine, State Politics and Anarchist Impasse. In *The Anarchist Turn.* Edited by Jacob Blumfield, Chiara Bottici and Simon Critchley, 202–223. London: Verso Press.

Byrd, Jodi A. 2014. Follow the typical signs: settler sovereignty and its discontents. *Settler Colonial Studies,* 4(2), 151–154.

Byrd, Jodi A. 2011. *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Byrne, Sian, and Lucien van der Walt. 2015. Worlds of Western anarchism: Class Struggle, Transnationalism, Violence and Anti-Imperialism, 1870s-1940s. *Canadian Journal of History,* 50(1), 98–123.

Carlson, Elizabeth. 2016. Anti-colonial methodologies and practices for settler colonial studies. *Settler Colonial Studies*, *7*(4), 1–22. doi:10.1080/2201473x.2016.1241213.

CBS News. Jan 20, 2026. Bovino vows ICE enforcement surge will continue: 'Public safety in Minneapolis is not negotiable.' <https://www.cbsnews.com/minnesota/video/bovino-vows-ice-enforcement-surge-will-continue-public-safety-in-minneapolis-is-not-negotiable/>. [Accessed Jan 25, 2026].

Charmaz, Kathy, and Anthony Bryant. 2008. Grounded Theory. In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods: Volumes 1&2*, Edited by Lisa M. Given, 374–377. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.

Chase-Dunn, Christopher, John Aldecoa, Ian Breckenridge-Jackson, and Joel S Herrera. 2019. Anarchism in the Web of Transnational Social Movements. *Journal of World-Systems Research*, 25(2), 373–94. https://doi.org/10.5195/jwsr.2019.876.

Cho, Ji Young, and Eun-Hee Lee. 2014. Reducing Confusion about Grounded Theory and Qualitative Content Analysis: Similarities and Differences. *The Qualitative Report,* 19(32), 1–20.

Choudry, Aziz. 2015. *Learning Activism: The Intellectual Life of Contemporary Social Movements*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Choudry, Aziz. 2016. Social movements and how they make, learn and teach ideas. *Rabble.ca* January 20. <http://rabble.ca/podcasts/shows/talking-radical-radio/2016/01/social-movements-and-how-they-make-learn-and-teach-idea>. [Accessed February 5, 2017]

Ciccariello-Maher, George. 2011. An Anarchism That is Not Anarchism: Notes Toward a Critique of Anarchist Imperialism. In *How Not To Be Governed: Readings and Interpretations from a Critical Anarchist Left*, Edited by Jimmy Casas Klausen and James Martel, 19–46. Lanham, MA: Lexington Books.

Clancy, Devin. 2019. Visualizing Resistance: The Politics of Art in Radical Anti-Fascist and Indigenous Movements, An Interview with Gord Hill. *Upping the Anti* <https://uppingtheanti.org/journal/article/21-visualizing-resistance>.

Clough, Nathan, and Renata Blumberg. 2012. Toward Anarchist and Autonomist Marxist Geographies. *ACME: An Intergenerational E-Journal for Critical Geographies,* 11(3), 335–351.

Cohn, Jesse. 2014. *Underground Passages: Anarchist Resistance Culture 1848–2011.* Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Collins, Gary. 2024. Examining the communist, anarchist ideas fueling anti-Israel campus encampments. *ABC 3340 News*. May 3rd, 2024. < https://abc3340.com/news/nation-world/examining-the-communist-anarchist-ideas-fueling-anti-israel-campus-encampments-columbia-university-on-april-17th-johns-hopkins-israeli-palestine-gaza-hamas-hamilton-hall-palestinian-river-to-sea-demonstrations-universities.> [Accessed April 4, 2025]

Confidence. Courage. Connection. Trust.: A proposal for security culture. 2019. <https://north-shore.info/2019/11/05/confidence-courage-connection-trust-a-proposal-for-security-culture/> [Accessed August 19, 2024]

Coombes, Annie E. 2006. Memory and History in Settler Colonialism. In *Rethinking Settler Colonialism: History and Memory in Australia, Canada, New Zealand and South Africa.* Edited by Annie E. Coombes, 1–12. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Cornell, Andrew. 2016. *Unruly Equality: U.S. Anarchism in the 20th Century*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Coulthard, Glen. 2017. Beyond A Common Dispossession: Deepening Transnational Anti-Colonial and Anti-Capitalist Solidarities. In *What Moves Us? The Lives and Times of the Radical Imagination.* Edited by Alex Khasnabish and Max Haiven, 91–103. Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.

Coulthard, Glen. 2015. 'Land is a Relationship': In conversation with Glen Coulthard on Indigenous nationhood, with Harsha Walia. *Rabble.ca* < https://rabble.ca/columnists/land-relationship-conversation-glen-coulthard-on-indigenous-nationhood/>

Coulthard, Glen. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Coulthard, Glen. 2010. Place Against Empire: Understanding Indigenous Anti-Colonialism. *Affinities: A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture and Action,* 4(2), 79–83.

Coulthard, Glen. 2003. Facing the Challenge of Freedom: Dene Nationalism and the Politics of Cultural Recognition. MA Thesis. University of Victoria.

Craib, Raymond. 2015. Anarchism and Alterity: The Expulsion of Casimiro Barrios from Chile in 1920. In *No Gods, No Masters, No Peripheries: Global Anarchisms,* Edited by Barry Maxwell and Raymond Craib, 158–179. Oakland, CA: PM Press.

Crass, Chris. 2013. *Towards Collective Liberation: Anti-Racist Organizing, Feminist Praxis, and Movement Building Strategy*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.

Crimethinc. 2004. What is Security Culture? *Crimethinc.* <https://crimethinc.com/2004/11/01/what-is-security-culture>. [Accessed November 14, 2017]

Christoyannopoulos, Alexandre J. M. E, and Matthew Adams. (eds.). 2017. *Essays in Anarchism and Religion: Volume I*. Stockholm: Stockholm University Press.

Christoyannopoulos, Alexandre J. M. E. 2010. *Christian Anarchism: A Political Commentary on the Gospel (Abridged Edition).* Andrews UK Limited.

Christoyannopoulos, Alexandre J. M. E. (ed.). 2009. *Religious Anarchism: New Perspectives*. 1st ed. London: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Crossley, Nick. 2003. From Reproduction to Transformation. *Theory, Culture & Society,* 20(6), 43–68.

Crossley, Nick. 2002. Global anti-corporate struggle: a preliminary analysis. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 53(4), 667–691. https://doi.org/10.1080/0007131022000021542

Croswell, Kimberly. 2024. Putting the word out there: The sub.media collective, indigenous resurgence, and prefigurative politics in the parallel present. *Ephemera, 24*(1), 197–213.

Daphi, Priska. 2014. Movement Space: A Cultural Approach. In *Conceptualizing Culture in Social Movement Research.* Edited by Britta Baumgarten, Priska Daphi, and Peter Ullrich, 165–185). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385796_8

Davis, Lynne, Jeffrey S Denis, Chris Hiller, and Dawn Lavell-Harvard. 2022. Learning and Unlearning: Settler Engagements in Long-Term Indigenous–Settler Alliances in Canada. *Ethnicities*. 22 (5), 619–41. https://doi.org/10.1177/14687968211063911.

Davis, Lynne, Vivian O'Donnell, and Heather Shpuniarsky. 2007. Aboriginal-Social Justice Alliances: Understanding the Landscape of Relationships through the Coalition for a Public Inquiry into Ipperwash. *International Journal of Canadian Studies,* 37(Fall), 95–119.

Davis, Lynne. (Ed.). 2010. *Alliances: Re/Envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Davis, Lynne, Sinclair, Raven, & Denis, Jeff (Eds.). 2020. *Pathways of settler decolonization*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Day, Richard. 2010. Angry Indians, Settler Guilt and the Challenges of Decolonization and Resurgence. In *This is an Honour Song: Twenty Years Since the Blockades.* Edited by Leanne Simpson and Kiera Ladner, 261–270. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

Day, Richard JF. 2008. Anarcha-Indigenism: Encounters, Resonances, and Tensions. *International Studies Association 2008 Conference*. San Francisco. 1–30.

Day, Richard JF. 2005. *Gramsci Is Dead: Anarchist Currents in the Newest Social Movements*. Toronto, ON: Between The Lines.

Day, Richard JF. 2004. From Hegemony to Affinity: The Political Logic of the Newest Social Movements. *Cultural Studies,* 18(5), 716–748.

Day, Richard JF. 2003. Anarchism, Indigenism, and Anti-Globalization in North American Social Movements. Appeared in *DeriveApprodi*, December 2003 in Italian, copy received from author 1–20.

Day, Richard. 2000. *Multiculturalism and the History of Canadian Diversity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Day, Richard J. F., and Adam Lewis. 2013. Radical Subjectivity and the N-Row Wampum: A General Model for Autonomous Relations Against and Beyond the Dominant Global Order? In *Subjectivity in the Twenty-First Century*, Edited by Romin W. Tafarodi, 169–89. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Day, Richard and Sean Haberle. 2006. Anarchist-Indigenous Solidarity at Six Nations. *New Socialist*. Issue # 58, September-October 2006, 26–27.

De Leon, David. 1978. *The American as Anarchist: Reflections on Indigenous Radicalism*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Denzin, Norma K., and Yvonna S. Lincoln. 2014. Introduction: Critical Methodologies and Indigenous Inquiry. In *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, by Norma K. Denzin, Yvonna S. Lincoln and Linda Tuhiwai and Smith, 1–20. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publishing Inc.

Denzin, Norman K. 2010. Grounded and Indigenous Theories and the Politics of Inquiry. *Sociological Inquiry,* 80(2), 296–312.

Dixon, Chris. 2014. *Another Politics: Talking Across Today's Transformative Movements.* Oakland: University of California Press.

Dolgoff, Sam. 1972. *Bakunin on Anarchy.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Dupuis-Déri, Francis and Pillet, Benjamin (eds.) 2023. A*narcho-Indigenism: Conversations on Land and Freedom.* London, UK: Pluto Press.

Duyvendak, Jan. W., & Fillieule, Olivier. 2015. Conclusion: Patterned Fluidity: An Interactionist Perspective as a Tool for Exploring Contentious Politics. In *Players and Arenas*, Edited by James Jasper and Jan W. Duyvendak. Vol. 1, 295–318. Amsterdam University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9789048524235–014

Ehrlich, Howard J. 1996a. Introduction to Reinventing anarchist Tactics. In *Reinventing Anarchy, Again*, edited by Howard J. Ehrlich, 329-330. San Francisco, CA: AK Press.

Ehrlich, Howard J. 1996b. How to Get From Here to There: Building Revolutionary Transfer Culture. In *Reinventing Anarchy, Again*, edited by Howard J. Ehrlich, 331–349. San Francisco, CA: AK Press.

Elkins, Caroline, and Susan Pedersen. 2005. Settler Colonialism: A Concept and Its Uses. In *Settler Colonialism in the Twentieth Century*, Edited by Caroline Elkins and Susan Pedersen, 1–20. New York: Taylor and Francis.

Eltzbacher, Paul. 1900/1907. *Anarchism.* < https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/paul-eltzbacher-anarchism>.

Englert, Sai. 2022. *Settler Colonialism: An Introduction*. London: Pluto Press.

EPIC (End the Prison Industrial Complex) n.d. <https://epic.noblogs.org/ >. [Accessed January 26, 2026]

Errandonea, Alfredo. 2001. Anarchism in the 21st Century. In *Anarchism A Documentary History of Libertarian Ideas Volume Three The New Anarchism (1974–2012)*, Edited by Robert Graham, 25–31. Montreal, QC: Black Rose Books.

Ervin, Lorenzo Kom'boa. 1994. *Anarchism and the Black Revolution*. Philadelphia: Monkeywrench Press.

Estes, Nick. 2019. *Our History Is the Future: Standing Rock Versus the Dakota Access Pipeline, and the Long Tradition of Indigenous Resistance*. London: Verso Press.

Evren, Sureyyya. 2012. There Ain't No Black in the Anarchist Flag! Race, Ethnicity and Anarchism. In *The Continuum Companion to Anarchism*, Edited by Ruth Kinna, 299–314. New York, NY: Continuum.

Faragher, John Mack. 2014. Commentary: Settler Colonial Studies and the North American Frontier. *Settler Colonial Studies,* 4(2), 181–191.

Federici, Silvia. 2004. *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation*. Brooklyn, NY: Autonomedia.

Federici, Sylvia. 2015. Global Anarchism: Provocations. In *No Gods, No Masters, No Peripheries: Global Anarchisms*, Edited by Barry Maxwell and Raymond Craib, 349–358. Oakland, CA: PM Press.

Ferguson, Kathy. 2022. Writing Anarchism with History from Below. *Anarchist Studies* 30 (1), 7–29, https://doi.org/10.3898/AS.30.1.01.

Ferguson, Kathy. 2011. Becoming Anarchism, Feminism, Indigeneity. Edited by Glen Coulthard, Jacqueline Lasky, Vanessa Watts and Adam Lewis. *Affinities: A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture and Action,* 5(1), 96–109.

Ferguson, Kathy E. 2010. Anarchist Counterpublics. *New Political Science*, 32(2), 193–214. https://doi.org/10.1080/07393141003722040

Fernandez, Luiz. A. 2009. Being there: Thoughts on anarchism and participatory observation. In *Contemporary Anarchist Studies: An Introductory Anthology of Anarchy in the Academy,* Edited by Randall Amster, Abraham DeLeon, Luis Fernandez, Anthony J. Nocella, II, and Deric Shannon, 93–102. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Firth, Rhiannon. 2022. *Disaster Anarchy: Mutual Aid and Radical Action*. London: Pluto Press.

Flesher Fominaya, Cristina 2016. Cultural Barriers to Activist Networking: Habitus (In)action in Three European Transnational Encounters. *Antipode*, 48(1), 151–171. https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12166

Flesher Fominaya, Cristina. 2014. Movement Culture as Habit(us): Resistance to Change in the Routinized Practices of Resistance. In *Conceptualizing Culture in Social Movement Research,* Edited by Britta Baumgarten, Priska Daphi, and Peter Ullrich, 186–205. Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Flowers, Rachel. 2015. Refusal to forgive: Indigenous women's love and rage. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society,* 4(2), 32–49.

Ford, Lisa. 2013. Locating Indigenous Self-Determination in the Margins of Settler Sovereignty: An Introduction. In *Between Indigenous and Settler Governance*, Edited by Lisa Ford and Tim Rowse, 1–11. New York: Routledge.

Fortier, Craig. 2017. *Unsettling the Commons: Movements Against, Within, And Beyond Settler Colonialism.* Winnipeg, MB: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

Fortier, Craig. 2015. Unsettling Movements: Decolonizing Non-Indigenous Radical Struggles in Settler Colonial States. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Toronto, ON: York University.

Fortier, Craig. 2013. No One Is Illegal Movements and Anti-colonial Struggles From Within The Nation-State. In *Producing and Negotiating Non-Citizenship: Precarious Legal Status in Canada*, Edited by Patrica Landolt and Luin Goldring, 274–290. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Fowler, Bridget. 2020. Pierre Bourdieu on social transformation, with particular reference to political and symbolic revolutions. *Theory and Society,* 49, 439–463. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186–019–09375–z

Freeman, Jo. 2002. The Tyranny of Structurelessness. In *Quiet Rumours: An Anarcha-Feminist Reader*. Edited by Dark Star Collective, 54–61. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Galián, Laura. 2020. *Colonialism, Transnationalism, and Anarchism in the South of the Mediterranean.* London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures; Selected Essays.* Basic Books.

Gelderloos, Peter. 2022. *The Solutions Are Already Here: Strategies for Ecological Revolution From Below*. London: Pluto Press.

Gelderloos, Peter. 2016. *Worshiping Power: An Anarchist View of Early State Formation.* Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Gelderloos, Peter. 2010. *Anarchy Works*. San Francisco, CA: Ardent Press.

Gemie, Sharif. 2007. Beyond the Borders: The Question of Third World Anarchism. In *Post Colonial/Non Western/Third World Anarchism*, 60–70. Available via: <http://takku.net/mediagallery/album.php?aid=65>.

Gemie, Sharif. 1994. Counter-Community: An Aspect of Anarchist Political Culture. *Journal of Contemporary History,* 29(2), 349–67.

Go, Julian. 2013. Decolonizing Bourdieu: Colonial and Postcolonial Theory in Pierre Bourdieu's Early Work. *Sociological Theory* 31(1), 49–74. ttp://www.jstor.org/stable/43186637.

Goaman, Karen. 2012. The Anarchist Travelling Circus: Reflections on Contemporary Anarchism, Anti-Capitalism and the International Scene. In C*hanging Anarchism: Anarchist Theory and Practice in a Global Age*, Edited by James Bowen and Jonathan Purkis, 163–180. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Goldman, Emma. 1917/1969. *Anarchism and Other Essays*. New York, NY: Dover.

Gómez-Barris, Macarena. 2021. Anarchisms Otherwise: Pedagogies of Anarco-Indigenous Feminist Critique. *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies*. (1), 119–31.

Goodwyn, Lawrence. 1978. *The Populist Moment: A Short History of the Agrarian Revolt in America*. Oxford University Press.

Gordon, Uri. 2008. *Anarchy Alive! Anti-Authoritarian Politics From Practice to Theory*. London: Pluto Press.

Gordon, Uri, and Ohal Grietzer. 2013. *Anarchists Against the Wall*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Graeber, David. 2011. Occupy Wall Street's anarchist roots. *Aljazeera*. November 20. <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2011/11/201111287283590450 8.html>. [Accessed February 14, 2015]

Graeber, David. 2002. The New Anarchists. *New Left Review,* 13(Jan-Feb), 61–73.

Graeber, David, and Andrej Grubacic. 2004. Anarchism, Or The Revolutionary Movement Of The Twenty-First Century. Downloaded PDF Version. January 6.

<http://www.zcommunications.org/anarchism-or-the-revolutionary-movement-of-the-twenty-first-century-by-david-graeber>. [Accessed May 15, 2013]

Graham, Robert (ed.). 2013. *Anarchism: A Documentary History of Libertarian Ideas Volume Three - The New Anarchism (1974–2012)*. Montreal, QC: Black Rose Books.

Graham, Robert (ed.). 2009. *Anarchism: A Documentary History of Libertarian Ideas Volume Two - The Emergence of the New Anarchism (1939–1977)*. Montreal, QC: Black Rose Books.

Graham, Robert (ed.). 2004. *Anarchism: A Documentary History of Libertarian Ideas Volume One - From Anarchy to Anarchism (300CE to 1939)*. Montreal, QC: Black Rose Books.

Grande, Sandy. 2013. Accumulation of the Primitive: the limits of liberalism and the politics of occupy Wall Street. *Settler Colonial Studies,* 3(3–04), 369–380.

Grubacic, Andrej. 2013. The Anarchist Moment. In *The Anarchist Turn,* Edited by Jacob Blumfield, Chiara Bottici and Simon Critchley, 187–201. London: Pluto Press.

Gruner, Sheila. 2010. Learning Relations and Grounding Solidarity: A Critical Approach to Honouring Struggle. In *This is an Honour Song: Twenty Years Since the Blockades*, Edited by Leanne Simpson and Kiera Ladner, 91–104. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

Guérin, Daniel (ed.). 2006. *No Gods, No Masters: An Anthology of Anarchism*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Haiven, Max, and Alex Khasnabish. 2014. *The Radical Imagination*. Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing.

Hall, Anthony J. 2010. *Earth Into Property: Colonization, Decolonization, and Capitalism*. Montreal: McGill-Queens' University Press.

Haluza-DeLay, Randolph. 2008. A Theory of Practice for Social Movements: Environmentalism and Ecological Habitus. *Mobilization*, 13(2), 205–218. DOI: 10.17813/maiq.13.2.k5015r82j2q35148

Hamilton Anarchist Bookfair. 2018. Update on the Hamilton, Ontario Anarchist Bookfair, March 3-4th. < https://itsgoingdown.org/update-hamilton-ontario-anarchist-bookfair-march-3-4/>. [Accessed March 17, 2024]

Hansen, Ann. 2018. *Taking the Rap: Women Doing Time for Society's Crimes*. Toronto: Between the Lines.

Hill, Gord. 2010. *500 Years of Indigenous Resistance*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.

Hill, Susan M. 2017*. The Clay We Are Made Of: Haudenosaunee Land Tenure on the Grand River.* Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba Press.

Hiller, Chris. 2017. Tracing the Spirals of Unsettlement: Euro-Canadian Narratives of Coming to Grips with Indigenous Sovereignty, Title, and Rights. *Settler Colonial Studies,* 7(4), 415–40. doi:10.1080/2201473X.2016.1241209.

Hirsch, Steven. 2010. Peruvian Anarcho-Syndicalism: adapting transnational influences and forging counterhegemonic practices, 1905–1930. In *Anarchism and Syndicalism in the Colonial and Postcolonial World, 1870–1940.*Edited by Steven Hirsch and Lucien van der Walt, 227–272. Boston, MA: Brill.

Hirsch, Steven, and Lucien van der Walt (eds.). 2010. *Anarchism and Syndicalism in the Colonial and Postcolonial World, 1870–1940.* Boston, MA: Brill Academic Publishers.

Ibrahim, Yousef. 2011. Political Distinction in the British Anti-capitalist Movement. *Sociology*, 45(2), 318–334. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038510394026

Ibrahim, Joseph. 2013. The Struggle for Symbolic Dominance in the British 'Anti-Capitalist Movement Field.' S*ocial Movement Studies*, 12(1), 63–80. https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2012.666396

Ince, Anthony. 2012. In the Shell of the Old: Anarchist Geographies of Territorialisation. *Antipode,* 44(5), 1645–1666.

Ince, Anthony. 2010. Whither Anarchist Geography? In N*ew Perspectives On Anarchism,* Edited by Nathan J Jun and Shane Wahl, 281–302. Plymouth, UK: Lexington Books.

Irlbacher-Fox, Stephanie. 2014. Traditional knowledge, co-existence and co-resistance. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society,* 3(3), 145–158.

It's Going Down. n.d. About. <https://itsgoingdown.org/about/>. [Accessed March 17th, 2014]

Jasper, James. M. 2015. Introduction: Playing the Game. In *Players and Arenas*, Edited by James Jasper and Jan W. Duyvendak. Vol. 1, 9–32. Amsterdam University Press. doi.org/10.1515/9789048524235–001

Johnson, Jat T., Garth Cant, Richard Howitt, and Evelyn Peters. 2007. Creating Anti-Colonial Geographies: Embracing Indigenous Peoples' Knowledges and Rights. *Geographical Research,* 45(2), 117–120.

Jeppesen, Sandra, Anna Kruzynski, Rachel Sarrasin, and Émilie Breton. 2014. The Anarchist Commons. *Ephemera: Theory and Politics in Organization,* 14(4), 879–900.

Jeppesen, Sandra. 2011. The DIY Post-Punk Post-Situationist Politics of CrimethInc. *Anarchist Studies*, 19(1), 23–55.

Jeppesen, Sandra. 2010. Creating Guerrilla Texts in Rhizomatic Value-Practices on the Sliding Scale of Autonomy: Toward an Anti-Authoritarian Cultural Logic. In *New Perspectives on Anarchism*, Edited by Nathan J. Jun and Shane Wahl, 473–96. Rowman & Littlefield.

Jun, Nathan. 2013. Rethinking the Anarchist Canon: History, Philosophy, and Interpretation. *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies,* 2013(1), 82–116.

Juris, Jeffrey S. 2009. Anarchism, Or the Cultural Logic of Networking. In *Contemporary Anarchist Studies: An Introductory Anthology of Anarchy in the Academy*, Edited by Randall Amster, Abraham DeLeon, Luis A. Fernandez, Anthony J. Nocella II and Shannon Deric, 213–223. New York, NY: Routledge.

Juris, Jeffrey S., and Alex Khasnabish. 2013. *Insurgent Encounters: Transnational Activism, Ethnography and the Political.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Kadir, Nazima. 2016. *The autonomous life?: paradoxes of hierarchy and authority in the squatters movement in Amsterdam*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Kauanui, J. Kēhaulani (ed.) 2021a. The Politics of Indigeneity, Anarchist Praxis, and Decolonization. Special Issue. *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies (ACDS),* 2021, (1).

Kauanui, J. Kēhaulani. 2021b. The Politics of Indigeneity, Anarchist Praxis, and Decolonization. *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies (ACDS)*, 2021(1)., 9–42.

Keck, Margaret. E., and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists beyond borders: advocacy networks in international politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Kelley, Robin D.G. 2017. The Rest of Us: Rethinking Settler and Native. *American Quarterly,* 69 (2), 267–276.

Kennelly, Jacqueline J. 2009. Youth cultures, activism and agency: revisiting feminist debates. *Gender and Education*, 21(3), 259–272. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540250802392281

Khan, Tariq. 2023. *The Republic Shall Be Kept Clean: How Settler Colonial Violence Shaped Antileft Repression*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Khan, Tariq. 2015. 'Come O Lions! Let Us Cause a Mutiny:' Anarchism and the Subaltern. *The Institute for Anarchist Studies*. April 2. <http://anarchiststudies.org/2015/04/02/come-o-lions-let-us-cause-a-mutiny-anarchism-and-the-subaltern-by-tariq-khan/>. [Accessed September 23, 2015]

Khasnabish, Alex, and Max Haiven (eds.). 2017. *What Moves Us: The Lives & Times of the Radical Imagination*. Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.

Khasnabish, Alex. 2011. Anarch@-Zapatismo: Anti-Capitalism, Anti-Power and the Insurgent Imagination. Edited by Glen Coulthard, Jacqueline Lasky, Adam Lewis and Vanessa Watts. *Affinities: A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture and Action,* 5(1), 70–95.

Khuri-Makdisi, Ilham. 2010. *The Eastern Mediterranean and the Making of Global Radicalism, 1860–1914.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Kilibarda, Konstantin. 2012. Lessons from #Occupy in Canada: Contesting space, settler consciousness and erasures within the 99%. *Journal of Critical Globalisation Studies,* 5, 24–41.

Kinna, Ruth. 2009. *Anarchism: A Beginner's Guide.* Oxford, UK: Oneworld Publications.

Klausen, Jimmy Casas, and James Martel. 2011. Introduction: How Not To Be Governed. In *How Not To Be Governed: Readings and Interpretations From A Critical Anarchist Left*, Edited by Jimmy Casas Klausen and James Martel, ix–xxviii. Lanham, MA: Lexington Books.

Knight, Ryan Allen. 2013. Anti-Colonial anarchism, or Anarchistic Anti-colonialism: The Similarities in the Revolutionary Theories of Frantz Fanon and Mikhail Bakunin. In *Without Borders or Limits: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Anarchist Studies*, Edited by Jorell A. Meléndez Badillo and Nathan J. Jun, 275–284. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Knowing the Land is Resistance (KLR) n.d. What Inspires KLR?. <https://knowingtheland.wordpress.com/what-inspires-klr/>. [Accessed May 27th 2024]

Knowing the Land is Resistance. (KLR) 2014. *Towards an Anarchist Ecology*. < https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/knowing-the-land-is-resistance-towards-an-anarchist-ecology>. [Accessed May 27th, 2024]

Kom'boa Ervin, Lorenzo. 1994. *Anarchism and the Black Revolution and Other Essays.* Philadelphia, PA: Monkeywrench Press.

Kovach, Margaret. 2009. *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations and Contexts.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Krebs, Mike, and Dana M. Olwan. 2012. 'From Jerusalem to the Grand River, Our Struggles Are One': Challenging Canadian and Israeli Settler Colonialism. *Settler Colonial Studies*, 2(2), 138–64. https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2012.10648846

Kropotkin, Peter. 1902/2006. *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution*. Chicago: Dover.

Kropotkin, Peter. 1892/2007. *The Conquest of Bread.* Oakland, CA: AK Press.

KW Bookfair Collective. 2014. Contested Spaces: A message from the Bookfair Collective on space in KW. < https://kwbookfair.noblogs.org/post/2014/02/25/gentrification/>. [Accessed March 17, 2014]

KW May Day Collective. 2019. Land Acknowledgement. <https://kwmayday.noblogs.org/land-acknowledgement/>. [Accessed March 17, 2024]

KW May Day Collective. 2018. 2018 Collective statement on KW May Day. <https://kwmayday.noblogs.org/>. [Accessed May 9, 2024]

Lagalisse, Erica M. 2019. *Occult Features of Anarchism: With Attention to the Conspiracy of Kings and the Conspiracy of the Peoples.* Oakland, CA: PM Press.

Lagalisse, Erica M. 2016. 'Good Politics': Property, Intersectionality, and the Making of the Anarchist Self. Doctoral Dissertation: Department of Anthropology, McGill University. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

Lagalisse, Erica M. 2011. 'Marginalizing Magdalena': Intersections of Gender and the Secular in Anarchoindigenist Solidarity Activism. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 36(3), 653–78. https://doi.org/10.1086/657526.

Landauer, Gustav. 1897/2010. A Few Words on Anarchism. In *Revolution and Other Writings: A Political Reader*, by Edited Gabriel Kuhn, 79–83. Oakland, CA: PM Press.

Landauer, Gustav. 1907/2010. Revolution. In *Revolution and Other Writings: A Political Reader*, Edited by Gabriel Kuhn, 110–185. Oakland, CA: PM Press.

Landauer, Gustav. 1901/2010. Through Separation to Community. In *Revolution and Other Writings: A Political Reader*, Edited by Gabriel Kuhn, 94–108. Oakland, CA: PM Press.

Landauer, Gustav. 1910/2010. Weak Statesmen, Weaker People. In *Revolution and Other Writings: A Political Reader*, Edited by Gabriel Kuhn, 213–214. Oakland, CA: PM Press.

Lasky, Jacqueline. 2011. Indigenism, Anarchism, Feminism: An Emerging Framework for Exploring Post-Imperial Futures. Edited by Glen Coulthard, Jacqueline Lasky, Adam Lewis and Vanessa Watts. *Affinities: A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture and Action,* 5 (1), 3–36.

Laursen, Erik. 2021. *The Operating System: An Anarchist Theory of the Modern State*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Laursen, Ole Birk. 2019. Anti-Imperialism. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism,* Edited by Carl Levy, Matthew S Adams, 149–167. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lawrence, Bonita. 2004. *"Real" Indians and Others: Mixed-Blood Urban Native Peoples and Indigenous Nationhood.* Vancouver: UBC Press.

Lawrence, Bonita, and Enakshi Dua. 2005. Decolonizing Antiracism. *Social Justice,* 32(4), 120–143.

Lazar, Hillary. 2016. Until All Are Free: Anarchism, Black Feminism, and Interlocking Oppression. *Perspectives on Anarchist Theory, No. 29: Anarcha-Feminism*. Portland, OR: Institute for Anarchist Studies, 35–52.

Lewis, Adam Gary. 2022. Recentering Place and Imagining *Other Worlds*: Structures of Settlement and Possibilities for the Future in Contemporary Anarchism. *Coils of the Serpent: Journal For the Study of Contemporary Power*. Issue 11, 172–185.

Lewis, Adam Gary. 2017. Imagining Autonomy on Stolen Land: Settler Colonialism, Anarchism and the Possibilities of Decolonization. *Settler Colonial Studies, 7*(4), 474–495.

Lewis, Adam Gary. 2016. Anarchy, Space, and Indigenous Resistance: Developing Anti-Colonial and Decolonizing Commitments in Anarchist Theory and Practice. In *Theories of Resistance: Anarchism, Geography and the Spirit of Revolt*, Edited by Marcelo Lopes de Sousa, Richard J. White and Simon Springer, 207–235. Lanham: MD: Rowan and Littlefield.

Lewis, Adam Gary. 2015. Anti-State Resistance on Stolen Land: Settler Colonialism, Settler Identity and the Imperative of Anarchist Decolonization. In *New Developments in Anarchist Studies,* Edited by PJ Lilley and Jeff Shantz, 145–186. Brooklyn, NY: Thought Crimes.

Lewis, Adam Gary. 2012a. Decolonizing Anarchism: Expanding Anarcha-Indigenism in Theory and Practice. MA Thesis. Cultural Studies, Queens University.

Lewis, Adam Gary. 2012b. Ethics, Activism and the Anti-Colonial: Social Movement Research as Resistance. *Social Movement Studies: Journal of Social, Cultural and Political Protest,* 11(2), 227–240.

Linebaugh, Peter, and Marcus Rediker. 2000. *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Linebaugh, Peter. 2016. *The Incomplete, True, Authentic, and Wonderful History of May Day*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.

Linebaugh, Peter. 2015. *Stop Thief! The Commons, Enclosures, and Resistance*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.

Loadenthal, Michael. 2017. *The Politics of Attack: Communiqués and Insurrectionary Violence.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Loewenstein, Antony. 2024. *The Palestine Laboratory: How Israel Exports the Technology of Occupation Around the World.* London: Verso.

Loyal, Steven. 2009. The French in Algeria, Algerians in France: Bourdieu, Colonialism, and Migration. *The Sociological Review,* 57(3), 406–427. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467–954X.2009.01847.x

Luchies, Timothy. 2015. Towards an Insurrectionary Power/Knowledge: Movement-Relevance, Anti-Oppression, Prefiguration. *Social Movement Studies*, 14(5), 523–538. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2014.998643.

Mackey, Eva. 2002. *The House of Difference: Cultural Politics and National Identity in Canada.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Mackey, Eva. 2016. *Unsettled Expectations: Uncertainty, Land and Settler Decolonization*. Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.

Macoun, Alissa, and Elizabeth Strakosch. 2013. The ethical demands of settler colonial theory. *Settler Colonial Studies,* 3(3–4), 426–443.

Malatesta, Errico, and Davide Turcato (ed.) 2014. T*he Method of Freedom: An Errico Malatesta Reader.* Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Malenfant, Jayne. 2018. Anarchist Youth in Rural Canada: Technology, Resistance, and the Navigation of Space. *Jeunesse, Young People, Texts, Cultures,* 10,(2), 126–51. https://doi.org/10.1353/jeu.2018.0020.

Mar, Tracey Banivanua, and Penelope Edmonds. 2010. Introduction: Making Space in Settler Colonies. In *Making Settler Colonial Space*, Edited by Tracey Banivanua Mar and Penelope Edmonds, 1–24. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Markoff, John, Hillary Lazar, Benjamin S. Case, and Daniel P. Burridge. 2024. *The Anarchist Turn in Twenty-First Century Leftwing Activism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marshall, Peter. 2010. *Demanding The Impossible: A History of Anarchism.* Oakland, CA: PM Press.

Marshall, Peter. 2009. Introduction. In *Religious Anarchism: New Perspectives*. Edited by Alexandre J. M. E. Christoyannopoulos, Xiii–1. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Martel, James. 2023. Anarchism Is the Only Future. *Philosophies,* 8,(6), 113, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.3390/philosophies8060113

Martinez, Elizabeth Betita. 2000. Where Was the Color in Seattle? Looking for reasons why the Great Battle was so white. March 10. <http://colorlines.com/archives/2000/03/where_was_the_color_in_seattlelooking_for_reasons_why_the_great_battle_was_so_white.html>. [Accessed March 12, 2014]

Mathieu, Lilian. 2021. The space of social movements. *Social Movement Studies*, 20(2), 193–207. https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2019.1630267

Mayrl, Damon. 2013. Fields, Logics, and Social Movements: Prison Abolition and the Social Justice Field. *Sociological Inquiry*, 83(2), 286–309. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475–682X.2012.00428.x

Mbah, Sam, and I.E Igariwey. 1997. *African Anarchism: The History of A Movement*. Tucson, AZ: See Sharp Press.

McAdam, Doug, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly. 2009. Comparative Perspectives on Contentious Politics. In *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure,* Edited by Mark Irving Lichbach and Alan S. Zuckerman, 260–90. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, Theresa. 2016. *In Divided Unity: Haudenosaunee Reclamation at Grand River.* Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

McClintock, Anne. 1992. The Angel of Progress: Pitfalls of the Term “Post-Colonialism”. *Social Text,* 31/32, 84–98.

Melucci, Alberto. 1985. The Symbolic Challenge of Contemporary Movements. *Social Research,* 52(4), 789–816.

Milstein, Cindy Barukh. 2022. *Try Anarchism for Life: The Beauty of Our Circle.* Strangers in a Tangled Wilderness.

Milstein, Cindy. 2010. *Anarchism and Its Aspirations.* Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Montano, John Paul. 2011. An Open Letter to the Occupy Wall Street Activists. *Zashnain*. September 24. <http://www.zashnain.com/2011/09/open-letter-to-occupy-wall-street.html>. [Accessed February 16, 2015]

Montreal Anarchist Bookfair Collective. 2023. Acknowledgment. < https://www.anarchistbookfair.ca/acknowledgement/>. [Accessed March 17, 2024]

Monture, Rick. 2014. *We Share Our Matters: Two Centuries of Writing and Resistance at Six Nations of the Grand River.* Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba Press.

Morgensen, Scott. 2011. *Spaces Between Us: Queer Settler Colonialism and Indigenous Decolonization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Morgensen, Scott. 2010. Settler Homonationalism: Theorizing Settler Colonialism within Queer Modernities. *GLQ A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies,* 16(1–2), 105–131.

Nangwaya, Ajamu. 2011. Race, Oppositional Politics, and the Challenges of Post-9/11 Mass Movement-Building Spaces. *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies,* 2011(1), 171–209.

Neigh, Scott. 2012a. *Gender & Sexuality: Canadian History Through the Stories of Activists*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Neigh, Scott. 2012b. *Resisting the State: Canadian History Through the Stories of Activists.* Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Newman, Saul. 2011. *The Politics of Postanarchism*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Nichols, Robert. 2020. *Theft is Property!: Dispossession and Critical Theory*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Nichols, Robert. 2015. Disaggregating Primitive Accumulation. *Radical Philosophy* (194), (Nov./Dec. 2015), 18–28.

NoCanada.info. n.d. Looking for Contributors and Co-Conspirators! <https://mtlcounter-info.org/en/nocanada-looking-for-contributors-and-co-conspirators/>. [Accessed February 7, 2022]

North-shore.info. n.d. About < https://north-shore.info/about/>. [Accessed March 17, 2024]

Öcalan, Abdullah. 2017. *The Political Thought of Abdullah Öcalan: Kurdistan, Woman's Revolution and Democratic Confederalism*. London: Pluto Press.

O' Connor, Alan. 1999. Who's Emma and the Limits of Cultural Studies. *Cultural Studies*, 13(4), 691–702. https://doi.org/10.1080/095023899335103

Olson, Joel. 2009. The Problem With Infoshops and Insurrection: US Anarchism, Movement Building and the Racial Order. In *Contemporary Anarchist Studies: An Introductory Anthology to Anarchy in the Academy*, Edited by Randall Amster, Abraham DeLeon, Luis A. Fernandez, Anthony J. Nocella II and Deric Shannon, 35–45. New York, NY: Routledge.

Pflug-Back, Kelly Rose and Enāemaehkiw Kesīqnaeh. 2016. Accumulation by Dispossession. *Briarpatch Magazine,* Oct, 24, 2016. <https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/accumulation-by-dispossession.[Accessed January 16, 2017]

Porter, David. 2011. *Eyes to the South: French Anarchists and Algeria*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Portwood-Stacer, Laura. 2013. *Lifestyle Politics and Radical Activism.* New York, NY: Bloomsbury Academic.

Proudhon, Pierre-Joseph. 1840/2011. What is Property? In *Property is Theft! A Pierre-Joseph Proudhon Reader*, Edited by Iain McKay, 89–138. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Puwar, Nirmal. 2009. Sensing a Post-Colonial Bourdieu: An Introduction. *The Sociological Review, 57*(3), 371–384. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467–954X.2009.01856.x

Ramnath, Maia. 2011. *Decolonizing Anarchism*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Ramnath, Maia. 2015. No Gods, No Masters, No Brahmins: An Anarchist Inquiry on Caste, Race, and Indigeneity in India. In *No Gods, No Masters, No Peripheries: Global Anarchisms,* Edited by Barry Maxwell and Raymond Craib, 44–79. Oakland, CA: PM Press.

Rapp, John A. 2012. *Daoism and Anarchism: Critiques of State Autonomy in Ancient and Modern China*. Bloomsbury Publishing: New York.

Razsa, Maple John. 2014. Beyond 'Riot Porn': Protest Video and the Production of Unruly Subjects. *Ethnos,* 79(4), 496–524. https://doi.org/10.1080/00141844.2013.778309

Reed, T. V. 2005. T*he Art of Protest Culture and Activism from the Civil Rights Movement to the Streets of Seattle*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Reed Ross, Alexander and Joshua Stephens. 2015. About Schmidt: How a White Nationalist Seduced Anarchists Around the World. October 12, 2015. <https://medium.com/@rossstephens/about-schmidt-how-a-white-nationalist-seduced-anarchists-around-the-world-chapter-1-1a6fa255b528>.

Regan, Paulette. 2010. *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Rifkin, Mark. 2014. The frontier as (moveable) space of exception. *Settler Colonial Studies,* 4 (2), 176–180.

Rifkin, Mark. 2013. Settler common sense. *Settler Colonial Studies,* 3(3–4), 322–340.

Robinson, Christine M. 2008. Order in Chaos: Security Culture as Anarchist Resistance to the Terrorist Label. *Deviant Behavior*, 29(3), 225–52.

Rothman, Hayyim. 2023. *No masters but God: Portraits of anarcho-Judaism*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Rousselle, Duane, and Süreyyya Evren (eds.). 2010. *Anarchist Developments in Culture Studies Issue #1 Post-Anarchism Today*. Little Black Cart Publishing and Distribution.

Rousselle, Duane, and Süreyyya Evren (eds.). 2011. *Post-Anarchism: A Reader.* London: Pluto Press.

Roussopoulos, Dmitri. 2012. The Politics of Neo-Anarchism. In *Anarchism A Documentary History of Libertarian Ideas Volume Three: The New Anarchism (1974–2012)*, Edited by Robert Graham, 31–44. Montreal, QC: Black Rose Books.

Saed. 2013. Socialism and Settler Colonialism on Great Turtle Island. C*apitalism Nature Socialism,* 24(1), 1–5.

Schayegh, Cyrus. 2024. Settler Colonial Studies: A Historical Analysis. *Settler Colonial Studies*, 14(4), 470–97. https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2024.2371490.

Schmidt, Michael. 2013. *Cartography of Revolutionary Anarchism*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Schmidt, Michael, and Lucien Van Der Walt. 2009. *Black Flame: The Revolutionary Class Politics of Anarchism and Syndicalism.* Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Seawright, Gardner. 2014. Settler Traditions of Place: Making Explicit the Epistemological Legacy of White Supremacy and Settler Colonialism for Place-Based Education. *Educational Studies: A Journal of the American Educational Studies Association,* 50(6), 554–572.

Sehdev, Robinder Kaur. 2010. Lessons From the Bridge: On the Possibilities of Anti-Racist Feminist Alliances in Indigenous Spaces. In *This is an Honour Song: Twenty Years Since the Blockades*, Edited by Leanne Simpson and Kiera Ladner, 105–124. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

Shannon, Deric, Anthony J. Nocella III, and John Asimakopoulos (eds.). 2012. *The Accumulation of Freedom: Writings on Anarchist Economics.* Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Shantz, Jeff. 2010. *Constructive Anarchy: Building Infrastructures of Resistance.* Surrey, England: Ashgate Publishing.

Shantz, Jeff. 2009. *Living Anarchy: Theory and Practice in Anarchist Movements*. Palo Alto, CA: Academica Press LLC.

Shantz, Jeff, and Dana. M. Williams, 2014. *Anarchy and society: reflections on anarchist sociology.* Chicago: Haymarket Books.

Sharma, Nandita, and Cynthia Wright. 2008–9. Decolonizing Resistance, Challenging Colonial States. *Social Justice,* 35(3), 120–138.

Sherman, Paula. 2010. Picking Up The Wampum Belt As An Act of Protest. In *Alliances: Re/Envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships*, Edited by Lynne Davis, 114–130. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Shukaitis, Stevphen, David Graeber, and Erika Biddle (eds.). 2007. *Constituent Imagination: Militant Investigations, Collective Theorization*. Oakland, Ca: AK Press.

Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. 2017. *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resistance.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. 2014. Land as pedagogy: Nishnaabeg intelligence and rebellious transformation. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society,* 3(3), 1–25.

Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. 2011. *Dancing on our Turtle's Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-Creation, Resurgence and A New Emergence*. Winnipeg, MB: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

Sitrin, Maria. 2019. Anarchism and the Newest Social Movements. In T*he Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, Edited Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams, 659–676. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sitrin, Marina. 2015. The Anarchist Spirit. *Dissent*, 62(4), 2015, 84–86, https://doi.org/10.1353/dss.2015.0079.

Sium, Aman, Chandni Desai, and Eric Ritskes. 2012. Towards the 'tangible unknown': Decolonization and the Indigenous Future. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society,* 1(1), I–XIII.

Skyer, Robin, Silke Roth, and Elizabeth Reed. 2025. Mutual Aid as Prefigurative Politics—Beyond Anarchism. *Sociology Compass,* 19(2), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.70037.

Sloan Morgan, Vanessa. 2016. Swimming against the Current: Towards an Anti-Colonial Anarchism in British Columbia, Canada. In *Theories of resistance: anarchism, geography, and the spirit of revolt*, Edited by Marcelo J. L. Souza, Richard J. White and Simon Springer, 177–206. London: Rowan and Littlefield International.

Smith, Andrea. 2005. *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Smith, Andrea. 2006. Heteropatriarchy and The Three Pillars of White Supremacy: Rethinking Women of Colour Organizing. *In The Colour of Violence: The INCITE! Anthology*, Edited by INCITE! Women of Colour Against Violence, 66–73. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 2004. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples.* London: Zed Books Ltd.

Snelgrove, Corey, Rita Kaur Dhamoon, and Jeff Corntassel. 2014. Unsettling settler colonialism: The discourse and politics of settlers, and solidarity with Indigenous nations. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society,* 3(2), 1–32.

Spade, Dean. 2020a. *Mutual aid: building solidarity during this crisis (and the next)*. London: Verso.

Spade, Dean. 2020b. Solidarity Not Charity: Mutual Aid for Mobilization and Survival. *Social Text,* 38(1), 131–151.

Springer, Simon. 2013. Anarchism and Geography: A Brief Genealogy of Anarchist Geographies. *Geography Compass,* 7(1), 46–60.

Springer, Simon. 2012. Anarchism! What geography still ought to be. *Antipode,* 44(5): 1605–1624.

Springer, Simon. 2014. Why a radical geography must be anarchist. *Dialogues in Human Geography,* 4(3): 249–270.

Sub.media. 2024. Gaza is an Image of the Future. <https://itsgoingdown.org/gaza-is-an-image-of-the-future>. [Accessed January 7, 2025]

Sub.media. n.d. 'About.' < https://sub.media/about-us/>.

Sunseri, Lina. 2011. Moving Beyond the Feminism Vs Nationalism Dichotomy: An Anti-Colonial Feminist Perspective on Aboriginal Liberation Struggles. In *Colonialism and Indigeneity in Canada*, Edited by Martin J. Cannon and Lina Sunseri, 154–161. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.

Tarrow, Sidney. 2005. *The New Transnational Activism* (1st ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tarrow, Sidney, and Charles Tilly. 2009. Contentious Politics and Social Movements. In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*, Edited by Carles Boix and Susan C Stokes, 438–61. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tawinikay. 2021. *Settlers on the Red Road. On Indigeneity, Appropriation and Belonging*. Aphikona Press.

Tawinikay. 2018. 'Autonomously and with Conviction: A Métis Refusal of State-Led Reconciliation.' <https://north-shore.info/2018/10/22/autonomously-and-with-conviction-a-met"is-refusal-of-state-led-reconciliation/>. [Accessed April 17, 2024]

The Invisible Committee. 2015. To Our Friends. Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e).

Thompson, Christopher Scott. 2016. What is Pagan Anarchism? *The Anarchist Library*. <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/christopher-scott-thompson-what-is-pagan-anarchism>. [Accessed May 6, 2024]

Tilly, Charles. 1985. War Making and State Making as Organized Crime. In *Bringing the State Back In*, Edited by Peter Evans, Dietrich Rusechemeyer and Theda Skocpol, 169–187. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tilly, Charles, Eernesto Castañeda, and Lesley J. Wood. 2020. *Social movements, 1768–2018* (Fourth edition.). Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Timmermans, Stefan, and Iddo Tavory. 2011. Advancing Ethnographic Research through Grounded Theory. In *The SAGE Handbook of Grounded Theory*, Edited by Antony Bryant and Kathy Charmaz, 493–512. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publishing Inc.

Toronto Anarchist Bookfair. 2020. Mission Statement and Land Acknowledgement. <https://torontoanarchistbookfair.noblogs.org/statements-and-policies/mission-statement-and-land-acknowledgement/>. [Accessed March 17, 2024]

Toronto G20 Main Conspiracy Group: The Charges and how they came to be. 2012. <https://north-shore.info/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/torontoconspiracy.pdf>. [Accessed August 19, 2024]

Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. 2012. Decolonization is not a Metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, Society,* 1(1), 1–40.

Turcato, Davide. 2015. Nations without Borders: Anarchists and National Identity. In *Reassessing the Transnational Turn: Scales of Analysis in Anarchist and Syndicalist Studies,* Edited by Constance Bantman and Bert Altena, 25–42. New York: Routledge.

Unsettling Guelph. 2019. Decolonizing Thanksgiving Dinner 2019. < <https://unsettlingguelph.wordpress.com/decolonizing-thanksgiving-dinner-2019/>. [Accessed March 12, 2026]

van der Walt, Lucien. 2001. Towards a History of Anarchist Anti-Imperialism. *Against War and Terrorism*, October, 9–12.

van der Walt, Lucien. 2010. Revolutionary Syndicalism, Communism and the National Question in South African Socialism, 186–1928. In A*narchism and Syndicalism in the Colonial and Postcolonial World*, 1870–1940, Edited by Steven Hirsch and Lucien van der Walt, 33–94. Boston, MA: Brill.

van der Walt, Lucien, and Michael Schmidt. 2009. *Black Flame: The Revolutionary Class Politics of Anarchism and Syndicalism*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Veracini, Lorenzo. 2021. *The World Turned Inside Out: Settler Colonialism as a Political Idea.* London: Verso Books.

Veracini, Lorenzo. 2015. *The Settler Colonial Present.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Veracini, Lorenzo. 2013. 'Settler Colonialism': Career of a Concept. T*he Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 41(2), 313–333.

Veracini, Lorenzo. 2011. Introducing settler colonial studies. *Settler Colonial Studies*, 1(1), 1–12.

Veracini, Lorenzo. 2010. *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Introduction*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Veracini, Lorenzo. 2006. *Israel and Settler Society.* London, UK: Pluto Press.

Volcano, Abbey, and Deric Shannon. 2012. Capitalism in the 2000s. In *The Accumulation of Freedom: Writings on Anarchist Economics*, Edited by Deric Shannon, Anthony Nocella II and John Askimakipoulos, 80–94. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Walia, Harsha. 2021. *Border and Rule: Global Migration, Capitalism and the Rise of Racist Nationalism.* Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing.

Walia, Harsha. 2013. *Undoing Border Imperialism*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Walia, Harsha. 2011. 2011: Reflecting on Social Movement Successes in Canada. *Canadian Dimension*. October 30th 2011. <https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/2011–reflecting-on-social-movement-successes-in-canada>. [Accessed November 12, 2017]

Walsh, Catherine. 2007. Shifting the Geopolitics of Critical Knowledge: Decolonial Thought and Cultural Studies 'Others' in the Andes. *Cultural Studies,* 21(2–3), 224–239.

Warburton, Theresa. 2021. *Other Worlds Here: Honoring Native Women's Writing in Contemporary Anarchist Movements*. Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

Warburton, Theresa. 2020. What Looks Like a Grave: Native and Anarchist Place-Making in New England. *Studies in American Indian Literatures,* 32(1–2), 75–110.

Warburton, Theresa. 2016. Coming to Terms: Rethinking Popular Approaches to Anarchism and Feminism. *Perspectives on Anarchist Theory No. 29: Anarcha-Feminism*. Portland, OR: Institute for Anarchist Studies, 66–79.

Ward, Colin. 2004. *Anarchism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Warner, Michael. 2005. *Publics and Counterpublics*. New York: Zone Books.

Warner, Michael. 2002. Publics and Counterpublics. *Public Culture*, 14(1), Winter 2002, 49–90.

Warrior, Robert. 2021. Settler Sidekick Solidarity? Response to Lorenzo Veracini: 'Is Settler Colonial Studies Even Useful?' *Postcolonial Studies*, 24(2), 283–289.

White, Alexandre I. R. 2022 Who can lead the revolution?: Re-thinking anticolonial revolutionary consciousness through Frantz Fanon and Pierre Bourdieu. *Theory and Society,* 51(3), 457–485. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186–021–09454–0

White, Roger. 2004. *Post-Colonial Anarchism: Essays on Race, Repression and Culture in Communities of Color, 1999–2004*. Oakland, CA: Jailbreak Press.

Wildcat, Matthew, Mandee McDonald, Glen Coulthard, and Stephanie Irlbacher-Fox. 2014. Learning from the land: Indigenous land based pedagogy and decolonization. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society,* 3(3), I–XV.

Wigger, Angela. 2014. A Critical Appraisal of What Could Be an Anarchist Political Economy. *Ephemera,* 14(4), 739–751.

Williams, Dana M. 2018. Contemporary Anarchist and Anarchistic Movements. *Sociology Compass,* 12(6), 1–17.

Williams, Dana M. 2017. *Black Flags and Social Movements: A Sociological Analysis of Movement Anarchism*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Willow, Anna J. 2012. *Strong Hearts, Native Lands: Anti-Clear-cutting Activism at Grassy Narrows First Nation.* Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Wilson, Matthew. 2023. What Happened to the Anarchist Century? *Anarchist Studies,* 31.1, 6–10.

Wilson, Shawn. 2008. *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods.* Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.

Withers, AJ. 2021. *Fight to Win: Inside Poor People's Organizing.* Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing.

Wolfe, Patrick. 2013. Recuperating Binarism: a heretical introduction. *Settler Colonial Studies,* 3(3–4), 257–279.

Wolfe, Patrick. 2006. Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native. *Journal of Genocide Research,* 8(4), 387–409.

Wolfe, Patrick. 1999. *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event*. London: Cassell.

Wood, Lesley. J. 2019. Anarchist Gatherings 1986–2017. *ACME an International e-Journal for Critical Geographies,* 18(4), 892–908.

Wood, Lesley. J. 2014. *Crisis and Control: The Militarization of Protest and Policing*. Toronto: Between the Lines.

Wood, Lesley. J. 2012. *Direct Action, Deliberation, and Diffusion: Collective Action after the WTO Protests in Seattle.* Cambridge University Press.

Woodcock, George. 2004. *Anarchism.* Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Yee, Jessica. 2011. Occupy Wall Street: The game of colonialism and the left. rabble.ca. October 1. <http://rabble.ca/columnists/2011/10/occupy-wall-street-game-colonialism-and-left>. [Accessed February 14, 2015]