

<a> CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION: CRITICAL GEOGRAPHIES OF RESISTANCE.

Sarah M. Hughes Department of Geography and Environmental Sciences, Northumbria University

Keywords: resistance, emergence, power, geography, subjectivity

Critical Geographies of Resistance emerges from a recognition that the contemporary geopolitical moment is characterised by an increase in actions that are recognised as, or claim to be, 'resistant'. The rise of the far-right, the decimation of the natural environment and the responses to the so-called refugee 'crisis' are illustrative of these disturbing times. This volume contents that revisiting debates on what we mean by *resistance* may go some way to question how Geographers can, or should, respond to the contemporary moment(s).

The chapters comprising this edited volume therefore critically interrogate the political work of resistance in the contemporary moment. The authors carefully explore the multiple and everyday spaces, subjects, and temporalities of resistance, and in doing so provide a novel approach to the study of resistance within Geography. Together we aim to push forward debates on resistance in Geography that have been perhaps stagnant over the last decade. That is not to say that there has not been scholarship on resisting and on resistance, but that a critical discussion on terminology of resistance remains. Whilst resistance has a long and rich history within Geography, the book emerges from a recognition that tracing the concept of resistance within Geography reveals a paradox: resistance is everywhere, and yet, surprisingly, elusive. Furthermore, whilst the conceptual vocabulary for resistance is increasingly diverse and splintered, and work on practices of resistance has proliferated, a critical engagement with resistance 'itself' has been rarely systematically engaged with, despite its apparent centrality to many geographical debates (for previous work see Staeheli 1994; Pile 1997; Cresswell 1996; Sharp et al. 2000; Routledge 1996, 1997; Rose 2002; Amoore 2005; Sparke 2008).

The conceptualisation of resistance is of importance for Geography, as the discipline has focussed upon theorising power. Over the last decade, a wealth of scholarship interrogating the various and emergent multiplicities, intensities, modes, forms and genres of power has developed (Anderson 2017; see also Crampton & Elden 2007; Allen 2011). Tracing the trajectory of resistance cannot be separated from power, and yet crucially, the shape of such

resistant forms remains delineated apriori (with the exception of Horton and Kraftl 2009). That is, the (in)actions that come to be framed as resistance, are not traced in their emergent becoming; Geographers remain wedded to particular coordinates – of intention, linearity and opposition – that serve to determine in advance what comes to be termed as resistance. Further, these developments in how power is conceived are now ontologically dissonant with prevailing understandings of resistance. It is now recognised in several areas of the discipline, (particularly within Social and Cultural Geography), that the non-human is lively and agentic (Braun and Whatmore 2010; Clark et al. 2008; Anderson and Wylie 2009; Gregson and Crang 2010). Yet, this focus upon the vitality of the non-human can serve to displace intention, which is a pivotal component of how resistance is determined in many dominant Geographical accounts (Pile 1997; Routledge 1997; Martin & Pierce 2013). How, then, does a focus upon the non-human unsettle the assumption of an intentional, resistant subject?

Critical Geographies of Resistance aims to rekindle debates on resistance within the discipline. It rejects grand narratives or predetermined accounts of the form of resistance, and instead focus on what a *critical* approach to resistance in its emergence might mean in the contemporary moment. Refuting a singular conceptualisation of resistance, the chapters are nonetheless united by an attempt to unpack how, where and for whom *resistance* does political work within Geography. Moving beyond binary accounts of power vs resistance, the authors of this edited volume think critically about the work the concept of resistance does in their scholarship. What forms of politics does a focus on resistance open up, and what does it risk foreclosing? How might Geography engage with resistance in the context of the 'material turn'? How does a focus upon the non-human unsettle the assumption of an intentional, resistant subject? Can Geographers recognise and research resistance without recourse to such a pre-determined form? In this way, *Critical Geographies of Resistance* takes stock of, and advances Geographical understandings of resistance.

In sharing these ontological, epistemological and political premises, the authors of *Critical Geographies of Resistance* demonstrate the potential of rethinking the work resistance does within Geography in productive ways, engaging in positive critical thinking and aimed at the identification of new voices, possibilities and agencies, and also at de-framing established knowledges.

The idea for this book has emerged gradually over last 5 years. It began during my doctoral research which explored resistance within the UK asylum system. Taking stock of the literature on resistance in Geography, I began to note that debates on the *conceptualisation* of resistance had perhaps reached an impasse. Since the debates on resistance in the late 1990s/early 2000s (including the edited volumes *Geographies of Resistance* (1997), and *Entanglements of Power: Geographies of Domination/Resistance* (2000)), debates on what Geographers mean by resistance had become stagnated. There has not been an edited or single author book specifically exploring the role of resistance within Geography for two decades. Accordingly, the essays that comprise this *Critical Geographies of Resistance* address this important lacuna in Geographical scholarship. The authors advance debates on resistance in Geography by interrogating what a *critical* geography of resistance might look like in the contemporary moment.

This chapter traces a history of resistance in Geography, reflecting on the trajectories of the term resistance. This includes a discussion of the possible 'impasse' in scholarship in the late 1990s, and also Marxist, anarchist, and post-political accounts of resistance, recognising the feminist and postcolonial contributions pushing the criticality of accounts of resistance. The introduction specifically addresses what is 'critical' in this volume's engagement with resistance, before outlining the rest of the volume so that the reader can navigate the arguments put forward.

I begin by outlining engagement with resistance in Geography, exploring approaches that conceive resistance as oppositional to power, and then addressing scholarship whereby resistance is always-already entangled with power, including attending to the diversity of the many terms that have arisen to ground the specificities of particular resistant relations. I then move to identify two interrelated logics which have come to undergird much scholarly attention in this area: first, that resistance as distributed or 'everywhere' reduces the conceptual purchase of the term, and second, that resistance requires (a recognition of) intention. The chapter then takes up these pervasive conceptual threads and frays them to *critically* destabilise these seemingly fixed coordinates of resistance, arguing that a non-reductive attention to the always-already entangled forces, claimed as power and resistance,

necessitates acknowledging the potentiality of forces. Such an approach to resistance prevents a foreclosure of these forces into predetermined forms (e.g. of activist, intentional subject, protest, tactic or dispute), and thereby keeps open the category of resistance to other subjects, materials, spaces and temporalities which do not always cohere to an expected, coherent, resistant form.

As I will demonstrate throughout this Introduction, a rethinking of resistance within Geography is important both within and beyond the academy, for a foreclosure of debate into 'what counts' as resistance, risks denying recognition to those involved, and shutting down the multiple possible futures that may, or may not emerge. This chapter therefore, does not settle on a specific definition of resistance, for this risks excluding and ignoring the "pluralities of resistance" (Foucault 1978, 95) which I will continue to detail. I follow Caygill's (2013, 7 emphasis as original) comments that "[a] philosophy of resistance has itself to resist the pressure of concept-formation, of reducing the practices of resistance to a single concept" and therefore avoid the "conceptual unification of 'a Resistance.'" An attention to the potentiality of resistant relations does however, I argue, necessitate a discursive shift; new dis-organizing grammars (of ambiguity, inconsistency and non-linearity) and vocabularies (of genre, intensity and mode), are needed for Geographers to meaningfully engage with resistance in its emergence. The chapter thereby details areas where scholarly debate on resistance could be productively reanimated.

** Resistance as oppositional**

Resistance has traditionally been viewed as an oppositional binary to power: a "central dialectic of opposing forces" (Sharp et al. 2000, 9). Such structural accounts, whereby society is understood in relation to an overarching system or framework, posit power as possessed and deployed by those who control the institutions comprising the sovereign state. This, often (neo) Marxist scholarship, focuses upon the hegemony of state and society, linking power with domination, control and coercion. When resistance is articulated thus, it is primarily recognised as mass mobilisations against a top-down, hierarchical manifestation of (sovereign) power; resistance is framed as power's antonym. Indeed,

'traditional' notions of resistance, as Cresswell (2000, 261) notes, pivot on this idea that power, "through force or persuasion, diverts people from pursuing their 'real interests.'"

Power and resistance are thus conceptualised as a dualism; resistance is considered emancipatory and acts against the seemingly totalising force of hegemonic state power (Hoy 2005). Across the wider Social Sciences, scholarship on resistance has its origins in this structural shared sense of counter-movement from below, double movement, or an identity orientated approach to resistance, looking at how "collective actors strive to create the identities and solidarities that they defend" (Sharp et al. 2000, 9; see Laclau and Mouffe 1985; de Certeau 1988; Polanyi 2001; Gramsci 2007).

More specifically, as Rose (2002) notes, Geography has also focused upon theorizing organized opposition (see Brown 2007; Peters 1998; Routledge 1996, 1997; Martin and Pierce 2013). This focus upon the geography of collective action cuts across many sub-sections of the discipline: Cloke et al. (2016) look at religion and contemporary activism in the Occupy movement; Flusty (2011) examines play as resistance to new developments in Los Angeles, Naseemullah (2018) analyses riots in India, and Murrey (2016) focusses upon community-led activity to fight against the Chad-Cameroon oil pipeline. Common across these empirically disparate accounts is an understanding of resistance in response to a particular configuration of power relations; resistance is placed in a dialectical relationship to power.

This dialectic is further developed in the influential work of feminist Geographer Katz (2004; 2009), whose alternative categorisations of agency as reworking, resilience or resistance has had significant traction across the discipline. As Sparke (2008, 424 emphasis as original) explains, Katz "contrasts resistance that involves oppositional consciousness and achieves emancipatory change, with forms of reworking that alter the organization but not the polarization of power relations". Katz' requirement for resistance to be oppositional (2004) has dominated much Geographic scholarship including: class and agency in post-industrial Glasgow (Cumbers et al. 2010), feminist accounts of intimate warfare in South Sudan (Faria 2017), migrant workers in Can Tho, Vietnam (Hauge and Fold 2016), and hip-hop cultures in Cape Town (Hammett 2012). Importantly for this paper's argument for

Geographers to expand their engagement with resistance, Katz' delineation of resistance determines a priori what form resistance can take, which risks denying recognition to those actions and actors that do not fit within a pre-assigned 'oppositional' narrative.

Moreover, following calls in the 1990s for Geographers to "challenge social oppression... putting ourselves 'on the line' as academics, and engage with activism as academics" (Chouinard 1994, 5), the discipline has seen a rise in work on activism as a particular form of oppositional resistance directed at influencing change. Here, "[r]adical and critical geographers seek not only to interpret the world, but also to change it through the melding of theory and political action" (Blomley 2008, 285). Activism can be broadly understood to be a "practice of political action by individuals or collectives in the form of social movements, non-government organizations" (Routledge 2009, 5) and is commonly understood as actions directed as oppositional to particular configurations of power relations. Feminist scholars have further "begun to expand the category of activism to include modest, quotidian acts of kindness and creativity" (Pottinger 2017, 215). Through this lens activism does not need to be revolutionary and is conceptualised beyond a revolutionary overthrowing of power. This attention to activism "beyond the militant subject" (Chatterton and Pickerill 2010, 478; see Larner and Craig 2005; Horton and Kraftl 2009; Pottinger 2017) has arisen "partly in response to the machismo that besets notions of wholesale revolution, giving rise to a need to understand post-heroic forms of activism more clearly" (Gill 2016, 168). These 'quiet' actions at the level of the everyday remain purposeful and oppositional; they are action on behalf of a cause; deliberate tactics with political orientations (Pottinger 2017).

Indeed, Geographers have paid close attention to quotidian tactics of oppressed groups, often utilising the work of de Certeau who proposes that many everyday practices of resistance are tactical, deployed by those who lack the backing of institutions of power, seize the "possibilities offered by circumstances" to oppose and eventually overthrow the forces oppressing them (1988, 37). Geographers have utilised the work of de Certeau to understand with resistance in a wide range of contexts, including migration (Gill et al. 2013), citizenship (Secor 2004), online mapping technologies (Elwood and Mitchell 2013) and through the 'dumpster diving' tactics of "contemporary anarchist collective, CrimethInc"

(Crane 2012). This approach to everyday, individual resistance is also characterised by opposition, coherence and intention.

These oppositional accounts are disparate in their ontologies, empirical focus and articulation of 'resistance' and yet they all broadly resonate within a framework of resistance as oppositional to power, resistance as "challenging oppressive power relations" (Routledge 2009, 6). Within (neo) Marxist accounts of (organised) opposition, resistance remains antonymic to power. Yet outside of an explicitly Marxist framework, dialectics haunt resistance; the residues of autonomous Marxism, side-lined by the post-structural and material turn within Geography, continue to surface in how resistance is defined, researched and recognised as oppositional. Recognising this undergirding dialectic is important for Geographic scholarship engaging with practices of resistance, for in predetermining what form resistance must take before its emergence, concerns over co-option emerge.

<c> Concerns about co-option

This narrative of resistance as oppositional to power, results in concerns around co-option and consequently, with what form 'real' resistance can take. Pierce and Williams (2016, 171 my emphasis) argue that scholarship from the 1990s, has tended to "use the term resistance to link a myriad of oppositional responses to existing, unjust, power relations" and voice their concerns about a resultant co-option of resistance into existing power relations. They note that (neo) Marxist oppositional accounts of resistance are often concerned with those for whom resistance is seeking inclusion within a particular system. Furthermore, post-political scholarship, with its varying emphases on antagonism (Mouffe 2005), dissensus (Rancière 2010) and foreclosure (Žižek 2004) emphasises – and critiques - the need for emancipatory change (Wilson and Swyngedouw 2014). These scholars variously call for radical transformative, revolutionary resistance (although Žižek (2004), argues that even when power is seized through a revolution, prior structures remain). The post-political view that those resisting power, will "inevitably reproduce a variation of the unjust institutions they have displaced" (Pierce and Williams 2016, 175) has had much traction within Geography; such scholarship is concerned with co-option as reproducing the hegemonic

order and resulting in structures and subjects becoming enveloped back into powerful systems (Wilson and Swyngedouw 2014).

These concerns with co-option extend beyond a post-political approach and are found throughout broader narratives of resistance as oppositional to particular forms of power relations. For example, Johnston (2017, 653) exploring the relationship between queer lives and normative institutions suggests in relation to the 2010 UK Equalities Act that “[t]raditional forms of activism – that oppose the state – are no longer necessary, yet these leave some questioning the incorporation of q ueer lives into normative institutions.” Furthermore, Naylor (2017, 26) looking at reframing autonomy within Political Geography argues for “a feminist geopolitics of autonomous resistance” moving beyond simply framing this as a “form of political resistance driven by social movement action against the state and/or neoliberal capitalist systems” and instead reinserting agency into geopolitics. Gill writing in the context of the UK asylum system is also sceptical about “the potential of compassion to be truly emancipatory” (2016, 158 my emphasis) and consequently argues against particular forms of activism that try and bring asylum seekers into contact with state actors.

These empirically diverse accounts underpinned by autonomy, emancipation and a concern with what ‘counts’ as resistance, reflect broader anxieties around co-option when resistance is framed as oppositional to power. Whilst these authors do engage with the complexity of power, an at times paradoxical and essentially binary view of resistance can be traced throughout much of this literature. This paper now turns to examine scholarship that attempts to refute this separation, framing resistance as intimately entangled with power relations (Sharp et al. 2000), discussing post-structuralist conceptualisations of term, before moving to unpack the logics that underpin these dual framings of resistance.

** Resistance as always-already entangled with power**

“[D]omination and resistance cannot exist independently of each other, but neither can they be reducible to one another: they are thoroughly hybrid phenomena, the one always

contains the seeds of the other, the one always bearing at least a trace of the other that contaminates or subverts it" (Sharp et al. 2000, 20)

Sharp et al.'s (2000, 27) influential account of the geographies of domination/resistance, draws upon Foucault to put forward an argument for an "ambiguous, entangled view of power" deploying the term 'entanglements' to refute a binary separation of power and resistance. For Sharp et al. (2000, xv), resistance and domination are both inherently linked; neither can "escape from the endless circulation of power." Indeed, Foucault's conceptualization of power and resistance as multiple and relational, produced by certain forms of social relationship and therefore unable to be possessed, contained or localised (1978; Allen and Cochrane 2010), has become close to orthodoxy within (and beyond) Geography. Within this framework "where there is power, there is resistance, and yet, or rather consequently, this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power" (Foucault 1978, 95). Consequently, resistance does not entail escaping power relations as the "strictly relational character of power relationships [whose] existence depends on a multiplicity of powers of resistance...present everywhere in the power network" (Foucault 1978, 95).

For Geographers, conceptualising this relationship as 'entangled', Sharp et al. argue, brings forward a new spatial metaphor of "knotted thoughts" (2000, 1), or as Massey frames it "a ball of wool after the cat has been at it" (2000, 283). An entanglement framework, necessitates alternative ways of thinking about resistance beyond the metaphorical, looking practically at how 'knots' of forces become grounded in the multiple materialities of space (Sharp et al. 2000). Therefore, recognizing these entangled resistant power relations may not mobilise individuals or groups in any definitive way but, crucially, this does not disqualify these (in)actions as resistance, rather it changes the way in which resistance is recognized as a multiplicity of potential relations. This is because, for Foucault, unlike the aforementioned accounts of resistance as oppositional: "no matter how terrible a given situation may be, there always remain the possibilities of resistance, disobedience, and oppositional groupings" (2002, 354). Yet this apparent optimism is in contrast with claims made by Thrift, that Foucault in his reliance upon discourse, does not leave space for lively, agentic subjects, resulting in "a certain rather gloomy outlook" (2007, 53). Such claims of futility are

important to address when thinking about the possible limitations of this approach to resistance within Geography, as Thrift (despite an acknowledgement that Foucault does leave some space for resistance) argues that “the overwhelming impression is, too often, of a world that has given up the ghost” (2000, 269), implicitly reinforcing resistance as intentional, linear and directed at a particular configuration of power relations.

What becomes apparent here is that debates over the nuances of Foucauldian framings of agentic subjects, serve to highlight how particular forms of resistance and power continue to be held apart, or in opposition, for analysis. Returning to the quote that opens this section: “the one always contains the seeds of the other” (Sharp et al. 2000, 20 my emphasis). Indeed, Sharp et al. remain with the domination/resistance couplet; for them, power is “operative in moments of both domination and resistance”, a focus upon entanglements of power, uses the terminology of “dominating power” and “resisting power” (2000, 3; 20 my emphasis) to name the forms that these various relations take. Such a focus has resulted in resistance placed as proxy for power relations, a “form of power” (Bale 2000, 148); an attunement to a different force. Grounding these forces in writing becomes difficult as the terms ‘power’ and ‘resistance’ imply a dualism, and entanglements of domination/resistance require the naming of a particular force: a discursive dialectic (re)emerges within this framework. Indeed, this separation of entangled forces can be traced throughout many Foucauldian inspired accounts that have emerged within Geographic literature, as this section will now continue to outline.

For example, Sparke (2008, 424) draws upon this entangled framework to comment that “writing on the geography of resistance is especially indicative of the widened field of political geography”. Political Geography emphasizes power; there is a large and widely acknowledged body of work which conceives power to be dispersed through multiple actors; a “tangled array of forces” (Allen and Cochrane 2010, 1073; see for example Agnew 1999; Allen 2004, 2006; Hyndman 2004; Allen and Cochrane 2007; Crampton and Elden 2007; Sharp 2009). Furthermore, there is significant attention to discussions over sovereign power as multiple and diffuse (see Connolly 2007; Painter 2006; Gill 2010; McConnell 2009; Mountz 2013; Amoore 2013). As a consequence of the development and intersection of these bodies of literature, sovereignty is now widely considered to have migrated “from

states to a loosely assembled global system” (Connolly 2007, 36). This attention to the multiplicity of power relations has resulted in, as Chatterton and Pickerill (2010, 482) argue “resistance...not usually articulated against a clear figure of oppression, be it the state, capital or the global corporation.” Yet whilst the ‘target’ of resistance has been interrogated and splintered, far less attention has been given to the multiplicity of forces of resistance within Political Geography (Sparke 2008).

Furthermore, postcolonial scholarship has also been concerned with a multiplicity of intertwined forces. In Bhabha’s critique of Edward Said’s ‘binary’ account of ‘the other’ (1978), Bhabha (1990) articulates how fluid, mixed, ambivalent and uncertain identities of emerge through colonialism: a mutual construction of subjectivities. Here the colonizer attempts to make those who have been colonized act, or behave like the coloniser, reforming a more-familiar, but always-different ‘other’ (Sambajee 2015). Yet, this mimicry “continually produces its slippage, its excess, its difference” (Bhabha 1984, 126), opening up an unstable and ambivalent ‘third space’ whereby different identities come together; a space “holding its opposite within it” (Mitchell 1997, 536). An attention to such hybridity for postcolonial Geography means that separation of domination and resistance is considered “analytically unsatisfactory” (Radcliffe 2000, 170). The hybridity of third space is important for understanding resistance as entangled, argues Radcliffe, writing on the politics surrounding indigenous clothing in Ecuador, for unpacking binaries illuminates the “complexities of power engaged in cultural contact and social change, highlighting the deeply entangled and impure, non-essential nature of societies and identities” (2000, 169).

An acknowledgement of the complex entanglements of forces, is further evident within Actor Network Theory (e.g. Pickering 1993, Latour 1996, Law 1999). Here “modern societies cannot be described without recognizing them as having fibrous, thread-like, wiry, stringy,ropy, capillary character” (Latour 1996, 370). Comparably, Geographers drawing upon the rhizomatic assemblage thinking of Deleuze and Guattari (1987) and DeLanda (2016) also acknowledge that “assemblage connotes not a central governing power, nor a power distributed equally, but power as plurality in transformation” (Anderson and McFarlane 2011, 125). This flat ontology which refutes a privileging of the human, means that resistance here also includes acknowledging the ‘vibrant materiality’ that Bennett (2010)

argues runs alongside humans, seeing things as having the capacity to act as quasi agents and as forces of their own. Whilst these accounts focus upon the multiplicity of non-hierarchical power relations that assemblage thinking obligates, the (albeit implicit) assumption here in this literature is that resistance is also splintered, multiple and non-hierarchical (see also McFarlane 2006, 2009; Allen and Cochrane 2007, 2010). An important exception here is Legg (2011, 128), who discusses “Deleuze’s commentary on Foucault’s work, in which he [Deleuze] stressed that ‘the final word on power is that resistance comes first’ (Deleuze 1988, 89).”

Such a relational approach has had considerable traction within Urban Geography (e.g. McFarlane 2009, 2011; Shaw 2014; Jacobs 2012; Storper and Scott 2016), with McGuirk et al. (2016, 129 my emphasis) arguing that understanding the city as an assemblage, means conceiving it to be “performed, emergent and diversely constituted [...] enacted in socio-material ‘frictions’ and negations of the everyday”. This non-hierarchical multiplicity also emerges within Wideman and Masuda’s (2018, 387) account of resistance to planning interventions in Downtown Eastside in Vancouver, where they argue that an assemblage approach which engages the material is a “powerful analytic tool for uncovering the contested production of place”. Such accounts of the liveliness of materials, that form new relations beyond (although not excluding) any human intention, destabilizes intention as a criteria for determining resistance a priori for, as this paper will continue to interrogate, Bennett’s concept of distributed agency “does not posit a subject as the root cause of an effect” (2010, 31). This multiplies the potential for resistance into material and other non-human actors, which aligns with the concern that a multiplicity of resistant relations is a dilution of the purchase of the term, resulting in particular pre-determined coordinates (of intention, coherence, opposition) that delineate the form of resistance.

** Logic 1: That resistance ‘everywhere’ dilutes the purchase of the term.**

A focus upon entanglement can be traced throughout much Geographic scholarship on resistance since the cultural turn. Yet, literature premised upon this understanding of power and resistance continues to separate them for analysis: to en-twine, to en-tangle requires a separation; the possibility to disentangle, unravel or untwine is inevitable within such a

discursive capture. Even for Foucault resistances are “the odd term in relations of power; they are inscribed in the latter as an irreducible opposite” (1990, 88 my emphasis). This enduring dialectic has resulted in a wide variety of productive terms emerging to detail particular manifestations, nuances and specificities of entanglements. For example, Geographers have explored: counter conduct (Cadman 2010; Conlon 2013; Rosol 2014); resilience (Munt 2012; Pugh 2014; Weichselgartner and Kelman 2015) and the complexities of social movements (Creasap 2012, Fairhurst et al. 2004) to conceptualise the nuances of these entanglements within the broader bracket of resistance. These reclassifications of the term have emerged to (re)define, delineate and capture particular manifestations of the complex relationship between power and resistance.

For example, Jones (2012, 686, 687) researching contested spaces at the India-Bangladeshi border, distances himself from Sharp et al (2000)’s “capacious definition of resistance”, arguing that “if everything is understood as part of the interplay of dominance and resistance in power relation, the analysis becomes increasingly meaningless because it fails to consider whether the resistance actually produces any changes to the power relationship or whether it was even intentional, a decision often left to the researcher, not the individual (Pile and Keith 1997, Rose 2002, Sparke 2008).” In contrast Jones (2012, 687) develops the framework of refusal to “conceptualize everyday actions [...] that disregard the rules of the state in these not completely administered spaces but are not politically motivated resistance to sovereignty.” Here Jones rejects the conceptual purchase of a multiplicity of resistances, and his articulation of spaces of refusal can be considered to delineate what form the interplay of power and resistance must take for it to be considered resistance, or refusal.

Jones’ (2012) concerns are illustrative of an impasse in accounts of resistance within Geography. That is, with the splintering of potential sites and subjects of power and resistance, further curtailment around what ‘counts’ as resistance is required to prevent a romanticisation of resistance. Cultural Geographer Rose (2002, 383) succinctly explains this impasse: “[T]he challenge for geographers has been to develop theories that recognize and categorize ‘resistant’ practice. Despite the interest that this new subfield has garnered, the challenge has created a theoretical crossroad. If we choose criteria narrowly, we risk

ignoring certain forms of contradictory practice, yet, if we accept every moment of contradictory practice as an example of resistance, our concepts of resistance become devoid of any practical use". In limiting our understanding of resistance, Geographers constrain opportunities for the recognition of subjects, materials, spaces (in)actions that do not cohere with a pre-set form to be woven into narratives of resistance. This "theoretical crossroad" (Rose 2002, 383) is therefore important for, as Amoore (2005, 7) notes "we tend to recognise resistances to take a particular form, and that in doing this we increase the visibility of these modes of politics whilst simultaneously rendering other modes invisible."

Therefore, whilst the move away from binary accounts of resistance towards a pluralized and relational understanding has (somewhat) displaced accounts of acts of opposition, it has also led to concerns that resistance is becoming romanticized in its multiplicity:

"Just as Foucault's lesson is that power is everywhere and inescapable, this new concern with resistance sees it in the most mundane activities. The discourse on resistance moved from strikes, protests, riots and the production of alternative cultures through the resistance of carnival, having fun and telling jokes to a whole plethora of unremarkable activities such as walking, eating, shopping and taking shortcuts. I do not wish to offer any definitive statement on resistance here but I will suggest a difficulty with defining certain kinds of activities, which seem to lack a crucial element of choice, as resistance."

(Cresswell 1996, 422)

In short, the argument is made here that if resistance is everywhere it becomes "increasingly meaningless" (Jones 2012, 687; Cresswell 1996, 2000; Ferguson and Golding 1997). As Cresswell later expands: "It is fair to say that human geography, and cultural studies even more so, have been guilty of romanticising resistance" (2000, 258). Whilst for Pile, resistance as ubiquitous, does not mean that that "resistance becomes 'anything' or 'everywhere', but precisely that resistance is understood where it takes place" (1997, 3),

Cresswell raises particular concerns that “there is a danger that no area of social life will not be described as resistance” and any act that is not definitively linked to dominant structures is held up as an example of ‘resistance’ (2000, 259). Massey echoes some of these concerns, noting that a recognition of resistance as everywhere should not mean that structural inequalities of power become lost and “dissipated in a plethora of multiplicities” (2000, 280). It is important, she cautions, not to “trivialise resistance, nor to underestimate what real resistance costs” (Massey 2000, 281). These narratives continue to hold traction within Geography; the logic that Foucauldian inspired entanglements of power and resistance risks overextending and romanticizing the term persists.

A notable exception to this viewpoint can however be found in the work of Chatterton and Pickerill (2010, 479) who, writing about the activist subject in relation to post-capitalist worlds, highlight: what “our findings point to is an altogether more complex and often contradictory process of activist-becoming-activist through trends that include the rejection of binaries between activists and their other, an embracing of a plurality of values, a pragmatic goal orientation and a growing professionalism.” In splintering the “assumed unified activist subject” to reveal “messy impurities” Chatterton and Pickerill’s work (2010, 479) contributes to critiques of what, for Nealon (2008, 105), is the predominant “old-fashioned, gold-standard thinking of resistance.” This is the view that “if it’s not scarce and it doesn’t refer to some grounding version of a ‘real thing’, then it’s not valuable’. It’s not actual resistance, it’s just a programmed product of power” (Nealon 2008, 105).

Further, understanding resistance as potentially percolating everywhere, has led to concerns that ‘true’ resistance is futile, for resistance cannot be necessarily linked to observable change (Hoy 2005; Jones 2012, 687). Should every disruption be theorized as resistance? This is by no means to suggest that challenging inequalities should not be a driving force behind scholarly attention to resistance, but instead to note that the assumption of linearity, towards a telos – an end goal is bound up in predetermined forms resistance. Yet, as this paper will continue to explore, is an explicit causal link to change required for an (in)action to be considered resistance? Can the critique that “resistance goes nowhere in particular, has no inherent attachments, and hails no particular vision” (Brown 1995, 49) be turned on its head? Hoy’s (2005, 229) reading of Derrida is useful here as it

critiques “the sense of direction suggested by any line of criticism proffered with the tacit implication that it knows the true picture and the best solution, even if it never fully articulates this knowledge.” A growing body of work on resistance as opening other possible futures has been examined in diverse spaces: for example Joronen (2017) discusses play, potentiality and form-of-life in Palestine; Bagelman and Wiebe look to political acts of resistance where “other possibilities may be glimpsed” in their work on the intimacies of global toxins in the Aamjiwnaang First Nation’s reserve (Anderson 2014 cited in Bagelman and Wiebe 2017, 83) and even Jones (2012, 698) who articulates concern over the multiplicities of resistance explains that “[b]y emphasizing nuance, fragmentation, and process, the possible remains.”

Resistance has thus been framed within Geography as entangled with power, present within everyday actions and not restricted to oppositional movements against (primarily) state power. This opening up of the term has resulted in scholars narrowing the scope of resistance, predetermining what forms actions must take before being identified as resistance; classifications emerging a priori; a privileging of form, the most significant, and pervasive logic of this is that resistance requires (a recognition of) intention.

** Logic 2: That resistance requires intention**

“I use the term ‘resistance’ to refer to any action imbued with intent that attempts to challenge, change or retain particular circumstances relating to societal relations, processes and/or institutions” (Routledge 1997, 360)

The word ‘intent’ is derived from the Latin *intendere* (verb), or *intentus* (adjective). It means ‘to stretch out, to strain’ (*tendere*) ‘towards’ (*in*), to direct action towards a purpose (Ainsworth et al. 1823). Importantly therefore, the aforementioned notion of *telos*, an end goal, is bound up with the idea of a subject acting with intent. This understanding of intent as being associated with the idea of an end goal is therefore crucial when thinking about how resistance has been conceptualised as intentional and linear, as future orientated actions are directed by a subject to resolve, at least in part, some problem of the present moment. This is not to say however, that intention is itself a binary; whilst the confines of

language frame intentional as oppositional to unintentional, subject (in)coherence is far more complex than this simple delineation of terms suggests. A destabilization of intent is however, bound up within the dangers of romanticizing resistance; the concern that multiplying the possible points of resistance results in a dilution of the political utility and potential of the term.

Conceptualisations of resistance within and beyond Geography have been framed by the view that 'acts of resistance' require the intention of subjects and/or a recognition of intent by a target or observer (see Cresswell 1996, 2000, Routledge 1996, 1997; Pile 1997; Jones 2012; Martin and Pierce 2013; Crane 2015; Nicholls 2016). Resistance is thus seen as a conscious practice, whereby a subject overcomes, or crucially intends to overcome, a particular configuration of power relations: "the person engaging in resistant acts must do so consciously and be able to relate that consciousness and intent" (Leblanc 1999, 18), in doing so a resistant subject is invoked. For example, in their work on radical democracy Martin and Peace (2013, 77 emphasis added) argue that "[r]esistance...needs to intentionally and deliberately employ the state to sow greater lines of contradiction within the state's neoliberal project." The concern that resistance necessitates conscious intent is, Hollander and Einwohner (2004) argue, central to debates over whether an act constitutes resistance throughout the Social Sciences.

Furthermore, a recognition of intention within (in)action is frequently linked to scalar analysis of resistance. Scott's work on local scale, intentional actions, the "hidden transcripts of subordinate groups," has influenced much work on resistance within Geography (1990, 15). Scott privileges intent as a better indicator of resistance than the outcome of actions, because acts of resistance do not always achieve the desired effect (1990). However, Scott's (1990) argument that it is reasonable to read intent in actions has been criticised by those who note that assessing intent is difficult, if not impossible (Hollander and Einwohner 2004). Pile also critiques accounts of resistance such as Scott's (1990) that prioritise intentional actions, arguing that determining intent is not straightforward (1997). Pile suggests that resistance may be unintentional but not accidental; rather than acting against perceived oppression, other motives may inspire resistant subjects (1997). This continues to resonate with intention as a binary, that can be located within a coherent subject (1997) and

supports the work of Cresswell (1996) who also points to the need to decouple intention from action, Yet Rose reads in Pile's argument an underlying assumption that resistance is still reacting: how reacting takes form shapes the debate, but "that resistance is a responsive act, however, is an assumed part of the equation" (2002, 387). This problematic of recognizing resistance aligns with concerns within animal geography on the use of the term resistance, which Wilbert argues "raises political and ethical questions about who, or what, can or cannot act purposefully to bring about change" (2000, 238 my emphasis). Wilbert's account again aligns with a purposeful action directed at a particular end goal (2000), a focus upon a recognition of an inscription of agency. These views are further premised upon the idea that there is a binary between intentional and unintentional actions, which relies upon the assumption of a coherent actor able to determine when, how or why they or 'others' are acting with intent.

Importantly for tracing the multiple trajectories of resistance within Geography, what becomes visible when attention to this logic of intention, is that such a priori delineations of resistance decouple from recent theorisations of power as emergent and "lived as part of the composition of experience" (Anderson 2017, 501). In short, the work that resistance does within Geography, is not ontologically compatible with new directions in power. The contributors to this volume work – in different, and deliberately incoherent ways - to variously decentre these logics, arguing that accepting the potentiality of resistant relations allows for different questions to be asked of the conceptual purchase of this term within Geography.

** Organisation of Critical Geographies of Resistance**

Critical Geographies of Resistance is a volume in two parts. The chapters comprising the first section ['Rethinking Resistance, Reframing the debate'] of the book focus upon reconceptualising concepts and approaches to the concept of resistance. The authors do not prescribe a singular or overarching framework of resistance. Instead, they explore multiple positions on the work that resistance does within Human Geography. The second section ['Emergent Resistances, reflections from the field'] then takes up these conceptual threads

and grounds them empirically, through a series of rich case studies that unpack the nuances of what a critical geography of resistance might look like in practice. Throughout, the authors make suggestions for future areas of research and reflection in this area.

The authors in this volume are united in their focus on the *critical* geographies of resistance. It is important to state from the start that this is *not* to claim that previous work on resistance has not been critical! Instead, we are interested in pushing, playing and pulling apart the expected conceptual boundaries of resistance in Geographical scholarship. The first section '**Rethinking resistance, Reframing the debate**' aims to reflect upon and advance understandings of resistance within Geography. Contributors revisit the concept of resistance in the context of ontological developments in the discipline. The section opens with a reflection on the role of feminist geographies of resistance. Maria Fannin and Julie MacLeavy describe such resistance 'not as a constant, shared or even necessarily antagonistic activity, but as something achieved through inconsistent behaviours and actions.' They explore this framing of resistance by tracing the spatial-political practices of the UK-based Feminist Archive South, looking at the 'political dimensions of collecting, cataloguing and preserving materials as a form of resistance'.

Catherine Oliver's chapter continues to unsettle the expected form of resistance in her focus on resistance beyond the human subject. Oliver argues that animal resistance is too often understood within 'an anthropocentric framework which is obscured by dominant epistemological assumptions about animals'. Moving to disrupt this narrative, Oliver's careful account of role of interspecies friendship provides a rethinking of the subject/object binary of many predetermined categorisations of resistance. Sage Brice furthers this discussion of subjectivity in the context of current geographical approaches - informed by a range of posthumanist and non-representational theories - that aim to decentre the pre-individuated subject as a unit of social and political analysis. Her work examines frames resistance both as a 'practice oriented towards opening up space to thrive in the face of oppressive systems, and a force of opposition or obstruction to that practice: an opposition experienced in the everyday as a kind of 'friction.'" In doing so, Brice explores how Geographers engage gender variance and transition, to ask what kinds of politics of resistance might be facilitated by emerging non-representational theories of subjectivity.

A conceptual engagement with intentionality and resistance beyond a coherent human subject is also threaded through Carlotta Molfese's chapter, which considers how more-than-human perspectives can assist in 'developing a non-anthropocentric framework of resistance in critical geography.' Building upon a post-phenomenological understanding of intentionality, Molfese argues that a rethinking of resistance beyond the traditional (human) subject of resistance, requires 'an expansion of what a political collective is, how it comes into being and the political work it does'. Charlotte Lee unpacks the relationship between activism and resistance within Geography and argues for greater attention to the nuances of this terminology. Lee identifies a hierarchical understanding in some accounts of activism and argues against this, claiming that that resistance 'should be considered a disposition present in some activism.' Finally, Sarah Zell and Amelia Curran reflect upon how an emergent understanding of resistance emerged in and through their ethnographic fieldwork. Drawing across their different research projects – on gang territories in Winnipeg, Canada and recruitment process and Canadian border for Mexican migrant workers - they argue that their methodological approaches helped them shift from thinking about 'resistance in space, to space as resistance'. Focussing on the ethnographic methods used to research resistance Zell and Curran discuss how a 'materialist orientation focused on practices helped ... encounter elusive spatial forms, and concomitantly, emergent and seemingly unremarkable instances of resistance'.

The second section of the book '**Emergent Resistances, reflections from the field**' builds upon the first by critically interrogating how we account for resistance(s) as it/they develop in *practice*. Building upon the conceptual groundwork of the first section, these contributions use case studies to push forward critical geographical understandings of resistance. Each chapter in the second section represents one of these possible ways of tracing, reading and researching resistance, carrying thus a value that is related both to its specific content and to its wider applicability and contribution to the approach proposed by the book. First Angharad Butler-Rees challenges conventional notions of resistance by drawing upon disabled peoples' direct narratives of how their everyday lives and bodies may constitute material forms of resistance. Through her detailed research on disability activism in response to austerity in the UK, Butler-Rees argues resistance may not constitute solely that of pre-determined forms but

also be 'lived out' through 'disabled people's everyday existence (and practices of self-care and mutual aid) along with their tenacity to keep accessing public space in uncompromising ways'.

In the next contribution, Hannah Awcock analyses the material politics of protests stickers in the context of urban spaces. Grounding her discussion in her photographic archive of 'Bollocks to Brexit' stickers that have emerged in the UK in the wake of the 2016 European Union Referendum, Awcock explores the forms for resistance that these stickers enable. Focussing on the material politics of these common forms of protest, she argues that stickers 'blur the boundaries of what constitutes resistance' as they are 'frequently unclear in their authorship and/or intention.' Karen Schouw Iverson also focuses on urban spaces of resistance, examining the struggles in and around a housing project (Plaza de la Hoja) built for displaced victims of the armed conflict in Bogota, Colombia. Schouw Iverson's argument that this project represents 'a spatial technology of control that renders the continued socio-economic marginalisation of the internally displaced politically invisible' emerges from her rich empirical reflections which serve to nuance binary approaches to 'power' or 'resistance' and calls instead for an attention to the mobility of the category of resistance itself. Continuing with housing, in the next chapter Mel Nowicki explores the multiple ways by which small-scale grassroots activism utilises the law as a method of resistance to housing inequality in the context of the UK's 'Bedroom Tax' (implemented as part of the 2012 Welfare Reform Act). Nowicki's research with social tenants, housing associations and welfare charities has identified how people navigate legal spaces to 'to resist its imposition in largely mundane settings not usually equated with resistance movements - online social media groups and housing association offices'.

Following this, the volume turns to the role of resistance within migration geographies. First Amanda Schmid-Scott explores the significance of volunteers bearing witness to asylum seekers reporting to the Home Office. This purposefully oppositional response to the violence of border control and management practices may not typically constitute a discrete 'act of resistance' but Schmid-Scott argues that - by making usually discrete practices visible - the act of witnessing constitutes 'a mode of resistance which holds potency, both through its ability to disrupt the hegemonic gaze of the Home Office officers over signers.' Next, Kahina Meziant

explores 'how quiet transgressions and sonic practices (and properties) can rework power structures in organisations.' Meziant draws upon a situated ethnographic study of community music practices in an organisation in the UK Voluntary and Community Sector to show how subtle transgressive acts contribute to the emergence of resistance. Finally, Leah Montange engage with frameworks from two Black feminist thinkers, Saidiya Hartman and Katherine McKittrick to explore crafting and resistance in US immigration detention centres. Montange offers a reading of crafting within detention and argues that it is 'agentic practice that does not demonstrate political subjectivization, or acquiescence with spatio-temporal domination' instead those within immigration detention 'use and make space and place around, despite, or without reference to the logics of spatio-temporal domination'.

<c> Acknowledgements

Sections of this chapter have already been published in *Hughes, Sarah M. (2020) On resistance in human geography. Progress in Human Geography, 44 (6). pp. 1141-1160. Copyright © 2019, © SAGE Publications*

 References

Agnew, J. (1999). "Mapping Political Power beyond State Boundaries: Territory, Identity, and Movement in World Politics." *Millennium* 28(3): 499–521.

Ainsworth, R., Morell, T. and Carey, J. (1823). "Intendus." In *Ainsworth's Latin Dictionary*. Edited by Ainsworth, R., Morell, T. and Carey, J. London: C. and J. Rivington.

Allen, J. (2004). "The Whereabouts of Power: Politics, Government and Space." *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 86(1): 19–32.

Allen, J. (2006). "Ambient Power: Berlin's Potsdamer Platz and the Seductive Logic of Public Spaces." *Urban Studies* 43(2): 441–55.

Allen, J. (2011). "Topological Twists: Power's Shifting Geographies." *Dialogues in Human Geography* 1(3): 283–98.

Allen, J., and Cochrane, A. (2007). "Beyond the Territorial Fix: Regional Assemblages, Politics and Power." *Regional Studies* 41(9): 1161–1175.

Allen, J., and Cochrane, A. (2010). "Assemblages of State Power: Topological Shifts in the Organization of Government and Politics." *Antipode* 42(5): 1071–89.

Amoore, L. (2005). "Introduction: Global Resistance - Global Politics." In *The Global Resistance Reader*, edited by Amoore, L. Abingdon: Routledge.

Amoore, L. (2013). *The Politics of Possibility: Risk and Security beyond Probability*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Anderson, B. (2017). "Cultural Geography 1: Intensities and Forms of Power." *Progress in Human Geography* 41(4): 501–11.

Anderson, B., and McFarlane, C. (2011). "Assemblage and Geography." *Area* 43(2): 124–127.

Anderson, B., and Wylie, J. (2009). "On Geography and Materiality." *Environment and Planning A* 41(2): 318–35.

Bagelman, J, and Wiebe, S M. (2017). "Intimacies of Global Toxins: Exposure and Resistance in 'Chemical Valley.'" *Political Geography* 60: 76–85.

Bale, J. (2000). "Sport as Power: Running as Resistance?" In *Entanglements of Power: Geographies of Domination/Resistance*, In *Entanglements of Power: Geographies of Domination/Resistance*, edited by Sharp, J P., Routledge, P., Philo, P., and Paddison, R. London: Routledge.

Bennett, J. (2010). *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham NC: Duke University Press.

Bhabha, H. (1984) Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse. *October Discipleship: A Special Issue on Psychoanalysis*.28: 125-33.

Bhabha, H. K. (1990) *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge.

Blomley, N. (2008) The spaces of critical geography *Progress in Human Geography*, 32 (2): 285-393.

Braun, B., and Whatmore, S. (2010). "The Stuff of Politics: An Introduction." In *Political Matter: Technoscience, Democracy, and Public Life*, edited by Braun, B., and Whatmore, S. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Cadman, L. (2010). How (Not) to be Governed: Foucault, Critique, and the Political. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 28(3), 539–556.

Caygill, H. (2013). *On Resistance: A Philosophy of Defiance*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Chatterton, P., and Pickerill, J. (2010). "Everyday Activism and Transitions towards Post-Capitalist Worlds: Everyday Activism and Transitions towards Post-Capitalist Worlds." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 35(4): 475–90.

Chouinard, V. (1994). "Reinventing Radical Geography: Is All That's Left Right?" *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 12(1): 2–6.

Clark, N., Massey, D., Sarre, P. (2008). eds. *Material Geographies: A World in the Making*. London: Sage Publications.

Cloke, P., Sutherland, C., and Williams, A. (2016). "Postsecularity, Political Resistance, and Protest in the Occupy Movement: Postsecularity in the Occupy Movement." *Antipode* 48(3): 497–523.

Conlon, D. (2013). "Hungering for Freedom: Asylum Seekers' Hunger Strikes - Rethinking Resistance as Counter-Conduct." In *Carceral Spaces: Mobility and Agency in Imprisonment and Migrant Detention*, edited by Moran, D., Gill, N., and Conlon, D. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Connolly, W E. (2007). "The Complexities of Sovereignty." In *Sovereign Lives: Power in Global Politics*, edited by Edkins, J., Pin-Fat, V., and Shapiro, M J. New York: Routledge.

Crampton, J W., and Elden, S. (2007). eds. *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Crane, N J. (2015). "Politics Squeezed through a Police State: Policing and Vinculación in Post-1968 Mexico City." *Political Geography* 47:1–10.

Crane, N. (2012). "Are 'Other Spaces' Necessary? Associative Power at the Dumpster." *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies* 11(3): 352-372.

Creasap, K. (2012), *Social Movement Scenes: Place-Based Politics and Everyday Resistance*. *Sociology Compass*, 6: 182-191.

Cresswell, T. (1996). "Writing, Reading and the Problem of Resistance: A Reply to McDowell." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 21(2): 420-424.

Cresswell, T. (2000). "Falling Down. Resistance as Diagnostic." In *Entanglements of Power: Geographies of Domination/Resistance*, In *Entanglements of Power: Geographies of Domination/Resistance*, edited by Sharp, J P., Routledge, P., Philo, P., and Paddison, London: Routledge.

Cumbers, A., Helms, G., and Swanson, K. (2010). "Class, Agency and Resistance in the Old Industrial City." *Antipode* 42(1): 46–73.

De Certeau, M. (1988). *The Practice of Everyday Life*. London: University of California Press.

- De Landa, M. (2016). *Assemblage Theory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Deleuze, G., and Guattari, F. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Elwood, S., and Mitchell, K. (2013). "Another Politics Is Possible: Neogeographies, Visual Spatial Tactics, and Political Formation" *Cartographica: The International Journal for Geographic Information and Geovisualization* 48(4): 275–92.
- Fairhurst, F., Ramutsindela, M., Bob, U. (2004) Social Movements, Protest, and Resistance In Staeheli, L., Kofman, E. and Peake, L. *Mapping Women, Making Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Faria, C. (2017). "Towards a Countertopography of Intimate War: Contouring Violence and Resistance in a South Sudanese Diaspora." *Gender, Place & Culture* 24(4): 575–93.
- Ferguson, M., and Golding, P. (1997) "Cultural Studies in Question. An Introduction." In *Cultural Studies in Question*, edited by Ferguson, M., and Golding, P. London: Sage Publications.
- Flusty, S. (2011). "Thrashing Downtown: Play as Resistance to the Spatial and Representational Regulation of Los Angeles." *Cities* 17(2): 149–58.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality*. New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (1990). *The Will to Knowledge. The History of Sexuality, Volume 1*. London: Penguin Books.
- Gill, N. (2010). "New State-Theoretic Approaches to Asylum and Refugee Geographies." *Progress in Human Geography* 34(5): 626–45.
- Gill, N. (2016). *Nothing Personal?: Geographies of Governing and Activism in the British Asylum System*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Gill, N., Conlon, D., and Moran, D. (2013). "Dialogues across Carceral Space: Migration, Mobility, Space and Agency." In *Carceral Spaces: Mobility and Agency in Imprisonment and Migrant Detention*, edited by Gill, N., Conlon, D., and Moran, D. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Gramsci, A. (2007). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Edited by Hoare, Q. and Nowell-Smith, G. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Gregson, N, and Crang, M. (2010). "Materiality and Waste: Inorganic Vitality in a Networked World." *Environment and Planning A* 42(5): 1026–32.

Hammett, D. (2012). "Reworking and Resisting Globalising Influences: Cape Town Hip-Hop." *GeoJournal* 77(3): 417–28.

Hauge, M M., and Fold. N. (2016). "Resilience and Reworking Practices: Becoming the First-Generation of Industrial Workers in Can Tho, Vietnam." *Geoforum* 77: 124–33.

Hollander, J A., and Einwohner, R L. (2004) "Conceptualizing Resistance." *Sociological Forum* 19(4): 533–54.

Horton, J., and Kraftl, P. (2009) "Small Acts, Kind Words and 'Not Too Much Fuss': Implicit Activisms." *Activism and Emotional Sustainability* 2(1): 14–23.

Hoy, D. C. (2005) *Critical Resistance From Poststructuralism to Post-Critique*. MIT Press: Massachusetts

Hyndman, J. (2004). "Mind the Gap: Bridging Feminist and Political Geography through Geopolitics." *Political Geography* 23(3): 307–22.

Jacobs, J M. (2012). "Urban Geographies I: Still Thinking Cities Relationally." *Progress in Human Geography* 36(3): 412–22.

Johnston, L. (2017) Gender and sexuality II: Activism. *Progress in Human Geography*, 41(5), 648–656.

Jones, R. (2012). "Spaces of Refusal: Rethinking Sovereign Power and Resistance at the Border." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 102(3): 685–99.

Joronen, M. (2017). "'Refusing to Be a Victim, Refusing to Be an Enemy'. Form-of-Life as Resistance in the Palestinian Struggle against Settler Colonialism." *Political Geography* 56: 91–100.

Katz, C. (2004). *Growing up Global: Economic Restructuring and Children's Everyday Lives*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Laclau, E., and Mouffe, C. (1985) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.

Larner, W, and Craig, D. (2005). "After Neoliberalism? Community Activism and Local Partnerships in Aotearoa New Zealand." *Antipode* 37(3): 402–24.

Latour, B. (1996). "On Actor-Network Theory: A Few Clarifications." *Soziale Welt*, 47(4). 369–381.

Law, J. (1999). "After ANT: Complexity, Naming and Topology." *The Sociological Review* 47 (1): 1–14.

Leblanc, L. (1999). *Pretty in Punk: Girls' Gender Resistance in a Boys' Subculture*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Legg, S. (2011). Assemblage/Apparatus: using Deleuze and Foucault *Area*. 43(2), 128-133.

Martin, D. G., and Pierce, J. (2013). "Reconceptualizing Resistance: Residuals of the State and Democratic Radical Pluralism." *Antipode* 45(1): 61–79.

Massey, D. (2000). "Entanglements of Power. Reflections." In *Entanglements of Power: Geographies of Domination/Resistance*, In *Entanglements of Power: Geographies of Domination/Resistance*, edited by Sharp, J P., Routledge, P., Philo, P., and Paddison, R. London: Routledge.

McConnell, F. (2009). "Governments-in-Exile: Statehood, Statelessness and the Reconfiguration of Territory and Sovereignty." *Geography Compass* 3(5): 1902–19.

McFarlane, C. (2009). Translocal assemblages: space, power and social movements. *Geoforum*. 40(4):561-567.

McFarlane, C. (2011). *Learning the city: knowledge and translocal assemblage*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

McGuirk, P M., Mee, K J., and Ruming. K J. (2016). "Assembling Urban Regeneration? Resourcing Critical Generative Accounts of Urban Regeneration through Assemblage." *Geography Compass* 10(3): 128–41.

Mitchell, K. (1997) Different Diasporas and the Hype of Hybridity *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 15 (5), 533-553.

Mouffe, C. (2005). *On the Political*. Routledge: London.

Mountz, A. (2013) "Political Geography I: Reconfiguring Geographies of Sovereignty." *Progress in Human Geography* 37(6), 829–841.

Murrey, A. (2016) Slow dissent and the emotional geographies of resistance. *Singapore Journal for Tropical Geography*, 37(2): 224-248.

Naseemullah, A. (2018). "Riots and Rebellion: State, Society and the Geography of Conflict in India." *Political Geography* 63: 104–15.

Naylor, L. (2017) Reframing autonomy in political geography: A feminist geopolitics of autonomous resistance. *Political Geography*. 58: 24-35.

Nealon, J T. (2008). *Foucault beyond Foucault: Power and Its Intensifications since 1984*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Nicholls, W. J. (2016). "Producing-Resisting National Borders in the United States, France and the Netherlands." *Political Geography* 51: 43–52.

Painter, J. (2006). "Prosaic Geographies of Stateness." *Political Geography* 25(7): 752–774.

Peters, E J. (1998). "Subversive Spaces: First Nations Women and the City." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 16(6): 665–85.

Pickering, A. (1993). "The Mangle of Practice: Agency and Emergence in the Sociology of Science." *American Journal of Sociology* 99(3): 559–89.

Pierce, J. and Williams, O.R. (2016), Against Power? Distinguishing Between Acquisitive Resistance and Subversion. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 98: 171-188.

Pile, S. (1997). "Introduction: Opposition, Political Identities and Spaces of Resistance." In *Geographies of Resistance*, edited by Pile, S and Keith, M. London: Routledge.

Polanyi, K. (2005). "The Self-Regulating Market and the Fictitious Commodities. Labour, Land and Money." In Amoore, L. eds. *The Global Resistance Reader*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Pottinger, L. (2017). "Planting the Seeds of a Quiet Activism." *Area* 49(2): 215–22.

Radcliffe, S. (2000) Entangling Resistance, Ethnicity, Gender and Nation in Ecuador In *Entanglements of Power: Geographies of Domination/Resistance*, edited by Sharp, J P., Routledge, P., Philo, P., and Paddison, R. London: Routledge.

Rancière, J. (2010) *Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics*. London: Continuum.

Rose, M. (2002). "The Seductions of Resistance: Power, Politics, and a Performative Style of Systems." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 20(4): 383–400.

Rosol, M. (2014) On resistance in the post-political city: conduct and counter-conduct in Vancouver, *Space and Polity*, 18(1), 70-84.

Routledge, P. (1996). "Critical Geopolitics and Terrains of Resistance." *Political Geography* 15(6–7): 509–31.

Routledge, P. (1997). "The Imagineering of Resistance: Pollok Free State and the Practice of Postmodern Politics." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 22(3): 359–76.

Routledge, P. (2009). "Activism." In *The Dictionary of Human Geography*, edited by Gregory, D. Malden: Blackwell.

Said, E. (1978) *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books: New York.

Scott, J C. (1990). *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Secor, A. (2004). "'There Is an Istanbul That Belongs to Me': Citizenship, Space, and Identity in the City." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 94(2): 352–68.

Sharp, J P., Routledge, P., Philo, P., and Paddison, R. (2000) "Entanglements of Power: Geographies of Domination/Resistance." In *Entanglements of Power: Geographies of*

Domination/Resistance, edited by Sharp, J P., Routledge, P., Philo, P., and Paddison, R. London: Routledge.

Sharp, J. (2009). "Geography and Gender: What Belongs to Feminist Geography? Emotion, Power and Change." *Progress in Human Geography* 33(1): 74–80.

Shaw R. (2014). Beyond Night-Time Economy: Affective Atmospheres of the Urban Night. *Geoforum*. 51(1), 87-95.

Sparke, M. (2008). "Political Geography -- Political Geographies of Globalization III: Resistance." *Progress in Human Geography* 32(3): 423–40.

Staeheli, L A. (1994). "Empowering Political Struggle: Spaces and Scales of Resistance." *Political Geography* 13(5): 387–91.

Storper, M., and Scott, A J. (2016). "Current Debates in Urban Theory: A Critical Assessment." *Urban Studies* 53(6): 1114–36.

Thrift, N. (2000). "Entanglements of Power. Shadows?" In *Entanglements of Power: Geographies of Domination/Resistance*, In *Entanglements of Power: Geographies of Domination/Resistance*, edited by Sharp, J P., Routledge, P., Philo, P., and Paddison, R. London: Routledge.

Wideman, T J., and Masuda, J R. (2018). "Toponymic Assemblages, Resistance, and the Politics of Planning in Vancouver, Canada." *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space* 36(3): 383–402.

Willbert, C. (2000) 'Anti-this – Against-that: resistances along a human-non-human axis'. In *Entanglements of Power: Geographies of Domination/Resistance*, edited by Sharp, J P., Routledge, P., Philo, P., and Paddison, R. London: Routledge.

Wilson, J. and Swyngedouw, E. (2014) *The Post-political and Its Discontents: Spaces of Depoliticisation, Spectres of Radical Politics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Žižek, S. (2004) The parallax view. *New Left Review* 25: 121–134.