

Introduction: The promises and perils of more-than-human resistance

Critique of Anthropology

2026, Vol. 46(3) 251–269

© The Author(s) 2026



Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/0308275X261469728

journals.sagepub.com/home/coa**Bob Kuřík¹** 

Abstract

Who resists? With whom and against whom do they do so? These questions, long thought to be exclusively human, are increasingly proving more than human in the conflicts of the Anthropocene. To keep up with such messy constellations, we suggest, in this special issue, the reintroduction of the concept of resistance by reworking it as more-than-human resistance. This captures confrontations from below, in which humans and other-than-humans forge alliances, partnerships, or otherwise collaborate to oppose dominant power. Defined as such, we argue, the concept with its orbiting analytics advances much-needed encounters between multispecies anthropology and political anthropology, to the benefit of both. This introduction conceptualizes such encounters in four steps, which the authors in this collection touch upon ethnographically in their contributions. First, recasting resistance to include more-than-humans is slowed down by careful interaction with debates from the intellectual history of the concept. Second, the concept is nuanced by juxtaposing the categories unruliness v. resistance, other-than-human v. more-than-human, or alliance v. adversity. Third, amid the contemporary rise of authoritarianism, the concept is detached from a critical anthropologist's sympathies to encompass a range of political positions. Fourth, resistance is reconnected with power analytics over more-than-human cases to cast both in sharper relief.

Keywords

more-than-human resistance, conflicts of the Anthropocene, unruliness, political anthropology, multispecies ethnography, power, environmental force

¹Faculty of Humanities, Charles University, Prague, Czechia

Corresponding author:

Bob Kuřík, Faculty of Humanities, Charles University, Pátkova 2137/5, Prague 8 – Libeň 182 00, Czechia.

Email: bob.kurik@fhs.cuni.cz

In homage to James C. Scott (1936–2024)

‘It is a beetle – an environmentalist,’ says an employee of the Nature Conservation Agency of Czechia, with a subversive smile on his face as he shows me the work of the European spruce bark beetle (*Ips typographus*) in the protected forests of the Western Carpathians on the Czech-Slovak borderland in the summer of 2021. After several years, yet another wave of elevated beetle activity among the European conifers, a so-called calamity, had just recently reached its peak. Czechia is one of the territories most impacted due to the omnipresence of spruce monocultures, which are managed in large part by one of the biggest and most powerful organizations in the country, a state corporation known as the Forests of the Czech Republic (LČR). ‘In what sense is it an environmentalist?’ I ask, looking across exposed hills with only islands of trees standing here and there. ‘Well, the beetle has succeeded in recent years in doing more conservationist work in the forests than we have managed to do in several decades of our existence. It skipped over the strenuous negotiations with the LČR, disobeyed all of their regulations and just kept eating their monocultures in the protected area,’ he replies.

How to make sense of these ‘pretty strange beetles’ participating in the ‘pretty strange battles’ (Latour, 2021: 88–94) of the Anthropocene, ‘battles’ in which other-than-human beings or materials become more often conceived of as not only food, resources or symbols but as allies or enemies in more-than-human struggles? How to understand such messy conflicts, in which the Earth, in its multiplicity of environmental forms and processes, keeps shifting from ‘the board on which conflicts were waged’ to ‘a party to those conflicts’ (Latour, 2020: 6)? To sharpen responses to these questions, in this special issue we suggest reintroducing the concept of resistance¹ by recasting it as more-than-human resistance.

By more-than-human resistance, we mean practices in which humans and other-than-humans forge alliances, partnerships, or otherwise collaborate to oppose dominant power. The concept, with its orbiting analytics, is promising as it enables us to explore contemporary ‘battles’ from a new angle. The angle, we argue, usually embraces three elementary features. First, where there is such resistance there is a conflict, that is, relationships of opposition are established. Resistance then is a practice of fighting back, pushing against, countering such antagonized relations and not ignoring them or reconciling with them. Thus, the concept accentuates confrontation and contention and not, for instance, diplomacy or lobbying. We do not say that all politics includes antagonism (Holbraad et al., 2019; Laszczkowski, 2020) but claim rather that such conflicting relations are always present in more-than-human resistance. Second, there is a vector of resistance: it rises from below, from those under pressure (Howe, 2019b; Scott, 1989: 52). Therefore, the concept of more-than-human resistance is especially suitable for analysing asymmetrical conflicts. Such uneven power distribution tends to be challenged via these empowering confrontations. Third, such resistance is always situational and processual. This partly methodological maxim tackles a long-term problem of ‘ethnographic refusal’ (Ortner, 1995), which already proved highly problematic, indeed, almost deadly for the concept of resistance in anthropology (Brown, 1996) – that is, the dismissal of tracking resistance ethnographically in all its complexity.

Returning to the original vignette, we do not say that the eating of and dwelling on spruce monocultures by the bark beetle is itself, by default, an act of resistance against the plantation economies of capitalism. We rather suggest it as a potential starting point to ethnographically trace how the deeds of the beetle are recognized, related to and mobilized in situations of more-than-human resistance, that is, in situations which include humans. For the productivity- and profit-oriented foresters from LČR, the bark beetle has become the number one villain, the arch-enemy against whom they have ‘declared war’, mobilizing various strategies in order to bring its unruly activities under control. Contrary to this, for many professional and bottom-up environmentalists, the beetle has become a silent and hardworking ally, a defiant ‘hero’, which helps in the conservation agenda. In such plots and stories of resistance in the contributions to this special issue, inspired by the lifetime work of James C. Scott, we trace capacities to make eco-political changes and co-produce rebelliously charged effects, practices, meanings and interpretations that are distributed and weaponized along more-than-human lines.

Re-equipped by such a move beyond the human, we argue, the renovated concept of resistance with its orbiting analytics becomes well suited for sharpening our understanding of the messy conflicts of the Anthropocene. But there is more. Defined as such, the concept enables and advances much-needed encounters between multispecies and political anthropology, to the benefit of both. Its conceptual toolkit, we argue, helps us to unravel some blind spots in both sub-disciplines, and move conceptual debates forward. The articles in our special issue target four such productive encounters. Thus the rest of the introduction elaborates on the encounters underlying this collection of texts by both well-established and emergent scholars. Each article addresses several of the encounters at once. Therefore, their contribution in the introduction is not discussed en bloc in accord with the special issue’s table of contents, but rather piecemeal according to themes. Across the articles, the analytics of more-than-human resistance is explored through examples from different regions, political standpoints and affordances to interact as regards the other-than-human stakeholders involved. We believe that by documenting such wide-ranging complexities of resistance, the novel field of anthropology of more-than-human resistance can gain sharper contours.

We dedicate the special issue to James C. Scott, a devoted scholar of resistance. Not only did he help to establish the field in political anthropology but, late in life, he himself pursued the multispecies angle. We are inspired by his lifelong ability to explore resistance analytics from ingenious angles – from introducing an initial attention to infrapolitics in between open protests and idleness, to paying attention recently to the multipolarity of power from the more-than-human perspective.

Slowing down in recasting resistance beyond human

We are not the first to propose analysing resistance beyond humans. On the contrary, in the last few years, resistance vocabulary has emerged in multispecies ethnographies in order to describe different features. These include diverse examples such as pests and weeds joining conflicts over monoculture plantations (Beilin and Suryanarayanan, 2017), spirits entering more-than-human struggles against mining (Whitaker, 2020), multispecies mourning in the face of extractivism (Chao, 2023a) or stygofaunal worlds

subverting technoscientific knowledge and control (Neimanis, 2023). Several names have been proposed for this conjuncture: ‘interspecies resistance’ (Beilin and Suryanarayanan, 2017), ‘slow resistance’ (Babidge, 2021), ‘multispecies resistance’ (Chao, 2021), ‘more-than-human resistance’ (Kuřík, 2022) and ‘resistant ecologies’ (Khayyat, 2023).

This proliferation of resistance vocabulary goes hand in hand with broader trends in more-than-human anthropology that have been accelerating in the last half-decade. Responding partly to a critique of its earlier texts (Lemke, 2021; Povinelli, 2021), more explicit and vocal encounters with conceptual tools and the perspective of post-Marxist, political and postcolonial anthropology have begun to gain momentum (Chao et al., 2022; Lazar, 2022; Scott, 2025). The momentum is challenging older relationships from the mid-2010s. At that time, mutual ignorance, hostility and incommensurability prevailed in the interactions between approaches targeting new materialist and multispecies heterogeneities, and those scrutinizing political-ecological and socio-economic inequalities (e.g. Bessire and Bond, 2014; de la Cadena and Blaser, 2018; Graeber, 2015; Kopnina, 2017).

The novel analytical encounters occur over remaking concepts from critical anthropology or affiliated disciplines via more-than-human lenses. In this light, intersectionality is being reworked as interspecies intersectionality (Tsing et al., 2019), class as geo-social class (Latour and Schultz, 2022; Schultz, 2020), labour as non-human labour (Besky and Blanchette, 2019; Hribal, 2003) or ecological work (Lorimer, 2020), solidarity as more-than-human solidarity (Tschakert, 2022) and, most-discussed, justice as multispecies justice (Celermajer, 2020; Chao and Celermajer, 2023; Chao et al., 2022).

In principle, we welcome these conjectures, after all, we intend to do something similar with the concept of more-than-human resistance. However, there are several perils in applying the older concept to the multispecies domain. There is a possibility that one might lose sight of the complexity and different genealogies of resistance. This is troubling, as instead of analytical rigour, it could lead to a kind of reconsecration of the concept simply by bringing in the other-than-humans. We argue that this theoretical blind spot is potentially problematic in all the conceptual cases, but especially in our case of resistance due to its very complicated intellectual history. Resistance has been a tricky, even controversial concept in anthropology. It was overused in the 1980s and heavily criticized in the 1990s (Abu-Lughod, 1990; Brown, 1996; Mahmood, 2005; Ortner, 1995), to the point of almost dying out. By being affiliated more closely with organized protest and activism (Escobar, 1992), the concept only slowly made a comeback in the last decade as the ‘new anthropology of resistance’ (Alexandrakis, 2016) while keeping its original human-centred focus (Kuřík, 2016; Laszczkowski, 2019; Ortner, 2016; Theodossopoulos, 2014).

Whereas a concept like multispecies justice is being upgraded through delicate work juxtaposing it with its older, human-centred versions, genealogies and debates, the debate about multispecies resistance has not been renewed to the same extent. Although ‘resistance’ as a term reappears frequently in the above-mentioned texts from more-than-human anthropology, including their titles and keywords, its proper conceptualization as a more-than-human endeavour is either completely missing (Beilin and Suryanarayanan, 2017; Chao, 2021, 2023a; Neimanis, 2023; Whitaker, 2020), very sparse (Khayyat, 2023) or fully exported outside anthropological frameworks (Chao, 2023b).

Such an absence rests on valid reasoning. One of the crucial tasks of this novel work on resistance beyond the human was to ‘provoke new patterns of seeing rather than to carry out a detailed study of resistance strategies’ (Beilin and Suryanarayanan, 2017: 207–8). Such a justification may no longer be sufficient. Reviving resistance as multispecies resistance, but keeping it completely detached from the concept’s history, runs a risk of presenting the latter as strictly separated, opposed to and different from the former. A rhetoric presupposing radical, even revolutionary, novelty has already been problematized in similar contexts. Lemke, for instance, criticizes some authors of new materialism for their tendency to ‘employ to excess the rhetoric of novelty, breakthroughs and originality, disregarding important materialist lines of thought and ignoring possible affinities and alliances’ (Lemke, 2021: 5–6; for a similar critique of ontological anthropology, see Bessire and Bond, 2014: 441 or Graeber, 2015: 31–2). Last, but not least, such a recovery process, as partially visible in some of the first texts on multispecies resistance, risks reconnecting this limited idea of resistance precisely with the above-mentioned problematic meanings, assumptions and imports from the concept’s neglected past, which the anthropology of resistance has spent years and hundreds of pages overcoming.

Unlike authors who completely dismiss the return of the term ‘resistance’ (Holbraad et al., 2019: 18–20; Thomas, 2024: 94–5), in line with some recent work in more-than-human anthropology, we see great potential in recovering it. However, we differ from the latter as to how to realize this potential as well as just what this potential entails. Instead of the tempting but risky reintroduction of the term by simply resuming its use but in a new way, we suggest slowing down (Stengers, 2018) by partaking in a careful interaction with older debates around the concept’s analytics in political anthropology. What is more, we argue that such a uniquely turbulent intellectual history has become an advantage nowadays due to its accumulated and rich index of related critiques, debates and sensitivities. Thus, it is from precisely this robust and plentiful equipment – tools, warnings and analytics of the older anthropology of human-centred resistance – that several articles in this special issue mobilize and reconnect with reworking analytics of resistance as more-than-human resistance.

In his contribution to this special issue, Agrawal (2026, this issue) takes us to everyday forms of precarious life among fieldworkers and farmers in rural areas of northern India who are ‘soaked into’ a tech-entrepreneurial sustainability programme of Alternate Wetting and Drying (AWD) for rice cultivation. The workers turn to the affordances of snakes, rodents, sun, rice plants as well as GPS, mobile devices and apps to thwart claims of the agtech start-up. This enables them not only to sustain their livelihoods, but also share stories of broader exploitation and inequality. To fully grasp such multispecies situation of low-profile defiance and manoeuvres, Agrawal reworks James Scott (1990) notion of infrapolitics via more-than-human optics.

Agrawal interacts with early 1990s debates about everyday forms of subaltern resistance (see also Laszczkowski, 2026, this issue). In contrast, Rončíková and Kuřík (2026, this issue) here address debates in the 2000s and 2010s about resistance as organized protest and activism. Diverging from a prioritized focus on dogs taking part in riots during the 2019 uprising in Chile, they scrutinize instead the social life of anarchists and free-roaming dogs, so-called *kiltras*, as cultivated on a daily basis in and around an

autonomous squat, occupied since 2020, in the outskirts of Santiago de Chile. Rončíková and Kuřík enter debates about politics of collective autonomy (e.g. Graeber, 2009; Juris, 2008; Krøijer, 2015) and show that such collectivity involves, in their case, a form of building everyday *compañerismo* – that is, a form, they argue, in which Harawayan companion species is politicized into *compañera* species.

Unruliness is not resistance and other-than-human is not more-than-human

Ever since the seminal work of Anna Tsing (2012) on ‘unruly edges and seams’, the language of unruliness has proliferated in more-than-human anthropology. It includes ‘unruly environments’ (Harvey and Knox, 2015), ‘unruly forms of life’ (Kirksey, 2015), ‘unruly appetites’ (Lien, 2017), ‘unruly qualities of infrastructure’ (Laszczkowski, 2020) and ‘unruly substance’ (Muehlebach, 2023), among others. Deployed over different instances, it tends to describe similar dynamics – a praxis of defying, blocking and, thus, troubling human-created designs, plans and developments inscribed, above all other things, in modern infrastructure projects. Some authors write in a *synonymous* sense about ‘refusal’ as the term comes to describe ‘weedy refusals of planners’ imagined discipline’ (Bubandt and Tsing, 2018: 8). What is more, Tsing et al. (2019) go even further and see the constant dynamics between these ‘weedy refusals’ and ‘intensive human management’ as the defining feature and the de facto environmental condition of the present so-called ‘Patchy Anthropocene’. Thus, such unruly refusals capture the more general, even planetary tendency of humans, materials, and non-humans to re-emerge under systematic pressure on their existence with their own trajectories, that is, to evade and obstruct control and mastery, to be disorderly, difficult to capture or tame, and to be fully redirected towards some particular goals.²

How then does more-than-human resistance differentiate itself from this more general tendency to become unruly? In our usage, more-than-human resistance is much more specific. After all, resistance was rightfully criticized for its reduction to meaning heroic opposition merely by virtue of one’s subordinated position. Such subaltern heroism (Mahmood, 2005) eventually transformed the concept into becoming more ideological, overstretched, and theoretically weak because it enabled ‘the discovery of resistance almost everywhere’ (Brown, 1996: 730; see also Abu-Lughod, 1990; Ortner, 2016; Rabinowitz, 2014). As a result, the concept of more-than-human resistance cannot aim at capturing any broader tendency as it could otherwise quickly lead to a new ‘stultifying grand narrative of subaltern/minority political agency’ (Holbraad et al., 2019: 18), this time via non-human heroism. Therefore, more-than-human resistance, we argue, comes to describe only those historically particular cases in which the unruly refusals are mobilized and politicized by vectoring, engaging, strategizing or weaponizing them in interactions with different human stakeholders. This may happen in myriad forms and plots which we explore in this special issue (see the contributions of Krøijer and Hougaard, Kely, or Agrawal).

Babidge’s article (2026, this issue) on controversies around underground mining of copper and lithium beneath Chile’s Salar de Atacama demonstrates this eloquently. Like groundwater generally, the groundwater here belongs to a complex hydrogeological and

chemical system difficult to reach, explore and translate into scientific fact. The author documents how the unruly uncertainties of the groundwater are mobilized in legal battles by those seeking to continue extractive domination over this territory or oppose it. The Indigenous-led team of scientists incorporate the complexity and messiness of the groundwater's unruly flux, not in order to master or erase that flux, but to stay with it. Mobilizing such unruliness means devising models for legal processes which take into account Atacameño-Likanantay cosmopolitics; water is life, and thus is correlated with the uncertainties generated by mining and its environmental damage as well as the potential of resistance and care.

Therefore, unruly refusals are broader conditions out of which cases of more-than-human resistance may or may not emerge. Such unruliness is necessary for resistance, but it is not the same as resistance and does not have to lead to it. While materials and non-humans can be unruly on their own, we contend that there always need to be humans involved for the given configuration to qualify as situations and processes of more-than-human resistance. This does not imply that humans are the only ones doing resistant work while all the other-than-humans are just passive objects, symbols or obstacles. To bolster the latest claim we suggest making one more distinction inspired by the scholars in the transdisciplinary field of animal studies highlighting the capacity of non-human animals to resist capture, containment, control and killing (Despret, 2016: 21–8; Hribal, 2010; Wadiwel, 2015). We distinguish between other-than-human and more-than-human resistance. Both instances capture situational and historically particular practices of thwarting dominating power from below. In the first case, it is non-humans themselves pushing back – such as when an orca strikes back against her trainer or when cows counter with their horns, kicks and heavy bodies to smash the chute and escape from the slaughterhouse (for early debates on animal resistance see Morgan, 1868: 234–5). With more-than-human resistance, however, we want to expand the scope of this work in animal studies as the concept enables scrutiny of how humans enter such situations – be it workers recognizing the resisting cows as adversarial troublemakers slowing down meat production and taking steps towards more efficient discipline or be it activists relating to them as to freedom-searching cows in order to help them escape and give them shelter.

In other words, resistant or unruly acts by non-humans, we claim, become more-than-human resistance when they are mobilized as such in interactions with human participants, and when, consequently, this resistance can be redistributed along more-than-human lines. Laszczkowski (2026, this issue), captures such redistribution in his analysis of more-than-human struggle against transforming the informally indwelt 'Dogs' Hillock' into a well-tended urban park in Warsaw, the capital of Poland. To oppose this plan, both humans and other-than-humans come to matter by synchronizing their vulnerable agencies. Butterflies, snails and other living beings flourish on the hillock in ways affecting their human neighbours. Drawing from the romance with the mound, these neighbours have redistributed the intensity of their affection into so-far victorious activism.

In this manner, we argue, incorporating lessons from the classic debates in the anthropology of resistance into the conceptualization of more-than-human resistance helps us to make its analytics more robust and precise, by drawing conceptual boundaries that separate it from cognate categories such as 'unruly refusal' or 'other-than-human

resistance'. Therefore, unlike scholars who dismiss the concept of resistance in favour of that of refusal (McGranahan, 2016; Thomas, 2024), we consider it important to grasp all these categories as linked and related, and not identical or mutually exclusive. The contributions to our special issue then trace their relations case by case, with their own inputs and innovations, but within broader analytics of more-than-human resistance.

In this regard, the framework of more-than-human resistance invites us to scrutinize strategic relations ranging from alliance to adversity. Several articles address the former (Babidge or Laszczkowski, this issue) as well as the latter (Agrawal, this issue). Rončíková and Kuřík evidence in their contribution that the alliance between dogs and human squatters is not given, or easily claimed, but entails the everyday labour of fostering a social life of *kiltra* politics (cf. Lazar, 2017). Three particular processes are reworked along more-than-human lines: making rules, carrying out reterritorializations and cultivating affinities. *Kiltra* resistance then, the authors insist, is also about resisting *with* and not only *like* dogs. However, not every other-than-human from our stories finds a human ally. Willow scrub thriving on peatland soil retired from production use on the Jutland peninsula is the case in point here (Krøijer and Hougaard, 2026, this issue). Withstanding alone, willows are nevertheless capable of producing political effects – in this case affects of adversity as the Danish farmers see their 'uncontrollable sprout[ing]' as a sign of a lack of care, ruining an agricultural idyll in rural areas.

Beyond struggles sympathetic to a critical anthropologist

The anthropology of resistance is haunted, we believe, by its long-lasting problem of not paying enough attention to conservative and far-right activism (for important exceptions see Holmes, 2000; Pasieka, 2024). Although calls to study different forms of such protests on their own terms and logic emerge repeatedly (Edelman, 2001; Graeber, 2016; Kuřík, 2016; Pasieka, 2019), the mainstream focus in the anthropology of human-centred resistance continues to gravitate mainly around struggles sympathetic to a critical anthropologist – be it peasant, subaltern, anti-colonial and Indigenous politics, mostly from the Global South (Gledhill and Schell, 2012; Scott, 1985, 1990; Simpson, 2014), or a left-leaning, democratic, progressive activism mostly from the Global North (Graeber, 2009; Juris, 2008; Krøijer, 2015; Laszczkowski, 2019). This remains true in analysing multispecies and ontological struggles of recent times. Apart from pivotal cases of emancipatory struggles in the West (Kallianos, 2013; Krøijer, 2019; Laszczkowski, 2020), the anthropological canon of 'resistance' literature is being established almost exclusively around sympathetic, pluriversal, democratizing and promising Indigenous struggles against different sorts of capitalist power – especially from Latin America (Babidge, 2021, 2025; Beilin and Suryanarayanan, 2017; Blaser, 2013; de la Cadena, 2015; de la Cadena and Blaser, 2018; Howe, 2019) and Australia and Oceania (Celermajer, 2020; Chao, 2021, 2023a; Povinelli, 2016, 2021; Tschakert, 2022). The recent research on human-centred refusal (Thomas, 2024) as well as on multispecies justice, continues in this tendency. Such justice is mostly built anthropologically around its conceptual and political *promise* as it targets 'situated struggles against ugly injustices, while also [being] attuned to beautiful creatures and multispecies communities' (Chao et al., 2022: 2).

This preference for struggles sympathetic to a critical anthropologist becomes, we claim, no longer tolerable in the face of the contemporary authoritarian turn, in which tech-fascist, conspiratorial, alt-right, settler-colonial and other illiberal movements gain more and more momentum in political positions of humans within Anthropocenic conflicts. Besides, there are other problems with this trend. Coțofană has recently rearticulated what other authors identified as the risk of romanticization (Abu-Lughod, 1990; Lemke, 2021: 40) by cautioning against the revival of a ‘romanticised image of indigeneity’ (Coțofană, 2023: 2). Lastly, Strathern provocatively asks how such sympathies may influence an anthropologist’s overall choices of who to research, what to analyse and how to compose ethnographic narratives (Strathern, 2024).

Therefore, one of the tasks of this special issue is to carve out analytics of more-than-human resistance that is capable *also* of scrutinizing struggles beyond sympathy. In order to achieve that, we suggest building on older texts critical of identifying resistance with progressive meanings (e.g. Hoodfar, 1997 or Mahmood, 2005). By researching women’s struggles in Muslim states, the authors documented resistance to dominant power as actually being grounded in inhabiting, conserving or conforming to norms, and not in opposing norms on one’s predetermined route to liberation, independence and freedom. Thus, there is no emancipatory teleology inscribed by default in resistance, just as liberation cannot be seen as a disengaged analytical device always present in resistance. On the contrary, such a conceptual toolkit is revealed in these investigations as being part of one particular political cosmology, that of Western modern progressivism.

Liberating resistance from the liberatory teleology invites us, among others, to study resistance against progress turned into hegemonic forms of power. The Danish state and European Union project of the green transition in Krøijer’s and Hougaard’s study (2026, this issue) is a case in point here (see also Agrawal, in this issue). Farmers and willow scrub forge different forms of conservative resistance, that is not for a change, but against progressive change. Both groups withstand the introduction of new climate regulation which enforces rewetting and deindustrialization of the rural landscape – willows by overgrowing it, farmers by protesting it.

Taking it all together, the more-than-human turn to resistance cannot be seen as a mere extension of the front lines of liberatory politics – on the one hand shifting from class or subaltern struggles to intersectional struggles and on to interspecies intersectional struggles, but on the other hand sharing the teleological goals of less domination and more justice, equality, freedom. To include struggles beyond sympathy means to open analytics for activism in which variously framed interspecies inequalities and (non-)privileges are not politicized in order to overcome or mitigate them, but to strengthen some at the expense of others and to exclude and disentangle those others. Such a move enables, among others, analysing less-than-human dynamics, that is, practices of dehumanization by likening humans to pests in myriad forms of racist and fascist activism (Gilroy, 2014; Povinelli, 2021), as much as it does researching how, for instance, non-human activities are mobilized as master-planned biological weapons in conspiratorial movements.

To cultivate such analytical openings, we suggest that the optimistic vocabulary of ‘entanglement’, ‘interdependence’, ‘relationality’, ‘coexistence’, ‘co-becoming’ – foundational for initiatory texts in multispecies studies (e.g. Haraway, 2007; Kirksey and Helmreich, 2010; Tsing, 2015; Tsing et al., 2017) – not be treated as ideologically

uncharged universals and conceptual devices in more-than-human resistance. The opposite is true, as we know from Povinelli (2021), documenting cogently what she terms the ancestral catastrophe of Western colonialism inscribed in ontological claims like ‘existence is entangled’ (see also Krøijer, 2021).³ We agree with her here (Povinelli, 2021: 16): history precedes ontology and is full of systemic violence, killing, domination and severance.

In carving out the analytics around more-than-human resistance, however, we mobilize the Povinellian claim *also* to two outcomes differing from her anti-colonial project of the Global West. First, such history does not *always* have to gravitate so centrally around the Western colonialism and slavery, formatting relations between the Global North and South. Laszczkowski’s article here about Central and Eastern Europe, the western frontier of the Global East (Müller, 2020), provides a different historical plot. Second, aiming at the inclusion of struggles beyond sympathy, we are not *only* interested in struggles against ongoing colonialism (see Babidge, 2026, this issue), or in Thomas’s refusals (2024), but also in struggles *via*, or building on, such colonialism. Kelty’s contribution here (2026, this issue), about two forms of settler-colonial activism in Los Angeles, evidences this nicely. On the one hand, there are environmentalists advocating for avian wildlife in urban areas. On the other hand, there are cat lovers advocating for a no-kill attitude to cats roaming through the streets. While the former disproves, in a long-lasting battle of reports and models, the efficiency of the ‘trap-neuter-return’ programme for sterilizing cats, the latter sees it as the way to cohabitate with cats without killing them. Although the cat and the bird activism stand against each other, Kelty conceptualizes them as two variations of shared delegated governance. Both groups are delegated entitlements by the settler-colonial history of the US to solve more-than-human issues on occupied land. For the author, this forms yet another layer in the environment-remaking nature of settlement and the enrollment of more-than-human entities in this ongoing process.

Derailing an anthropology of resistance from prioritizing struggles sympathetic to a critical anthropologist is not, we believe, a step back from its engaged positioning. We actually hope for the opposite effect as it enables us to better understand the contemporary rise of authoritarianism. This analytical expansion, however, should not be accomplished through exclusion of such sympathetic struggles. Whereas Coțofană and her colleagues re-shift the focus on xenophobic matters in order to study struggles beyond sympathy (Coțofană and Kuran, 2023), we suggest here that the strength of the analytics of more-than-human resistance lies in its suitability to operate *sideways* – that is, to capture and thus keep in conversation not only emancipatory movements (Rončíková and Kuřík), Indigenous politics (Babidge) or subaltern struggles (Agrawal), but also civic engagement (Laszczkowski), conservative protest (Krøijer and Hougaard) as well as activism delegated by a settler-colonial state (Kelty).

Reconnecting power with resistance analytics

After pivotal work in multispecies research, in which issues of power were present but also implicitly side-stepped or peripheral (e.g. Kirksey, 2015; Tsing, 2012; Tsing et al., 2017), in recent years there seems to be a more direct and explicit interest around

environmental issues in the analytics of power, understood mostly in a Foucauldian sense as technologies of government. These include, among others, investigations of sustainable extractivism, energopower and wind power, intertwined with eco-modernizing megaprojects in contemporary Mexico (Boyer, 2019; Howe, 2019a); Western probiotic governance, resilient biopolitics or holobiont governmentality, which ‘uses life to manage life’ (Lorimer, 2020); the securitization of vital systems, that is, critical infrastructures for life by ‘the government of emergency’ (Collier and Lakoff, 2021); and contemporary ‘environmentalisation of capitalist economies’ as connected to environmental modes of the ‘government of things’ in parts of the Global North (Lemke, 2021: 126–41). Such research is crucial as it complicates a tricky temptation to flatten power inequalities in multispecies dynamics by leaving them aside or making them symmetrical through favouring entangled relationality at the expense of a conflictual approach (Krøijer, 2021; Wadiwel, 2015).

How can the analytics of more-than-human resistance be of any help here? As Foucault famously stated, ‘Where there is power, there is resistance’ (1978: 95). However, the recent staging of issues of power more centrally was not accompanied in the very same works by staging issues of resistance with similar intensity (for an exception see Howe, 2019a). Thus, conceptualizing more-than-human resistance can lead to reconnection of this loosened dyad. What is more, by doing so from a unique and allotted angle of resistance, power can be cast into sharper relief. Several articles in this special issue scrutinize how structures of power harvest unruly or resistant activities for their own ends (Kelty, 2026, this issue).

Whereas, in the above-mentioned relations of alliance or adversity, unruliness is mobilized in a different array of resistance strategies, Babidge’s contribution to this special issue documents such a mobilization by corporate power. Mining companies attempt to harness the unruly unknowns around the groundwater to the benefit of litigating for ongoing exploitation of the underground. This happens by carving out the problematics with proprietary models and conceptual frameworks which confirm stability in ‘water balance’ calculations (or the conventional model of water availability), regardless of company pumping. The groundwater’s epistemic unruliness is mastered to serve ongoing ‘sustainable extraction’ and disprove any direct ecological harm. A similar power-cementing effect is described in Agrawal’s study of struggle against Agrico’s Alternative Wetting and Drying (AWD) programme in northern India. Although AWD’s efficiency is failing agronomically, the covert nature of infrapolitical acts – from cutting off water from pipes to relocating the pipes – makes it possible to keep the problems partly off the radar. Doing this helps to generate not only carbon credits or incentives, but also the company’s success stories about agtech fixes and the continuation of the whole ‘sustainability bandwagon’.

Therefore unruliness but also resistance are mobilized not only to subvert but also to serve dominant power. However, it can also work the other way round, as we know from Laszczkowski’s contributions here: the resistance coalition around the Dog’s Hillock actually harnesses affordances of dominant power and mobilizes them to its own advantage. The author calls it the ‘administrative jujitsu’ of activists against the municipality and the state. It is a capacity to use a stronger opponent’s own force – in this case science and law – against the opponent by, for instance, making use of do-it-yourself

species surveys or slowing down bureaucratic work in governing environmental problematics.

Up until now we have discussed more-than-human conundrums of two rather classical, that is human-centred, definitions of power – either understood in a post-Marxist way, as structural violence, domination and hegemony, or in a post-Foucauldian way, as political technology, governmentality and conductivity. To end the discussion here, however, risks presenting a too simplistic vision of the Anthropocene: powerful humans dominating unruly non-humans. To avoid that and better target more-than-human distribution of power, we briefly sketch here two interconnected extensions, inspired by the later work of James C. Scott ([Scott, 2017, 2025](#)).

First, we encourage approaching other-than-humans as historical agents also capable of dominating others. In his last, posthumously published book, Scott considers moving oak and beech trees from Europe after the last glacial period as ‘floral settlers colonizing the northern latitudes’ and becoming, ‘like many colonists [...] also shapers of a new landscape’ ([2025: 12](#)). Scott accentuates something ecological sciences take for granted: to colonize or dominate others is not solely a human endeavour.⁴ While Scott targets other-than-human colonization, [Kelty \(2026, this issue\)](#) focuses here on settler colonialism as a process of more-than-human domination ([Crosby, 1986](#)). To use the author’s words, the cats from Los Angeles are ‘settler companions’, that is ‘agents of settlement in the US disrupting ecological relations of all kinds’. Symptomatically, in urban areas they even form so-called ‘cat colonies’ – lethal zones for smaller birds of all varieties.

Thinking through such cat and tree powers brings us to the second extension. We suggest adding into the analytics of more-than-human resistance yet another modality of power aside from domination and governmentality: power as environmental, geophysical, atmospheric and other forces of the Earth ([Clark and Yusoff, 2017; Howe, 2019a; Latour, 2020](#)). Nevertheless, in the conflicts of the Anthropocene, we find it decisive that forces of history shape, and even alter many of such forces of the Earth and vice versa. [Krøijer and Hougaard \(2026, this issue\)](#) document this eloquently here in relation to the extra vitality of willows. Namely, these willow scrubs are boosted by governing peatlands through rewetting them as well as by excessive overdosing of agricultural land with nutrients from industrial fertilizers. As a result, willows not only grow sturdier with environmental force, but, in the authors’ words, they also actually ‘dominate rewetted areas in ways that are hard to control’. As the farmers feel weakened vis-à-vis the Danish government by such willows’ enforcement, a ‘multipolar situation of power’ emerges. Along similar lines, inspired by Scott’s late focus on pursuing the multispecies angle, we hope the analytics of more-than-human resistance make it possible to better approach tangles of different modalities of power – from domination, via governmentality, to forces of the Earth.

Acknowledgement

The special issue was a long time in the making. The initial idea was seeded during the workshop ‘Insurgent Ecologies? Anthropology of Resistance in the Light of the Multispecies Turn’ that took place at Charles University in Prague, in May 2022. Many human and other-than-human encounters helped shape this introduction. I would like to thank Chris Kelty, Mateusz Laszczkowski, Lucia

Rončíková, Stine Krøijer, Nikhit Agrawal, Sally Babidge and Cymene Howe for always being very easy to work with while assembling the special issue together. I learned a lot from you all. I am immensely grateful to Marcos Arranz, an academic coordinator from UCLA, for becoming our assistant editor during the peer-review process. Without his experience, knowledge and organizational style, the process would have been much more onerous, even unfinishable. I owe a lot to Yen-ling Tsai and National Yang Ming Chiao Tung University in Taiwan, as well as to Kata Beilin, Sainath Suryanarayanan and the Holtz Center for Science & Technology Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison for organizing public events in 2025 where earlier versions of this text could be presented. Lastly, special thanks go to my students and colleagues from our [ResisTerra](#) project – it has been a pleasure to think collectively with you through the promises and perils of researching more-than-human resistance.

ORCID iD

Bob Kuřík  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0611-9075>

Funding

The author disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and publication of this article: This work was supported by the Primus program of the Charles University under Grant number [PRIMUS/24/SSH/16] ‘ResisTerra: Conceptualizing More-than-human Resistance of the Anthropocene’.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Notes

1. The meaning of resistance has shifted extensively in the past. Authors working from the postcolonial and post-Gramscian perspective scrutinised the historical agency of so-termed ‘subalterns’ in opposing the demands of dominant classes via a myriad of everyday forms of resistance ([Scott, 1985](#)). With the Foucauldian turn, the focus shifted to revolts of conduct: the so-called counter-conduct, which was cultivated in relation to particular modes of governmentality. Here, resistance was seen rather as a formative ‘experience that constructs and reconstructs the identity of subjects’ ([Gupta and Ferguson, 1997](#): 19). The first decade and a half of the new millennium witnessed a much closer identification of resistance with social movements and activism. The focus on identity and subjectivity formation remained one of its central themes, but this time within collectives organised in protest ([Graeber, 2009](#); [Juris, 2008](#)). From the mid-2010s, there has been a ‘resistance redux’ in political anthropology ([Ortner, 2016](#): 61). The overarching scrutiny of protest and activism has kept its central position up to the present day, but the focus shifts either towards local meanings and the social life of resistance ([Lazar, 2017](#); [Theodossopoulos, 2014](#)) or to emergence rather than identity, as well as to the bodily capacities to affect, be affected and become otherwise ([Alexandrakis, 2016](#); [Krøijer, 2015](#); [Laszczkowski, 2019](#)).
2. ‘Unruliness’ is a rather novel term. In contrast, the ‘refusal’ vocabulary makes its conceptual clarification possible by juxtaposing it with human-centred refusals recently captured in

anthropology targeting the more general dynamics of ongoing coloniality, imperialism and racism, especially in the trans-Atlantic context (McGranahan, 2016; Simpson, 2014; Thomas, 2024). Simpson (2014) reveals the concept – evidenced by the example of Mohawk life despite colonialism in the contemporary United States – to mean saying NO by ‘refusing to go away, to cease to be ... [to] continue to live under the conditions of this occupation’ (Simpson, 2014: 2, 22). Aimed at refusing ‘hegemonic terms of life’ (Thomas, 2024: 95) and enduring in the labour of one’s existence in spite of the brute settler-state logic willing to erase them, we consider this definition helpful for carefully translating the concept to mean also unruly refusals from a more-than-human perspective. Indeed, this is a tricky translation as there exists a robust colonial, heteropatriarchal and racist history and presence of dehumanization of Natives, slaves and other marginal groups by likening them to non-humans (Gilroy, 2014; Povinelli, 2021). Nevertheless, we believe it is a translation worth pursuing in the Anthropocene as we moved, in doing anthropology after the multispecies turn, to study actual relations with other-than-humans, that is, beyond the reduction of non-humans to mere likened figures in human stories, horrifying and appalling as they may be. As documented in several articles in the special issue (Krøijer and Hougaard; Laszczkowski), such translation work is possible by – among other methods – attentively deploying to conditions of hostility, domination and power inequality the Spinozan concept of *conatus*, describing endurance in life of non-humans (Deleuze, 2016; Spinoza, 1977), that is, their capacity to persevere in being, to re-exist and re-emerge.

3. For critique of one-sided positivity in initial texts of new materialism see Lemke (2021: 40–56).
4. It is beyond the scope of this article to juxtapose varied meanings of such processes in biology or ecology and anthropology. As with resistance, however, we consider it productive to open spaces for such transdisciplinary encounters over shared vocabulary with differing connotations.

References

- Abu-Lughod L (1990) The romance of resistance: Tracing transformations of power through Bedouin women. *American Ethnologist* 17(1): 41–55.
- Agrawal N (2026) More-than-human infrapolitics in an Indian tech-entrepreneurial sustainability program. *Critique of Anthropology* 46(3), this issue.
- Alexandrakis O (ed.) (2016) *Impulse to Act: A New Anthropology of Resistance and Social Justice*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Babidge S (2021) Seeing water: Slow resistance and the material enigma of extractive effects on society and ecology. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 11(2): 395–411.
- Babidge S (2025) *Groundwater Politics: Advanced Extractivism and Slow Resistance*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Babidge S (2026) Epistemically resistant, unruly and relational: Modelling groundwater in the Salar de Atacama (Chile). *Critique of Anthropology* 46(3), this issue.
- Beilin KO and Suryanarayanan S (2017) The war between amaranth and soy: Interspecies resistance to transgenic soy agriculture in Argentina. *Environmental Humanities* 9(2): 204–229.
- Besky S and Blanchette A (eds) (2019) *How Nature Works: Rethinking Labor on a Troubled Planet*. Santa Fe, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- Bessire L and Bond D (2014) Ontological anthropology and the deferral of critique. *American Ethnologist* 41(3): 440–456.

- Blaser M (2013) Ontological conflicts and the stories of peoples in spite of Europe: Toward a conversation on political ontology. *Current Anthropology* 54(5): 547–568.
- Boyer D (2019) *Energopolitics: Wind and Power in the Anthropocene*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Brown MF (1996) On resisting resistance. *American Anthropologist* 98(4): 729–735.
- Bubandt N and Tsing AL (2018) Supplement: An ethnoecology for the Anthropocene: How a former brown-coal mine in Denmark shows us the feral dynamics of post-industrial ruin. *Journal of Ethnobiology* 38(1): 1–13.
- Celermajer D et al. (2020) Justice through a multispecies lens. *Contemporary Political Theory* 19: 475–512.
- Chao S (2021) The beetle or the bug? Multispecies politics in a West Papuan oil palm plantation. *American Anthropologist* 123(3): 476–489.
- Chao S (2023a) Multispecies mourning: Grieving as resistance on the West Papuan plantation frontier. *Cultural Studies* 37(4): 553–579.
- Chao S (2023b) Bouncing back? Kangaroo–human resistance in contemporary Australia. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space* 6(1): 331–354.
- Chao S and Celermajer D (eds) (2023) Multispecies justice – a special issue. *Cultural Politics* 19(1).
- Chao S, Bolender K and Kirksey E (eds) (2022) *The Promise of Multispecies Justice*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Charvát J and Kuřík B (eds) (2018) *Mikrofon je naše bomba: politika a hudební subkultury mládeže v postsocialistickém Česku*. Prague: Togga.
- Clark N and Yusoff K (2017) Geosocial formations and the Anthropocene. *Theory, Culture & Society* 34(2–3): 3–23.
- Collier SJ and Lakoff A (2021) *The Government of Emergency: Vital Systems, Expertise, and the Politics of Security*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Coțofană A (2023) Introduction. In: Coțofană A and Kuran H (eds) *Sentient Ecologies: Xenophobic Imaginaries of Landscape*. Oxford: Berghahn, pp. 1–22.
- Coțofană A and Kuran H (eds) (2023) *Sentient Ecologies: Xenophobic Imaginaries of Landscape*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Crosby AW (1986) *Ecological Imperialism: The Biological Expansion of Europe, 900–1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- de la Cadena M (2015) *Earth Beings: Ecologies of Practice across Andean Worlds*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- de la Cadena M and Blaser M (eds) (2018) *A World of Many Worlds*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Deleuze G (2016) *Spinoza: Praktická filozofie*. Praha: Oikomenh.
- Despret V (2016) *What Would Animals Say If We Asked the Right Questions?* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Edelman M (2001) Social movements: Changing paradigms and forms of politics. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30: 285–317.
- Escobar A (1992) Culture, practice and politics: anthropology and the study of social movements. *Critique of Anthropology* 12(4): 395–432.
- Foucault M (1978) *The History of Sexuality, vol. 1: An Introduction*. London: Allen Lane.

- Gilroy P (2014) Lecture I: Suffering and inhumanity. *The Tanner Lectures in Human Values*. Yale University, February 21. <https://tannerlectures.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/Gilroy-manuscript-PDF.pdf>
- Gledhill J and Schell PA (eds) (2012) *New Approaches to Resistance in Brazil and Mexico*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Graeber D (2009) *Direct Action: An Ethnography*. Edinburgh: AK Press.
- Graeber D (2015) Radical alterity is just another way of saying 'reality'. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 5(2): 1–41.
- Graeber D (2016) Reflections on reflections. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 6(2): 5–9.
- Gupta A and Ferguson J (1997) Culture, power, place: An ethnography at the end of an era. In: Gupta A and Ferguson J (eds) *Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 1–32.
- Haraway DJ (2007) *When Species Meet*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Harvey P and Knox H (2015) *Roads: An Anthropology of Infrastructure and Expertise*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Holbraad M, Kapferer B and Sauma JF (2019) Introduction: Critical Ruptures. In: Holbraad M, Kapferer B and Sauma JF (eds) *Ruptures: Anthropologies of Discontinuity in Times of Turmoil*. London: UCL Press, pp. 1–26.
- Holmes DR (2000) *Integral Europe. Fast-Capitalism, Multiculturalism, Neofascism*. Princeton, NR: Princeton University Press.
- Hoodfar H (1997) The veil in their minds and on our heads: The persistence of colonial images of Muslim women. In: Lloyd D and Lowe L (eds) *Politics of Culture in the Shadow of Capital*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 248–279.
- Howe C (2019a) *Ecologies: Wind and Power in the Anthropocene*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Howe C (2019b) Greater goods: Ethics, energy, and other-than-human speech. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 25(S1): 160–176.
- Hribal J (2003) Animals are part of the working class: A challenge to labor history. *Labor History* 44(4): 435–453.
- Hribal J (2010) *Fear of the Animal Planet: The Hidden History of Animal Resistance*. Oakland, CA: AK Press/Counterpunch.
- Juris J (2008) *Networking Futures: The Movements against Corporate Globalization*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Kallianos Y (2013) Agency of the Street. *City* 17(4): 548–557.
- Kelty C (2026) Cats v. Birds: A story of more-than-human resistance and governance. *Critique of Anthropology* 46(3), this issue.
- Khayyat M (2023) Resistant ecologies: The life of war in South Lebanon. *American Ethnologist* 50(2): 181–195.
- Kirksey E (2015) *Emergent Ecologies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Kirksey E and Helmreich S (2010) The emergence of multispecies ethnography. *Cultural Anthropology* 25: 545–576.
- Kopnina H (2017) Beyond multispecies ethnography: Engaging with violence and animal rights in anthropology. *Critique of Anthropology* 37(3): 333–357.
- Krøijer S (2015) *Figurations of the Future: Forms and Temporalities of Left Radical Politics in Northern Europe*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

- Krøijer S (2019) Slow rupture: The art of sneaking in an occupied forest. In: Holbraad M, Kapferer B and Sauma JF (eds) *Ruptures: Anthropologies of Discontinuity in Times of Turmoil*. London: UCL Press, pp. 157–173.
- Krøijer S (2021) The non-relational forest: Trees, oil palms and the limits to relational ontology in lowland Ecuador. In: Bonelli C and Walford A (eds) *Environmental Alterities*. Manchester: Mattering Press, pp. 117–137.
- Krøijer S and Hougaard I-M (2026) Willows and farmer resistance: Withstanding change in rural Denmark. *Critique of Anthropology* 46(3), this issue.
- Kuřík B (2016) Emerging subjectivity in protest. In: Vallas S and Courpasson D (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Resistance*. London: Sage, pp. 51–77.
- Kuřík B (2022) Towards an anthropology of more-than-human resistance: New challenges for noticing conflicts in the Plantationocene. *Sociální studia/Social Studies* 19(1): 55–72.
- Kuřík B, Magincová D and Slačálek O (eds) (2024) *Nečekáme nic od reforem: kapitoly o českém anarchismu*. Prague: Herrmann & synové.
- Laszczkowski M (2019) Rethinking resistance through and as affect. *Anthropological Theory* 19(4): 489–509.
- Laszczkowski M (2020) Encountering ‘micro-dust’: Material entities, affect, and politics in infrastructural conflict in Italy. *Ethnos* 85(5): 938–956.
- Laszczkowski M (2026) Defending Dogs’ Hillock: The romance of ‘nature’ and administrative jujitsu as tactics of more-than-human resistance. *Critique of Anthropology* 46(3), this issue.
- Latour B (2020) Seven objections against landing on Earth. In: Latour B and Weibel P (eds) *Critical Zones: The Science and Politics of Landing on Earth*. Karlsruhe: ZSK and Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 2–9.
- Latour B (2021) *After Lockdown: A Metamorphosis*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Latour B and Schultz N (2022) *On the Emergence of an Ecological Class: A Memo*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Lazar S (2017) *The Social Life of Politics: Ethics, Kinship, and Union Activism in Argentina*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Lazar S (2022) Anthropology and the politics of alterity: A Latin American dialectic and its relevance for ontological anthropologies. *Anthropological Theory* 22(2): 131–153.
- Lemke T (2021) *The Government of Things: Foucault and the New Materialisms*. New York: NYU Press.
- Lien ME (2017) Unruly appetites: Salmon domestication ‘all the way down’. In: Tsing A, Swanson H, Gan E and Bubandt N (eds) *Arts of Living on a Damaged Planet*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, pp. m107–m124.
- Lorimer J (2020) *The Probiotic Planet: Using Life to Manage Life*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mahmood S (2005) *Politics of Piety: The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- McGranahan C (2016) Theorizing refusal: An introduction. *Cultural Anthropology* 31(3): 319–325.
- Morgan LH (1868) *The American Beaver and His Works*. Philadelphia, PA: JB Lippincott & Co.
- Muehlebach A (2023) *A Vital Frontier: Water Insurgencies in Europe*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Müller M (2020) In search of the global East: Thinking between North and South. *Geopolitics* 25(3): 734–755.
- Neimanis A (2023) Stygofaunal worlds: Subterranean estrangement and otherwise knowing for multispecies justice. *Cultural Politics* 19(1): 18–38.
- Ortner SB (1995) Resistance and the problem of ethnographic refusal. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 37(1): 173–193.
- Ortner SB (2016) Dark anthropology and its others: Theory since the eighties. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 6(1): 47–73.
- Pasieka A (2019) Anthropology of the far right: What if we like the ‘unlikeable’ others? *Anthropology Today* 35(1): 3–6.
- Pasieka A (2024) *Living Right: Far-Right Youth Activists in Contemporary Europe*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Povinelli EA (2016) *Geontologies: A Requiem to Late Liberalism*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.
- Povinelli EA (2021) *Between Gaia and Ground: Four Axioms of Existence and the Ancestral Catastrophe of Late Liberalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Rabinowitz D (2014) Resistance and the city. *History and Anthropology* 25(4): 472–487.
- Rončíková L and Kuřík B (2026) *Kiltra* resistance: Doing autonomous politics with street dogs in post-uprising Chile. *Critique of Anthropology* 46(3), this issue.
- Schultz N (2020) New climate, new class struggles. In: Latour B and Weibel P. (eds) *Critical Zones: The Science and Politics of Landing on Earth*. Karlsruhe: ZSK and Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 302–305.
- Scott JC (1985) *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Scott JC (1989) Everyday forms of resistance. *Copenhagen Papers in East and Southeast Asian Studies* 4: 33–62.
- Scott JC (1990) *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Scott JC (2017) *Against the Grain: A Deep History of the Earliest States*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Scott JC (2025) *In Praise of Floods: The Untamed River and the Life it Brings*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Simpson A (2014) *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life across the Borders of Settler States*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Spinoza B (1977) *Etika*. Praha: Svoboda.
- Stengers I (2018) *Another Science is Possible: A Manifesto for Slow Science*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Strathern M (2024) Practicing restraint. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 14(1): 235–239.
- Theodossopoulos D (2014) On de-pathologizing resistance. *History and Anthropology* 25(4): 415–430.
- Thomas DA (2024) Refusal (and repair). *Annual Review of Anthropology* 53: 93–109.
- Tschakert P (2022) More-than-human solidarity and multispecies justice in the climate crisis. *Environmental Politics* 31(2): 277–296.
- Tsing A (2012) Unruly edges: Mushrooms as companion species. *Environmental Humanities* 1(1): 141–154.

- Tsing A (2015) *The Mushroom at the End of the World: On the Possibility of Life in Capitalist Ruins*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tsing A, Andrew M and Bubandt N (2019) Patchy Anthropocene. *Current Anthropology* 60(S20): S186–S197.
- Tsing A, Swanson H, Gal E and Bubandt N (2017) *Arts of Living on a Damaged Planet*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Wadiwel DJ (2015) *The War against Animals*. Leiden: Brill Rodopi.
- Whitaker JA (2020) Strategic alliance and the Plantationocene among the Makushi in Guyana. *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale* 28(4): 881–896.

Author biography

Bob Kuřík is an assistant professor of anthropology at Charles University in Prague, Czechia. His ethnographic and historical work explores the intersection of politics, environment and anthropological theory. He is the co-editor of *The Microphone is Our Bomb: Politics and Youth Music Subcultures in Post-Socialist Czechia* (Togga, 2018, in Czech) and *We Expect Nothing from Reforms: Chapters on Czech Anarchism* (Herrmann and Synové, 2024, in Czech). He has published in the *Journal of Urban Affairs, Communications*, the *Czech Sociological Journal* and *The Sage Handbook of Resistance*. His current work is ‘ResisTerra project’ (<https://www.resisterra.org/>), a multidisciplinary collaborative research inquiry into arrays of more-than-human resistance and power in Central and Eastern Europe.