

Toward the Logistization of Politics: Rethinking Contemporary Protest Practices

Gilles Paché

CERGAM Lab, Aix-Marseille University
IUT TC Aix & TC Marseille, 413 Avenue Gaston Berger
13625 Aix-en-Provence Cedex, France
E-mail: gilles.a.pache@gmail.com

Abstract

In an era where the seamless movement of goods, people, and information is fundamental to economic efficiency, supply chains have emerged as critical infrastructures of the contemporary world. No longer merely operational mechanisms, they now function as decisive strategic levers in evolving power dynamics. Logistical concerns have thus transcended their traditional status as technical matters, becoming central to the strategic repertoire of social movements. From the roundabout occupations of the Yellow Vests in France to the mobile blockades organized by Canadian truckers, recent mobilizations underscore a significant shift: logistics is no longer a passive backdrop to protest but a principal site of political contestation. In a global economy predicated on uninterrupted circulation, the disruption of these flows constitutes a direct challenge to the structural foundations of power. This article investigates how self-organized encampments, activist supply chains, and targeted disruptions of infrastructure are more than mere tactical responses—they embody a form of logistical intelligence mobilized for political purposes. The analysis reframes logistics not simply as a domain concerned with the efficient management of flows, but as a political language through which counter-power is formulated and enacted. By drawing on the concept of the “logistization of politics,” the article offers a novel interpretive framework for understanding protest as a form of engineered resistance. From this perspective, the occupation of strategic spaces and the obstruction of circulation systems are not incidental, but deliberate and potent instruments of political confrontation. The significance of this research lies in its ability to bridge supply chain studies and political sociology, illuminating how logistical infrastructures are not only arenas of economic value creation but also terrains of political struggle. In doing so, it contributes to a growing body of work that rethinks contemporary activism in terms of its spatial, material, and infrastructural dimensions—shifting the focus from symbolic resistance to operational disruption.

Keywords: Blockade, Critical infrastructure, Disruption, Protest practices, Social movements, Supply chains

DOI: 10.7176/JCSD/74-06

Publication date: July 30th 2025

1. Introduction

In a world where the fluidity of flows—whether of goods, people, or information—has become a fundamental element of economic efficiency, supply chains play a structural role that extends far beyond their technical function (Christopher & Holweg, 2017). Optimizing supply circuits is often seen as a guarantee of prosperity, yet these infrastructures also become highly vulnerable to disruption when social movements decide to target them. The example of the Yellow Vests (“*Gilets Jaunes*”) movement in France during the winter of 2018–2019 vividly illustrates this phenomenon: by blocking roundabouts, fuel depots, or shopping centers, protesters strategically recognized that targeted disruptions to supply chains were an exceptionally powerful weapon. These actions were much more than mere protests; they aimed to create a tangible and immediate impact on economic operations, disrupting critical flows to force the attention of authorities and society to focus squarely on pressing social demands. From this perspective, logistical areas are no longer viewed as invisible or neutral transit points, but as dynamic battlegrounds where competing interests are sharply contested. Disruptions to supply chains thus expose the inherent vulnerabilities of a system that prioritizes continuity at any cost (Schrank & Whitford, 2011), while simultaneously revealing social inequalities often overlooked in broader public discourse.

Contemporary social movements that use logistics as a tool of resistance do not simply limit themselves to occasional acts of disruption (Feigenbaum *et al.*, 2013; Gago & Mezzadra, 2017). Rather, they aim to develop a robust and sustainable organization capable of maintaining continuous, strategic pressure on targeted institutions while maximizing the overall impact of their actions. Unlike traditional forms of protest, which primarily rely on

the simple expression of discontent, some protests invest heavily in the logistical management of their mobilization efforts. Whether organizing human flows, distributing materials, supplying food, or setting up communication systems, activist groups have adopted techniques from the business world, but without any profitability or performance objectives in mind. On the contrary, the purpose of using logistical strategies is to disrupt a system that values flow optimization, creating a rupture that captures attention, raises awareness, and destabilizes authorities. This logistics of resistance thus evolves into more than just material organization; it becomes a powerful means of communication, visibility, and pressure. More broadly, it transforms social actors into impromptu logisticians, drawing on organizational skills they did not initially intend to develop but which prove crucial and essential to the success of their mobilization.

This article examines the logistical dimensions of contemporary protest practices, with particular attention to how flow management and supply chain disruption function. The second section investigates how activist groups design and implement their logistical strategies, showing how the coordination of human and material resources has become a key lever in resistance dynamics. The aim is to demonstrate that, far from being limited to basic resupply operations, these practices rely on complex organizational frameworks that sustain mobilization and amplify the broader impact of protest actions. The third section analyzes specific tactics used to disrupt supply chains—blockades, occupations, slowdowns, and interventions at strategic nodes—which constitute potent forms of resistance capable of paralyzing critical segments of the economic system. The fourth section offers a theoretical reflection on the *logistization of politics*: the emergence of protest practices grounded in the instrumental use of logistics as a form of political engagement. It critically addresses the ethical implications of these tactics. In doing so, the article offers an original and nuanced exploration of the logistical dimension of social action, raising questions about the long-term viability of resistance in a world where the optimization of flows and resource management dominate.

2. Toward a New “Grammar” of Conflict

The traditional view of social movements tends to portray them as collective mobilizations—often spontaneous—motivated by moral indignation or the search for identity. However, this perspective neglects a critical dimension of their contemporary effectiveness: the mastery of logistical operations. The sustained occupation of roadways, the targeted encirclement of warehouses serving retail supply chains (Fulconis *et al.*, 2016), the blockade of industrial zones, and the coordinated distribution of food at protest sites all point to a strategic reality. These mobilizations endure and succeed largely because of their capacity to organize and manage flows. Far from being expressions of disorder, such actions reflect empirical, deliberate, and often inventive strategies that adapt conventional supply chain tools to advance political objectives. In this context, logistics emerges not as a peripheral concern but as a core component of the political efficacy of social movements. Protest, therefore, can be reinterpreted as a form of “delivery”—of bodies, messages, and disruptions. It becomes essential, then, to reconceptualize protest practices not merely as symbolic gestures but as logistical operations with defined goals, infrastructural dependencies, and support systems. A new “grammar” of conflict is taking shape—one in which logistics is intimately entwined with tactics, and the street becomes a platform for political assembly, as vividly demonstrated in Madrid during the COVID-19 pandemic (Corsín Jiménez, 2024).

2.1 Tactical Occupation and the Control of Space

Social movements—particularly trade unions and activists—are increasingly deploying logistics as a strategic tool to disrupt economic and political flows. Faced with repressive policies, unions are compelled to adapt their resistance tactics. As Ngwama (2016) highlights, the interaction between union practices and anti-union measures directly influences the effectiveness of logistical interventions, whether through strikes, blockades, or the occupation of key sites such as factories and warehouses. Contemporary protest practices have evolved beyond symbolic demonstrations to strategically target vital public spaces—such as roundabouts and transit hubs—to amplify the impact of their actions. These locations, often rendered invisible in daily life and conceptualized as “non-places” by Augé (1995), become flashpoints of friction when disrupted. The Occupy Wall Street movement, for instance, transformed Zuccotti Park in New York into a focal site of protest, illustrating how the reclamation of space can catalyze collective mobilization (Hatuka, 2016). By seizing symbolic sites, protesters redefine spatial power dynamics, turning logistical and transit zones into arenas of political resistance. Table 1 presents six recent and emblematic cases. This shift signals the rise of “protest logistics,” in which spatial mastery becomes a core tactical asset. As Hesse (2020) argues, logistics—once

regarded as a neutral managerial function—is increasingly recognized for its role in shaping territories and, consequently, influencing the trajectories of social movements.

Table 1. Logistical Strategies in Social Movements

Movement	Country Date	Logistical characteristics	Outcomes
<i>ZAD (zone to defend)</i>	France 2009–Present	Occupation and blockade of development sites (e.g., airports, dams); self-organized procurement	Halted major infrastructure projects; demonstrated alternative resource management models
<i>Occupy Oakland Port Shutdown</i>	United States 2011	Coordinated port blockades; disruption of goods flow through key West Coast logistical hub	Temporarily shut down port operations; linked economic injustice to logistical facilities
<i>Standing Rock Sioux Protests</i>	United States 2016–2017	Blockade of construction access to Dakota Access Pipeline; encampments	Delayed pipeline construction; raised global awareness of Indigenous rights and sovereignty
<i>Yellow Vests</i>	France 2018–2019	Road and roundabout blockades, fuel depot disruptions, decentralized coordination	Disrupted fuel distribution; pressured the French government into suspending new fuel tax hikes
<i>Chile's Estallido Social</i>	Chile 2019–2020	Coordinated strikes, metro shutdowns, highway blockades by unions and student groups	Paralyzed transport infrastructure; led to constitutional reform process
<i>India Farmers' Protest</i>	India 2020–2021	Road blockades around Delhi; disruption of food and goods procurement routes	Forced repeal of controversial farm laws; highlighted agrarian and logistical inequalities

Source: The author.

In addition to occupying physical space, contemporary protest practices are increasingly targeting logistical flows to amplify their messages and maximize their impact. By disrupting supply chains, they underscore the systemic dependence of modern societies on the smooth flow of goods, energy, and information. This reliance is even more pronounced in the context of accelerating globalization, where logistical optimization has become essential for the efficient functioning of the global economy. For instance, the repeated blockades of various terminals at the port of Buenaventura in Colombia have demonstrated that the disruption of product flows is not merely an act of inconvenience, but a strategic lever for expressing social, political, and territorial demands (Jenss, 2021). These actions thus transcend one-off interruptions; they emerge as deliberate political statements, using logistics as a form of protest language. Danyluk (2023) notes that disrupting choke points—narrow, strategically significant maritime passages such as the Strait of Malacca or the Suez Canal—exposes the vulnerabilities inherent in global capitalism. What were once simple transit points become spaces of symbolic confrontation, where every slowdown or blockade is framed as a militant act, a form of political narrative that appropriates existing infrastructure for protest purposes.

2.2 Logistics as Political Infrastructure

The success of a social movement relies not only on occupying space or disrupting logistical flows, but also on its ability to organize, maintain, and distribute its own resources on the ground. What the literature on social movement theory refers to as the mobilization of resources, following the seminal work of McCarthy & Zald (1977), takes on a distinct logistical dimension here, as ensuring the supply of food, equipment, care, or information becomes a tactical priority. Recent examples, such as the zone to defend (“*zones à défendre*”, or ZAD) and the Yellow Vests movement in France, and the Standing Rock encampments in the United States, demonstrate an impressive mastery of collective subsistence in contexts requiring prolonged autonomy. These movements embody what Squire (2010) describes as a relational politics of logistics—a network of material solidarity that resists neoliberal dislocation. In this way, logistics not only serves as a means of sustaining a social movement over time but also becomes a vector of political transformation. Demonstrators assume the role of logisticians, capable of hijacking the tools of the supply chain to support alternative forms of existence. In her

analysis of supply chain capitalism, Tsing (2015) highlights how this tactical reconfiguration of “logistics from below” subverts its conventional use, effectively creating a counter-logistics rooted in the field.

The capacity to structure autonomous logistics enables protest movements to resist resource asymmetries when confronting state or corporate power. The 2022 Freedom Convoy in Canada—an extensive mobilization of truck drivers and demonstrators opposing COVID-19 public health mandates, which effectively paralyzed Ottawa and disrupted key border crossings for several weeks—is particularly illustrative. Beyond its controversial political implications regarding identity-driven protest (Gillies *et al.*, 2025), the movement demonstrated a remarkable level of logistical organization, including self-sustained procurement networks, decentralized communication systems, and ad hoc accommodations. This case exemplifies what Cowen (2014) refers to as “logistical life,” a mode of political organization rooted in the material practices of movement, provisioning, and the occupation of infrastructural “non-places.” Such logistical life directly challenges the authority of the state, whose foundational role involves regulating circulation for the purported benefit of the public. Paradoxically, the more authorities seek to destabilize movements by blocking access or seizing key assets, the more these movements refine their operational strategies, revealing a deeper struggle between two competing forms of logistical sovereignty: that of the state and that of emergent protest collectives. As Chua *et al.* (2018) argue, this form of “logistical conflictuality” constitutes a new grammar of power—one in which legitimacy is increasingly measured by the ability to mobilize, supply, and sustain a political cause. In this sense, protest sites become laboratories for an alternative politics of flow.

3. The Logistical Tactics of Popular Struggles

Several recent popular struggles have converged around a common strategy: disrupting essential supply chains to make their demands more effectively heard. What distinguishes these forms of social resistance is their ability to interrupt the flow of goods in economies operating on a just-in-time model, where this very flow is crucial for millions of consumers. By blocking major transport routes, protest practices exert direct pressure on political authorities, sometimes with dire consequences, as seen in Chile with the CIA-financed transport strike that contributed to the fall of Allende in September 1973 and the subsequent rise of Pinochet’s brutal dictatorship (Devine, 2014). While the Chilean example is one of the most dramatic in contemporary history, it should not overshadow the dual objective of most social movements: to disrupt supply chains while delivering a clear political message. However, these mobilizations go beyond merely interrupting the flow of goods; they also involve a form of logistical autonomy, in which social movements redefine their own procurement channels. This evolution calls for a deeper analysis of the tactics at play and the challenges these movements pose to conventional supply chain systems.

3.1 Strategic Use of Logistical Blockade

Logistical blockades are central to many recent social struggles, with one of the most notable being the Yellow Vests movement in France, extensively covered by *The New York Times* (Fulconis & Paché, 2020). During 2018–19, Yellow Vests occupied thousands of roundabouts to disrupt traffic flows, particularly targeting the delivery of goods to stores and shopping centers. This type of action is part of a broader tradition of mobilizations aimed at disrupting critical infrastructure. According to Folkers & Stenmanns (2019), logistical blockades expose the significant vulnerabilities of supply chains, which rely on a continuous and fluid movement of goods. By interrupting this flow, protesters not only disrupt the economy but also bring attention to logistical networks that are otherwise invisible, yet vital to modern society. As noted earlier, this strategy has also been employed by movements such as the Canadian truckers in 2022, who blocked border crossings between Canada and the United States to protest health restrictions. In both cases, logistical disruptions reveal the critical role of infrastructure, demonstrating how these networks have become key battlegrounds for political struggles (Paché, 2024). Similar dynamics can be observed in labor conflicts, as seen in a Swiss case where workers mobilized around the logistical “last-mile,” highlighting how even localized disputes can expose broader structural tensions within supply chain capitalism (Pons-Vignon, 2025). These actions underscore modern society’s increasing dependence on interconnected supply chains.

Far from merely disrupting flows, logistical blockades also serve as acts of symbolic reappropriation by protesters. In France, for instance, ZAD activists have occupied land to block the construction of a new airport near Nantes, while simultaneously developing autonomous survival logistical organizations over several years. These occupations directly contrast with the ordering of global supply chains by advocating for the collective management of resources and creating alternatives to dominant economic structures. According to Tarrow (2022), protest practices explicitly aim to create alternatives to the capitalist organization of work and resources, often

through decentralized and grassroots efforts. The establishment of alternative procurement channels within these occupied areas—such as collective kitchens and autonomous care systems—demonstrates protesters' ability to organize viable and resilient micro-logistics that are independent of capitalist frameworks. This model of resistance fosters internal organization based on solidarity, communal cooperation, and shared resource management, rather than profit maximization or the neoliberal logic of over-consumption (Holloway, 2010). Ultimately, logistical reorganization is built as a direct response to dominant economic models that prioritize efficiency and profit, yet fail to address crucial social and environmental needs, ignoring the long-term sustainability of communities.

3.2 Logistical Self-Sufficiency of Social Movements

An essential aspect of popular struggles is the ability of movements to create their own independent and relatively efficient supply chains. For instance, the Yellow Vests have succeeded in establishing alternative supply circuits, organizing fundraisers, and distributing food while maintaining political and media visibility (Carpenter & Perrier, 2023). These forms of logistical autonomy are crucial for the sustainability of mobilization, as they enable protesters to function independently of conventional infrastructures controlled by those in power. According to Castells (2012), self-organization challenges the centralization of economic power, offering a counter-model based on cooperation, solidarity, and shared responsibility. Self-organized logistics, associated with various protest practices, therefore becomes a political act that proposes an alternative to the dominant organization of work, resources, and economic control. By reinventing distribution channels, the social movements not only challenge the established economic order but also expose the inefficiency and inequities of traditional supply models. These alternatives empower communities, enhancing their resilience against repression, and enabling independent management of the resources essential to their survival (van Ginneken, 2022). Through such acts of logistical innovation, movements push back against the status quo, creating self-sustaining systems that reflect their broader political goals.

Practices of logistical autonomy extend beyond mere resource management; they challenge the core principles of the market economy. By establishing alternative systems of distribution and procurement, protest practices seek to disrupt the logic of profit maximization and the unsustainable exploitation of natural resources. As illustrated in Table 2, which presents six well-known French ZADs, activists have created collective infrastructures for resource governance, including community gardens, renewable energy systems, and local exchange networks (Bulle, 2020). These forms of self-organization stand in direct opposition to state and corporate models of production and distribution, which prioritize profitability at the expense of ecological sustainability and social equity. Constructed in deliberate contrast to these dominant frameworks, such movements demonstrate that it is possible to design supply chains that are cooperative, sustainable, and ecologically mindful. As Gibson-Graham (2006) notes, these activist interventions are context-specific responses to the extractive logics of neoliberal capitalism, seeking to build autonomous structures that contest the foundations of the prevailing economic order. Through these protest practices, social movements are expanding the horizon of the possible, illustrating that alternatives to exploitative systems are not only necessary—they are already taking shape.

Table 2. Overview of Major ZADs in France (2000–2025):
Locations, Motivations, and Logistical Means

ZAD Name	Date Location	Motivations	Logistical means
<i>Notre-Dame-des-Landes</i>	2000–2018 Western France	Resistance to the construction of a new airport (Notre-Dame-des-Landes airport, near Nantes city)	Construction of self-built shelters, barricades, roadblocks, collective organization of food and medical supplies
<i>La Colline des Morts</i>	2004–2009 North of France	Opposition to a motorway project threatening agricultural land	Organizing the transport of materials for building shelters, establishing food cooperatives
<i>Testet</i>	2014–2015 Southwestern France	Resistance to the construction of a dam on the Tescou River	Occupation of forest, barricades, collective kitchens, and medical support for protesters
<i>Roybon</i>	2015–2017 Southeastern France	Protest on the construction of a holiday village in a forest area	Occupation of forest, barricades, mobile kitchens, self-sufficiency with food, and medical facilities
<i>Bure</i>	2015–present Eastern France	Opposition to the underground nuclear waste storage site (Cigéo)	Camps, communication networks, food collectives, medical teams, and strategic relocation of people

Source: The author.

4. Theoretical Issues and Critical Perspectives

Viewing protest practices through the lens of logistics marks a significant shift in the analysis of contemporary power, where the ability to organize—or disrupt—the flows of goods, energy, and information becomes a central concern. What was once the domain of technical and specialized functions is now a common language shared by States, transnational corporations, and protest movements. The logistization of politics reflects a transformation in the balance of power. Institutions are no longer scrutinized solely for their symbolic legitimacy but also for their capacity to maintain the continuity of the material infrastructures upon which modern societies depend. In this context, targeted actions—blockades, occupations, strikes—can yield immediate effects by disrupting the resources they rely on. However, this tactic is not without its complexities. It raises significant ethical questions, particularly regarding its collateral effects on the most vulnerable populations: supply disruptions, delivery delays, and interruptions of essential services. Moreover, it challenges conventional distinctions between economic and political action. As Safdar *et al.* (2016) highlight in their study of Pakistan, cultural violence emerges from the complex interplay between social norms, inequalities, and power structures. This analytical framework urges us to view logistics as a *total social phenomenon*, existing at the intersection of management and political contestation.

4.1 Power, Asymmetry, and Configuration

The concept of the logistization of politics represents a significant shift in the way social movements engage with power structures. Once viewed as a technical function designed to facilitate the production and physical distribution of goods to consumers, logistics has now emerged as a central political issue. Movements such as the Yellow Vests in France and the global climate strikes demonstrate that disrupting the flow of goods and services can have far-reaching political consequences, often exceeding the size of the mobilization itself, even when limited to a few thousand people occupying a “non-place,” as described by Augé (1995). The logistization of politics is grounded in the notion of modern society as a complex system of interconnected human and material flows (Luhmann, 1996), where disruptions to any one flow can potentially affect the entire system, akin to a “butterfly effect.” This perspective leads Hardt & Negri (2001) to argue that, since global flows are at the core of neoliberal hegemony, protest practices must destabilize these flows to challenge prevailing power structures. By targeting the circulation of goods, energy, and information, militant groups exert pressure that disrupts the very technical systems upon which States and multinational corporations depend.

Logistics-based resistance dynamics reveal a form of asymmetrical power, where targeted actions—often involving a relatively small number of participants—can exert a significant impact on the functioning of global supply chains. This observation aligns with Rancière’s (2015) concept of *dissensus*, which posits that political action is not contingent on numbers or scale, but rather on the ability to disrupt the consensus that sustains the

established order. The dynamics of dissensus also intersect with generational and cultural factors, as shown in the case of Hong Kong, where younger citizens' identification with local causes and divergent migration aspirations shape their modes of protest and engagement (Kan *et al.*, 2025). Logistical blockades of warehouses, ports, or strategic transit points—such as the actions carried out by dockworkers in Oakland in support of the *Black Lives Matter* movement—demonstrate how localized acts of resistance can become integral components of a global network of interdependencies. As Tsing (2005) and Cowen (2014) argue, these spaces are not neutral; they are infused with political, ecological, and social tensions, making them highly symbolic and tactical targets. Logistics thus transforms into a battlefield where the scale of intervention is not necessarily tied to the size of the resistance, but rather to its ability to exploit systemic vulnerabilities within specific links in global supply chains. This form of contestation reconfigures the conditions under which power is exercised, shifting from a territorial centrality of sovereignty to an operational centrality rooted in the control—or sabotage—of flows.

4.2 Balancing Tactical Efficiency and Social Responsibility

While logistical blockades serve as a highly effective strategic tool for social movements, they also raise significant ethical concerns, particularly regarding their social consequences. By intentionally disrupting supply chains, these actions aim to exert pressure on institutions or corporations, making the invisible dependencies of the globalized economy visible. Recent analyses of urban transport protests underscore similar ethical tensions, showing how disruption can disproportionately affect marginalized populations (Rye *et al.*, 2025). However, the tactical efficiency of these actions can generate undesirable side effects that cannot be overlooked. The most vulnerable populations—those with low incomes, precarious workers, the sick, or individuals living in underserved areas—are especially reliant on uninterrupted access to resources, medicines, food, and transportation. When these flows are disrupted, these groups often bear the brunt of the negative consequences. Juris (2008) argues that while logistical blockades seek to expose systemic injustices, they can inadvertently harm peripheral or marginalized actors, thereby reinforcing existing inequalities. This paradox calls for a more nuanced ethic of resistance, where the modalities of action are carefully considered in relation to their differentiated impact. Political responsibility thus extends beyond the mere selection of targets, encompassing the visibility and symbolism of the actions themselves. The tension between disruptive efficiency and social justice pervades contemporary social mobilizations, necessitating continuous vigilance regarding their broader effects.

Finally, it is crucial to emphasize that the strategic effectiveness of logistical blockades hinges not only on their capacity to disrupt the targeted technical systems but also on their medium- and long-term repercussions in terms of solidarity and public support. As Tarrow (2022) observes, a social movement can only achieve lasting success if it manages to expand its support base beyond the militant core. When logistical blockades result in prolonged inconvenience or even tangible suffering for those uninvolved—such as delays in the delivery of essential goods or disruptions to public services—they risk provoking a significant backlash, alienating entire segments of the population who may otherwise be sympathetic. From this vantage point, Featherstone's (2012) framework offers valuable insights, emphasizing the necessity of relational solidarity that considers the social asymmetries inherent in resistance practices. Featherstone's (2012) approach reminds us that the ethics of means must always be aligned with the political ends pursued. Ignoring this consideration, movements risk undermining social unity in favor of immediate tactical gains. Thus, logistical efficiency becomes ambivalent: it can either reinforce the momentum of social mobilization or lead to enduring disaffection.

5. Conclusion

Logistics now occupies a strategic position within the dynamics of contemporary protest practices, serving as a central lever in challenging existing economic and political systems. Drawing on concrete examples such as the Yellow Vests and the ZADs, it becomes evident that modern mobilizations increasingly depend on the sophisticated coordination of material, human, and informational flows. Re-centering logistics in the analysis of resistance allows us to move beyond traditional narratives that frame social movements as disorganized or anarchic. On the contrary, many of these movements rely on complex organizational structures that deliberately target the critical infrastructures sustaining the dominant order. In this context, examining the logistical strategies employed by social movements offers a new lens through which to understand political resistance—one that redefines these strategies as powerful instruments of collective agency capable of reshaping power relations in contemporary society. The approach taken in this article opens promising avenues for rethinking activist practices, providing an innovative theoretical framework that contributes to the broader field of protest practices studies. By reconsidering logistics through the lens of power, we invite a critical reassessment of governance

mechanisms and the systemic vulnerabilities exposed by targeted disruptions to supply chains and other infrastructural networks.

The significance of this study lies not only in its analysis of contemporary protest practices but also in its contribution to broader theoretical inquiries spanning multiple social science disciplines. By introducing logistics as an original and compelling analytical prism, the study offers renewed perspectives across diverse fields such as sociology, economy, political science, and supply chain management. One of its major contributions is the reconceptualization of logistics—not merely as a set of technical or economic operations, but as a powerful language through which authority is expressed and contested. This language actively shapes contemporary power relations, particularly within ecological activism, and opens promising new avenues for understanding the evolving dynamics of governance on a global scale. Flows, in this sense, become strategic levers of influence—not only for states and corporations, but also for social movements that aim to disrupt them to challenge the established order. By treating logistics as a critical entry point, the analysis enables a rethinking of the role of infrastructures and flow management in structuring modern societies, while also shedding light on the tactical use of disruption by activist groups. This perspective ultimately raises crucial questions about the organization of protests and the ways in which actors harness logistics to advance their political agendas.

Several promising research avenues could significantly enhance our understanding of the logistical dimensions of social movements. The first research avenue involves examining the relationships between activist groups and State institutions or multinational corporations in the context of supply chain operations. Such an analysis would shed light on how logistics function simultaneously as a tool of control for dominant actors and as a mechanism of resistance for oppositional forces. A second research avenue of inquiry centers on the impact of increasing digitization on mobilization strategies. Emerging technologies—such as blockchain and real-time information-sharing platforms—are reshaping activist practices by facilitating more agile, decentralized, and rapid coordination of protest actions. These digital tools are playing an increasingly prominent role in the organization of collective struggles, and their influence on contemporary forms of protest warrants deeper investigation. A third research avenue calls for a critical ethical examination of activist tactics, particularly in terms of their unintended consequences on vulnerable populations. Logistical disruptions—such as blockades—can have significant effects on workers, local communities, and other groups reliant on supply chain continuity. This dimension raises important questions about the social costs of protest and the boundaries of legitimate resistance. The three suggested directions represent promising avenues for future research, providing valuable insight into the evolving nature of social movements and the complex challenges raised by resistance logistics in contemporary societies.

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to express sincere gratitude to the two anonymous reviewers of the *Journal of Culture, Society & Development* for their valuable comments and constructive suggestions. Their insights have contributed to strengthening the clarity of the manuscript.

References

- Augé, M. (1995). *Non-places: Introduction to an anthropology of super-modernity*. London: Verso.
- Bulle, S. (2020) A zone to defend: The utopian territorial experiment of Notre-Dame-des-Landes. In: Frère, B., & Jacquemain, M. (eds.), *Everyday resistance: French activism in the 21st century* (pp. 205–228). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Carpenter, M., & Perrier, B. (2023). Yellow Vests: Anti-austerity, pro-democracy, and popular (not populist). *Frontiers in Political Science*, 5: Article 1037942. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2023.1037942>
- Castells, M. (2012). *Networks of outrage and hope: Social movements in the Internet age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Christopher, M., & Holweg, M. (2017). Supply chain 2.0 revisited: A framework for managing volatility-induced risk in the supply chain. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, 47(1): 2–17. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPDLM-09-2016-0245>
- Chua, C., Danyluk, M., Cowen, D., & Khalili, L. (2018). Turbulent circulation: Building a critical engagement with logistics. *Environment & Planning D: Society & Space*, 36(4): 617–629. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775818783101>

- Corsin Jiménez, A. (2024). Popular logistics for collective unpredictabilities in pandemic Madrid. *Environment & Planning D: Society & Space*, 42(3): 358–379. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02637758241242219>
- Cowen, D. (2014). *The deadly life of logistics: Mapping violence in global trade*. Minneapolis (MN): University of Minnesota Press.
- Danyluk, M. (2023). Seizing the means of circulation: Choke points and logistical resistance in Coco Solo, Panama. *Antipode*, 55(5): 1368–1389. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12836>
- Devine, J. (2014). What really happened in Chile: The CIA, the coup against Allende, and the rise of Pinochet. *Foreign Affairs*, 93(5): 168–174. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/chile/what-really-happened-chile-pinochet>
- Featherstone, D. (2012). *Solidarity: Hidden histories and geographies of internationalism*. London: Zed Books.
- Feigenbaum, A., Frenzel, F., & McCurdy, P. (2013). *Protest camps*. London: Zed Books.
- Folkers, A., & Stenmanns, J. (2019). Logistical resistance against operations of capital: Security and protest in supply chains and finance. *Geoforum*, 100: 199–208. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2019.01.011>
- Fulconis, F., & Paché, G. (2020). Food supply chain fragility: A reading of the Yellow Vests crisis. *Food Systems*, 5: 247–257. <https://doi.org/10.15122/isbn.978-2-406-11062-0.p.0247>
- Fulconis, F., Nollet, J., & Paché, G. (2016). Purchasing of logistical services: A new view of LSPs' proactive strategies. *European Business Review*, 28(4): 449–466. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-06-2015-0054>
- Gago, V., & Mezzadra, S. (2017). A critique of the extractive operations of capital: Toward an expanded concept of extractivism. *Rethinking Marxism*, 29(4): 574–591. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08935696.2017.1417087>
- Gibson-Graham, J.-K. (2006). *A postcapitalist politics*. Minneapolis (MN): University of Minnesota Press.
- Gillies, J., Raynauld, V., & Wisniewski, A. (2025). Canada is no exception: The 2022 Freedom Convoy, political entanglement, and identity-driven protest. *American Behavioral Scientist*, forthcoming. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00027642231166885>
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2001). *Empire*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.
- Hatuka, T. (2016). The challenge of distance in designing civil protest: The case of Resurrection City in the Washington Mall and the Occupy Movement in Zuccotti Park. *Planning Perspectives*, 31(2): 253–282. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02665433.2015.1058183>
- Hesse, M. (2020). Logistics: Situating flows in a spatial context. *Geography Compass*, 14(7): Article e12492. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12492>
- Holloway, J. (2010). *Crack capitalism*. London: Pluto Press.
- Jenss, A. (2021). Disrupting the rhythms of violence: Anti-port protests in the city of Buenaventura. *Global Policy*, 12(1): 99–109. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12878>
- Juris, J. (2008). *Networking futures: The movements against corporate globalization*. Durham (NC): Duke University Press.
- Kan, M.-Y., Loa, S.-P., & Richards, L. (2025). Generational differences in local identities, participation in social movements, and migration intention among Hong Kong people. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 69(3): 277–298. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00027642231192023>
- Luhmann, N. (1996). *Social systems*. Redwood City (CA): Stanford University Press.
- McCarthy, J., & Zald, M. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(6): 1212–1241. <https://doi.org/10.1086/226464>
- Ngwama, J. (2016). Trade union structure and government's anti-union public policies: A challenge for unions strategic response in Nigeria. *Journal of Culture, Society & Development*, 20: 32–43. <https://iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JCSD/article/view/31068>
- Paché, G. (2024). Logistics of resistance—Investigating supply chain practices in social movements. *Journal of Economics & Development Studies*, 12(1): 90–98. <https://doi.org/10.15640/jeds.v12n1a8>
- Pons-Vignon, N. (2025). Power resources and the last-mile problem in logistics: Reflections on a Swiss labour struggle. *New Political Economy*, 30(3): 403–417. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13563467.2025.2462141>
- Rancière, J. (2015). *Dissensus: On politics and aesthetics*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

- Rye, T., Tønnesen, A., & Hansson, L. (2025). A social justice perspective on protests against urban transport measures. *Urban, Planning & Transport Research*, 13(1): 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21650020.2025.2480385>
- Safdar, G., Shabir, G., & Javed, M.-N. (2016). Culture of violence: A case study of Pakistan. *Journal of Culture, Society & Development*, 20: 1–5. <https://iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JCSD/article/view/31064>
- Schrank, A., & Whitford, J. (2011). The anatomy of network failure. *Sociological Theory*, 29(3): 151–177. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9558.2011.01392.x>
- Squire, V. (2011). The contested politics of mobility: Politicizing mobility, mobilizing politics. In Squire, V. (ed.), *The contested politics of mobility: Border zones and irregularity* (pp. 1–25). London: Routledge.
- Tarrow, S. (2022). *Power in movement: Social movements and contentious politics* (4th ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tsing, A. (2015). *The mushroom at the end of the world: On the possibility of life in capitalist ruins*. Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press.
- van Ginneken, J. (2022). *Climate, chaos and collective behaviour: A rising fickleness*. Cham: Springer.