



## WORKS

a process or phenomenon or method or paradigm for stretching the potentials of natural/organic Black anarchy whenever and wherever they manifest. We call it an “Anarkata Turn,” because it is like with Sankofa; the movement progresses because it is rooted in us going back to fetch what’s before us, going back to fetch what we have already been carrying with and in us. Those children at the park that day proved this thesis, because again they led themselves, outside the State, in a dedicated and contextually devised, systematic manner, to meet a community need — due to the interaction of both revolutionary commitments on our part, and due to their own ancestrally-inherited, culturally-reinforced Black conscience.

Now there are revolutionaries who reject the Anarkata Turn. There are revolutionaries who would overlook those young girls as not anarchists for lacking a political tract, or who would even say we Anarkatas are not revolutionary for failing to preach to those kids the gospel of whoever’s ideology. They also would never even hold such an action as a back to school “Kickback,” and even if they did they would quietly insist that the people they share resources with and provide mutual aid for to be other anarchists who share their ideology. They spurn comprehensive survival-program-style mutual aid praxis because it fosters “dependency,” in their minds, from undeserving populations who aren’t radical enough to qualify for their graces. Even where this isn’t the case, the only people these types of “revolutionaries” talk to are those who share their radical “lifestyle” and aesthetic. And often times, because what they do materially is so conditional on ideology, the people they end up sharing resources with and for are other bourgeois/white folk who claim their particular brand of radicalism. So what we have is people who got much to give by virtue of their class position, but who circulate it all among themselves, and when they “organize” they create opportunities not for building the community (because how can you when you isolated to your ideological social club?) but for indulging only themselves mentally and materially. The material consequence of this type of “anarchism” is to never truly challenge oppression or its effects. And, to be honest, these people aren’t real radicals and are just as much partaking in hierarchy and robbery as the enemy. They are, after all, powerful and privileged folk hoarding resources at the end of the day, cloaking themselves in radical talk. They have **their own interests**, whether it’s in a certain political clique (or cult) or moral high ground over competing ideologies. Though they claim to “lead,” they don’t nurture or guide or affirm the oppressed’s organic activity. Instead, they impose their self-interest onto the oppressed’s activities, subjecting or hindering them in a way that doesn’t challenge their class participation in larger contexts of displacement and carceral endangerment of the locals.

Anarkatas have witnessed this hierarchical charade known as (white) anarchism time and time again, and that is why collectives like mine decide to do Kritical

