# 1AC – Bronx

## 1AC – Bronx

### 1AC – Bronx

#### Before we can talk about the embargo in Cuba, or the oil in Mexico, or the crazy cocaine cartels in Venezuela, we need to talk about why we’re debating this topic in the first place. The resolution calls us to affirm a legacy of violence towards Latin America – the projection of Western values throughout the globe and the instrumentalization of the topic countries for the gain of the US.

James Petras, Bartle Professor (Emeritus) of Sociology at Binghamton University, New York, 12-30-11, “Imperialism and the “Anti-Imperialism of the Fools,”
 <http://petras.lahaine.org/?p=1886>

There is a long history of imperialist “anti-imperialism”, officially sponsored condemnation, exposés and moral indignation directed exclusively against rival imperialists, emerging powers or simply competitors, who in some cases are simply following in the footsteps of the established imperial powers. English imperialists in their heyday justified their world-wide plunder of three continents by perpetuating the “Black Legend”, of Spanish empire’s “exceptional cruelty” toward indigenous people of Latin America, while engaging in the biggest and most lucrative African slave trade. While the Spanish colonists enslaved the indigenous people, the Anglo-american settlers exterminated [indigenous people]….. In the run-up to World War II, European and US imperial powers, while exploiting their Asian colonies condemned Japanese imperial powers’ invasion and colonization of China. Japan, in turn claimed it was leading Asia’s forces fighting against Western imperialism and projected a post-colonial “co-prosperity” sphere of equal Asian partners. The imperialist use of “anti-imperialist” moral rhetoric was designed to weaken rivals and was directed to several audiences. In fact, at no point did the anti-imperialist rhetoric serve to “liberate” any of the colonized people. In almost all cases the victorious imperial power only substituted one form colonial or neo-colonial rule for another. The “anti-imperialism” of the imperialists is directed at the nationalist movements of the colonized countries and at their domestic public. British imperialists fomented uprisings among the agro-mining elites in Latin America promising “free trade” against Spanish mercantilist rule ;they backed the “self-determination” of the slaveholding cotton plantation owners in the US South against the Union;they supported the territorial claims of the Iroquois tribal leaders against the US anti-colonial revolutionaries … exploiting legitimate grievances for imperial ends. During World War II, the Japanese imperialists supported a sector of the nationalist anti-colonial movement in India against the British Empire. The US condemned Spanish colonial rule in Cuba and the Philippines and went to war to “liberate” the oppressed peoples from tyranny….and remained to impose a reign of terror, exploitation and colonial rule… The imperial powers sought to divide the anti-colonial movements and create future “client rulers” when and if they succeeded. The use of anti-imperialist rhetoric was designed to attract two sets of groups. A conservative group with common political and economic interests with the imperial power, which shared their hostility to revolutionary nationalists and which sought to accrue greater advantage by tying their fortunes to a rising imperial power. A radical sector of the movement tactically allied itself with the rising imperial power, with the idea of using the imperial power to secure resources (arms, propaganda, vehicles and financial aid) and, once securing power, to discard them. More often than not, in this game of mutual manipulation between empire and nationalists, the former won out … as is the case then and now. The imperialist “anti-imperialist” rhetoric was equally directed at the domestic public, especially in countries like the US which prized its 18th anti-colonial heritage. The purpose was to broaden the base of empire building beyond the hard line empire loyalists, militarists and corporate beneficiaries. Their appeal sought to include liberals, humanitarians, progressive intellectuals, religious and secular moralists and other “opinion-makers” who had a certain cachet with thelarger public, the ones who would have to pay with their lives and tax money for the inter-imperial and colonial wars. The official spokespeople of empire publicize real and fabricated atrocities of their imperial rivals, and highlight the plight of the colonized victims. The corporate elite and the hardline militarists demand military action to protect property, or to seize strategic resources; the humanitarians and progressives denounce the “crimes against humanity” and echo the calls “to do something concrete” to save the victims from genocide. Sectors of the Left join the chorus, finding a sector of victims who fit in with their abstract ideology, and plead for the imperial powers to “arm the people to liberate themselves” (sic). By lending moral support and a veneer of respectability to the imperial war, by swallowing the propaganda of “war to save victims” the progressives become the prototype of the “anti-imperialism of the fools”. Having secured broad public support on the bases of “anti-imperialism”, the imperialist powers feel free to sacrifice citizens’ lives and the public treasury ,to pursue war, fueled by the moral fervor of a righteous cause. As the butchery drags on and the casualties mount, and the public wearies of war and its cost, progressive and leftist enthusiasm turns to silence or worse, moral hypocrisy with claims that “the nature of the war changed” or “that this isn’t the kind of war that we had in mind …”. As if the war makers ever intended to consult the progressives and left on how and why they should engage in imperial wars.! In the contemporary period the imperial “anti-imperialist wars” and aggression have been greatly aided and abetted by well-funded “grass roots” so-called “non-governmental organizations” which act to mobilize popular movements which can “invite” imperial aggression. Over the past four decades US imperialism has fomented at least two dozen “grass roots” movements which have destroyed democratic governments, or decimated collectivist welfare states or provoked major damage to the economy of targeted countries. In Chile throughout 1972-73 under the democratically elected government of Salvador Allende, the CIA financed and provided major support – via the AFL-CIO–to private truck owners to paralyze the flow of goods and services .They also funded a strike by a sector of the copper workers union (at the El Tenient mine) to undermine copper production and exports, in the lead up to the coup. After the military took power several “grass roots” Christian Democratic union officials participated in the purge of elected leftist union activists. Needless to say in short order the truck owners and copper workers ended the strike, dropped their demands and subsequently lost all bargaining rights! In the 1980’s the CIA via Vatican channels transferred millions of dollars to sustain the “Solidarity Union” in Poland, making a hero of the Gdansk shipyards worker-leader Lech Walesa, who spearheaded the general strike to topple the Communist regime. With the overthrow of Communism so also went guaranteed employment, social security and trade union militancy: the neo-liberal regimes reduced the workforce at Gdansk by fifty percent and eventually closed it, giving the boot to the entire workforce.. Walesa retired with a magnificent Presidential pension, while his former workmates walked the streets and the new “independent” Polish rulers provided NATO with military bases and mercenaries for imperial wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. In 2002 the White House, the CIA , the AFL-CIO and NGOs, backed a Venezuelan military-business – trade union bureaucrat led “grass roots” coup that overthrew democratically elected President Chavez. In 48 hours a million strong authentic grass roots mobilization of the urban poor backed by constitutionalist military forces defeated the US backed dictators and restored Chavez to power .Subsequently oil executives directed a lockout backed by several US financed NGOs. They were defeated by the workers’ takeover of the oil industry. The unsuccessful coup and lockout cost the Venezuelan economy billions of dollars in lost income and caused a double digit decline in GNP. The US backed “grass roots” armed jihadists to liberated “Bosnia” and armed the“grass roots” terrorist Kosova Liberation Army to break-up Yugoslavia.Almost the entire Western Left cheered as, the US bombed Belgrade, degraded the economy and claimed it was “responding to genocide”. Kosova “free and independent” became a huge market for white slavers, housed the biggest US military base in Europe, with the highest per-capita out migration of any country in Europe. The imperial “grass roots” strategy combines humanitarian, democratic and anti-imperialist rhetoric and paid and trained local NGO’s, with mass media blitzes to mobilize Western public opinion and especially “prestigious leftist moral critics” behind their power grabs. The Consequence of Imperial Promoted “Anti-Imperialist” Movements: Who Wins and Who Loses? The historic record of imperialist promoted “anti-imperialist” and “pro-democracy” “grass roots movements” is uniformly negative. Let us briefly summarize the results. In Chile ‘grass roots’ truck owners strike led to the brutal military dictatorship of Augusto Pinochet and nearly two decades of torture, murder, jailing and forced exile of hundreds of thousands, the imposition of brutal “free market policies” and subordination to US imperial policies. In summary the US multi-national copper corporations and the Chilean oligarchy were the big winners and the mass of the working class and urban and rural poor the biggest losers. The US backed “grass roots uprisings” in Eastern Europe against Soviet domination, exchanged Russian for US domination; subordination to NATO instead of the Warsaw Pact; the massive transfer of national public enterprises, banks and media to Western multi-nationals. Privatization of national enterprises led to unprecedented levels of double-digit unemployment, skyrocketing rents and the growth of pensioner poverty.The crises induced the flight of millions of the most educated and skilled workers and the elimination of free public health, higher education and worker vacation resorts. Throughout the now capitalist Eastern Europe and USSR highly organized criminal gangs developed large scale prostitution and drug rings; foreign and local gangster ‘entrepeneurs’ seized lucrative public enterprises and formed a new class of super-rich oligarchs Electoral party politicians, local business people and professionals linked to Western ‘partners’ were the socio-economic winners. Pensioners, workers, collective farmers, the unemployed youth were the big losers along with the formerly subsidized cultural artists. Military bases in Eastern Europe became the empire’s first line of military attack of Russia and the target of any counter-attack. If we measure the consequences of the shift in imperial power, it is clear that the Eastern Europe countries have become even more subservient under the US and the EU than under Russia. Western induced financial crises have devastated their economies; Eastern European troops have served in more imperial wars under NATO than under Soviet rule; the cultural media are under Western commercial control. Most of all, the degree of imperial control over all economic sectors far exceeds anything that existed under the Soviets. The Eastern European ‘grass roots’ movement succeeded in deepening and extending the US Empire; the advocates of peace, social justice, national independence, a cultural renaissance and social welfare with democracy were the big losers. Western liberals, progressives and leftists who fell in love with imperialist promoted “anti-imperialism” are also big losers. Their support for the NATO attack on Yugoslavia led to the break-up of a multi-national state and the creation of huge NATO military bases and a white slavers paradise in Kosova. Their blind support for the imperial promoted “liberation” of Eastern Europe devastated the welfare state, eliminating the pressure on Western regimes’ need to compete in providing welfare provisions. The main beneficiaries of Western imperial advances via ‘grass roots’ uprisings were the multi-national corporations, the Pentagon and the rightwing free market neo-liberals. As the entire political spectrum moved to the right a sector of the left and progressives eventually jumped on the bandwagon. The Left moralists lost credibility and support, their peace movements dwindled, their “moral critiques” lost resonance. The left and progressives who tail-ended the imperial backed “grass roots movements”, whether in the name of “anti-stalinism”, “pro-democracy” or “anti-imperialism” have never engaged in any critical reflection; no effort to analyze the long-term negative consequences of their positions in terms of the losses in social welfare, national independence or personal dignity. The long history of imperialist manipulation of “anti-imperialist” narratives has found virulent expression in the present day. The New Cold War launched by Obama against China and Russia, the hot war brewing in the Gulf over Iran’s alleged military threat, the interventionist threat against Venezuela’s “drug-networks”,and Syria’s “bloodbath” are part and parcel of the use and abuse of “anti-imperialism” to prop up a declining empire. Hopefully, the progressive and leftist writers and scribes will learn from the ideological pitfalls of the past and resist the temptation to access the mass media by providing a ‘progressive cover’ to imperial dubbed “rebels”. It is time to distinguish between genuine anti-imperialism and pro-democracy movements and those promoted by Washington, NATO and the mass media.

#### This westernizing lens makes it impossible to imagine Latin America outside of a Eurocentric understanding of the world – the resolution hails us to affirm the expansion of empire and the extermination of the barbarian, primitive, black, native, savage racialized other who “has nothing to contribute to society.”

Edgardo Lander, 2000 (Prof. of Sociology and Latin American studies at the Venezuelan Central University in Caracas , Nepantla: Views from South Volume 1, Issue 3, 2000, “Eurocentrism and Colonialism in Latin American Social Thought”, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/nepantla/summary/v001/1.3lander.html :)

Political and social thought regarding Latin America has been historically characterized by a tension between the search for its specific attributes and an external view that has seen these lands from the narrow perspective of European experience. There has also been an opposition between the challenge of the rich potentialities of this New World and distress over its difference, which stands in contrast with the ideal represented by European culture and racial composition. Nonetheless, external colonial views and regrets because of the difference have been widely hegemonic. A brief revision of the texts of the first republican constitutions is enough to illustrate how liberals, in their attempt to transplant and install a replica of their understanding of the European or North American experience, almost completely ignore the specific cultural and historical conditions of the societies about which they legislate. When these conditions are considered, it is with the express purpose of doing away with them. The affliction because of the difference—the awkwardness of living in a continent that is not white, urban, cosmopolitan, and civilized—finds its best expression in positivism. Sharing the main assumptions and prejudices of nineteenth-century European thought (scientific racism, patriarchy, the idea of progress), positivism reaffirms the colonial discourse. The continent is imagined from a single voice, with a single subject: white, masculine, urban, cosmopolitan. The rest, the majority, is the “other,” barbarian, primitive, black, Indian, who has nothing to contribute to the future of these societies. It would be imperative to whiten, westernize, or exterminate that majority.

#### The topic cannot be separated from the way we debate it – the purpose of this year’s resolution is clear, and it’s to teach us to be better imperialists. This understanding of Latin America, the topic and the debate space destroys education and turns us into the agents of Empire.

Shanara Reid-Brinkley, 2008 (Shanara Rose Reid-Brinkley, Assistant Professor of African American Studies and Communications, Director of Debate @ University of Pittsburgh, “THE HARSH REALITIES OF “ACTING BLACK”: HOW AFRICAN-AMERICAN POLICY DEBATERS NEGOTIATE REPRESENTATION THROUGH RACIAL PERFORMANCE AND STYLE”, http://www.comm.pitt.edu/faculty/documents/reid-brinkley\_shanara\_r\_200805\_phd.pdf :)

Mitchell observes that the stance of the policymaker in debate comes with a “sense of detachment associated with the spectator posture.”115 In other words, its participants are able to engage in debates where they are able to distance themselves from the events that are the subjects of debates. Debaters can throw around terms like torture, terrorism, genocide and nuclear war without blinking. Debate simulations can only serve to distance the debaters from real world participation in the political contexts they debate about. As William Shanahan remarks…the topic established a relationship through interpellation that inhered irrespective of what the particular political affinities of the debaters were. The relationship was both political and ethical, and needed to be debated as such. When we blithely call for United States Federal Government policymaking, we are not immune to the colonialist legacy that establishes our place on this continent. We cannot wish away the horrific atrocities perpetrated every day in our name simply by refusing to acknowledge these implications” (emphasis in original).116 The “objective” stance of the policymaker is an impersonal or imperialist persona. The policymaker relies upon “acceptable” forms of evidence, engaging in logical discussion, producing rational thoughts. As Shanahan, and the Louisville debaters’ note, such a stance is integrally linked to the normative, historical and contemporary practices of power that produce and maintain varying networks of oppression. In other words, the discursive practices of policy oriented debate are developed within, through and from systems of power and privilege. Thus, these practices are critically implicated in the maintenance of hegemony. So, rather than seeing themselves as government or state actors, Jones and Green choose to perform themselves in debate, violating the more “objective” stance of the “policymaker” and require their opponents to do the same.

#### If you’re still waiting for us to read a plan text at this point, you should probably stop holding your breath – we understand the topic, not through the resolution’s violent call to “economic engagement,” but through the lens of Zapatismo. Debate should be a world in which many worlds are possible. Rejecting the colonizing interpretation of the topic mandated by the resolution allows for a multifaceted understanding of Latin America, creating the conditions for counter-hegemony.

David Solnit, writer and activist organizer who helped take a part in the 1999 Seattle WTO protests, 2003, “Globalize Liberation: How to Uproot the System and Build a Better World”

Throughout the struggle, the Zapatistas have punctuated their statements, especially those circulated through the communiques, with calls for democracy, liberty and justice. These concepts, taken together, may be the most difficult, and the most crucial to engage. In new political spaces, all voices, all proposals must be responded to with respect. New political relationships must not be limited by institutions, organizations, or ideologies that seek to contain moments of resistance or rebellion. The new relationships must speak to the collectively defined obligations of a community in a dialogue based on respect. Political projects and proposals need to emerge organically, not be imposed by an individual or a cabal. The provocation suggested by this principle implies a reliance on our collective talents and abilities for self-governance that transcends systems of representative democracy. The Zapatistas have insisted that the marginalized, forgotten and faceless are agents of history, and that they cannot be fully included by adding in such a manner that does not alter the political relations that maintains their marginalization by elites. A “radical” or participatory democracy requires a system that seeks and respect the contribution of everyone, each sharing their own word. “Perhaps,” Subcomandante Marcos declares, “the new political morality is constructed in a new space that is not the taking or retention of power, but serves as the counterweight and opposition that contains it and obliges it to, for example, ‘lead by obeying.’” The Zapatistas demonstrated that it is possible to organize collective action based on a communitywide dialogue, consensus and commitment. Given that in any local context there is not simply one single, homogenous community, how do we determine who leads and who obeys? *Mandar obedeciendo*, or “lead by obeying,” suggests going beyond a system of hierarchy and rank where elites are conferred the duty and the right to direct. The leadership of a community, the process from which it emerges and is articulated, requires clarification, such that *mandar obedeciendo* is not an excise for a small coterie to direct, either out of cynicism or ambition. *Mandar obedeciendo* requires humility and a commitment to listening, neither of which can be take for granted. It is an invitation to a profound transformation, collective and individual. Transformation is both a necessary and integral struggle as we provoke, incite, facilitate, inspire, listen and work with one another with humility. The emergence of the EZLN as a people’s army is a narrative of transformation. The small group of urban revolutionaries who traveled to Chiapas expecting to become a revolutionary vanguard abandoned their concepts once they were “contaminated by and subordinated to the communities.” In another move the community itself became armed. The Zapatistas emerged from a context of a variety of ethnic groups, political organizations, and economic interests. Early in the struggle, during the critical movement of the original EZLN’s transformation from a vanguardist guerrilla to a community in arms, the Zapatistas reflected not one single indigenous identity, but the interests of Tzeltal, Tolojobal, Tzotzil, Chol and Mam people, to name a few. The political imperatives of mandar obedeciendo also challenge many of the assumptions and previously unexamined strategies of organizing associated with “solidarity” efforts that often rely on a singular model, plan, or program fostering paternalism and elitism. Solidarity campaigns too often focus on a single issue, developing networks of short-lived and fragile coalitions that can be resistant to crucial modifications and slow to adapt to shifting contexts. More importantly, solidarity projects that represent, define and speak for the struggle(s) of others presuppose the progress or development of those being aided and not the transformation of those providing the aid. Unfortunately, they are too ill-prepared to acknowledge the transformations already taking place in targeted communities. In an effort to go beyond solidarity, mandar obedeciendo begins with the premise that communities made up of diverse constituencies begins with the premise that communities made up of diverse constituencies are, to varying and complex degrees, already organized. Taking our cues from the EZLN, we can imagine, in a place of solidarity work, a politics of refusal, listening and community-building in which people become part of “the struggle” in their own way, at their own pace, and without being measured by an specific model of “conscientization” or a political program specified by “the organization.” We must operate from the premise that a given community possesses the resources for its own transformation and has the collective genius to marshal those resources for political action. *Encuentro* as a model of political work presupposes individual and collective transformation that results from dialogue, and it allows for the possibility of individual and collective transformation into a community with purpose. Thus, the Zapatistas provide an important example of the possibilities for an unarmed guerrilla operating in sites of privilege, a resistance that makes direct action and disciplined formations central elements of their political practice without abandoning dialogue. Todo para todos, nada para nosotros, “everything for everything, nothing for ourselves,” underscores the commitment to define struggle not by taking state power, but imagining a new world, “a world where many worlds fit." Forsaking the desire to replace one elite with another, todo para todos, nada para nosotros invites us not to submit to individual needs but to elaborate collective ones. More important, it asserts that communities are driven by collectively articulated obligations, not by the competing interests of individual needs. Zapatista political proposals and strategy posit a "collective subject," demanding the fundamental rights that emerge from collective identities and communal needs. Caminamos preguntando, or "we walk asking," challenges us to travel in dialogue with one another, always with a view of a shared horizon. We are often schooled to repress the fundamental impulse to question. A commitment to inquiry allows us to transcend the facade of ideology and the oppression of rigid institutions in favor of discovery. It contests a process in which we have been "educated" to accept being left out or rendered invisible to everyone, including ourselves. The violence of cultural homogenization produced through social fictions and the ideological maneuvers of a "democratic" system attempt to force us to deny ourselves as we deny the uniqueness and diversity of others. Processes of exclusion target specific communities, especially those groups who have chosen to resist, such as the communities who have taken up arms in Chiapas. Other groups, such as youth, women, communities of color, constituencies who craft diverse, often seemingly less obvious strategies of resistance, have also been marginalized as well and are threatened by relentless progresses of homogenization. Such exclusions could also be exerted in revolutionary movements, a history the Zapatistas have struggled not to repeat. Violence was not a means to dominate, or even convince others of the virtues of a Zapatista vision or program. Ideas asserted through the force of arms are always suspect, and as Marcos admits, "the task of an armed movement should be to present the problem, and then step aside." Able to pursue and develop a "model of peace," their change in strategy corresponds to Gandhi's often misunderstood explanation of nonviolence as being an appropriate strategy of the strong, not the weak. They have not abandoned the "model of war" altogether, but have held it in abeyance, the two possibilities working in conjunction to expand their political project for Mexico and beyond. Zapatista strength derives not only from their mobilizations but from the way in which people have rallied to their banner, confident in their commitment not to take state power and impose themselves as a revolutionary vanguard. "For us it would be a failure. What would be a success for the politico-military organizations of the sixties or seventies which emerged with the national liberation movements would be a fiasco for us," claims Marcos. Nunca jamas un mundo sin nosotros, “never again a world without us,” seeks to reverse the history of marginalization in which communities have been systematically silenced. The nunca jamas is a declaration that recognizes that processes of marginalization and homogenization portent the extinction of a people, suggesting the necessity for action that must include cultural renewal. It proclaims the possibilities of a reimagined world, a world in which those in rebellion have responsibilities and have obligations to one another. As a statement against elitism it reminds us that the struggle is not limited to the Zapatistas or those in the south, but must be reimagined to include multiple struggles in numerous sites. Zapatismo offers a strategy of struggle on a variety of fronts, including cultural ones. Fundamental to the Zapatistas’ struggle to make themselves visible has been the claim that they narrate their own history and speak their own truths. The “not forgetting” reminds us to recover our past while we document our struggle. In asserting critical elements of a vibrant Mayan culture, the Zapatistas have successfully resisted market forces that seek to homogenize all people. Their struggle has been successful primarily because it has been rooted locally, a deliberate effort to maintain their commons by reclaiming their history, culture and community. We must also reclaim our histories and cultures as we reclaim our commons. In sites of privilege such as those found in the "the west," a consumer culture fosters values, attitudes, and practices peculiar to a disposable, individualistic, and competitive society. If we begin with a definition of community that stresses sharing knowledge of what works locally between generations and fulfilling collectively determined obligations with one another, then we must ask ourselves how do we collectively define obligations and acknowledge local wisdom in the face of cultural homegenization? *Notes in Conclusion* The Zapatistast commitment to difference rather than identity, dialogue over command, and autonomy in opposition to state or market control has revealed a radical new practice, a commitment to theoretical reflection and direct action that does not subordinate local struggles (issues in particular contexts), prioritize actions (strategies of resistance), or alternative practices (strategies for living outside of state and market forces) to any specific political formation, program, or ideology. The Zapatistas have refused to do battle within a framework of old organizational structures. Thus, they have insisted that they will not fall back into the past that, as Marcos suggests, was defined by the battle over ideologies. During the March for Indigenous Dignity the Zapatistas made it clear they were not trying to turn back the clock to a bucolic past of native harmony. "No," proclaimed Marcos, "we Indian peoples have come in order to wind the clock and to thus ensure that the inclusive, tolerant, and plural tomorrow which is, incidentally, the only tomorrow possible, will arrive. In order to do that, in order for our march to make the clock of humanity march, we Indian peoples have resorted to the art of reading what has not yet been written. Because that is the dream which animates us as indigenous, as Mexicans and, above all, as human beings. With our struggle, we are reading the future which has already been sown yesterday, which is being cultivated today, and which can only be reaped if one fights, if, that is, one dreams.

#### The academy has been colonized – we go from round to round, pretending like the topic we’ve been given is value-neutral while ignoring its drive to Westernize. Our affirmation of Zapatismo politics re-ignites the revolutionary potential of the debate space by allowing us to link up with other movements in order to move beyond the oppositional politics of the status quo.

El Kilombo Intergaláctico, 07 “BEYOND RESISTANCE: EVERYTHING,” <http://libcom.org/files/beyondresistance.pdf>

The Fourth World War continues unabated and the result has been a near total devastation of the earth and the misery of the grand majority of its inhabitants. Given this situation and the sense of despair it brings, it would be easy to lose a sense of purpose, to raise our hands in defeat and utter those words that have been drilled into us for the past thirty years: "there is in fact no alternative." Despite the new contours of the Fourth World War and the sense of social dizziness that it has created, it is important for us to realize that this war shares one fundamental con­stant with all other wars in the modern era: it has been foisted upon us in order to maintain a division (an inequality) between those who rule and those who are ruled. Since the attempted conquest of the "New World" and the conse­quent establishment of the modern state-form, we have so internalized this division that it seems nearly impossible to imagine, let alone act on, any social organization without it. It is this very act of radical practice and imagination that the Zapatistas believe is necessary to fight back in the era of total war. But how might this alternative take shape? In order to begin to address this question, the Zapatistas implore us to relieve ourselves of the positions of "observers" who insist on their own neutrality and distance; this position may be adequate for the microscope-wielding academic or the "precision-guided" TV audience of the latest bombings over Baghdad, but they are completely insufficient for those who are seeking change. The Zapatistas insist we throw away our microscopes and our televisions, and instead they demand that we equip our "ships" with an "inverted peri­scope.' According to what the Zapatistas have stated, one can never ascertain a belief in or vision of the future by looking at a situation from the position of "neutrality" provided for you by the existing relations of power. These methods will only allow you to see what already is, what the balance of the relations of forces are in your field of inquiry. In other words, such methods allow you to see that field only from the perspective of those who rule at any given moment. In contrast, if one learns to harness the power of the periscope not by honing in on what is happen­ing "above" in the halls of the self-important, but by placing it deep below the earth, below even the very bottom of society, one finds that there are struggles and memories of struggles that allow us to identify not "what is" but more importantly "what will be." By harnessing the transformative capacity of social movement, as well as the memories of past struggles that drive it, the Zapatistas are able to identify the future and act on it today. It is a paradoxical temporal insight that was perhaps best summarized by "El Clandestino" himself, Nlanu Chao, when he proclaimed that, "the future happened a long time ago!" Given this insight afforded by adopting the methodology of the inverted periscope, we are able to shatter the mirror of power, to show that power does not belong to those who rule. Instead, we see that there are two completely different and opposed forms of power in any society: that which emerges from above and is exercised own people (Power with a capital "P"), and that which is born below and is able to act with and through people (power with a lower case "p"). One is SCE on maintaining that which is (Power), while the other is premised on transformation (power). These are not only not the same thing; they are (literally) worlds apart. According to the Zapatistas, once we have broken the mirror of Power by identifying an alternative source of social organization, we can then see it for what it is—a purely negative capacity to isolate us and make us believe that we are powerless. But once we have broken that mirror-spell, we can also see that power does not come from above, horn chose "In power," and therefore that it is possible to exercise power without taking it—that is, without simply changing places with those who rule. In this regard, it is important to quote in its entirety the famous Zapatista motto that has been circulated in abbreviated form among movements throughout the world: "What we seek, what we need and want is for all chose people without a party or an organization to make agreements about what they don't want and what they do want and organize themselves in order to achieve it (preferably through civil and peaceful means), not to take power, but to exercise it."" Only now can we understand the full significance of this statement's challenge. It is important to note how this insight sets the Zapatistas apart from much of the polemics that has domi­nated the Left, be it in "socialist" or "anarchist" camps, throughout the 20th century. Although each of these camps has within itself notable historical precedents that strongly resemble the insights of Zapatismo (the original Soviets of the Russian revolution and the anarchist collectives of the Spanish Civil War come most immediately to mind), we must be clear that on the level of theoretical frameworks and explicit aims, both of these traditions remain (perhaps despite themselves) entangled in the mirror of Power. That is, both are able *to* identify power only as that which comes from above (as Power), and define their varying positions accordingly. Socialists have thus most frequently defined their project as the organization of a social force that seeks *to* "take [Plower.' Anarchism, accepting the very same presupposition, can see itself acting in a purely negative fashion as that which searches *to* eliminate or disrupt Power—anarchist action as defenestration, throwing Power out the window. IS Thus, for each, Power is a given and the only organizationally active agent. From this perspective, we can see that despite the fact that Zapatismo contains within itself elements of both of these traditions, it has been able to break with the mirror of Power. It reveals that Power is but one particular arrangement of social force, and that below that arrangement lies a second—that of power which is never a given but which must always be the project of daily construction. In sum, according to the Zapatistas, through the construction of this second form of power it is possible to overcome the notion and the practice which sustains it that society is possible only through conquest, the idea that social organization necessitates the division between rulers and ruled. Through the empowerment of power, it is pos­sible to organize a society of "mandar obedeciendo*"* (rule by obeying),19 a society that would delegate particular functions while ensuring that those who are commissioned to enact them answer to the direct voice of the social body, and not vice-versa. In other words, our choices now exceed those previously present; we are not faced with the choice of a rule from above (we would call this Sovereignty), or no rule at all (the literal meaning of Anarchy). The Zapatistas force us to face the imminent reality that all can rule—democracy (as in "Democracy, Liberty, and justice)? 4. THE PRACTICE OF DEMOCRACY When democracy is wrenched from the clenched fist of idealism, and is instead understood as the cultiva­tion of habits and institutions necessary for a society to *"mandar obedetientio,"* a whole new continent of revolutionary praxis opens before us. That is, having been able to identify the autonomous and antagonistic relation *that* "exercising power" (a conduct of power) has to "taking power" Ca conduct of Power), the Zapatistas have been unique in their capacity to move beyond the street protest and rhetorical denunciation that have seemed to dominate much of the rest of the anti-globalization movement in recent years. In fact, it seems that in the same way that the Zapatistas were an inspiration for the recovery of the spirit of resistance that has characterized the movements of the past decade, their vision will continue to be a key inspiration as these same movements struggle with the necessity of moving "beyond resistance.

#### The resolution’s Eurocentric mode of knowledge production needs to be questioned – the politics of “economic engagement” relies on a matrix of domination which valorizes and values the white heterosexual male at the expense of indigenous and black bodies. Pluralistic politics is necessary to decolonize debate and invert the status quo geopolitics of knowledge which makes death inevitable.

Catherine Walsh, 2012 (Estudios Culturales Latinoamericanos de la Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar, “The Politics of Naming” Cultural Studies 26:1 p. 117-122 :)

To think with knowledges produced in Latin America and the Caribbean (as well as in other ‘Souths’, including those located in the North) and by intellectuals who come not only from academia, but also from other projects, communities and social movements are, for us, a necessary and essential step, both in de-colonization and in creating other conditions of knowledge and understanding. Our project, thus, concerns itself with the work of inverting the geopolitics of knowledge, with placing attention on the historically subjugated and negated plurality of knowledge, logics and rationalities, and with the political-intellectual effort to create relationships, articulations and convergences between them. The de-colonial element is intimately related to the two preceding points. Here our interest is, on one hand, to make evident the thoughts, practices and experiences that both in the past and in the present have endeavoured to challenge the colonial matrix of power and domination, and to exist in spite of it, in its exterior and interior. By colonial matrix, we refer to the hierarchical system of racial civilizational classification that has operated and operates at different levels of life, including social identities (the superiority of white, heterosexual males), ontological-existential contexts (the dehumanization of indigenous and black peoples), epistemic contexts (the positioning of Euro-centrism as the only perspective of knowledge, thereby disregarding other epistemic rationalities), and cosmological (the control and/or negation of the ancestral-spiritual-territorial-existential bases that govern the life-systems of ancestral peoples, most especially those of African Diaspora and of Abya Yala) (see Quijano 1999). At the centre or the heart of this matrix is capitalism as the only possible model of civilization; the imposed social classification, the idea of ‘humanity’, the perspective of knowledge and the prototype life-system that goes with it defines itself through this capitalistic civilizational lens. As Quijano argues, by defending the interests of social domination and the exploitation of work under the hegemony of capital, ‘the ‘‘racialization’’ and the ‘‘capitalization’’ of social relationships of these models of power, and the ‘‘eurocentralization’’ of its control, are in the very roots of our present problems of identity,’ in Latin America as countries, ‘nations’ and States (Quijano 2006). It is precisely because of this that we consider the de-colonial to be a fundamental perspective. Within our project, the de-colonial does not seek to establish a new paradigm or line of thought but a critically-conscious understanding of the past and present that opens up and suggests questions, perspectives and paths to explore. As such, and on the other hand, we are interested in stimulating methodologies and pedagogies that, in the words of Jacqui Alexander (2005), cross the fictitious boundaries of exclusion and marginalization to contribute to the configuration of new ways of being and knowing rooted not in alterity itself, but in the principles of relation, complement and commitment. It is also to encourage other ways of reading, investigating and researching, of seeing, knowing, feeling, hearing and being, that challenge the singular reasoning of western modernity, make tense our own disciplinary frameworks of ‘study’ and interpretation, and persuade a questioning from and with radically distinct rationalities, knowledge, practices and civilizational-life-systems. It is through these three pillars of the inter-cultural, the inter-epistemic and the de-colonial that we attempt to understand the processes, experiences and struggles that are occurring in Latin America and elsewhere. But it is also here that we endeavour to contribute to and learn from the complex relationships between culture-politics-economics, knowledge and power in the world today; to unlearn to relearn from and with perspectives otherwise. Practices, experiences and challenges In this last section, my interest is to share some of the particularities of our doctorate programme/project, now in its third cycle; its achievements and advancements; and the challenges that it faces in an academic context, increasingly characterized regionally and internationally, by disciplinarity, depolitization, de-subjectivation, apathy, competitive individualism and nonintervention. Without a doubt, one of the unique characteristics of the programme/ project is its students: all mid-career professionals mainly from the Andean region and from such diverse fields as the social sciences, humanities, the arts, philosophy, communication, education and law. The connection that the majority of the students have with social and cultural movements and/or processes, along with their dedication to teaching or similar work, helps to contribute to dynamic debate and discussion not always seen in academia and post-graduate programmes. Similarly, the faculty of the programme stand out for being internationally renowned intellectuals, and, the majority, for their commitment to struggles of social transformation, critical thinking and the project of the doctorate itself. The curriculum offering is based on courses and seminars that seek to foment thinking from Latin American and with its intellectuals in all of their diversity comprehend, confront and affect the problems and realities of the region, which are not only local but global. The pedagogical methodological perspective aforementioned works to stimulate processes of collective thought and allow the participants to think from related formations, experiences and research topics and to think with the differences disciplinary, geographical, epistemic and subjective thereby fracturing individualism by dialoguing, transgressing and inter-crossing boundaries. Trans-disciplinarity, as such, is a fundamental position and process in our project. The fact that the graduate students come from an array of different backgrounds provides a plurality in which the methodological pedagogical practice becomes the challenge of collectively thinking, crossing disciplinary backgrounds and creating new positions and perspectives, conceived and formed in a trans-disciplinary way. The majority of courses, seminars and professors, also assume that this is a necessary challenge in today’s world when no single discipline and no single intellectual is capable alone of analyzing, comprehending or transforming social reality. Nevertheless, trans-disciplinary gains continue to be a point of criticism and contention, especially given the present trend to re-discipline the Latin American university. As Edgardo Lander has argued (2000a), this tendency reflects the neo-liberalization of higher education, as well as the increasing conservatism of intellectuals, including those that previously identified as or to continue to identify themselves as progressives and/or leftists. To establish oneself in a discipline or presume truth through a discipline, a common practice today, is to reinstall the geopolitics of knowing. This, in turn, strengthens Euro-USA-centrism as ‘the place’ of theory and knowledge. As such, the subject of dispute is not simply the trans-disciplinary aspect of Cultural Studies but also its ‘indisciplinary’ nature, that is, the effort central to our project to include points of view that come from Latin America and thinkers who are not always connected to academia (see Walsh et al. 2002). Our interest is not, as some claim, to facilitate the agendas or cultural agency of subaltern groups or social movements, promote activism or simply include other knowledge forms, but instead to build a different political-intellectual project a political-intellectual project otherwise. Such project gives centrality to the need to learn to think from, together and with Latin American reality and its actors, thereby stimulating convergences, articulations and inter-culturalizations that aim at creating an academia that is committed to life itself. Such a perspective does not eliminate or deny knowledge conceived in Europe or North America usually named as ‘universal’ or its proponents and thinkers. Instead, it incorporates such knowledge as part of a broader canon and worldview that seeks pluriversality, recognizing the importance of places and loci of enunciation. For our project, all of this serves to highlight the doubly complicated situation that is still in flux. On one hand, there is the negative association with trans-disciplinarity and the academic suppositions that accompany it, particularly in the area of research; this requires that our theses be doubly rigorous. And, on the other hand, there is the geopolitical limitation not only of disciplines but also of academic disciplining. To argue, as we do, that knowledge and thought are also produced outside of universities and, in dialogue with Hall, that political movements also produce and provoke theoretic moments and movements, is to question and challenge the academic logic and the authority of a universal and singular reasoning and science. We will, through such questioning and challenges, always be marginalized, placed on the fringe, under a microscope, criticized and disputed. Because of this, the challenges that we have encountered have been many. On one hand, there are those challenges that many face in the Latin-American academic context: the real difficulties of financing, infrastructure and research support. On the other hand, are the challenges that come with the traditional academic disciplinary structure, its de-politization and de-subjectification. Here the challenge is to transgress the established norms of neutrality, distance and objectivity. It is also to confront the standards that give little relevance to historically subjugated groups, practices and knowledges, and to the interlinking of race, ethnicity, gender and sexuality with the structures and models of power and knowledge. It is to make evident past and present struggles that give real meaning to the arguments of heterogeneity, decoloniality and inter-culturality. Here the criticism and dispute comes from many sides: from those who describe these efforts as too politicized (and, as such, supposedly less ‘academic’), uni-paradigmatic (supposedly limited to only one ‘line of thought’), fundamentalist (supposedly exclusionary of those subjects not marked by the colonial wound) and as obsessed with conflict (and therefore far from the tradition of ‘culture’, its letters and object of study). These challenges together with the tensions, criticisms and disputes that they mark often times make the path more difficult. Still, and at the same time, they allow us to clarify the distinctive and unique aspects of our project and its motivations to continue with its course of construction, insurgence and struggle. Our concern here is not so much with the institutionalizing of Cultural Studies. Better yet, and in a much broader fashion, we are concerned with epistemic inter-culturalization, with the de-colonialization and pluriversalization of the ‘university’, and with a thinking from the South(s). To place these concerns, as argued here, within a perspective and a politics of naming: ‘(inter)Cultural Studies in de-colonial code,’ is to open, not close, paths. Conclusion In concluding the reflections I have presented here, it is useful to return to a fundamental point touched by Stuart Hall: ‘intervention’. In particular and with Hall, I refer to the will to intervene in and transform the world, an intervention that does not simply relate to social and political contexts and fields, but also to epistemology and theory. That is to an intervention and transformation in and a de-colonization of the frameworks and logics of our thinking, knowing and comprehending. To commit oneself in mind, body and spirit as Frantz Fanon argued. To consider Cultural Studies today a project of political vocation and intervention is to position and at the same time build our work on the borders of and the boundaries between university and society. It is to seriously reflect on whom we read and with whom we want and/or need to dialogue and think, to understand the very limits or our knowledge. And precisely because of this, it is to act on our own situation, establishing contacts and exchanges of different kinds in a pedagogicalmethodological zeal to think from and think with, in what I have elsewhere called a critical inter-culturality and de-colonial pedagogy (Walsh 2009). In universities and societies that are increasingly characterized by nonintervention, auto-complacency, individualism and apathy, intervention represents, suggests and promotes a position and practice of involvement, action and complicity. To take on such a position and practice and to make it an integral part of our political-intellectual project is to find not only ethical meaning in work on culture and power, but also to give this work some heart. That is to say, to focus on the ever-greater need and urgency of life. To call these Cultural Studies or critical (inter)Cultural Studies is only one of our options, and part of the politics of naming.

#### The current strategies of oppositional politics fail because they rest on a fixed identity or solidarity activism – Zapatismo ruptures the fixed dialectic between sovereignty and rebellion, allowing resistance to take on new meaning and potential. Attempts to contain our politics deprive it of its revolutionary potential and make the debate space static and meaningless.

Michael Hardt, and Antonio Negri, 2011 (Michael Hardt is a Professor of Literature and Italian at Duke University. Antonio Negri is an independent researcher and writer. He has been a Lecturer in Political Science at the University of Paris and a Professor of Political Science at the University of Padua., “common wealth”, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press :)

The Zapatista campaigns for indigenous rights in Mexico provide a clear political example of this altermodernity. The Zapatistas do not pursue either of the conventional strategies that link rights to identity: they neither demand the legal recognition of indigenous identities equal to other identities nor do they claim the sovereignty of traditional indigenous power structures and authorities with respect to the state (according to natural law). For most Zapatistas, in fact, the process of becoming politicized already involves both a conflict with the Mexican state and a refusal of the traditional authority structures of indigenous communities. Autonomy and self-determination are thus the principles that guided the Zapatista strategy in negotiating the constitutional reforms in the 1996 San Andrés Accords on Indigenous Rights and Culture with the government of Ernesto Zedillo. When the government failed to honor the agreement, however, the Zapatistas began a series of projects to put its principles into action by instituting autonomous regional administrative seats (caracoles) and “good government councils” (juntas de buen gobierno). Even though the members of Zapatista communities are predominantly indigenous, then, and even though they struggle consistently and powerfully against racism, their politics does not rest on a fixed identity. They demand the right not “to be who we are” but rather “to become what we want.” Such principles of movement and self-transformation allow the Zapatistas to avoid getting stuck in antimodernity and move on to the terrain of altermodernity.66 Altermodernity thus involves not only insertion in the long history of antimodern struggles but also rupture with any fixed dialectic between modern sovereignty and antimodern resistance. In the passage from antimodernity to altermodernity, just as tradition and identity are transformed, so too resistance takes on a new meaning, dedicated now to the constitution of alternatives. The freedom that forms the base of resistance, as we explained earlier, comes to the fore and constitutes an event to announce a new political project. This conception of altermodernity gives us a preliminary way to pose the distinction between socialism and communism: whereas socialism ambivalently straddles modernity and antimodernity, communism must break with both of these by presenting a direct relation to the common to develop the paths of altermodernity.

#### The monocultural and hegemonic understanding of debate, the topic and Latin America imposed by the resolution makes the debate space socially useless.

Cynthia Valdivia-Sutherland, Professor and Director of Forensics at Buttle Community College, 1998, “Celebrating Differences: Successfully Diversifying Forensics Programs,” <http://www.phirhopi.org/phi-rho-pi/spts/spkrpts05.2/sutherland.htm>

Although the foundation of forensics events may have been grounded in the ancient rhetoric of Greece and Rome, the globalization of American culture calls for a more diverse rhetorical competency. One of the ways such competency can be developed is by reviewing different multicultural communicative styles. To accomplish this we will briefly examine some features of Asian culture as an exemplar of multicultural differences affecting forensic participation. Although this perusal is limited, it should offer insight into potential multicultural impacts. Perhaps the single most important feature affecting communicative styles within some Asian cultures centers around Confucianism, a philosophy encouraging both reciprocity and group harmony -- empathetic understanding of the other, and self-sacrifice for the good of the community. Consequently, cultures upholding Confucianism as their dominant paradigm place high value on group conformity and relational ethics, resulting in communication patterns designed to "initiate, develop, and maintain social relationships" (Yum, 1988, p. 384) Subsequently, such cultures are more interested in the process by which communication occurs rather than its outcome, most often utilizing indirect communication as a primary tool of the communication event. The impact of Confucianism on the communicative styles of its proponents is profound. First, communication is designed to induce cooperation among group members, and second, to promote relationships rather than individual goal attainments. In the world of forensic competitions, such commitment to the group disallows satisfaction in individualized success, while at the same time creating an environment fraught with face-losing potential. Imagine the shame evident in the one team member who does not advance to awards, or that debate team who drops in the final round. Such face-losing occurrences are common in current forensic practices, and may account for the small number of known debate societies within collectivist societies. Equally relevant to this examination of multicultural differences is nonverbal communication. Culturally bound, nonverbal communication is an area in which misunderstanding between cultures has the potential to flourish. For example, Japanese display rules prohibit negative facial expressions; consequently, it is common for the Japanese to smile even when angry (Argyle, 1982, p. 63). Consider the confusion during an interpretation of literature in which an angry or distraught character smiles in what is perceived an inappropriate moment. The same would hold true if this competitor was attempting to persuade the audience concerning some grave or life-threatening matter. Given Western cultural nonverbal norms, forensic critics would assess the smiling competitor negatively, and the competitor would suffer the impact on the ballot. It is not unlikely such negative attribution would result in the competitor not advancing into the final round, and thus, the competitor would not have opportunity to contribute to the overall success of the team through acquisition of sweepstakes points. Again, such an outcome would constitute loss of face for the competitor, a serious offense in many Asian cultures. Beyond facial expression, noted cultural differences in nonverbal communication range from amount and frequency of eye contact to arrangements of time and space, as well as appropriateness of gestures. Any of these holds the potential for negative impact within a forensics tournament, either in a round of competition, or during social interaction between rounds. The consequences of such misunderstandings may be that multicultural students, feeling uncomfortable in the Westernized cultural realm of forensics, will leave the activity in order to maintain their own cultural perspectives. From this brief overview of some of the inherent differences within multicultural approaches to communicative style, it is evident that the current underlying philosophy of forensic competitions needs to expand if accommodation of cultural dissimilarities is to take place. The question remains: How? Toward Pluralism in Forensics It has been argued that forensics is (or should be) primarily an educational enterprise, rooted in pedagogy, rhetoric, and research. If this is so, then in advancing into the 21st century, an era in which societies will increasingly become multicultural, it makes sense to adopt Albert and Triandis' (1985) objective of effectuating intercultural education within a multicultural society. The aim of this objective is "to prepare individuals to function effectively in both their culture of origin and in their new culture" (p. 391). Implementing this objective in forensics will not be easy. Change never is. However, while human beings do not automatically embrace the unknown, inability to move beyond a state of stasis equates to stagnation in human development. Within the world of forensics, coaches, critics, and competitors must continually adapt, evolving in their interactions with an ever-changing environment, or risk extinction. The possibility for forensic multicultural evolution can be strengthened in several ways. First, those of us involved in the activity must hone our self-diagnostic skills; in other words, we must consistently and honestly examine what we are doing, why, and with what effect. Are we "doing the greatest good for the greatest number?" If not, why not? Second, we must recognize the potential for educational gain when we expose ourselves and our students to multicultural awareness, knowledge, and acceptance. Not only will our learning experience be enriched, but we may also be led to explore identities and to question cultural domination, thereby increasing acceptance of differences. Finally, we must begin to begin. We cannot advance beyond our current state until we initiate action. This can be accomplished in many different ways. Here are a few: a. Recruitment of forensics competitors through on campus multicultural clubs and organizations. b. Development of non-traditional forensics programs. For example: a one-unit non-traveling team that exposes students to and educates them about forensics and/or the use of intramural competitions. c. Adoption of debate topics centered on global rather than national concerns. d. Expository speeches geared to inform about other cultures. e. Interpretive programs adopted from another culture's canons of literature. f. Creation of new events or a return to old ones (such as oratorical speeches which harmonize with African speaking styles). g. Experiential activities designed to expose individuals in forensics to other cultural views. h. Research assessing current forensic multiculturalism. Summary Returning to the question, "Is it possible for pluralism, 'a process by which both minority and majority cultural members adopt some norms of the other group' to thrive within the context of the competitive speech and debate arena?," the answer is yes, but a qualified yes. The reason for this response comes from the understanding of what a process is: a state of evolution, a passage from one place to another. From this understanding, it is easy to see that process implies ongoingness, a continuous going forth from one point to the next. Consequently, in investigating its status quo, questioning its pedagogies, and attempting to initiate change, forensic professionals concerned with multiculturalism are already involved in such a process. Ultimately, as gaps in cultural knowledge decrease, norms will shift. At such a time, we will begin to co-opt certain cultural elements from outside our own -- in turn, sharing what has been exclusively ours with others. Arguably, this is not pluralism in its purest form, but it is a move toward pluralism that constitutes participation in the process of pluralism. As such, it is a move toward multiculturalism in what has traditionally been the monocultural world of forensics. So you still want to increase diversity within your forensics program? Good for you, and for us. Now, let the celebration of differences begin!

#### Imagining a world where many world exist allows for a more open, equal society where communal-oriented government is truly possible – only Zapatismo allows us to define our relation to the state in our own, unique way – all other ways just forces dominant ideologies back onto us and retrenches

Lisa Poggiali, 2005 (MA in the Social Anthropology of Development, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, “Reimagining The Possible: Zapatista Discourse And The Problematics Of Rights”, https://www.sussex.ac.uk/webteam/gateway/file.php?name=8-poggiali-reimagining-the-possible&site=15 :)

In the case of Chiapas, the Zapatista movement promoted the concept of autonomy not in terms of narrow indigenous separatism or secession, nor as a petition for permission to devolve governmental functions, but rather as a demand for recognition of ongoing practices. Since the state was widely perceived to have abrogated its compact with social collectivities through the reform of Article 27--eroding the rights of ejido peasant communities, which represented 54% of the land in Chiapas (Yashar 1998b:54)--and other neoliberal policies, this demand for renegotiation of the social pact had broad resonance beyond Chiapas. Autonomy, as negotiated in the 1996 San Andrés accords on indigenous rights and culture, was supported by the new National Indigenous Congress. It was also backed up by ILO Convention 169, which recognized the collective rights of indigenous peoples to control resources in their communities (Aubry 2000). Mexico’s ratification of this convention was followed by the 1992 revision of Article 4 of the Constitution, recognizing Indians for the first time as existing with a distinct identity within a multiethnic state (Collier & Quaratiello 1999:173). This vision of autonomy incorporates part of the liberal democratic ideal of rights on the basis of citizenship, but it rejects the homogenizing implications of the market-oriented model of globalization. In its place, the Zapatista demand for a “world in which many worlds fit” would allow for a diversity of forms in which people may define their relations with the state. By demanding both political and collective rights, in the form of “ethnic citizenship” for indigenous communities (Mattiace 1998, Aubry 2000), the Zapatistas were really inviting others to cast their local struggles in terms of the political construction of democratic citizenship (Harvey 1997). This meant not only decentralization of administrative functions of the state, but the bottom-up definition of autonomy, involving the freedom to choose political and jurisdictional space and relations with other units (Esteva 2000). It was precisely because of the radically democratic implications of this model that the Zedillo administration insisted on torpedoing the COCOPA congressional commission’s efforts to legislate implementation of the San Andrés accords; and then disingenuously offered administrative decentralization as an alternative, in the form of “indigenous rights” and “remunicipalization” laws written by the Executive. As Yashar (1998a) has noted, this kind of “ethnic citizenship” demanded by indigenous communities in Mexico and elsewhere in Latin America challenges liberal ideology’s assumptions of unit homogeneity (individuals as the constitutive political unit), administrative homogeneity (uniformly defined boundaries and relations with the central state), and identity homogeneity (with the corollary assumption of correspondence between nation and state). However, this kind of new federalism, rooted in collective and historic rights to protection from central power, could be confused in the neoliberal context for the central government’s abandoning of its obligations by sloughing off the costs of social services and public works to peripheral units (Aubry 2000).10 This danger led to some ambiguity in the Zapatista call for autonomy. One historic current within the autonomy movement in Chiapas was the “Pluriethnic Autonomous Regions” (RAP) project, promoted by some indigenous leaders such as Margarito Ruiz of the Independent Front of Indigenous Peoples (FIPI) and some academics (Mattiace 1997, Díaz- Polanco 1997). This approach calls for a regional, fourth level of government (besides national, state, and municipal) which would give juridical representation to indigenous regions. An alternative, communalist approach emphasizes local practices of direct democracy and self-government at the community level. Critics of the RAP model were wary of the possibility of caciquismo and cooptation, and noted that it accepted the basic design of the existing state which was less than democratic (Esteva 2000). Skeptics of the communalist model noted the vulnerability of local communities to isolation and government attack, arguing that sustaining empowerment would require a broader mechanism of engagement with the national state (Mattiace 1998). The Zapatistas avoided exclusively embracing either model of the autonomous unit, in effect supporting a kind of “autonomy of autonomies.”5 As a result, both the RAP and the CNI (which leaned toward the communalist model) supported the San Andrés accords and roundly rejected the Indigenous Reform Initiative presented by President Zedillo to the Senate on 15 March 1998. The tradeoff of inclusiveness for coherence of political strategy was perhaps a central dilemma of the Zapatista response to globalization. While arguably a necessary challenge of democratization-from-society within the framework of an authoritarian regime, this remained both a source of weakness and a source of strength of the Zapatista movement going into the 21st century.

# 2AC

### AT: Speaking for Others

#### There is no link argument – we aren’t pretending that we’re Zapatistas of the debate community – rather, we think that the method that the Zapatistas used in Mexico is productive and should be affirmed – there is a distinction made that they don’t understand

#### Link ev in context of NGO cooperation and “handouts” to the Zapatistas – no reason why that is us

#### The academy and the debate space is connected to political instutions – decolonizing that education is a necessary prerequisite to making change

#### Not speaking for other reflects blame and maintains the oppression of others – speaking for other is uniquely necessary for coalition building

Laura Sells, Instructor of Speech Communication at Louisiana State University, 1997, “On Feminist Civility: Retrieving the Political in the Feminist Public Forum”

In her recent article, "The Problems of Speaking For Others," Linda Alcoff points out the ways in which this retreat rhetoric has actually become an evasion of political responsibility. Alcoff's arguments are rich and their implications are many, but one implication is relevant to a vital feminist public forum. The retreat from speaking for others politically dangerous because it erodes public discourse. First, the retreat response presumes that we can, indeed, "retreat to a discrete location and make singular claims that are disentangled from other's locations." Alcoff calls this a "false ontological configuration" in which we ignore how our social locations are always already implicated in the locations of others. The position of "not speaking for others" thus becomes an alibi that allows individuals to avoid responsibility and accountability for their effects on others. The retreat, then, is actually a withdrawal to an individualist realm, a move that reproduces an individualist ideology and privatizes the politics of experience. As she points out, this move creates a protected form of speech in which the individual is above critique because she is not making claims about others. This protection also gives the speaker immunity from having to be "true" to the experiences and needs of others. As a form of protected speech, then, "not speaking for others" short-circuits public debate by disallowing critique and avoiding responsibility to the other. Second, the retreat response undercuts the possibility of political efficacy. Alcoff illustrates this point with a list of people--Steven Biko, Edward Said, Rigoberta Menchu--who have indeed spoken for others with significant political impact. As she bluntly puts it, both collective action and coalition necessitate speaking for others.

#### Not speaking for others perpetuates oppression

Judith Roof, Professor of English and film studies at Michigan State University, and Robyn Wiegman, Professor of Literature and Women's Studies and former Director of the Women's Studies Program at Duke, 1995, “Who Can Speak? Author and Critical Identity”

This passage raises a fascinating question, particularly in relation to Spivak's analysis of the subaltern. If the very ontology of being subal­tern is silence, illiteracy, lack of voice and agency, and thus lack of those elements of personhood that we take for granted as constitut­ing the grounds for individual social and political rights, then Arendt, by naming the oppressed as silent, thereby silences the oppressed. Her statement that oppressed minorities do not know what is best for them because they want -social opportunity (which a poor person might understand as food and shelter) rather than "rights" (which that same person might not understand at all since it has no immediate referent) marks her as elite and qualifies what she says later in her introduction: I should like to remind the reader that I am writing as an outsider. I have never lived in the South and have even avoided occasional trips to Southern states because they would have brought me into a situa­tion that I personally would find unbearable. Like most people of Eu­ropean origin I have difficulty in understanding, let alone sharing, the common prejudices of Americans in this area. Since what I wrote may shock good people and be misused by bad ones. I should like to make it clear that as a Jew I take my sympathy for the cause of the Negroes as for all oppressed or underprivileged peoples for granted and should appreciate it if the reader did likewise. (-Reflections" 46) As Spivak has made the case in her work, it is precisely sympathy or empathy that cannot be taken for granted; the mere desire to be on the side of the underprivileged is not enough, never enough. For what sympathy or empathy must always cover or neglect is the very rela­tionship between the elite and the subaltern that constitutes the op­pressive situation Arendt would like to address with her good will. Placing Arendt and Spivak side by side details the problem. On the one hand, Arendt writes that African Americans are not in a position to judge what is best for themselves. This statement, along with Spivak's announcement that the subaltern cannot speak, indicates that we can­not merely drop our common prejudices, take our sympathies for grant­ed, and permit the underclass to speak; that they are an underclass is precisely what constitutes their silence. It is a function of the elite—and what makes them elite—to indicate and instantiate this silence. On the other hand, Arendt identifies with these particular underprivileged peo­ple, for in her experience as a European Jew she understands especial­ly well that the visible marks of racial difference function to permit a society to discriminate against the others in its midst. The impasse or difficulty that Arendt faces is that she both identifies with and distances herself from the oppressed. As a Jew, she carries with her in her flesh the marks of difference that during the war would have helped the Germans u) separate her out for killing, but as an intellectual she sees herself as in a better position to judge what is best for society as a whole. Arendt does not, of course, see this contradiction as a difficulty; indeed, she does not see it as a contradiction.

### AT: Kritik

#### We solve all of their offense – Zapatismo entails creating a world in which where many world are possible – this means that we necessarily don’t exclude their discussions about [the black body], but rather, we allow your discussions into creating a better tomorrow.

#### This ability allows us to move past traditional leftist movements that have failed and create new political spaces for change – their alternative necessarily creates a static identity that fails

Manuel Callahan, Professor of Race relations at Humboldt State University, 2005, “Why not share a dream? Zapatismo as Political and Cultural Practice,” http://www.jstor.org/stable/23263123

While we should not abandon the responsibilities and challenges of sincere solidarity work, taking our cues from the EZLN, we might suggest that Zapatismo invites people to become part of "the struggle" in their own manner, at their own pace, and without being measured by any specific model of "conscientization" or a political program specified by "the organization." However, the effort at encuentro challenges us to interrogate the limitations and contradictions of more traditional solidarity activism. Zapatismo reveals the political tensions of building a movement based only on single issue campaigns, on behalf of a specific constituency, and relying on short-lived fragile coalitions often over-determined by the most immediate crisis. In many cases those solidarity efforts that fail to escape a liberal mold can unwittingly promote possessive individualism, celebrating a single leader, often considered the best and the brightest of the group, who is expected to state the group's issues, history, strategies and goals. The result is a single model, plan, or program dominated by an elite. Consequently, a narrowly defined solidarity effort can easily reproduce paternalism and hierarchy within the organization and between the organization and the constituency being "served." Echoing Holloway's warning in this volume, traditional solidarity projects fall into the trap of defining, representing, and speaking for the struggle(s) of others, while at the same moment insisting on "the progress" of those being aided, making solidarity efforts resistant to modifications and slow to adapt to shifting contexts. Solidarity projects that represent, define and speak for the struggle (s) of others presuppose the progress of those being aided and not the transformation of those pro viding the aid. Moreover, aide workers operating in a narrow solidarity mode are less likely to acknowledge or celebrate the transformations that have already taken place in "targeted" com munities, inadvertently facilitating an insidious imperialism. Professional well-funded NGOs, for example, "can become shadow bureaucracies parallel to Southern nation state administrations."30 Ultimately, a bureaucratic model of social change will not be able to prioritize and promote the transformation of those pro viding the aid. Although there may be valid concerns we must interrogate regarding the challenges of "solidarity," the political practice examined here does not seek to impose a rigidly defined alternative practice. The Zapatistas have been consistent in keeping with what they have argued is the task of an armed movement: to "present the problem, and then step aside."31 As critical catalysts in posing problems they have deliberately not posed solutions on other groups or spaces. "But it is already known that our specialty is not in solving problems, but in creating them. 'Creating them?' No, that is too presumptuous, rather in proposing. Yes, our specialty is proposing problems."32 The Zapatista provocation insists that rights emerge from collective identities and communal needs expressing collectively articulated obligations and not the competing interests of individual need.33 Rather than emphasize networks as our only organizing objective, we might also imagine the movement in solidarity with the Zapatistas as an imagined community, a collective effort to define obligations that are rooted in a locally placed culture generating knowledge about what works across generations. The very act of provocation undertaken has been a bridge manifest in a new international, not an international based on rigid party doctrines or dogmas of competing organizations but "an international of hope." The new international is defined by dignity, "that nation without nationality, that rain bow that is also a bridge, that murmur of the heart no matter what blood lives it, that rebel irreverence that mocks borders, customs and wars."34 "Instead of a new bureaucratic apparatus, for the world coordination of a political movement expressing universal ideals and proposals," Esteva explains, "the International of Hope was created: a web constituted by innumerable differentiated autonomies, without a center or hierarchies, within which the most varied coalitions of discontents can express themselves, to dismantle forces and regimes oppressing all of them."35 The process of creating political space for dialogue between a diverse number of constituencies occupying a particular space suggests that community is neither homogenous nor static. Rather than speak of "the community," Zapatismo strives for a notion of community embodying a multiplicity of histories, experiences, resources, and obligations. The pursuit of new political relationships underscores the need to re-discover strategies to collectively define obligations of and within a community through dialogue based on respect. Political projects and proposals need to emerge organically—not imposed either by an individual (caciquismo) or a cabal (protagonismo). As the Frente Zapatista de Liberacion Nacional (FZLN) have warned, people organizing themselves must begin "with the situation in which they find themselves, not in the one which we might desire to be found."36 In new political spaces all voices, all proposals must be responded to with respect. Democracy, as Marcos suggests, is a gesture "to decide upon the dominant social proposal." Liberty implies the freedom necessary to pursue one action over another, the expression of desire for the fulfillment of hope and dignity. Free from oppression, fear or persecution liberty sustains diversity and the choice, "to subscribe to one or another proposal."37 "It is," writes Marcos, "the same desire: democracy, liberty, and justice. In the heroic delirium of the Mexican southeast, hope implies a name: Tachicam, the unity of long ing for a better future."

### AT: Alt

#### Singularity disad – they paper over the ways oppression constitutes itself in different ways than just antiblackness – dooms their movement to failure

Simon Tormey, Head of the School of Social and Political Sciences at the University of Sydney, 2006, ‘Not in my Name’: Deleuze, Zapatismo and the Critique of Representation”

Thinking more generally about the socio-political ideology of Zapatismo, what becomes evident is the reluctance to commit themselves to a ‘vision’ or blueprint of how the world should be transformed, or indeed how even the Chiapas should be transformed. This again is a source of irritation for otherwise sympathetic onlookers who would like to see in the Zapatistas the vanguard of an attempt to construct a viable ‘counter- empire’ of the kind influentially discussed by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri in their controversial work Empire. Surely it is asked, there must be some notion of what the world should look like in order to mobilise people against the world as it is now? Again, the notion that ‘resistance against’ can only make sense when seen as the antonym of a ‘resistance for’, in this case in favour of a distinct political system or space is one that is challenged both implicitly and explicitly by Zapatista practice. As Marcos insists: Zapatismo is not an ideology, it is not bought and paid for by a doctrine. It is … an intuition. Something so open and flexible that it really occurs in all places. Zapatismo poses the question: ‘What is it that excluded me?’‘What is that has isolated me?’ In each place the response is different. Zapatismo simply states the question and stipulates that the response is plural, that the response is inclusive … 29 In attempting to elaborate what Zapatismo is, communiqués articulate the idea of ‘a political force’ that operates in negation to that which is, as opposed to the embodiment of something that has yet to be created. In this sense they directly eschew the idea of a government or system ‘in waiting’ as per the classic ‘putschist’ rhetoric of traditional revolutionary movements. As has often been noted, they have yet to articulate a response to the ‘land question’, which is the very issue that caused the Zapatistas to come into being in the first place. Zapatismo is ‘silent’ on this and all the other matters that have animated left radicals over the past two centuries, that have nurtured them in the ‘hard times’, and helped to maintain their faith that history is on their side. But the ‘silence’ is surely telling in positive ways. As we noted at the outset, this is a political force that prefers not to ‘speak’, but rather to ‘listen’ and provide what Marcos terms an ‘echo’ of what it ‘hears’. As Marcos notes, this would be: An echo that recognises the existence of the other and does not overpower or attempt to silence it. An echo that takes its place and speaks its own voice, yet speaks with the voice of the other. An echo that reproduces its own sound, yet opens itself to the sound of the other. An echo […] transforming itself and renewing itself in other voices. An echo that turns itself into many voices, into a network of voices that, before Power’s deafness, opts to speak to itself, knowing itself to be one and many, acknowledging itself to be equal in its desire to listen and be listened to, to recognising itself as diverse in the tones and levels of voices forming it.30 To Marcos this is a different kind of political practice. It is one that insists that there are no a priori truths that can be handed down to ‘The People’; there is no doctrine that has to be learned or spelled out; there is only ‘lived experience’. Zapatismo is a political force that is concerned with the means by which people can be ‘present’ as opposed to being represented, whether it be by political parties, ideologies, or the other familiar devices and strategies that have prevented voices being heard. To quote Marcos, what they are struggling for is a world in which ‘all worlds are possible’. Similarly In The Second Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle, Marcos declares (on behalf of the Zapatistas) that: ‘we aren’t proposing a new world, but something preceding a new world; an antechamber looking into the new Mexico. In this sense, this revolution will not end in a new class, faction of a class, or group in power. It will end in a free and democratic space for political struggle’.30 Their struggle is one to permit other conceptions of the world to come into being. Of course this is punctuated by a view of what it is that such spaces require: the obliteration of party machines, of the bloated and antique structures of representation that clog Mexico’s political system; but the point is such strictures are regarded as the basis upon which a genuine political process can take place. What is left out is any ‘final’ account of justice, equality or democracy. Contrast Zapatismo in other words, with traditional revolutionary rhetoric and more particularly with the communist struggles of the past with their tightly knit, disciplined hierarchies built on a thorough going utilitarianism that is prepared, as Trotsky once bluntly put it, ‘to break eggs to make an omelette’. In Zapatismo we find on the contrary a sentiment that insists that all the ‘eggs’ are of value. It is ‘dignity’ and ‘respect’ for the singular voice that animates this struggle against representation, not a desire to fulfil the historical or foreordained destiny to which all voices are or will be subject. In this sense as in the other senses discussed here, it seems to me that this is a very Deleuzian kind of struggle, and Deleuze (and Guattari) anticipate on the plane of high theory the kinds of demands being articulated by Marcos and the Zapatistas. This is also to say that the search for a post-representational form of political practice should not be read as necessarily ‘nihilistic’ (as Laclau insists) or as one that inevitably pits the aristocratic ‘one’ against the many. Or if it is, then it is a nihilism that, as per Deleuze’s reading of ‘eternal return’, isa struggle in which being and difference are constantly affirmed. It is an affirmation of difference itself, of the singular voice, and of the possibility of and necessity for ‘spaces’ in which those voices can be heard. In the terms offered by Deleuze and Guattari this would be ‘smooth’ space as opposed to the ‘striated’ space of representational systems. It would be a ‘deterritorialised’ space of combination and recombination in accordance with differentiated, disaggregated desires; not the territorialised space of hierarchy, fixed and known roles that define ‘identity’. In terms of Zapatismo, this is a space in which ‘all worlds are possible’and in which it is the constant combination and recombination of the indigenous peoples that determines what ‘happens’.

#### Empirics prove – singular movements are doomed to failure – only Zapatismo solves

David Solnit, writer and activist organizer who helped take a part in the 1999 WTO Shutdowns, 2003, “Globalize Liberation: How to Uproot the System and Build a Better World,” Text

The new radicalism is a movement of movements, a network of networks, not merely intent on changing the world, but—as the Zapatistas describe—making a new one in which many worlds will fit. It is a patchwork quilt of hope sewn together with countless hands, actions, songs, e-mails, and dreams into a whole that is much greater than the sum of its pieces. These movements, with their new ways of organizing, resistance, communication and new forms of alternative institutions, represent a dramatic departure from the last century’s prevailing strategies of working for change. A common theme within the new radicalism is the practice of letting the means determine the ends. Unless the community or world we want is built into and reflected by the struggle to achieve it, movements will always be disappointed in their efforts. Groups, political parties, or movements that are hierarchically structured themselves cannot change the antidemocratic and hierarchical structures of government, corporations, and corporate capitalism. Many of the twentieth-century’s major efforts – reforming existing institutions or governments in order to make them kinder and gentler, or overthrowing them and then occupying and replicating those same or similar structures of power – were ultimately not successful, and in the worst cases they left a legacy of disaster and betrayal for those who gave their sweat and blood in the fight for a better world. The term “Left,” has sadly lumped authoritarian groups, parties, governments, and dictators together with genuinely democratic social movements, and the “Left” and “Right” are no longer adequate to describe the complex political spectrum of the twenty-first century. Unless positive new ideas and methods are more clearly articulated and widely explored, people and movements striving for a better world will remain trapped in the failed models of the past. Without a creative break from these patterns we doom ourselves to stagnant movements, another generation of dishearted radicals, and a world unchanged. It is desperately clear that we need to articulate new ways of making change. The new radicalism has been birthed from this desire to popularize and self-organize mass movements form the ground up using these new ways. It’s time to throw out the old mythology that a single organization, ideology, or network can effectively change the world. The era of monolithic movements and international political parties is over. “Correct” political lines, one-ideology-fits-all, rigid blueprints, and cookie-cutter solutions won’t work. Instead, the new radicalism finds its hopeful possibilities in the diverse interconnected movements of movements that has risen up around the planet. These movements are distinct in each culture, community and place, and this diversity is at the heart of the new radicalism’s strength and appeal. This movement of movements represents the evolution of a new model of unity and expanded definitions of solidarity. This is the unity of acting in concert, finding points of convergence, making alliances and building networks, and networks of networks, that articulate a “NO” to the system, louder and more effectively than the sums of all our individual “NO’s.” The new radicalism has emerged organically as the impacted peoples of the world have listened to and connected with each other’s experience. Out of this instinct has come mutual respect and a common understanding of the interlocking systems that keep us all down in different ways. This is the healthy biodiviersity of an ecosystem of resistance.

### Perm

#### Perm – affirm Zapatismo and [the alternative]

#### Perm solves – Zapatismo can link up with other struggles effectively

Jeffery Popke, East Carolina University Professor, 06-xx-04, “The face of the other: Zapatismo,

responsibility and the ethics of deconstruction,” <http://myweb.ecu.edu/popkee/social%20and%20cultural.pdf>

Although it is undoubtedly important to assess, and support, the reform process in the domain of ‘political realism’, I want to focus my attention here on the messianic tenor of Zapatista discourse, on what Huntington (2000) has called their ‘politics of poetic resistance’ (see also Evans 1999; Higgins 2000). I do so because the discursive intervention of Zapatismo represents, in its aims, strategies and composition, a challenge to modern ethical ideals in a manner consistent with what I have argued thus far: ﬁrst, they articulate a form of ethical subjectivity that transcends both cultural difference and borders; and second, they argue for an alternative conception of politics, in which the future is open to construction in the absence of certainty. This ethical discourse is important in part because it has produced effects that resonate far beyond the immediate context of southern Mexico. The Zapatistas are ‘awakening, moving and stimulating the creative imagination of many others, who are already involved in similar concerns and struggles but often found themselves at a dead end’ (Esteva and Prakash 1998: 36). In this sense, I believe that the writings of Marcos and the EZLN are more than simply interventions in a regional struggle over indigenous rights and autonomy. They also both reﬂect and contribute to, through their broader engagement with global civil society, the development of a new conception of social and cultural agency, within which a different form of ethics and politics is at stake (Couch 2001; Stahler-Sholk 2001).

### AT: Link

#### Their neolib link makes no sense – there is no reason why the 1AC posits resistance to just neoliberalism – rather, we are a movement against dominant ideologies, like against white supremacy like they say

#### Against modernity doesn’t make any sense – vik said that we are a movement against the broader institutions of power – that obviously synergizes with their movement

### AT: Wilderson

#### Creating a new, more inclusionary society is possible through Zapatismo

Lisa Poggiali, 2005 (MA in the Social Anthropology of Development, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, “Reimagining The Possible: Zapatista Discourse And The Problematics Of Rights”, https://www.sussex.ac.uk/webteam/gateway/file.php?name=8-poggiali-reimagining-the-possible&site=15 :)

Another way in which the Zapatista movement might be seen as a response to globalization is in its attempt to forge connections with the wider civil society. The growing global integration of capital, based on its increasing mobility and flexibility to operate above the restrictive context of the nation-state, creates the need for new forms of countervailing organization of society. The Zapatistas have resolutely refused to be reduced to an armed guerrilla movement fighting for state power. Instead, they have insisted that they are part of an inclusionary vision of civil society, seen not just as a collection of organizations that are independent of, or antagonistic to the state; but a movement to recover community and autonomy in the face of larger structures of globalization. Rather than seeking state power, they seek to rediscover the power in society (Esteva 2000). From the November 1994 convocation of a National Democratic Convention (CND) at the symbolically named Aguascalientes site (Stephen 1995), to the January 1996 Fourth Declaration of the Lacandón Jungle calling for a broad civic front (FZLN) and the July 1996 International Encounter for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism, the Zapatistas presented their movement as a wake-up call to civil society. As Zapatista spokesperson Subcommander Marcos explained, That is something not understood by those who view the National Democratic Convention with bitterness. They see it is a failure. Why a failure? . . . The truth is from there we can already start to speak of a civil zapatismo and an armed zapatismo. Even the EZLN starts t o modify its discourses and its initiatives to be more participatory in that dynamic. That’s where the San Andrés dialogue starts to develop. The guerrillas insist that it be a bigger table where others sit, not just the government and guerrillas. That’s where the Consultation starts to take shape, the Fourth Declaration, then the encounters, later the forums. . . . Arms still have their function, in this case the most evident is that the government only dialogues with an armed force . . . with the social citizenry forces it does not dialogue except when presented with an armed event . . . (quoted in LeBot 1997:256-64) Elaborating on the concept of civil society, Marcos extended the invitation to the international plane, and welcomed the networking: It took awhile for zapatismo to become known abroad, digested, assimilated. . . . They come here and have their own idea of what zapatismo is, their own wish for what zapatismo should be, in reality their own project. But it is a phenomenon that exists, that is real, that keeps branching off beyond the indigenous question and points more toward finding a series of universal values that will be useful for the Japanese, the Australian, the Greek, the Kurd, the Catalan, the Chicano, the Chilean Mapuche and the indigenous of Ecuador, for example . . . [but] It cannot pretend to constitute itself into a universal doctrine, to lead the new international or anything like that. (in LeBot 1997:260) At the International Encounter attended by some 3,000 people from around the world, this global approach to civil society organizing was also made explicit: Of the many expressions of resistance and opposition to neoliberalism and globalization expressed in the world, two can be emphasized: On the one hand, the emergence of civil society as the opponent that is most experienced, diverse, inclusive and radical in the face of ‘savage capitalism’; on the other hand, the situation of oppression that exists in all countries has highlighted common interests and needs throughout the planet . . . The universal need for a more just and inclusive world, in opposition to the commodified and exclusionary world of neoliberalism, is the great event of our century; it opens the possibility of joining together local, national, sectoral and class struggles, in one single struggle for the formation of a Planetary Community, the self-realization of civil society and the construction of a world ‘where many worlds fit.’ (EZLN 1996:151) Globalization involves not only the kind of shrinking of space that puts Mexican rainforest resources on the drawing boards of the World Bank and transnational corporate consortia, or brings European anarchists to the Lacandón Jungle for a conclave against neoliberalism. It also involves awareness of the implications of this compression, and a corresponding struggle to reformulate identities and communities based on subjective interpretation of this changing reality. Much has been made of the Zapatistas’ recourse to the Internet (Cleaver 1998). The significance of this aspect of the movement is not in the technology per se, but in the Zapatistas’ creative use of the porosity of the state to reach out through it and beyond it, choosing their interlocutors in an act of self-affirmation and self-determination. In Mexico as elsewhere, globalization has multiplied points of contact for local communities and increased their capacity to autonomously define their forms of global insertion. By undermining the prevailing ideological construction of nationalism--for example, by wresting Zapata away from the PRI and reinventing his historical struggle as part of a more inclusive nationalism--it poses a fundamental threat to state hegemony (Long 1999). That more inclusive nationalism has resonated with “deep Mexico” (Esteva 2000), and indeed with the experience and imagination of oppressed people around the world (Rabasa 1997), in ways that cannot be easily contained within the established structures of the nation-state. Ironically, the same state that surrendered so much national sovereignty through neoliberal policies found itself invoking narrow nationalism, in expelling hundreds of foreign human rights observers and aid workers from Chiapas beginning in the late 1990s.4 The concept of an emerging “global civil society” is a problematical one, not least because there is no corresponding global state. The related notion of “transnational advocacy networks” (Keck & Sikkink 1998) suggests a way in which oppositional movements can do end-runs around repressive states by plugging into structures above the level of the nation-state. This kind of networking has provided some protection through the globalization of human rights norms and “accompaniment” in various parts of the world (Mahony & Eguren 1997). Globalization may create some new space for this kind of reorganizing of civil society, as Marcos recognized in the case of Chiapas: . . . Contact with this international zapatismo means, for the communities, the possibility of resisting and having a more effective shield than the EZLN, than civil organization, than national zapatismo. And that has to do with the very logic of neoliberalism in Mexico, which stakes a lot on its international image. (in LeBot 1997:260) A similar aspect of globalization can be seen through inter-governmental organizations, specifically in the case of the International Labor Organization (ILO). The forces of globalization induced the Mexican government in 1989 to ratify Convention 169 of the ILO, which recognizes the rights of indigenous peoples as collective owners of resources in their territorial “habitat” (Aubry 2000). This in turn gave leverage to the Zapatistas and to the national civil society networks they helped inspire, such as the National Indigenous Congress (CNI), to claim collective rights for indigenous peoples within the nation-state. The “transnational advocacy network” approach is limited in that it conceives of those networks essentially as backboards for bouncing off shots that will hit the state from another direction. It focuses on the resources and political opportunities for domestic mobilization, rather than the interactive causes. It still treats the state as autonomous, rather than analyzing the class content of the opposing state and transnational “networks.” A more nuanced approach to civil society organizing in response to globalization would locate both state and oppositional networks in their historical contexts, and also consider the “meso-level” networking that allows local communities (e.g. Zapatistas) to connect with each other across state-structured divides (Yashar 1998a, 1998b). The real novelty of the Zapatista movement is not just that it connects the very local to the global, but rather in its insistence on the autonomous right of local communities to choose and define the manner of their connection to larger structures.

#### Their operation within a black-white paradigm of race relations can never be truly liberatory because it marginalizes bodies that do not fit neatly into either category – from the Tainos and Chinese to the mulattas and mestizos.

Juan F. Perea, 10-31-1997, Professor of Law, University of Florida College of Law, “The Black/White Binary Paradigm of Race: The Normal Science of American Racial Thought,” http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1605&context=californialawreview

Hacker's omission of non-Black minority groups in his discussion of specific topics similarly suggests that these groups' experiences do not exist. Chapter nine, on segregated schooling, describes only the experience of Black segregation. This chapter makes no reference to the extensive history of segregation in education suffered by Latinos/as.39 Chapter ten asks, "What's Best for Black Children?" with no commensurate concern for other children. Similarly, Chapter eleven, on crime, discusses only perceptions of Black criminality and their interpretation. In discussing police brutality, Hacker describes only White police brutality against Blacks. There is not a single word about the similar police brutality suffered by Latino/a people at the hands of White police officers.' Nor are there any words in these chapters describing the experiences of Native Americans or Asian Americans. The greatest danger in Hacker's vision is its suggestion that non-White groups other than Blacks are not really subject to racism. Hacker seems to adopt the deservedly criticized ethnicity theory," which posits that non-White immigrant ethnics are essentially Whites-in-waiting who will be permitted to assimilate and become White.42 This is illustrated best in Chapter eight, "On Education: Ethnicity and Achievement," which offers the book's only significant discussion of non-White groups other than Blacks. Hacker describes Asians in "model minority" terms, because of high standardized test scores as a group. 3 He portrays Latinos/as as below standard, because of low test scores and graduation rates, and as aspiring immigrants. 4 Describing Asian Americans, Latinos/as and other immigrant groups, Hacker writes: Members of all these "intermediate groups" have been allowed to put a visible distance between themselves and black Americans. Put most simply, none of the presumptions of inferiority associated with Africa and slavery are imposed on these other ethnicities4 While a full rebuttal of this proposition is beyond the scope of this Article, its inaccuracy can be quickly demonstrated. Consider, for instance, the observations of historian David Weber, who described early Anglo perceptions of Mexican people: "American visitors to the Mexican frontier were nearly unanimous in commenting on the dark skin of Mexican mestizos who, it was generally agreed, had inherited the worst qualities of Spaniards and Indians to produce a 'race' still more despicable than that of either parent. '46 Rufus B. Sage expressed the common view of Mexicans in 1846: There are no people on the continent of America, whether civilized or uncivilized, with one or two exceptions, more miserable in condition or despicable in morals than the mongrel race inhabiting New Mexico.... To manage them successfully, they must needs be held in continual restraint, and kept in their place by force, if necessary,-else they will become haughty and insolent. As servants, they are excellent, when properly trained, but are worse than useless if left to themselves.47 More briefly, the common perception of Mexican Americans was that "They are an inferior race, that is all. 48 Incredibly, and without any supporting evidence, Hacker writes that "[m]ost Central and South Americans can claim a strong European heritage, which eases their absorption into the 'white' middle class."'49 Hacker continues, "[w]hile immigrants from Colombia and Cyprus may have to work their way up the social ladder, they are still allowed as valid a claim to being 'white' as persons of Puritan or Pilgrim stock."5 Hacker's comments are simply incredible for their blithe lack of awareness of how racism burdens the lives of Latino/a, Asian American and other racialized immigrant groups. While some Latinos/as may look White and may act Anglo (the phenomenon of passing for White is not limited to Blacks), Hacker's statement is certainly false for millions of Latinos/as. Current anti-immigrant initiatives targeted at Latinos/as and Asians, such as California's Proposition 1875' and similar federal legislation targeting legal and illegal immigrants,52 California's Proposition 209,53 and unprecedented proposals to deny birthright citizenship to the United States-born children of undocumented persons, debunk any notion that the White majority tolerates easily the presence of Latino/a or Asian people.' Ultimately, Hacker seems determined to adhere to the binary paradigm of race and to ignore the complexity introduced by other nonWhite groups, because it is convenient-which, it will be recalled, is a principal danger of paradigms. In the statistical section of the book, Hacker explains some of the problems with statistics he reproduces: Some government publications place persons of Hispanic origin within the black and white racial groupings. Others put them in a separate category, to differentiate them from blacks and whites. Wherever the sources permit, Two Nations has separated out Hispanics, to keep the book's emphasis on race as coherent as possible. Where this has not been possible, readers should bear in mind that the figures for whites may be inflated by the inclusion of considerable numbers of Hispanics.55 Although government publications have confused the ability to count Latinos/as,56 what is startling here is Hacker's vision that coherence in discussion of race requires emphasis on only Black and White. In other words, "real" race is only Black or White. Other groups only render this framework "incoherent." This is why the Black/White paradigm of race must be expanded: it causes writers like Hacker to ignore other non-White Americans, which in turn encourages others to ignore us as well.

#### Wilderson’s totalizing account of blackness is flawed and overly US centric

Dr. Saer Maty Ba, Professor of Film – University of Portsmouth and Co-Editor, 2011, “The US Decentred: From Black Social Death to Cultural Transformation”, Cultural Studies Review, 17(2), September

<http://epress.lib.uts.edu.au/journals/index.php/csrj/article/viewFile/2304/2474>

A few pages into Red, White and Black, I feared that it would just be a matter of time before Wilderson’s black‐as‐social‐death idea and multiple attacks on issues and scholars he disagrees with run (him) into (theoretical) trouble. This happens in chapter two, ‘The Narcissistic Slave’, where he critiques black film theorists and books. For example, Wilderson declares that Gladstone Yearwood’s Black Film as Signifying Practice (2000) ‘betrays a kind of conceptual anxiety with respect to the historical object of study— ... it clings, anxiously, to the film‐as‐text‐as‐legitimateobject of Black cinema.’ (62) He then quotes from Yearwood’s book to highlight ‘just how vague the aesthetic foundation of Yearwood’s attempt to construct a canon can be’. (63) And yet Wilderson’s highlighting is problematic because it overlooks the ‘Diaspora’ or ‘African Diaspora’, a key component in Yearwood’s thesis that, crucially, neither navel‐gazes (that is, at the US or black America) nor pretends to properly engage with black film. Furthermore, Wilderson separates the different waves of black film theory and approaches them, only, in terms of how a most recent one might challenge its precedent. Again, his approach is problematic because it does not mention or emphasise the inter‐connectivity of/in black film theory. As a case in point, Wilderson does not link Tommy Lott’s mobilisation of Third Cinema for black film theory to Yearwood’s idea of African Diaspora. (64) Additionally, of course, Wilderson seems unaware that Third Cinema itself has been fundamentally questioned since Lott’s 1990s’ theory of black film was formulated. Yet another consequence of ignoring the African Diaspora is that it exposes Wilderson’s corpus of films as unable to carry the weight of the transnational argument he attempts to advance. Here, beyond the US‐centricity or ‘social and political specificity of [his] filmography’, (95) I am talking about Wilderson’s choice of films. For example, Antwone Fisher (dir. Denzel Washington, 2002) is attacked unfairly for failing to acknowledge ‘a grid of captivity across spatial dimensions of the Black “body”, the Black “home”, and the Black “community”’ (111) while films like Alan and Albert Hughes’s Menace II Society (1993), overlooked, do acknowledge the same grid and, additionally, problematise Street Terrorism Enforcement and Prevention Act (STEP) policing. The above examples expose the fact of Wilderson’s dubious and questionable conclusions on black film.

#### Their argument elevates white supremacy to an all-pervasive force—this conceptual expansion hides the actual practice of racism and makes breaking it down more difficult

Andersen 3 – Margaret L. Andersen, Professor of Sociology and Women's Studies and Vice Provost for Academic Affairs at the University of Delaware, 2003, “Whitewashing Race: A Critical Perspective on Whiteness,” in White Out: The Continuing Significance of Racism, ed Doane & Bonilla-Silva, p. 28

Conceptually, one of the major problems in the whiteness literature is the reification of whiteness as a concept, as an experience, and as an identity. This practice not only leads to conceptual obfuscation but also impedes the possibility for empirical analysis. In this literature, "whiteness" comes to mean just about everything associated with racial domination. As such, whiteness becomes a slippery and elusive concept. Whiteness is presented as any or all of the following: identity, self-understanding, social practices, group beliefs, ideology, and a system of domination. As one critic writes, "If historical actors are said to have behaved the way they did mainly because they were white, then there's little room left for more nuanced analysis of their motives and meanings" (Stowe 1996:77). And Alastair Bonnett points out that whiteness "emerges from this critique as an omnipresent and all-powerful historical force. Whiteness is seen to be responsible for the failure of socialism to develop in America, for racism, for the impoverishment of humanity. With the 'blame' comes a new kind of centering: Whiteness, and White people, are turned into the key agents of historical change, the shapers of contemporary America" (1996b:153). Despite noting that there is differentiation among whites and warning against using whiteness as a monolithic category, most of the literature still proceeds to do so, revealing a reductionist tendency. Even claiming to show its multiple forms, most writers essentialize and reify whiteness as something that directs most of Western history (Gallagher 2000). Hence while trying to "deconstruct” whiteness and see the ubiquitousness of whiteness, the literature at the same time reasserts and reinstates it (Stowe 1996:77). For example, Michael Eric Dyson suggests that whiteness is identity, ideology, and institution (Dyson, quoted in Chennault 1998:300). But if it is all these things, it becomes an analytically useless concept. Christine Clark and James O'Donnell write: "to reference it reifies it, to refrain from referencing it obscures the persistent, pervasive, and seemingly permanent reality of racism" (1999:2). Empirical investigation requires being able to identify and measure a concept— or at the very least to have a clear definition—but since whiteness has come to mean just about everything, it ends up meaning hardly anything.

#### The alt is a snake eating its own tail – ontologically opposing Blackness to Whiteness makes Black struggle STRUCTURALLY dependent on the existence of White Racism and wounded attachments to suffering.

Pinn 2004 (Anthony, Anthony B. Pinn is an American professor and writer whose work focuses on liberation theology, Black religion, and Black humanism. Pinn is the Agnes Cullen Arnold Professor of Humanities and Professor of Religious Studies at Rice University, “‘‘Black Is, Black Ain’t’’: Victor Anderson, African American Theological Thought, and Identity,” Dialog: A Journal of Theology, Volume 43, Number 1 . Spring 2004

This connection between ontological blackness and religion is natural because: ‘‘ontological blackness signifies the totality of black existence, a binding together of black life and experience. In its root, religio, religion denotes tying together, fastening behind, and binding together. Ontological blackness renders black life and experience a totality.’’13 According to Anderson, Black theological discussions are entangled in ontological blackness. And accordingly, discussions of black life revolve around a theological understanding of Black experience limited to suffering and survival in a racist system. The goal of this theology is to find the ‘‘meaning of black faith’’ in the merger of black cultural consciousness, icons of genius, and post-World War II Black defiance. An admirable goal to be sure, but here is the rub: Black theologians speak, according to Anderson, in opposition to ontological whiteness when they are actually dependent upon whiteness for the legitimacy of their agenda. Furthermore, ontological blackness’s strong ties to suffering and survival result in blackness being dependent on suffering, and as a result social transformation brings into question what it means to be black and religious. Liberative outcomes ultimately force an identity crisis, a crisis of legitimation and utility. In Anderson’s words: Talk about liberation becomes hard to justify where freedom appears as nothing more than defiant self-assertion of a revolutionary racial consciousness that requires for its legitimacy the opposition of white racism. Where there exists no possibility of transcending the blackness that whiteness created, African American theologies of liberation must be seen not only as crisis theologies; they remain theologies in a crisis of legitimation.14 This conversation becomes more ‘‘refined’’ as new cultural resources are unpacked and various religious alternatives acknowledged. Yet the bottom line remains racialization of issues and agendas, life and love. Falsehood is perpetuated through the ‘‘hermeneutic of return,’’ by which ontological blackness is the paradigm of Black existence and thereby sets the agenda of Black liberation within the ‘‘postrevolutionary context’’ of present day USA. One ever finds the traces of the Black aesthetic which pushes for a dwarfed understanding of Black life and a sacrifice of individuality for the sake of a unified Black ‘faith’. Yet differing experiences of racial oppression (the stuff of ontological blackness) combined with varying experiences of class, gender and sexual oppression call into question the value of their racialized formulations. Implicit in all of this is a crisis of faith, an unwillingness to address both the glory and guts of Black existence—nihilistic tendencies that, unless held in tension with claims of transcendence, have the potential to overwhelm and to suffocate. At the heart of this dilemma is friction between ontological blackness and ‘‘contemporary postmodern black life’’—issues, for example related to ‘‘selecting marriage partners, exercising freedom of movement, acting on gay and lesbian preferences, or choosing political parties.’’15 How does one foster balance while embracing difference as positive? Anderson looks to Nietzsche. European genius, complete with its heroic epic, met its match in the aesthetic categories of tragedy and the grotesque genius revived and espoused by Friedreich Nietzsche. The grotesque genius served as an effective counter-discourse by embracing both the ‘light’ and ‘dark’ aspects of life, and holding in tension oppositional sensations—pleasure and pain, freedom and oppression.16 Utilizing Nietzsche’s work, Anderson ask: ‘‘what should African American cultural and religious criticism look like when they are no longer romantic in inspiration and the cult of heroic genius is displaced by the grotesquery—full range of expression, actions, attitudes, behaviors everything found in African American life—of contemporary black expressive culture and public life?’’17 Applied to African Americans, the grotesque embodies the full range of African American life—all expressions, actions, attitudes, and behavior. With a hermeneutic of the grotesque as the foci, religio-cultural criticism is free from the totalizing nature of racial apologetics and the classical Black aesthetic. By extension, Black theology is able to address both issues of survival (Anderson sees their importance.) and the larger goal of cultural fulfillment, Anderson’s version of liberation. That is to say, placing ‘‘blackness’’ along side other indicators of identity allows African Americans to define themselves in a plethora of ways while maintaining their community status. This encourages African Americans to see themselves as they are— complex and diversified—no longer needing to surrender personal interests for the sake of monolithic collective status.

#### Black optimism is comparatively better – it allows for actual structural positive changes to the black body

**Moten 7** Fred, Professor of English and African American Studies, Duke University "black optimism/black operation", Chicago -- working text for "Black Op" Source: [PMLA](http://www.mlajournals.org/loi/pmla), Volume 123, Number 5, October 2008, pp. 1743–1747 (5)

http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=3&cad=rja&ved=0CDQQFjAC&url=http%3A%2F%2Flucian.uchicago.edu%2Fblogs%2Fpoliticalfeeling%2Ffiles%2F2007%2F12%2Fmoten-black-optimism.doc&ei=1fE2UO65KuG8yAHpiIHYCg&usg=AFQjCNE8N66fQjQ7TP0PkJ0eYZDI6cNLvA&sig2=BUrcwC5Cfz5Ero2I14PBsg

My field is black studies. In that field, I’m trying to hoe the hard row of beautiful things. I try to study them and I also try to make them. Elizabeth Alexander says “look for color everywhere.” For me, color + beauty = blackness which is not but nothing other than who, and deeper still, where I am. This shell, this inhabitation, this space, this garment—that I carry with me on the various stages of my flight from the conditions of its making—is a zone of chromatic saturation troubling any ascription of impoverishment of any kind however much it is of, which is to say in emergence from, poverty (which is, in turn, to say in emergence from or as an aesthetics or a poetics of poverty). The highly cultivated nature of this situated volatility, this emergent poetics of the emergency, is the open secret that has been the preoccupation of black studies. But it must be said now—and I’ll do so by way of a cool kind of accident that has been afforded us by the danger and saving power that is power point—that there is a strain of black studies that strains against black studies and its object, the critique of western civilization, precisely insofar as it disavows its aim (blackness or the thinking of blackness, which must be understood in what some not so strange combination of Nahum Chandler and Martin Heidegger might call its paraontological distinction from black people). There was a moment in Rebecca’s presentation when the image of a black saxophonist (I think, but am not sure, that it was the great Chicago musician Fred Anderson) is given to us as a representative, or better yet a denizen (as opposed to citizen), of the “space of the imagination.” What’s cool here, and what is also precisely the kind of thing that makes practitioners of what might be called the new ~~black~~ studies really mad, is this racialization of the imagination which only comes fully into its own when it is seen in opposition, say, to that set of faces or folks who constituted what I know is just a part of Lauren’s tradition of Marxist historiographical critique. That racialization has a long history and begins to get codified in a certain Kantian discourse, one in which the imagination is understood to “produce nothing but nonsense,” a condition that requires that “its wings be severely clipped by the imagination.” What I’m interested in, but which I can only give a bare outline of, is a two-fold black operation—one in which Kant moves toward something like a thinking of the imagination as blackness that fully recognizes the irreducible desire for this formative and deformative, necessarily supplemental necessity; one in which black studies ends up being unable to avoid a certain sense of itself as a Kantian, which is to say anti-Kantian and ante-Kantian, endeavor. The new black studies, or to be more precise, the old-new black studies, since every iteration has had this ambivalence at its heart, can’t help but get pissed at the terrible irony of its irreducible Kantianness precisely because it works so justifiably hard at critiquing that racialization of the imagination and the racialized opposition of imagination (in its lawless, nonsense producing freedom) and critique that turns out to be the condition of possibility of the critical philosophical project. There is a voraciously instrumental anti-essentialism, **powered in an intense and terrible way by good intentions**, that is the intellectual platform from which **black studies’ disavowal of its object** and aim is launched, even when that disavowal comes in something which also thinks itself to be moving in the direction of that object and aim. I’m trying to move by way of a kind of resistance to that anti-essentialism, one that requires a paleonymic relation to blackness; I’m trying to own a certain dispossession, the underprivilege of being-sentenced to this gift of constantly escaping and to standing in for the fugitivity (to echo Natahaniel Mackey, Daphne Brooks and Michel Foucault) (of the imagination) that is an irreducible property of life, persisting in and against every disciplinary technique while constituting and instantiating not just the thought but that actuality of the outside that is what/where blackness is—as space or spacing of the imagination, as condition of possibility and constant troubling of critique. It’s annoying to perform what you oppose, but I just want you to know that I ain’t mad. I loved these presentations, partly because I think they loved me or at least my space, but mostly because they were beautiful. I love Kant, too, by the way, though he doesn’t love me, because I think he’s beautiful too and, as you know, a thing of beauty is a joy forever. But even though I’m not mad, I’m not disavowing that strain of black studies that strains against the weight or burden, the refrain, the strain of being-imaginative and not-being-critical that is called blackness and that black people have had to carry. Black Studies strains against a burden that, even when it is thought musically, is inseparable from constraint. But my optimism, **black optimism**, is bound up with what it is to claim blackness and the appositional, runaway black operations that have been thrust upon it. The burden, the constraint, is the aim, the paradoxically aleatory goal that animates escape in and the possibility of escape from. Here is one such black op—a specific, a capella instantiation of strain, of resistance to constraint and instrumentalization, of the propelling and constraining force of the refrain, that will allow me to get to a little something concerning the temporal paradox of, and the irruption of ecstatic temporality in, optimism, which is to say black optimism, which is to say blackness. I play this in appreciation for being in Chicago, which is everybody’s sweet home, everybody’s land of California, as Robert Johnson puts it. This is music from a Head Start program in Mississippi in the mid-sixties and as you all know Chicago is a city in Mississippi, Mississippi a (fugue) state of mind in Chicago. “Da Da Da Da,” The Child Development Group of Mississippi, Smithsonian Folkways Records, FW02690 1967 The temporal paradox of optimism—that it is, on the one hand, necessarily futurial so that optimism is an attitude we take towards that which is to come; but that it is, on the other hand, in its proper Leibnizian formulation, an assertion not only of the necessity but also of the rightness and the essential timelessness of the always already existing, resonates in this recording. It is infused with that same impetus that drives a certain movement, in Monadology, from the immutability of monads to that enveloping of the moral world in the natural world that Leibniz calls, in Augustinian echo/revision, “the City of God.” With respect to C. L. R. James and José (Muñoz), and a little respectful disrespect to Lee Edelman, these children are the voices of the future in the past, the voices of the future in our present. In this recording, this remainder, their fugitivity, remains, for me, in the intensity of their refrain, of their straining against constraint, cause for the optimism they perform. That optimism always lives, which is to say escapes, in the **assertion of a right to refuse**, which is, as Gayatri Spivak says, the first right: an instantiation of **a collective negative tendency** to differ, to resist the regulative powers that resistance, that differing, call into being. To think resistance as originary is to say, in a sense, that we have what we need, that we can get there from here, that there’s nothing wrong with us or even, in this regard, with here, even as it requires us still to think about why it is that difference calls the same, that resistance calls regulative power, into existence, thereby securing the vast, empty brutality that characterizes here and now. Nevertheless, however much I keep trouble in mind, and therefore, in the interest of making as much trouble as possible, I remain hopeful insofar as I will have been in this very collective negative tendency, this little school within and beneath school that we gather together to be. For a bunch of little whiles, this is our field (i.e., black studies), our commons or undercommons or underground or outskirts and it will remain so as long as it claims its **fugitive proximity to blackness**, which I will claim, with ridiculousness boldness, **is the condition of possibility of politics**.

# 1AR

## Black Optimism

### 1AR Black Ops – Moten

#### Afro-pessimism locks in a view where black social ontology is impossible – the alt just upholds structures of whiteness

Moten 2008 (Fred, English Professor at Duke University, “The Case of Blackness,” Criticism, 50.2, MUSE)

The cultural and political discourse on black pathology has been so pervasive that it could be said to constitute the background against which all representations of blacks, blackness, or (the color) black take place. Its manifestations have changed over the years, though it has always been poised between the realms of the pseudo-social scientific, the birth of new sciences, and the normative impulse that is at the heart of—but that strains against — the black radicalism that strains against it. From the origins of the critical philosophy in the assertion of its extra-rational foundations in teleological principle; to the advent and solidification of empiricist human biology that moves out of the convergence of phrenology, criminology, and eugenics; to the maturation of (American) sociology in the oscillation between good- and bad-faith attendance to “the negro problem”; to the analysis of and discourse on psychopathology and the deployment of these in both colonial oppression and anticolonial resistance; to the regulatory metaphysics that undergirds interlocking notions of sound and color in aesthetic theory: blackness has been associated with a certain sense of decay, even when that decay is invoked in the name of a certain (fetishization of) vitality. Black radical discourse has often taken up, and held itself within, the stance of the pathologist. Going back to David Walker, at least, black radi- calism is animated by the question, What’s wrong with black folk? The extent to which radicalism (here understood as the performance of a general critique of the proper) is a fundamental and enduring force in the black public sphere—so much so that even black “conservatives” are always constrained to begin by defining themselves in relation to it—is all but self- evident. Less self-evident is the normative striving against the grain of the very radicalism from which the desire for norms is derived. Such striving is directed toward those lived experiences of blackness that are, on the one hand, aligned with what has been called radical and, on the other hand, aligned not so much with a kind of being-toward-death but with something that has been understood as a deathly or death-driven nonbeing. This strife between normativity and the deconstruction of norms is essential not only to contemporary black academic discourse but also to the discourses of the bar- bershop, the beauty shop, and the bookstore. I’ll begin with a thought that doesn’t come from any of these zones, though it’s felt in them, strangely, since it posits the being of, and being in, these zones as an ensemble of specifi c impossibilities: As long as the black man is among his own, he will have no occasion, except in minor internal confl icts, to experience his being through others. There is of course the moment of “being for others,” of which Hegel speaks, but every ontology is made unattainable in a colonized and civilized society. It would seem that this fact has not been given enough attention by those who have discussed the question. In the Weltanschauung of a colonized people there is an impurity, a flaw, that outlaws [interdit] any ontological explanation. Someone may object that this is the case with every indi- vidual, but such an objection merely conceals a basic problem. Ontology—once it is fi nally admitted as leaving existence by the wayside—does not permit us to understand the being of the black man. For not only must the black man be black; he must be black in relation to the white man. Some critics will take it upon themselves to re- mind us that the proposition has a converse. I say that this is false. The black man has no ontological resistance in the eyes of the white man. 1 This passage, and the ontological (absence of) drama it represents, leads us to a set of fundamental questions. How do we think the possibility and the law of outlawed, impossible things? And if, as Frantz Fanon suggests, the black cannot be an other for another black, if the black can only be an other for a white, then is there ever anything called black social life? Is the designation of this or that thing as lawless, and the assertion that such lawlessness is a function of an already extant fl aw, something more than that trying, even neurotic, oscillation between the exposure and the replication of a reg- ulatory maneuver whose force is held precisely in the assumption that it comes before what it would contain? What’s the relation between explana- tion and resistance? Who bears the responsibility of discovering an ontol- ogy of, or of discovering for ontology, the ensemble of political, aesthetic, and philosophical derangements that comprise the being that is neither for itself nor for the other? What form of life makes such discovery possible as well as necessary? Would we know it by its fl aws, its impurities? What might an impurity in a worldview actually be? Impurity implies a kind of non-completeness, if not absence, of a worldview. Perhaps that non- completeness signals an originarily criminal refusal of the interplay of framing and grasping, taking and keeping—a certain reticence at the ongo- ing advent of the age of the world picture. Perhaps it is the reticence of the grasped, the enframed, the taken, the kept—or, more precisely, the reluc- tance that disrupts grasping and framing, taking and keeping—as episte- mological stance as well as accumulative activity. Perhaps this is the flaw that attends essential, anoriginal impurity—the fl aw that accompanies impossible origins and deviant translations. 2 What’s at stake is fugitive movement in and out of the frame, bar, or whatever externally imposed social logic—a movement of escape, the stealth of the stolen that can be said, since it inheres in every closed circle, to break every enclosure. This fugitive movement is stolen life, and its relation to law is reducible neither to simple interdiction nor bare transgression. Part of what can be attained in this zone of unattainability, to which the eminently attainable ones have been relegated, which they occupy but cannot (and refuse to) own, is some sense of the fugitive law of movement that makes black social life ungovernable, that demands a para-ontological disruption of the supposed connection between explanation and resistance. 3 This ex- change between matters juridical and matters sociological is given in the mixture of phenomenology and psychopathology that drives Fanon’s work, his slow approach to an encounter with impossible black social life poised or posed in the break, in a certain intransitive evasion of crossing, in the wary mood or fugitive case that ensues between the fact of blackness and the lived experience of the black and as a slippage enacted by the meaning—or, perhaps too “trans-literally,” the (plain[-sung]) sense—of things when sub- jects are engaged in the representation of objects. The title of this essay, “The Case of Blackness,” is a spin on the title of the fifth chapter of Fanon’s Black Skins, White Masks , infamously mistranslated as “the fact of blackness.” “The lived experience of the black” is more liter al—“experience” bears a German trace, translates as Erlebnis rather than Tatsache , and thereby places Fanon within a group of postwar Franco- phone thinkers encountering phenomenology that includes Jean-Paul Sar- tre, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Emmanuel Levinas, and Tran Duc Thao. 4 The phrasing indicates Fanon’s veering off from an analytic engagement with the world as a set of facts that are available to the natural scientific attitude, so it’s possible to feel the vexation of certain commentators with what might be mistaken for a flirtation with positivism. However, I want to linger in, rather than quickly jump over, the gap between fact and lived experience in order to consider the word “case” as a kind of broken bridge or cut suspen- sion between the two. I’m interested in how the troubled, illicit commerce between fact and lived experience is bound up with that between blackness and the black, a difference that is often concealed, one that plays itself out not by way of the question of accuracy or adequation but by way of the shad- owed emergence of the ontological difference between being and beings. At- tunement to that difference and its modalities must be fine. Perhaps certain recalibrations of Fanon—made possible by insights to which Fanon is both given and blind—will allow us to show the necessity and possibility of another understanding of the ontological difference. In such an under- standing, the political phonochoreography of being’s words bears a con- tent that cannot be left by the wayside even if it is packaged in the pathologization of blacks and blackness in the discourse of the human and natural sciences and in the corollary emergence of expertise as the defining epistemological register of the modern subject who is in that he knows, regulates, but cannot be black. This might turn out to have much to do with the constitution of that locale in which “ontological explanation” is precisely insofar as it is against the law. One way to investigate the lived experience of the black is to consider what it is to be the dangerous—because one is, because we are (Who? We? Who is this we? Who volunteers for this already given imposition? Who elects this imposed affi nity? The one who is homelessly, hopefully, less and more?) the constitutive—supplement. What is it to be an irreducibly disor- dering, deformational force while at the same time being absolutely indispensable to normative order, normative form? This is not the same as, though it does probably follow from, the troubled realization that one is an object in the midst of other objects, as Fanon would have it. In their intro- duction to a rich and important collection of articles that announce and enact a new deployment of Fanon in black studies’ encounter with visual studies, Jared Sexton and Huey Copeland index Fanon’s formulation in order to consider what it is to be “the thing against which all other subjects take their bearing.” 5 But something is left unattended in their invocation of Fanon, in their move toward equating objecthood with “the domain of non-existence” or the interstitial space between life and death, something to be understood in its difference from and relation to what Giorgio Agamben calls naked life, something they call raw life, that moves—or more precisely cannot move—in its forgetful non-relation to that quickening, forgetive force that Agamben calls the form of life.

## Speaking for Others

### AT: Alcoff

#### Finding an alternative to speaking for others is impossible – there is no brightline and their author concludes that it is ok

Linda Martin Alcoff, Department of Philosophy at Syracuse University, Winter 1992, “The Problem with Speaking for Others”

As social theorists, we are authorized by virtue of our academic positions to develop theories that express and encompass the ideas, needs, and goals of others. However, we must begin to ask ourselves whether this is ever a legitimate authority, and if so, what are the criteria for legitimacy? In particular, is it ever valid to speak for others who are unlike me or who are less privileged than me? We might try to delimit this problem as only arising when a more privileged person speaks for a less privileged one. In this case, we might say that I should only speak for groups of which I am a member. But this does not tell us how groups themselves should be delimited. For example, can a white woman speak for all women simply by virtue of being a woman? If not, how narrowly should we draw the categories? The complexity and multiplicity of group identifications could result in "communities" composed of single individuals. Moreover, the concept of groups assumes specious notions about clear-cut boundaries and "pure" identities. I am a Panamanian-American and a person of mixed ethnicity and race: half white/Angla and half Panamanian mestiza. The criterion of group identity leaves many unanswered questions for a person such as myself, since I have membership in many conflicting groups but my membership in all of them is problematic. Group identities and boundaries are ambiguous and permeable, and decisions about demarcating identity are always partly arbitrary. Another problem concerns how specific an identity needs to be to confer epistemic authority. Reflection on such problems quickly reveals that no easy solution to the problem of speaking for others can be found by simply restricting the practice to speaking for groups of which one is a member.

### AT: Commodification

#### Ballot is key – necessary to understand and recognize our movement’s truth value

Rebecca Bjork, Former college debater and now coach and professor at the U of Utah, 1993, “Women in Debate: Reflections on the Ongoing Struggle,” <http://web.archive.org/web/20011012220529/members.aol.com/womynindebate/article3.htm>

Goodnight lamented what he saw as the debate community's participation in, and unthinking perpetuation of what he termed the "death culture." He argued that the embracing of "big impact" arguments--nuclear war, environmental destruction, genocide, famine, and the like-by debaters and coaches signals a morbid and detached fascination with such events, one that views these real human tragedies as part of a "game" in which so-called "objective and neutral" advocates actively seek to find in their research the "impact to outweigh all other impacts"--the round-winning argument that will carry them to their goal of winning tournament X, Y, or Z. He concluded that our "use" of such events in this way is tantamount to a celebration of them; our detached, rational discussions reinforce a detached, rational viewpoint, when emotional and moral outrage may be a more appropriate response. In the last few years, my academic research has led me to be persuaded by Goodnight's unspoken assumption; language is not merely some transparent tool used to transmit information, but rather is an incredibly powerful medium, the use of which inevitably has real political and material consequences. Given this assumption, I believe that it is important for us to examine the "discourse of debate practice:" that is, the language, discourses, and meanings that we, as a community of debaters and coaches, unthinkingly employ in academic debate. If it is the case that the language we use has real implications for how we view the world, how we view others, and how we act in the world, then it is imperative that we critically examine our own discourse practices with an eye to how our language does violence to others. I am shocked and surprised when I hear myself saying things like, "we killed them," or "take no prisoners," or "let's blow them out of the water." I am tired of the "ideal" debater being defined as one who has mastered the art of verbal assault to the point where accusing opponents of lying, cheating, or being deliberately misleading is a sign of strength. But what I am most tired of is how women debaters are marginalized and rendered voiceless in such a discourse community. Women who verbally assault their opponents are labeled "bitches" because it is not socially acceptable for women to be verbally aggressive. Women who get angry and storm out of a room when a disappointing decision is rendered are labeled "hysterical" because, as we all know, women are more emotional then men. I am tired of hearing comments like, "those 'girls' from school X aren't really interested in debate; they just want to meet men." We can all point to examples (although only a few) of women who have succeeded at the top levels of debate. But I find myself wondering how many more women gave up because they were tired of negotiating the mine field of discrimination, sexual harassment, and isolation they found in the debate community. As members of this community, however, we have great freedom to define it in whatever ways we see fit. After all, what is debate except a collection of shared understandings and explicit or implicit rules for interaction? What I am calling for is a critical examination of how we, as individual members of this community, characterize our activity, ourselves, and our interactions with others through language. We must become aware of the ways in which our mostly hidden and unspoken assumptions about what "good" debate is function to exclude not only women, but ethnic minorities from the amazing intellectual opportunities that training in debate provides. Our nation and indeed, our planet, faces incredibly difficult challenges in the years ahead. I believe that it is not acceptable anymore for us to go along as we always have, assuming that things will straighten themselves out. If the rioting in Los Angeles taught us anything, it is that complacency breeds resentment and frustration. We may not be able to change the world, but we can change our own community, and if we fail to do so, we give up the only real power that we have