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#### 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).

#### Focus on black love can still work across racial boundaries – pluralistic coalition-building solves.

Angela Davis and Elizabeth Martinez, authors and longtime activists in struggles for social justice, No date “Coalition Building Among People of Color,” <http://www.elkilombo.org/coalition-building-among-people-of-color/>

There do seem to be a lot of problems with that idea of coming together across differences. For example, some people want to spend more time just on African American issues, which might not be the priority of a multicultural coalition. DAVIS: Some people may want to do work specifically around African American issues. But this approach does not have to exclude working across and beyond racial boundaries as, for example, the National Black Women's Health Project focuses on Black women's health issues and, at the same time, is involved in the Women of Color Coalition for Reproductive Rights. At the same time, this idea of "spending more time with one's own group" needs to be interrogated. How would you define "one's own group"? For African Americans, would that include every person who meets the requirements of physical appearance or every person who identifies as African American, regardless of their phenotype? Would it include Republican African Americans who are opposed to affirmative action? I think we need to be more reflective, more critical and more explicit about our concepts of community. There is often as much heterogeneity within a Black community, or more heterogeneity, than in cross-racial communities. An African American woman might find it much easier to work together with a Chicana than with another Black woman, whose politics of race, class, gender and sexuality would place her in an entirely different community. What is problematic is the degree to which nationalism has become a paradigm for our community-building processes. We need to move away from such arguments as "Well, she's not really Black." "She comes from such-and-such a place." "Her hair is..." "She doesn't listen to 'our' music," and so forth. What counts as Black is not so important as our political coalition building commitment to engage in anti-racist, anti-sexist, and anti-homophobic work. Do you think it's necessary to have ideological unity to build a coalition? And if we do not use ideology as a basis to build coalitions, what's the basis that we use? DAVIS: First of all, people who subscribe to similar ideologies can and do come together. Historically, the particular formations within which they work have been called political parties. Until a few years ago, I was a member of the Communist Party, for example. However, ideological affinity is not essential to coalition work, and that is what we presently are concerned with. For twenty years I was co-chairperson of the National Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression (I am presently chair emeritus). Our work initially was framed by a project to free political prisoners. This work raises questions. How do you develop campaigns to free political prisoners? Does one have to identify, for example, with the philosophical nationalism of a Black nationalist political prisoner in order to join the effort to free her? Or can one articulate a position of opposition to political repression, while disagreeing with the prisoner's particular politics? Take the movement that developed around my case. My communist politics did not deter the vast numbers of people, and the over 250 separate committees, in this country and abroad, many of whom may have absolutely disagreed with my politics, from becoming active in the "Free Angela Davis Campaign." There are many ways of configuring networks, alliances and coalitions, departing from people's commitment to social change. Again, I want to emphasize the importance of historical memory in our contemporary efforts to work together across differences. I raise the importance of historical memory not for the purpose of presenting immutable paradigms for coalition-building, but rather in order to understand historical trajectories and precisely to move beyond older conceptions of cross-racial organizing

#### Sole focus on self-love reinforces colonial society by trading off with opportunities to build communities of care – self-love is not enough, making the perm necessary.

MacDonald – ’14 – Women and Gender Studies and First Nations Studies, Vancouver University, British Columbia (Andrea MacDonald, 2014, “Calling for Community Care: a reflection on whiteness, privilege, connection and spirit,” http://www.decolonizingyoga.com/calling-for-community-care-a-reflection-on-whiteness-privilege-connection-and-spirit/)

Much of what is taught in the mainstream western yoga world focuses on teaching us to build better relationships with ourselves. We are told to “turn inward” and “be the light we are”. Put simply, we are learning to cultivate self love. Now don’t get me wrong, I am all for self love – that’s something I am working very hard to build in my own life and it is an ongoing and challenging process. That being said, my position is this – self love isn’t enough. Not even close. It is just the beginning, a fundamental beginning, but just the beginning. Loving yourself, taking care of yourself – these things are important, they are undeniably necessary – but if all we do is turn inward, if our goal is only to take care of ourselves, then we are limiting our practice and we are missing out on accountability to each other, our communities and our shared struggles and resilience. We are missing opportunities to build communities of care. / Self care is, put simply, about taking care of yourself. This is an off shoot of an individualist society that puts the individual before the collective – a colonial, consumer capitalism society that teaches us ruthless self reliance, no matter the cost to others. Self care practices, particularly spiritual practices, that teach us only to go inward, I feel, are missing a key lesson. If we believe that “we’re all one”, why are we missing the part where we learn and practice care and accountability to each other? Not just to people like us, but everyone we’re supposedly referencing when we say, “we’re all one”. / Often I hear people in the yoga “community” make comments like “you chose your destiny” or “your thoughts shape your reality”. Now, I don’t want to throw the baby out with the bath water here, these concepts can be useful. But here’s the problem – we aren’t often engaging these concepts critically. We say things like “we’re all one” and “Namaste” – I say them myself. I believe these things, but that doesn’t mean the way we use them isn’t sometimes deeply problematic. These phrases and concepts, especially when gestured to by privileged people, tend to erase or minimize the real, tangible differences in our lived realities. When you say “your thoughts shape your reality” or “this person is just angry at me because they are carrying this or that attachment” we are minimizing all the systemic factors that shape people’s experiences. We are minimizing forces like racism, sexism, homophobia and importantly for the yoga world – ableism. Without intending to, we are being condescending and dismissive. We are causing harm because, without even meaning to, we are reinforcing our privilege. / Now, here’s the thing I have recently been discovering about privilege. While it does give us undeserved advantages, this is not without harmful consequences. Privilege breeds isolation. It teaches those of us who have privilege (which is everyone, to some extent) that our common lack of empathy and self reflexivity is normal and even necessary. For our privilege to go unchallenged it is necessary that we learn not to consider other people – that we learn to see ourselves as separate from the rest of humanity and the world. The lived experience of privilege and the process of replicating and reproducing it teaches us to continue looking out for ourselves – to continue breeding individualism and isolation. Privilege can make us lonely because it prevents us from relying on and trusting community. / One of my profs, Glen Coulthard, recently said something in class that I found really helpful in understanding this idea: “Power doesn’t just impose it’s will on you, it’s also productive. It normalizes injustice”. / There is a lot to parse through in this statement. For my purposes I find it useful, when thinking about power, to remember we aren’t just thinking about oppression and who is marginalized. We’re also thinking about the privilege and advantages that power produces. From there we can start to think about how the differences in our social locations are not only produced but normalized. Privilege is co-optive, because it’s comfort and it’s ability to veil injustice distract us from our responsibilities to each other. The more privileged we are, often the less we are willing to step outside our own experience and connect to our humanity. We get scared. We are fearful of losing our unearned privilege. We don’t want to be challenged, because if we truly learn to feel for one another we could not possibly let injustice continue like we do. / I recently read something by Lee Maracle that really helped me understand my own relationship to systems of power and domination: “We need a country free of racism, but we do not need to struggle with white people on our backs to eradicate it. White people have this need as well. They need to stop our continued robbery, to rectify colonialism in order to decolonize their lives and feel at home in this land. Racism has dehumanized us all. It once filled me with shame and nearly drove me to death. It separated me from my brother, my sisters and my beautiful mother. It keeps white people separated from each other. It keeps white people either feeling sorry for us or using us as a scapegoat for whatever frustrations this society creates for us.” – pg 240 and 241 of Bobbi Lee, emphasis added. / I think part of what Lee Maracle is gesturing to here, when she says that racism is dehumanizing and harmful even for white people, is that the privilege racism produces carries a destructive burden. Privilege suggests that stepping on others and having more then others is normal – even necessary. Privilege works to normalize our profound lack of empathy. It can work to dissolve our humanity and leave us inward turning, isolated and fearful. It breeds attachment and often it prevents us from building community – because we don’t need it and we haven’t been taught the skills to tend it. Often when you have lots of privilege you are only taught how to look after yourself and maybe a small circle of loved ones. You are taught the skills to maintain your position of privilege. This is why simply seeking self care, as a person in a position of privilege, can be so problematic.

#### The Zapatista movement is an example of self-care – it cares for its people and land

Sandor Ellix Katz, author of Wild Fermentation, The Revolution Will Not Be Microwaved, 2006, “The Revolution Will Not Be Microwaved,”

The Zapatista rebels continue, a decade later, to hold a portion of Chiapas, hemmed in by Mexican troops. They have established thirty-seven autonomous municipios that have provided people with land, education, health care, and other services and continue to demand autonomy for indigenous communities. The Zapatistas have inspired people around the world. The word zapatismo has become an expres­sion to describe any bold assertion of indigenous rights. Zapatismo involves both a love of the land and respect for its people.

#### Their emphasis on black self-love fails – it ignores the different ways that oppression is constituted

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."

#### Only a multifaceted understanding of oppression has any hope of solvency – anything else ignores other forms of oppression – only Zapatismo solves

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’.

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

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 to 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.

#### Marcos, the spokesman of the Zapatistas, constructs his image from positive elements of Mexican cultural history.

McCowan 3 (M. Clint McCowan, 2003, “Imagining the Zapatistas: Rebellion, Representation and Popular Culture,” International Third World Studies Journal and Review, Volume XIV, p. 31)

Marcos carefully constructed his image to draw on the beloved heroes of Mexican history and draw international sympathy. Pena writes: His serious but nonchalant demeanor, adorned with a pipe and a Zapata-style bandolera with bullets that don't match the model of his weapon, made him extremely photogenic. His persona was a carefully crafted collage of twentieth-century revolutionary symbols, costumes, and props borrowed from Zapata, Sandino, Che, and Arafat as well as from celluloid heroes such as Zorro and Mexico's movie Wrestler, 'El Santo.' Because of all this, the New York Times christened him "the first postmodern guerrilla leader.' and newspapers and magazines throughout the world made it a priority to obtain an interview with him. The cult of Marcos was born.'

#### Zapatismo is super loving – it is a respect for themselves and them around them

Kelley Teamey, Past 18 years has been deeply embedded within the educational system, either as a student, a researcher, or as a teacher.  During these years, I have, amongst other jobs, taught primary school for 2 years in the South Bronx, worked in an environmental non-profit in NYC as an educator with high school students from around the City to introduce environmental history and eco-political action projects, taught English in Chinatown and pre-school on the upper east side, January 1st 2013, “Reflections and Learnings about Zapatismo,” http://enlivenedlearning.com/2013/01/01/reflections-and-learnings-about-zapatismo/

During the seminar at Unitierra, there were many fragments of discussion that directly engaged with the Zapatista insight of a Fourth World War. For example, Gustavo commented toward the end of the seminar that ‘War is everywhere now’. And engaging with the repeated questions of ‘What do we do – what should we do?’ Gustavo commented — ‘The Lacondon jungle is inside of us – we are already in it…’ Many of the young people in the Unitierra seminar room had spoken of their involvement in social and political change – profound frustration with the present challenges and a lack of coherent vision for the future. I remember how several spoke of their lack of knowledge and understanding of political activities prior to the Zapatistas, how wonderful it was for people like Gustavo who were older and had such a rich history of experiences and knowledge. Several also spoke of the importance of ‘searching for light’ — ‘looking for examples that inspire us to invoke the world through thinking of it, imagining it. It is also about acting out of love, hospitality and friendship’. I remember something very wise that Edgar (Edi) the young Zapotec learner at Uniterra we had met first earlier that day, said during the Zapatismo seminar. He said that Zapatismo is about looking into the mirror at ourselves, seeing our own path, our own choices. It is about looking at the responsibilities that we face and that we choose each and every day. I left the seminar, my head and my heart full – yet also hungry for more of these encounters, these assemblies, to inspire my imagination to create….

#### Constant recognition of racial atrocities is vital to the construction of liberatory frameworks

Charles Mills, 1997, The Racial Contract, p. 1-3

White supremacy is the unnamed political system that has made the modern world what it is today. You will not find this term in introductory, or even advanced, texts in political theory. A standard undergraduate philosophy course will start off with Plato and Aristotle, perhaps say something about Augustine, Aquinas, and Machiavelli, move on to Hobbes, Locke, Mill, and Marx, and then wind up with Rawls and Nozick. It will introduce you to notions of aristocracy, democracy, absolutism, liberalism, representative government, socialism, welfare capitalism, and libertarianism. But though it covers more than two thousand years of Western political thought and runs the ostensible gamut of political systems, there will be no mention of the basic political system that has shaped the world for the past several hundred years. And this omission is not accidental. Rather, it reflects the fact that standard textbooks and courses have for the most part been written and designed by whites, who take their racial privilege so much for granted that they do not even see it as political, as a form of domination. Ironically, the most important political system of recent global history—the system of domination by which white people have historically ruled over and, in certain important ways, continue to rule over nonwhite people—is not seen as a political system at all. It is just taken for granted; it is the background against which other systems, which we are to see as political, are highlighted. This book is an attempt to redirect your vision, to make you see what, in a sense, has been there all along. / Philosophy bias remained remarkably untouched by the debates over multiculturalism, canon reform, and ethnic diversity racking the academy; both demographically and conceptually, it is one of the "whitest" of the humanities. Blacks, for example, constitute only about 1 percent of philosophers in North American universities—a hundred or so people out of more than ten thousand—and there are even fewer Latino, Asian American, and Native American philosophers.1 Surely this underrepresentation itself stands in need of an explanation, and in my opinion it can be traced in part to a conceptual array and a standard repertoire of concerns whose abstractness typically elides, rather than genuinely includes, the experience of racial minorities. Since (white) women have the demographic advantage of numbers, there are of course far more female philosophers in the profession than nonwhite philosophers (though still not proportionate to women's percentage of the population), and they have made far greater progress in developing alternative conceptualizations. Those African American philosophers who do work in moral and political theory tend cither to produce general work indistinguishable from that of their white peers or to focus on local issues (affirmative action, the black "underclass") or historical figures (W. E. B. Du Bois, Alain Locke) in a way that does not aggressively engage the broader debate. / What is needed is a global theoretical framework for situating discussions of race and while racism, and thereby challenging the assumptions of white political philosophy, which would correspond to feminist theorists' articulation of the centrality of gender, patriarchy, and sexism to traditional moral and political theory. What is needed, in other words, is a recognition that racism (or, as I will argue, global white supremacy) is itself a political system, a particular power structure of formal or informal rule, socioeconomic privilege, and norms for the differential distribution of material wealth and opportunities, benefits and burdens, rights and duties. The notion of the Racial Contract is, 1 suggest, one possible way of making this connection with mainstream theory, since it uses the vocabulary and apparatus already developed for contractarianism to map this unacknowledged system. Contract talk is, after all, the political lingua franca of our times.

#### Unreflexive self-love is bad—it is co-opted by white “allies” who assuage their white guilt through their strategy of self love

Quintrospection, 7-20-2013, “The Discursive Feast of Privilege: Towards a Theory of Self-Abjection,” http://quintrospection.wordpress.com/2013/07/20/the-discursive-feast-of-privilege-towards-a-theory-of-self-abjection/

I’m going to call this scenario the “call out high.” It happens when the privileged “ally” feels empowered and “clean” from condemning the similarly privileged but pro-oppression folks around them. It happens in the classroom, on the Internet, in social justice organizations, on the street, across the dinner table, and everywhere else one finds white folks talking about race, middle-class and wealthy folks talking about class, men talking about sexism, cis folks talking about transphobia, straight folks talking about heterosexism, and so on. Though the “caller-outer” may mean perfectly well, they run the unique risk of losing their sense of self-reflexivity. You can shout “I am NOT Trayvon Martin” from the rooftops all day. If you are white, you still benefit from all the privileges attendant thereupon. Being “right” is not enough when you still use your privilege like a blunt weapon, crudely addressing complex issues of power and identity about which you have no first-hand experience and simultaneously silencing the population for whom you claim to speak. I believe that this phenomenon (and it most certainly is a phenomenon) ties very closely to the language of self-love. If all of us should love ourselves equally, and in an equally unqualified way, then those of us who society has granted significant privilege already start out with more love to lavish upon ourselves. As a white anti-racist “ally”, I gain significant psychic and social benefits from claiming this “status” in many contexts, and in those where it is not beneficial to me, I can hide it or ignore its immaterial consequences. In either case, I can feel a smug sense of self-righteousness from being “one of the good whites,” rather than one of those straightforward racists, or those liberals of the colorblind variety. But no matter how good I feel about myself, I have done little to either shift the consciousness of my white peers, or to deconstruct material or ideological systems of racist oppression.

#### Material focus key

George Yancy, 2008, Associate Professor of Philosophy, Duquesne University, Black bodies, white gazes: the continuing significance of race, p. 299

Although there are many while antiracists who do fight and will continue to fight against the operations of white power, and while it is true that the regulatory power of whiteness will invariably attempt to undermine such efforts, it is important that white antiracists realize how much is at stake. While antiracist whites take time to get their shit together, a luxury that is a species of privilege, Black bodies and bodies of color continue to suffer, their bodies cry out for the political and existential urgency for the immediate undoing of the oppressive operations of whiteness. Here, the very notion of the temporal gets racialized. My point here is that even as whites take the time to theorize the complexity of whiteness, revealing its various modes of resistance to radical transformation, Black bodies continue to endure tremendous pain and suffering. Doing theory in the service of undoing whiteness comes with its own snares and seductions, its own comfort zones, and reinscription of distances. Whites who deploy theory in the service of fighting against white racism must caution against the seduction of white narcissism, the recentering of whiteness, even if it is the object of critical reflection, and, hence, the process of sequestration from the real world of weeping, suffering, and traumatized Black bodies impacted by the operations of white power. As antiracist whites continue to make mistakes and continue to falter in the face of institutional interpellation and habituated racist reflexes, tomorrow, a Black body will be murdered as it innocently reaches for its wallet. The sheer weight of this reality mocks the patience of theory.