**The starting point of theoretical reflection is opposition!**

#### Holloway 2 (John, anarchist, political scientist and socialist theorist, professor at Autonomous University of Puebla. 2002, Zapatismo contributor and empathizer “Changing the World without taking power”—chapter 1, the scream. Full text online <http://libcom.org/library/chapter-1-%E2%80%93-scream>)

In the beginning is the scream. We scream. When we write or when we read, it is easy to forget that the beginning is not the word, but the scream. Faced with the mutilation of human lives by capitalism, a scream of sadness, a scream of horror, a scream of anger, a scream of refusal: NO. The starting point of theoretical reflection is opposition, negativity, struggle. It is from rage that thought is born, not from the pose of reason, not from the reasoned-sitting-back-and-reflecting-on-the-mysteries-of-existence that is the conventional image of the thinker. We start from negation, from dissonance. The dissonance can take many shapes. An inarticulate mumble of discontent, tears of frustration, a scream of rage, a confident roar. An unease, a confusion, a longing, a critical vibration. Our dissonance comes from our experience, but that experience varies. Sometimes it is the direct experience of exploitation in the factory, or of oppression in the home, of stress in the office, of hunger and poverty, or of state violence or discrimination. Sometimes it is the less direct experience through television, newspapers or books that moves us to rage. Millions of children live on the streets of the world. In some cities, street children are systematically murdered as the only way of enforcing respect for private property. In 1998 the assets of the 200 richest people were more than the total income of 41% of the world's people (two and a half billion). In 1960, the countries with the wealthiest fifth of the world's people had per capita incomes 30 times that of the poorest fifth: by 1990 the ratio had doubled to 60 to one, and by 1995 it stood at 74 to one.

**If struggle and wrestling are what lead us to opposition, urbano provides recourse for those struggling alone that seek friends against a common enemy.**

#### Holloway 5 (John, political scientist and socialist theorist, professor at Autonomous University of Puebla and major contributor to the Zapatista movement. “Zapatismo Urbano” Department of Sociology, Humboldt State University. *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations* vol. 29 no. 1, “Zapatismo as Political and Cultural Practice” pp. 168-178)

The Zapatistas of Chiapas are peasants. Most of us who read and write this journal are city-dwellers. Our experiences are far removed from those of the Zapatistas of Chiapas. Our living conditions are very different from those of the Zapatistas of Chiapas, and our forms of struggle too. And yet the resonance of the Zapatista uprising in the cities has been enormous. Why? What does Zapatismo mean in the cities? There have been two forms of reaction in the cities. The first is a reaction of solidarity: the struggle of the indigenous of Chiapas is a just struggle and we give it all the material and political support possible. Solidarity defines the struggle as being the struggle of a "them," and "they" are indians who live in Chiapas. I do not dismiss this reaction, but it is not what interests me here. The second reaction goes much further. Here it is not a question of solidarity with the struggle of others, but of understanding that the Zapatistas and we are part of the same struggle. The Zapatistas of Chiapas do not give us a model that we can apply to our part of the struggle, but we see their forms of struggle as an inspiration for the development of our forms of struggle. In that sense we can speak of the spread of Zapatismo to the cities, the development of an urban Zapatismo, There is no linear progression here. It is not the spread of an organisation that we are speaking of (though certainly the spread of the Frente Zapatista within Mexico is part of the process). Neither is it really a question of the spread of an in fluence from Chiapas. It is not that the decisions of the EZLN have an influence on struggles in Rome or Buenos Aires. It is rather a question of resonance and inspiration. The Zapatista uprising has had an enormous impact in the cities of the world because the themes that the EZLN raise and the orientations they suggest have resonated strongly with the preoccupations and directions of people in the cities. They have been a constant source of inspiration because they have formulated with particular clarity (not just in the communiques but in their actions) directions and themes that were already present in the struggles of the cities. The purpose of speaking of urban Zapatismo is twofold: On the one hand it is a way of focusing more closely on this process. What is this resonance? Is it an imagined or a real resonance? What are the differences between Zapatismo in the cities and Zapatismo in the countryside? What are the practical problems for the development of this sort of politics in the cities? But secondly, to speak of urban Zapatismo is to speak of Zapatismo as a challenge. The Zapatistas do not ask for our sympathy or our solidarity. To commemorate the ten and twenty years of the EZLN should not be a celebration of them, but a challenge to us. They ask us to join in their struggle for a world of dignity. How do we do it, we who live in the cities, we who write and read this journal? There are aspects of the Zapatista uprising that have not found any echo in the cities. We urban Zapatistas generally do not want to be organized as an army and often reject militarism as a form of organization and concept of struggle. In the current debates in Italy, the Zapatistas are even held up as a model in arguing for a complete rejection of all violence. The other aspect of the Zapatismo of Chiapas that has found little resonance in the cities is their use of national symbols—the national flag, the playing of the national anthem. The urban Zapatista movement tends not to be nationalist and in many cases it is profoundly anti-nationalist. It has been not so much an inter-national movement as a global movement, a movement of struggle for which global capitalism and not the nation-state has been the principal point of reference. What, then, are the aspects of the Zapatista uprising that have found echo in the cities of the world? The most obvious is the mere fact of rebellion— the fact that the Zapatistas rose up when the time for rebellion seemed to have passed, their \ Ya Bastal to a world that is so obviously obscene. But it is more than that. It is also that their \Ya Bastal turns too against a Left that had grown stale and stiff and alienating. It is the rejection both of revolutionary vanguardism and of state-oriented reformism, the rejection of the party as an organizational form and of the pursuit of power as an aim. The rejection of the old forms of left-wing politics leaves us with an enormous question mark. That itself is important. The Zapatista saying "caminamos preguntando" [we walked asking] acquires a particular resonance because we are conscious that we do not know the way forward. The world around us makes us scream, but where do we go with our scream, what do we do with our scream? The politics of rebellion is a politics of searching— not for the correct line, but for some sort of way forward, some way of making our scream effective. There is no party to tell us which way to go, so we must find it for ourselves. The politics of asking leads on to certain forms of organization. The organizational forms of the Zapatistas of Chiapas are characterized by a tension, as they themselves emphasize. This is the tension concentrated in their principle of "mandar obedeciendo." [order and obey] On the one hand, they are organized as an army, with all that that means in terms of vertical lines of command. On the other hand, the army is subject to the control of the village councils, where discussion and consensus are the guiding principles. The rejection of the party as an organisational form has meant (inevitably, perhaps) the revival of councilism, the revival of the council or assembly. The council is the traditional form for expressing revolt which arises again and again in rebellions, from the Paris Commune to the Neighbourhood Councils of the recent revolt in Argentina. It is an expressive form of organisation, one that seeks to articulate the anger and worries of the participants. This can be contrasted with the party form, which is not expressive but instrumental, designed to attain the end of winning state power. As an expressive form, the council tends to be horizontal in its structures, encouraging the free participation of all and aiming to reach consensus in its decisions. Seen in this way, the council is not so much a formal structure as an organisational orientation. This organisational orientation—the emphasis on horizontality, the encouragement of the expression of people's concerns, whether or not they are "revolutionary" or "political" —has been a characteristic feature of the current wave of urban struggle: not just of the neighbourhood councils of Argentina, but equally of some of the piquetero groups, of the Madres de la Plaza de Mayo, of the Centri Sociali of Rome, Milan or Turin, of the altermundista movement in general. Councilism is related to the question of community. In the Zapatista areas of Chiapas the community exists, not as an idyll to be romanticized, but simply because most of the people of a village have known one another all their lives and because there are established practices of common work and decision making. In the cities, there is often very little sense of community. The people who work together do not necessarily live close together, and people who live close to one another often have no contact. The scream of protest that we feel is often experienced as an isolated and hopeless scream, a scream that we share at best with a handful of friends. The (re)construction of community bonds has, therefore, been a central concern of the movement in the cities. The construction of social centres or alternative cafes, the coming together of people in informal and changing movements create new patterns of community and mutual trust which are part and parcel of the development of councilist forms of organisation. Perhaps the central challenge of urban Zapatismo is the challenge of autonomy. Autonomy is simply the other side of saying that we want to change the world without taking power. Rejecting the pursuit of state power means rejection of the party as a form of organisation (understanding the party as a state-oriented form of organisation). But it means much more than that. It means also a change in the understanding of social conflict or class struggle. The traditional concept sees class struggle as a struggle for power, a struggle for power which inevitably determines the agenda, the rhythms and the forms of struggle. Confrontation is then the pivot of social struggle. If, however, we say that we do not want to take power, then the whole conception of struggle shifts. What is central now is not the confrontation with the other side (capital) but the construction of our own world. We try to focus on our own doing, to push confrontation to one side. This is still class struggle, it is still confrontation with capital (inevitably, since capital is the imposition of an alien control of our activity). But in so far as possible we seize the initiative, we seize the agenda. We make capital follow our agenda, so it becomes clear that the aggression comes from them, not from us. We cannot be autonomous in a capitalist society, but we can push our autonomy as far as possible. Capital is the negation of autonomy, the ever repeated negation of our self-determination. (As part of this, the state is the ever-repeated negation of the council.) If we see confrontation as the axis of struggle, then we are anticipating and therefore participating in this negation. By making the development of our own creativity (our own power-to-do) the centre of the movement, capital is revealed as a parasite, forced all the time to run after us. This is illustrated by the Caracoles, the Zapatista establishment of their own Juntas de Buen Gobierno, in which the Zapatistas shrug off the state, turn their back on the state, neither demanding anything of it nor openly confronting it, just doing their own thing.

Wo**rking through the state is an active process of attempting to achieve power by rearticulating violence and that approach should be rejected.**

#### Lebowitz 5(Michael A., former editor of Studies on the Left, professor of sociology and political science at Simon Fraser University. “Holloway’s Scream: Full of Sound and Fury” *Historical Materialism*, vol. 13:4 (217-231).)

Most of all, that which exists and must be negated is power over us – the power of our products over us, the power of social relations over us. But also to be negated are the false paths taken in the past, paths that history and theory reveal to be just other forms of power over us, indeed paths that are counter-revolutionary. So, we must say NO to the state – because ‘the very notion that society can be changed through the winning of state power’ is the source of all our sense of betrayal, and we need to understand that ‘to struggle through the state is to become involved in the active process of defeating yourself’; NO to seeking power in order to achieve our goals—because ‘once the logic of power is adopted, the struggle against power is already lost’; NO to the party – because the party (whether revolutionary or parliamentary) is the instrument by which our struggles are impoverished, placing control of the state at the top of the hierarchy and ‘sensuality, playing, laughing, loving’ at the bottom; NO to armed struggle – because ‘even in the unlikely event of military victory, it is capitalist social relations that have triumphed’; NO to national liberation – because the assertion of national identity in national liberation movements [has] done little more than reproduce the oppression against which the scream was directed; NO to struggles over identity—because the appeal to identity always involves the consolidation of identity, the strengthening, therefore, of the fracturing of doing, in short, the reinforcement of capital; NO to identifying and classifying the working class – because we do not struggle *as* working class, we struggle *against* being working class, against being classified [and because of] the cumulative evidence ofa separation between ‘the working class’ as an empirically identifiable group and the most striking forms of rebellion.And, finally, NO to the idea that we as thinkers have any privileged understanding of history and the world – because that would imply there are ‘Knowers’, ‘a vanguard of some sort’, and because such a positive-scientific displacement of Marx’s concept of negative science ensures that power-over penetrates into revolutionary theory and undermines it far more effectively than any government undercover agents infiltrating a revolutionary organization. As can be seen, there are many NO’s here, far more than would be anticipated—given Holloway’s rejection of an all-Knower. Yet, as we will see, there is one basic, fundamental NO – NO to Marx.

wherein the authority of the state does not apply or is not acknowledged. A vote for the affirmative allows this conversation to continue—by endorsing an anti-authority paradigm, a space for free political imagination

#### Bey 91(Hakim. Nome de guerre of Peter Lamborn Wilson, American anarchist and pirate utopian. Close ties to Sufism and Neopaganaism, founder of Green Hermeticism. *T.A.Z.: The temporary autonomous zone, ontological anarchy, poetic terrorism*. 1991)

The TAZ is thus a perfect tactic for an era in which the State is omnipresent and all-powerful and yet simultaneously riddled with cracks and vacancies. And because the TAZ is a microcosm of that "anarchist dream" of a free culture, I can think of no better tactic by which to work toward that goal while at the same time experiencing some of its benefits here and now. In sum, realism demands not only that we give up waiting for "the Revolution" but also that we give up wanting it. "Uprising," yes--as often as possible and even at the risk of violence. The *spasming* of the Simulated State will be "spectacular," but in most cases the best and most radical tactic will be to refuse to engage in spectacular violence, to *withdraw* from the area of simulation, to disappear. The TAZ is an encampment of guerilla ontologists: strike and run away. Keep moving the entire tribe, even if it's only data in the Web. The TAZ must be capable of defense; but both the "strike" and the "defense" should, if possible, evade the violence of the State, which is no longer a *meaningful* violence. The strike is made at structures of control, essentially at ideas; the defense is "invisibility," a martial art, and "invulnerability"--an "occult" art within the martial arts. The "nomadic war machine" conquers without being noticed and moves on before the map can be adjusted. As to the future--Only the autonomous can *plan* autonomy, organize for it, create it. It's a bootstrap operation. The first step is somewhat akin to satori--the realization that the TAZ begins with a simple act of realization.

#### Adapting a Zapatismo ethic necessitates a focus on how we influence the TAZs we occupy: to fill them with government policy or to debate the value of rejection? The topic inspires us to consider power as a changeable thing, but those changing it would exert their own power, perpetuating violence by institutions. At face value, the resolution asks us to start from a position of violence, or one in which certain amounts of violence is acceptable. We won’t do it. How do we even begin to restructure power; how to begin that changing in power dynamics? Prior to having a debate about the mechanics of policy or performance, we have to have a debate about debate, because we have some fundamental disagreements, and unlike the deserts of Chiapas where physical and existential violence punish thinkers, this room gives us options. OR AT LEAST IT SHOULD.

#### The topic’s implicit acceptance of collateral damage replicates state violence: restrictions entail that some bombs will get dropped, some kids will die, some cities will be destroyed.

#### Quezada-Grant 8

(Autumn; assistant professor of History, roger Williams university. “Savage violence and lessons of action: Zapatista response to the drug violence in Mexico”. *Empowering voices in poverty: sex, violence, and gender in marginalized communities in the U.S. and Mexico*.)

The normalization of violent acts in war paints a frightening reality. The violence against women in a militarized state is well documented however, as brave women come forward with testimonies. A change, however, is that gone are the days of thinking of indigenous women as passive and silent individuals. To combat such violence the Zapatistas have turned their attentions to the development of ‘carocal’ communities with ‘Good-government programs’ – that is attempting to separate themselves from the Mexican government and form cohesively sound spaces of protection. Now, to remind you what I’ve just presented to you. The outbreak of a revolution, the response on militarization and rising levels of violence. Let me state, these issues are not limited to the highland indigenous population, but now affects everyone in the state. There are military checkpoints in regions will few indigenous peoples. And the problems are similar. Picture of cartel I want to put forth a way to begin to conceive of the heart of the real issue and then connect to the effects of the drug war. Picture routes Thinking about structural violence allows us to do this. Medical anthropologist Paul Farmer, in his work *Pathologies of Power*, brilliantly argues that in the case of this argument, developing countries condition their societies to accept poverty and violence as the experience of everyday life. Farmer states that the “right to survive” without fear of violation or injury is today the most critical issue facing these impoverished communities. In this case, the threat comes directly from organizations that by definition are constituted to protect. The implicit acceptance of violence has allowed an opening for drug cartel violence, which is horrific. In Chiapas, the Sinaloan Cartel and Los Zetas fight to control not only the flow of drugs coming in through Central America but also the flow of migrants. Felipe Jacome makes a case for structural violence in the trans-Mexican migration. Picture of the train He writes, “social forces, policies, and the systemization of violence” creates scenarios of “a theater of violence, suffering and impunity.” *Polleros* connected to cartels kidnap, beat, rape and murder many of these undocumented migrants and while men make up the bulk of those who choose to make the passage through Mexico there are many women and children. Without their ‘community’ the flows of migrants are opened up to untold horrors. *¡We’ve Had Enough!* To conclude, creating a society that accepts violence as a norm, be it military, paramilitary or organized crime speaks to Paul Farmer’s charge that structural violence undermines the fabric of society and by extension faith in the system. In January of 2009, Subcomandante Marcos’ critiqued Calderón’s war on organized crime as an expression of “savage violence”, a war that specifically took the lives of men, women and children. This war is arguably a macho turf war. Often, male victims around found dead naked in the streets with their genitalia cut off and stuff in their mouth. The weapon of war is not with just bullets, but is sexual in nature. Marcos makes the confident charge that this is a “War from Above,” that the origins of structural violence originate from the Mexican government and are aiding to eliminate cartel competition. By May of 2011 the Zapatistas united with opposition movements, most notably famed Mexican poet Javier Sicilia (whose son was murdered by drug violence.) The combined movement *¡Hasta la Madre!* attempt to speak up for the drug-war dead and to shed light on the sheer absurdity of crimes against humanity. Giving voice to those silenced and the fearful is bringing a community to those that have been and are shattered as his ‘war from above’ deeply impacts the most vulnerable from below.

**Zapatismo urbano allows for an inclusive, autonomous dialogue where profit motive does not exist and where alternatives can be genuinely imagined.**

#### Haworth 12(Robert, H. August 2012. Anarchists Pedagogies: Collective Actions, Theories and Critical Reflections on Education.)

In the context of settler states like Canada and the United States, for example, coming to terms with the enduring reality of coloniality and finding ways to radically unsettle it in solidarity with indigenous struggles for autonomy should be a principle pillar of any radical social justice struggle and yet it is often rhetorically invoked without being manifested materially (see Alfred 2005). But what this points to, beyond the necessity of addressing coloniality as the material basis critical to the very existence of settler states, is that there is no retreat to an “other”—pure, uncontaminated, authentic, holistically grounded—that can save us from the systems of violence, domination, and exploitation that structure people’s lived realities. So what of Zapatismo as radical imagination and radical pedagogy at the level of the transnational? Throughout this piece I have brought the words of my research partners to bear on elements of Zapatismo in order to shed critical illumination on them from the perspective of those who experienced the resonance of this radical movement. These reflections are only a very small fragment of work I have done elsewhere (see Khasnabish 2010, 2008a, 2008b, 2007) that has sought to explore Zapatismo as a radical and trans-nationalized political imagination. These brief reflections are by no means meant to be representative of the depth of Zapatismo’s resonance among radical social justice activists elsewhere but they do stand as a testament to it. In more than a year of ethnographically grounded research that engaged activists and organizers from across Canada and the United States who self-identified as having had politically significant encounters with Zapatismo. These encounters took a tremendous variety of forms as Zapatismo has circulated transnationally through diverse channels, including: the Internet; academic, activist, and journalistic writing; solidarity delegations and report-backs; Zapatista communiqués, denunciations, speeches, and the writing of Subcomandante Marcos; visual media and a host of other artifacts associated with the Zapatista movement. Many of the people with whom I worked had direct experience with the Zapatista struggle on the ground in Chiapas, although the depth of such commitments varied widely, while others had only encountered Zapatismo in mediated forms. The collectives and organizations represented by the organizers and activists with whom I spoke were similarly diverse ranging from non-governmental organizations such as Global Exchange to radical media-making collectives like Big Noise Tactical to transnational anti-capitalist networks such as Peoples’ Global Action to groups engaged in direct action struggles against the daily realities of capitalist violence and exploitation like the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty. Of course, one need look no further than writing that has emerged from the ranks of the alter globalization movement itself to encounter a rhetorical confirmation of the significance of Zapatismo to this “movement of movements” (see Kingsnorth, 2003; Klein, 2002; Notes from Nowhere, 2003; Solnit, 2004). Far from merely celebrating them as icons of militancy, the conversations I had with diverse activists and organizers in Canada and the United States as well as activist media produced about the Zapatistas and Zapatismo situate them as vital pieces of a global rebellion against neoliberal capitalism and elite domination of people and the planet. Transmitted via diverse channels, Zapatismo found resonance in the midst of a multiplicity of different struggles because it did not offer an answer to the challenge of building mass movements capable of changing the world, rather, it served as a constant source of provocation and inspiration for radical struggles seeking paths beyond the violence, oppression, and exploitation of current systems of power as well as the failures of past movements in attempting to address them. Of course, Zapatismo as a transnationalized radical pedagogy also foreground elements of the Zapatista struggle while downplaying others. Prominent in activists’ writings and reflections about the significance of Zapatismo for their own understanding of struggle are notions of hope, inclusivity,

ation, dignity, communication, democracy, and a radical sense of possibility as well as an equally radical critique of power. These elements are most certainly present in Zapatismo, particularly with respect to the communiqués and communicative actions directed toward “civil society” transnationally; however, the prominence of these concepts as opposed to others relating more directly to the difficult work of building a living revolutionary struggle in the midst of formidable challenges from state repression to lack of resources also speaks to the subjectivities and contexts for which Zapatismo has proven such a potent imagination. The emphasis upon a powerful rejection of neoliberalism, the affirmation of human dignity, peace, autonomy and interconnectedness, and the desire for dialogue, coupled with a valorization of communicative and symbolic action rather than violent insurrection cannot be divorced from the Northern context within which Zapatismo as radical pedagogy and radical imagination has resonated. This has always been a problematic dynamic as people view movements elsewhere through the lens of their own desire for change and their own understandings of struggle, and this has certainly happened.

AND CAPITAL creates real human impacts unable to be quantified by net lives saves or net homes built. **Collapse of capitalism is inevitable it’s just a question of how we prepare ourselves for the transition so that capitalism doesn’t reemerge. We believe that how we orient ourselves towards capitalism in the transition before its inevitable collapse will determine what type of society exist in the aftermath. Urbano allows communities to arise in opposition of authority.**

### AS: In light of this realization, Subcomandante Benjamin and I advocate for a redefinition of power through an ethic of Zapatismo urbano.

#### Khasnabish 05 (Alex, “An Echo That Reechoes: Transnational Activism and the Resonance of Zapatismo” in *Ameriquests* Vol 2, No 1 (2005) A socio-cultural anthropologist by training, my research interests revolve around the following issues: culture, power, and resistance; globalization; critical and radical political theory; the radical imagination, socio-political struggle and transformation, and social movements; anti-capitalism, anarchism, and grassroots alternative-building. Over the last decade, I have done research in Mexico, the United States, and Canada focusing on the relationship between the radical imagination and radical social movements. I am the author of two books, [Zapatistas: Rebellion from the Grassroots to the Global](http://www.fernwoodpublishing.ca/Zapatistas-Alex-Khasnabish/) (2010, Zed Books and Fernwood Publishing) and Zapatismo Beyond Borders: New Imaginations of Political Possibility (2008, University of Toronto Press), and the co-editor both of a forthcoming edited volume about transnational activism (with Jeffrey Juris) and a special issue of the journal Affinities (with Max Haiven). I am also the author of several articles that have been published in edited volumes and in journals such as Anthropologica, Critique of Anthropology, Ephemera, and Journal for the Study of Radicalism. Bachelor of Arts (Honours), English and Anthropology, McMaster University, Masters of Arts, Anthropology, McMaster University. PhD, Socio-Cultural Anthropology, McMaster University. For more information about my research, teaching, and writing, please go to <http://alexkhasnabish.wordpress.com/>)

A brief reflection on the character of Zapatismo is in order. It is vital to recognize that Zapatismo is not an ideology, that it is not a doctrine; it is not even a loosely codified set of principles. Nor is Zapatismo identical with the EZLN or even the Zapatista base communities in the highlands and jungles of Chiapas. Rather, as Subcomandante Marcos has said, Zapatismo is perhaps best described as an intuition, a position elaborated upon by Manuel Callahan in the following way: Zapatismo is a political strategy, an ethos, a set of commitments claimed by those who claim a political identity (2004, 218-219). Emerging originally out of the encounter between urban and Marxist-inspired guerrillas and the Indigenous communities in the Lacandan Jungle and highlands of Chiapas in the early 1980s, an encounter that by all accounts led to the defeat of Marxist doctrine at the hands of these Indigenous realities contemporary Zapatismos socio-political spirit is both novel and simultaneously a creative reformulation of various Mexican revolutionary trajectories. Deeply and directly democratic, radically inclusive, and non-hierarchical, Zapatismo has been expressed best since 1994 not only though the communiques and public demonstrations of the EZLN and the Zapatista communities but through the day-to-day practices of Indigenous Mayan communities in the highlands and jungle of Chiapas struggling to build relationships among themselves and with others marked by justice, democracy, and liberty. This is not to say that the realization of these principles has been achieved perfectly by the Zapatistas; lived realities are always more complex and complicated. Rather these are the central commitments that guide the Zapatista struggle. Along with a rejection of neoliberal capitalism, the pillars of Zapatismo are a renouncing of a teleology of revolution, a vision of struggle directed toward building a world where many worlds fit, where all worlds fit, and a sincere belief in the importance of hope, dignity, and creativity.

### ROB: these ideas we argue the ballot should be used as an endorsement of who best reorients structures of power. WE argue that the use of our speech act of endorsement of the Zapatismo urbano is the best method to create a radical political strategy through our critique of power and adoption of this form of activism and theatre in the debate space.

#### This debate space is our attempt to form community; To allow for the possibility of a future without authority. We seek to engage in the struggle against “framework”, or against the presupposition that debate *is* something that admits of rules and not possibilities. A starting point of anything less than screaming lacks direction: we want anarchy NOT entropy: we want a debate space that allows us to discuss options as if they were real options. This begins and ends with an alternative understanding of power.

#### Holloway 5 (John, political scientist and socialist theorist, professor at Autonomous University of Puebla and major contributor to the Zapatista movement. “Zapatismo Urbano” Department of Sociology, Humboldt State University. *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations* vol. 29 no. 1, “Zapatismo as Political and Cultural Practice” pp. 168-178)

But doing our own thing, developing our own creativity, is not the same in the cities as in the countryside. We do not possess land on which we can grow even the most basic food crops. It may be possible to occupy land for these purposes (as some of the piquetero groups in Argentina are beginning to do), but for most urban groups this is not an option. In order to develop our autonomy we are forced into contradictory situations, in which it is much better to recognize those contradictions rather than to gloss over them, just as the Zapatistas of Chiapas have had the great merit of recognizing from the beginning the contradiction of their military organization in a movement for human dignity. Urban autonomous groups survive either on the basis of state subsidies (sometimes forced by the groups themselves as in the case of the piqueteros who use the roadblocks to force the government to give money to the unemployed) or on the basis of some mixture of occasional or regular paid employment and state subsidies. Thus, many urban groups are composed of a mixture of people in regular employment, of people who are by choice or by necessity in irregular or occasional employment and of those who (again by choice or necessity) are unemployed, often dependent on state subsidies or some sort of market activity for their survival. These different forms of dependency on forces that we do not control (on capital) pose problems and limitations that should be recognized. At the same time, the significance of these limitations obviously depends on the collective strength of the groups: in the case of the piqueteros, for example, the payment of the state subsidies was imposed by road blocks and administered by the groups themselves. All these different forms of dependency on capital are imposed by property, by the fact that all the wealth produced by human doing is congealed in the form of property which confronts and excludes us. The limiting of our autonomous self-determination appears in the form of property, behind which stand the forces of law and order which defend property. We seem to be forced, then, back into a logic of confrontation in which we lose the initiative, or in which we are forced to focus on winning power so that we can control the police and change the laws on property. If we exclude this course (simply because control of the state tends to become control by the state), how can we go forward? Possibly by defetishising property, by seeing that property is not an established thing, but a constant process of appropriating, a verb and not a noun. The problem then is not to conceptualize our own action in terms of the challenge to property, but to focus on our own construction of an alternative world and think how to avoid the capitalist appropriation of the products of our own doing. The problems indicated all point to the dangers of con fusing an emphasis on autonomy with a concept of micropolitics. The notion of autonomy, as understood here, points to the centrality of our own doing and the development of our own power to do: if we see the world from this perspective, then it is clear that capital is a parasite and that the so called "rulers" simply run after us all the time trying to appropriate the results of our creative doing. The problem of revolution is to shake off these parasites, to prevent them appropriating our creativity and its results, to make them irrelevant. This struggle does not require any central organization (and certainly not any orientation towards the state) but its strength does de pend on its massive character. What any particular group can achieve clearly depends on the strength of an entire movement pushing in the same or similar directions. The strength of the component groups depends on the strength of the movement, just as the strength of the movement depends on the strength of the component groups