# **highlight**

## **Zapatista 1:00**

#### **Just governments should engage in methods of autonomous self-governance modeled after the Zapatista movement – the CP solves the aff.**

**Briy 2020** (Anya Briy, Anya Briy is a PhD student in Sociology, based in NY, doing a comparative research on the Kurdish movement and indigenous movements in Mexico. She is also a steering committee member of Emergency Committee for Rojava (ECR). June 25 2020, “Zapatistas: Lessons in community self-organisation in Mexico,” OpenDemocracy.net, <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/democraciaabierta/zapatistas-lecciones-de-auto-organizaci%C3%B3n-comunitaria-en/>) //neth

In the 26 years after the initial uprising, Zapatistas have become a leading voice of Mexico’s indigenous peoples and built a de facto autonomous system of self-governance in noncontiguous territories of the state of Chiapas, inhabited by the movement’s supporters. A key principle underlying the Zapatista project, which ensures that autonomous institutions serve the people, is mandar obedeciendo, which means to lead by obeying. It implies that political leaders do not make decisions on behalf of their community as its representatives, but rather act as the community's delegates, implementing decisions made in local assemblies—a traditional decision-making mechanism. These exist on a village level and, in contrast to traditional assemblies of Mexico, include women, whose empowerment has been at the center of the Zapatista revolution. Assemblies elect delegates to a municipal council—the next level in the Zapatista administrative structure. Next, on the regional level, several autonomous municipalities are represented through delegates in Juntas of Buen Gobierno (JBG), or Councils of Good Government—called so in contrast to the “bad” Mexican government. JBG members serve for 3 years on a rotating basis in shifts as short as a few weeks. Such frequent rotation is intended to prevent the emergence of clientelistic networks. Any ideas proposed at a higher administrative level go through the consultation process with each community, after which delegates carry their communities’ opinion back to a municipal meeting. There is a strong emphasis on consensus decision making, although that oftentimes means sitting through day-long meetings where everyone has to be heard, and decision is not taken until a compromise is reached. Leaders are chosen based on the indigenous tradition of cargo—an obligation to serve one’s community—and commit to unremunerated posts of responsibility. Communities have the right to revoke the mandate of those officials who do not fulfill their duty of serving the people. The military-political formation EZLN, which had organized clandestinely since 1983 culminating in the 1994 uprising and land occupations, exists parallel to the three levels of autonomous administration and gives political direction to the movement. While it is hierarchically organized, its highest body is made up of civilians elected by community assemblies. Moreover, its presence in communal affairs has been limited in order to ensure a genuine democratic self-governance of Zapatista communities. Having adopted a position of refusal of any aid from the so called “bad” government, Zapatistas took on the state's function of service provision in communities affiliated with the movement. That meant building their own, community-based justice, education, healthcare and production systems.

#### **The Zapatista justice system is restorative and built on antiracist ideology**

**Briy 2020** (Anya Briy, Anya Briy is a PhD student in Sociology, based in NY, doing a comparative research on the Kurdish movement and indigenous movements in Mexico. She is also a steering committee member of Emergency Committee for Rojava (ECR). June 25 2020, “Zapatistas: Lessons in community self-organisation in Mexico,” OpenDemocracy.net, <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/democraciaabierta/zapatistas-lecciones-de-auto-organizaci%C3%B3n-comunitaria-en/>) //neth

The Zapatista justice system has gained trust and legitimacy even beyond the movement's supporters. It is free of charge, conducted in indigenous languages and is known to be less corrupt or partial compared to governmental institutions of justice. But more importantly, it adopts a restorative rather than punitive approach and places an emphasis on the need to find a compromise that satisfies all parties. Rooted in the community, the system consists of three levels: the first level concerns issues among Zapatista supporters, such as gossip, theft, drunkenness, or domestic disputes. Such cases are resolved by elected authorities or, if necessary, by the communal assembly, based on customary practice. When resolving conflicts, authorities largely function as mediators, proposing solutions to the parties involved. If unresolved, cases go up to the next, municipal level where they are dealt with by an elected Honor and Justice Commission. Sentences most of the time involve community service or a fine; jail sentences normally do not exceed several days. As Melissa Forbis explains, community jail is usually just a locked room with a partially open door so that people can stop by to chat and pass food. Since the perpetrator often has to borrow money for a fine from his or her family members, the latter are also involved and their pressure helps prevent further transgression. Women-related and domestic issues are addressed by women on the Commission. Mariana Mora provides a telling illustration of the movement’s approach to punishment, documenting a case in which Zapatistas issued a year-long community service sentence for a robbery. Those found guilty were allowed to alternate service with work on their own cornfields so that their families did not have to share in the punishment. The Commission explained their decision as follows: "We thought that if we simply put them in jail, those who really suffer are the family members. The guilty just rest all day in jail and gain weight, but their families are the ones who have to work the cornfield and figure out how to survive." The highest level of the justice system, that of the JBG, deals with cases that primarily involve non-Zapatistas or other local political organizations—usually in disputes over land—as well as local governmental authorities. Non-Zapatistas seek out the autonomous justice system not only when they have disputes with members of Zapatista communities, but also when they experience unjust treatment by the government’s officials, in which case Zapatistas may decide to accompany the claimants to the public office and argue on their behalf. While Zapatistas still have police, it is quite distinct from how we are used to think of it. As Paulina Fernandez Christlieb documents, they are neither armed, uniformed, nor professional. Similar to other authorities, police are elected by their community; they are not remunerated and do not serve in this function permanently. Every community has its own police, while higher administrative levels—those of municipality and region—do not. Decentralized and deprofessionalized, police thus serve and are under control of the community that elects them.

## **Swt 2:00**

#### **[ROB & Dolmage 1] The Role of the Ballot is to Endorse the Debater who Better Challenges the Exclusion of Educational Spaces. Interrogating ableism is key to understanding education itself.**

**Dolmage 1:** Dolmage, Jay Timothy. [Associate Chair, Undergraduate Communication Outcome Initiative at University of Waterloo, Miami University] “Academic Ableism: Disability and Higher Education” *University of Michigan Press*, Chpt. 1, 2017. AZ **Brackets in original text**

Disavowing disability is in no body’s best interest. Teachers recognize the diversity of the students they teach. But teachers must also recognize their roles within institutions, disciplines, and perhaps even personal pedagogical agendas, in which they may seek to avoid and disavow the very idea of disability—­to give it no place. This avoidance and disavowal brings with it its own spatial metaphors—­I use the steep steps to express this negative force. That these steps are real in the lives of people with disabilities adds to the power of the metaphor. The steps have a strong connotation in the disability community, and not just for people who use wheelchairs and crutches. When I say that the academy builds steep steps, I hope that this verb entails many things—­most of all, I want to show that the steep steps are constructed for a reason. As I have already shown, not only did eugenics actually reshape the North American population through things like immigration restriction, not only did it reshape families through its campaigns for “better breeding,” not only did it reshape bodies through medical reinvention, but it reshaped how North Americans thought about bodies and minds. Here, for example, is a diagram of the steps that were created to distinguish between different grades of the “feeble-­minded” in the United States in the heyday of the eugenics movement before the Second World War. The definitions were used to classify a group of humans according to mental age, suggesting that development had been arrested and would proceed no further past the step at which the individual was placed. The mental age was determined based upon variations of a standard test, the Binet test, which asked literally hundreds of standard common-­knowledge questions, of increasing difficulty. The test was also designed to stop the subject once they had reached the stage or step of difficulty at which they could proceed no further. Fig. 3. “Exhibit of Work and Educational Campaign for Juvenile Mental Defectives.” American Philosophical Society, 1906. Fig. 3. “Exhibit of Work and Educational Campaign for Juvenile Mental Defectives.” American Philosophical Society, 1906. This image shows five people, each stationed on one of five very steep steps. The bottom person, slouched on the ground, is labeled an “idiot, mentally 3 yrs. old.” On the next step up, an individual is hunched over, looking downwards, labeled “low-­grade imbecile, 4 to 5 yrs. old.” Next step up, a “medium imbecile, mentally 6 to 8 yrs. old.” Then a “high grade imbecile, mentally 8 to 10 yrs. Old” is pictured on the next step up, now gazing upwards. Finally, we view a person, described in the caption as a “moron, mentally 10 to 12 years old,” attempting to climb above the final and topmost step but only getting halfway up. As the image reveals, the steps were also closely associated with forms of work, and thus classed citizens and linked their value to this labor-­output, but also placed almost all of the feebleminded below reason and judgment, not only in a space of rational vacuity, but deficit. You’ll also notice that the bodily bearing of these individuals conveys a message: the different levels of animation suggest physical and cognitive correlation. These people look tired. The disabled mind equates with the disabled body. These states correspond with affects: the slumped shoulders and downcast eyes suggest or physicalize depression. If these steps in the image on the next page represent the very bottom of the steep set we climb to the ivory tower, they nonetheless cannot be disconnected from the history of North American higher education. In fact, “morons,” “imbeciles,” and “idiots” were both rhetorically (and eugenically) constructed by the “fathers” of higher education, and those individuals who were given these labels were also studied and researched.[10] At the top of the steps were those who taught and studied at premier universities, and these people studied and experimented upon the bodies of those on the bottom steps. We may like to believe that, today, practices of eugenics have not only been rejected but that they’ve also been corrected. Yet the selectivity of this environment must be continually interrogated or questioned. We must all evaluate the ways in which we ourselves continue to decide which bodies and which minds will have access to the considerable resources, privileges, and advantages we have and we bestow—and as we ask this question, we must wonder whether what we have to offer is truly worthwhile if it translates into policies of exclusion, programs of incarceration, and reductive definitions of human worth. Interrogating the steep steps metaphor works to highlight not just how space and spatialization are exclusionary but also the ways that the distance between a hypothetical “us” and a “them,” perhaps the able and the disabled, has a particular structure. Yet we must look at the steps from other angles, along other axes. What are the attitudes, requirements, and practices that might represent boundaries, jumps on the graph, risers on the steps? Are there chutes, or are there ladders, set up to speed movement from top to bottom or bottom to top? What forces move up and down, affecting students’ progress? Should we even want to get to the top? How do students go back down the steps or out of the university gates and back to home communities? What makes this journey possible or impossible? What does it mean to skip the steps? Where do the steps actually start?

Links

#### **[hedva 1] The aff’s appeals to change, progress, and revolution equate the political with action – that requires the oppressed to position themselves in the public sphere and “do something.”**

- They claim ONLY a revolution that changes the way we communicate in the debate space can make our words mean something- this is linking debate the public sphere to change

- The framing of revolutionary communication as key to make revolutionary worker movement possible excludes debaters who have anxiety or certain disability and cannot get up and perform this aff in front of others

hedva 1: hedva, johanna. [johanna hedva lives with chronic illness and their sick woman theory is for those who were never meant to survive but did] “Sick Woman Theory.” *Mask* Magazine, January 26, 2016. CH

1. In late 2014, I was sick with a chronic condition that, about every 12 to 18 months, gets bad enough to render me, for about five months each time, unable to walk, drive, do my job, sometimes speak or understand language, take a bath without assistance, and leave the bed. This particular flare coincided with the Black Lives Matter protests, which I would have attended unremittingly, had I been able to. I live one block away from MacArthur Park in Los Angeles, a predominantly Latino neighborhood and one colloquially understood to be the place where many immigrants begin their American lives. The park, then, is not surprisingly one of the most active places of protest in the city. I listened to the sounds of the marches as they drifted up to my window. Attached to the bed, I rose up my sick woman fist, in solidarity. I started to think about what modes of protest are afforded to sick people – it seemed to me that many for whom Black Lives Matter is especially in service, might not be able to be present for the marches because they were imprisoned by a job, the threat of being fired from their job if they marched, or literal incarceration, and of course the threat of violence and police brutality – but also because of illness or disability, or because they were caring for someone with an illness or disability. I thought of all the other invisible bodies, with their fists up, tucked away and out of sight. If we take Hannah Arendt’s definition of the political – which is still one of the most dominant in mainstream discourse – as being any action that is performed in public, we must contend with the implications of what that excludes. If being present in public is what is required to be political, then whole swathes of the population can be deemed a-political – simply because they are not physically able to get their bodies into the street. In my graduate program, Arendt was a kind of god, and so I was trained to think that her definition of the political was radically liberating. Of course, I can see that it was, in its own way, in its time (the late 1950s): in one fell swoop she got rid of the need for infrastructures of law, the democratic process of voting, the reliance on individuals who’ve accumulated the power to affect policy – she got rid of the need for policy at all. All of these had been required for an action to be considered political and visible as such. No, Arendt said, just get your body into the street, and bam: political. There are two failures here, though. The first is her reliance on a “public” – which requires a private, a binary between visible and invisible space. This meant that whatever takes place in private is not political. So, you can beat your wife in private and it doesn’t matter, for instance. You can send private emails containing racial slurs, but since they weren’t “meant for the public,” you are somehow not racist. Arendt was worried that if everything can be considered political, then nothing will be, which is why she divided the space into one that is political and one that is not. But for the sake of this anxiety, she chose to sacrifice whole groups of people, to continue to banish them to invisibility and political irrelevance. She chose to keep them out of the public sphere. I’m not the first to take Arendt to task for this. The failure of Arendt’s political was immediately exposed in the civil rights activism and feminism of the 1960s and 70s. “The personal is political” can also be read as saying “the private is political.” Because of course, everything you do in private is political: who you have sex with, how long your showers are, if you have access to clean water for a shower at all, and so on.

#### **Further, their framing of the aff as a 6-minute revolution “radical constellation” is a performative link – the aff is only revolutionary because they got up and read it in a public sphere.**

#### **[hedva 2] They adopt a “view from nowhere” – a myth of neutrality that frames the public as an open space for anyone willing to do the work to fight. These reps are rooted in Whiteness – what about people who CAN’T join the public sphere, or those who’ve tried and failed? And assuming progress is possible and things get better is ableist af.**

hedva 2: hedva, johanna. [johanna hedva lives with chronic illness and their sick woman theory is for those who were never meant to survive but did] “Sick Woman Theory.” *Mask* Magazine, January 26, 2016. CH

There is another problem too. As Judith Butler put it in her 2015 lecture, “Vulnerability and Resistance,” Arendt failed to account for who is allowed in to the public space, of who’s in charge of the public. Or, more specifically, who’s in charge of who gets in. Butler says that there is always one thing true about a public demonstration: the police are already there, or they are coming. This resonates with frightening force when considering the context of Black Lives Matter. The inevitability of violence at a demonstration – especially a demonstration that emerged to insist upon the importance of bodies who’ve been violently un-cared for – ensures that a certain amount of people won’t, because they can’t, show up. Couple this with physical and mental illnesses and disabilities that keep people in bed and at home, and we must contend with the fact that many whom these protests are for, are not able to participate in them – which means they are not able to be visible as political activists. There was a Tumblr post that came across my dash during these weeks of protest, that said something to the effect of: “shout out to all the disabled people, sick people, people with PTSD, anxiety, etc., who can’t protest in the streets with us tonight. Your voices are heard and valued, and with us.” Heart. Reblog. So, as I lay there, unable to march, hold up a sign, shout a slogan that would be heard, or be visible in any traditional capacity as a political being, the central question of Sick Woman Theory formed: How do you throw a brick through the window of a bank if you can’t get out of bed? 2. I have chronic illness. For those who don’t know what chronic illness means, let me help: the word “chronic” comes from the Latin chronos, which means “of time” (think of “chronology”), and it specifically means “a lifetime.” So, a chronic illness is an illness that lasts a lifetime. In other words, it does not get better. There is no cure. And think about the weight of time: yes, that means you feel it every day. On very rare occasions, I get caught in a moment, as if something’s plucked me out of the world, where I realize that I haven’t thought about my illnesses for a few minutes, maybe a few precious hours. These blissful moments of oblivion are the closest thing to a miracle that I know. When you have chronic illness, life is reduced to a relentless rationing of energy. It costs you to do anything: to get out of bed, to cook for yourself, to get dressed, to answer an email. For those without chronic illness, you can spend and spend without consequence: the cost is not a problem. For those of us with limited funds, we have to ration, we have a limited supply: we often run out before lunch. I’ve come to think about chronic illness in other ways. Ann Cvetkovich writes: “What if depression, in the Americas, at least, could be traced to histories of colonialism, genocide, slavery, legal exclusion, and everyday segregation and isolation that haunt all of our lives, rather than to be biochemical imbalances?” I’d like to change the word “depression” here to be all mental illnesses. Cvetkovich continues: “Most medical literature tends to presume a white and middle-class subject for whom feeling bad is frequently a mystery because it doesn’t fit a life in which privilege and comfort make things seem fine on the surface.” In other words, wellness as it is talked about in America today, is a white and wealthy idea. Let me quote Starhawk, in the preface to the new edition of her 1982 book Dreaming the Dark: “Psychologists have constructed a myth – that somewhere there exists some state of health which is the norm, meaning that most people presumably are in that state, and those who are anxious, depressed, neurotic, distressed, or generally unhappy are deviant.” I’d here supplant the word “psychologists” with “white supremacy,” “doctors,” “your boss,” “neoliberalism,” “heteronormativity,” and “America.” There has been a slew of writing in recent years about how “female” pain is treated – or rather, not treated as seriously as men’s in emergency rooms and clinics, by doctors, specialists, insurance companies, families, husbands, friends, the culture at large. In a recent article in The Atlantic, called “How Doctors Take Women’s Pain Less Seriously,” a husband writes about the experience of his wife Rachel’s long wait in the ER before receiving the medical attention her condition warranted (which was an ovarian torsion, where an ovarian cyst grows so large it falls, twisting the fallopian tube). “Nationwide, men wait an average of 49 minutes before receiving an analgesic for acute abdominal pain. Women wait an average of 65 minutes for the same thing. Rachel waited somewhere between 90 minutes and two hours,” he writes. At the end of the ordeal, Rachel had waited nearly fifteen hours before going into the surgery she should have received upon arrival. The article concludes with her physical scars healing, but that “she’s still grappling with the psychic toll – what she calls ‘the trauma of not being seen.’” What the article does not mention is race – which leads me to believe that the writer and his wife are white. Whiteness is what allows for such oblivious neutrality: it is the premise of blankness, the presumption of the universal. (Studies have shown that white people will listen to other white people when talking about race, far more openly than they will to a person of color. As someone who is white-passing, let me address white people directly: look at my white face and listen up.) The trauma of not being seen. Again – who is allowed in to the public sphere? Who is allowed to be visible? I don’t mean to diminish Rachel’s horrible experience – I myself once had to wait ten hours in an ER to be diagnosed with a burst ovarian cyst – I only wish to point out the presumptions upon which her horror relies: that our vulnerability should be seen and honored, and that we should all receive care, quickly and in a way that “respects the autonomy of the patient,” as the Four Principles of Biomedical Ethics puts it. Of course, these presumptions are what we all should have. But we must ask the question of who is allowed to have them. In whom does society substantiate such beliefs? And in whom does society enforce the opposite? Compare Rachel’s experience at the hands of the medical establishment with that of Kam Brock’s. In September 2014, Brock, a 32-year-old black woman, born in Jamaica and living in New York City, was driving a BMW when she was pulled over by the police. They accused her of driving under the influence of marijuana, and though her behavior and their search of her car yielded nothing to support this, they nevertheless impounded her car. According to a lawsuit brought against the City of New York and Harlem Hospital by Brock, when Brock appeared the next day to retrieve her car she was arrested by the police for behaving in a way that she calls “emotional,” and involuntarily hospitalized in the Harlem Hospital psych ward. (As someone who has also been involuntarily hospitalized for behaving “too” emotionally, this story feels like a rip of recognition through my brain.) The doctors thought she was “delusional” and suffering from bipolar disorder, because she claimed that Obama followed her on twitter – which was true, but which the medical staff failed to confirm. She was then held for eight days, forcibly injected with sedatives, made to ingest psychiatric medication, attend group therapy, and stripped. The medical records of the hospital – obtained by her lawyers – bear this out: the “master treatment plan” for Brock’s stay reads, “Objective: Patient will verbalize the importance of education for employment and will state that Obama is not following her on Twitter.” It notes her “inability to test reality.” Upon her release, she was given a bill for $13,637.10. The question of why the hospital’s doctors thought Brock “delusional” because of her Obama-follow claim is easily answered: Because, according to this society, a young black woman can’t possibly be that important – and for her to insist that she is must mean she’s “sick.” 3. Before I can speak of the “sick woman” in all of her many guises, I must first speak as an individual, and address you from my particular location. I am antagonistic to the notion that the Western medical-insurance industrial complex understands me in my entirety, though they seem to think they do. They have attached many words to me over the years, and though some of these have provided articulation that was useful – after all, no matter how much we are working to change the world, we must still find ways of coping with the reality at hand – first I want to suggest some other ways of understanding my “illness.” Perhaps it can all be explained by the fact that my Moon’s in Cancer in the 8th House, the House of Death, or that my Mars is in the 12th House, the House of Illness, Secrets, Sorrow, and Self-Undoing. Or, that my father’s mother escaped from North Korea in her childhood and hid this fact from the family until a few years ago, when she accidentally let it slip out, and then swiftly, revealingly, denied it. Or, that my mother suffers from undiagnosed mental illness that was actively denied by her family, and was then exasperated by a 40-year-long drug addiction, sexual trauma, and hepatitis from a dirty needle, and to this day remains untreated, as she makes her way in and out of jails, squats, and homelessness. Or, that I was physically and emotionally abused as a child, raised in an environment of poverty, addiction, and violence, and have been estranged from my parents for 13 years. Perhaps it’s because I’m poor – according to the IRS, in 2014, my adjusted gross income was $5,730 (a result of not being well enough to work full-time) – which means that my health insurance is provided by the state of California (Medi-Cal), that my “primary care doctor” is a group of physician’s assistants and nurses in a clinic on the second floor of a strip mall, and that I rely on food stamps to eat. Perhaps it can be encapsulated in the word “trauma.” Perhaps I’ve just got thin skin, and have had some bad luck. It’s important that I also share the Western medical terminology that’s been attached to me – whether I like it or not, it can provide a common vocabulary: “This is the oppressor’s language,” Adrienne Rich wrote in 1971, “yet I need it to talk to you.” But let me offer another language, too. In the Native American Cree language, the possessive noun and verb of a sentence are structured differently than in English. In Cree, one does not say, “I am sick.” Instead, one says, “The sickness has come to me.” I love that and want to honor it. So, here is what has come to me: Endometriosis, which is a disease of the uterus where the uterine lining grows where it shouldn’t – in the pelvic area mostly, but also anywhere, the legs, abdomen, even the head. It causes chronic pain; gastrointestinal chaos; epic, monstrous bleeding; in some cases, cancer; and means that I have miscarried, can’t have children, and have several surgeries to look forward to. When I explained the disease to a friend who didn’t know about it, she exclaimed: “So your whole body is a uterus!” That’s one way of looking at it, yes. (Imagine what the Ancient Greek doctors – the fathers of the theory of the “wandering womb” – would say about that.) It means that every month, those rogue uterine cells that have implanted themselves throughout my body, “obey their nature and bleed,” to quote fellow endo warrior Hilary Mantel. This causes cysts, which eventually burst, leaving behind bundles of dead tissue like the debris of little bombs. Bipolar disorder, panic disorder, and depersonalization disorder have also come to me. This means that I live between this world and another one, one created by my own brain that has ceased to be contained by a discrete concept of “self.” Because of these “disorders,” I have access to incredibly vivid emotions, flights of thought, and dreamscapes, to the feeling that my mind has been obliterated into stars, to the sensation that I have become nothingness, as well as to intense ecstasies, raptures, sorrows, and nightmarish hallucinations. I have been hospitalized, voluntarily and involuntarily, because of it, and one of the medications I was prescribed once nearly killed me – it produces a rare side effect where one’s skin falls off. Another cost $800 a month – I only took it because my doctor slipped me free samples. If I want to be able to hold a job – which this world has decided I ought to be able to do – I must take an anti-psychotic medication daily that causes short-term memory loss and drooling, among other sexy side effects. These visitors have also brought their friends: nervous breakdowns, mental collapses, or whatever you want to call them, three times in my life. I’m certain they will be guests in my house again. They have motivated attempts at suicide (most of them while dissociated) more than a dozen times, the first one when I was nine years old. That first attempt didn’t work, only because after taking a mouthful of sleeping pills, I somehow woke up the next day and went to school, like nothing had happened. I told no one about it, until my first psychiatric evaluation in my mid 20s. Finally, an autoimmune disease that continues to baffle all the doctors I’ve seen, has come to me and refuses still to be named. As Carolyn Lazard has written about her experiences with autoimmune diseases: “Autoimmune disorders are difficult to diagnose. For ankylosing spondylitis, the average time between the onset of symptoms and diagnosis is eight to twelve years. I was lucky; I only had to wait one year.” Names like “MS,” “fibromyalgia,” and others that I can’t remember have fallen from the mouths of my doctors – but my insurance won’t cover the tests, nor is there a specialist in my insurance plan within one hundred miles of my home. I don’t have enough space here – will I ever? – to describe what living with an autoimmune disease is like. I can say it brings unimaginable fatigue, pain all over all the time, susceptibility to illnesses, a body that performs its “normal” functions monstrously abnormally. The worst symptom that mine brings is chronic shingles. For ten years I’ve gotten shingles in the same place on my back, so that I now have nerve damage there, which results in a ceaseless, searing pain on the skin and a dull, burning ache in the bones.

#### **[hedva 3] Reject their representations of liberation and endorse Sick Woman Theory as a survival strategy for oppressed people. This means re-centering the discussion to oppose incorporation into oppressive structures. It is NOT the burden of the oppressed to fix the world around them – instead, an ethic of care for self and others should replace the call for public protest.**

hedva 3: hedva, johanna. [johanna hedva lives with chronic illness and their sick woman theory is for those who were never meant to survive but did] “Sick Woman Theory.” *Mask* Magazine, January 26, 2016. CH

Despite taking daily medication that is supposed to “suppress” the shingles virus, I still get them – they are my canaries in the coalmine, the harbingers of at least three weeks to be spent in bed. My acupuncturist described it as a little demon steaming black smoke, frothing around, nestling into my bones. 4. With all of these visitors, I started writing Sick Woman Theory as a way to survive in a reality that I find unbearable, and as a way to bear witness to a self that does not feel like it can possibly be “mine.” The early instigation for the project of “Sick Woman Theory,” and how it inherited its name, came from a few sources. One was in response to Audrey Wollen’s “Sad Girl Theory,” which proposes a way of redefining historically feminized pathologies into modes of political protest for girls: I was mainly concerned with the question of what happens to the sad girl when, if, she grows up. Another was incited by reading Kate Zambreno’s fantastic Heroines, and feeling an itch to fuck with the concept of “heroism” at all, and so I wanted to propose a figure with traditionally anti-heroic qualities – namely illness, idleness, and inaction – as capable of being the symbol of a grand Theory. Another was from the 1973 feminist book Complaints and Disorders, which differentiates between the “sick woman” of the white upper class, and the “sickening women” of the non-white working class. Sick Woman Theory is for those who are faced with their vulnerability and unbearable fragility, every day, and so have to fight for their experience to be not only honored, but first made visible. For those who, in Audre Lorde’s words, were never meant to survive: because this world was built against their survival. It’s for my fellow spoonies. You know who you are, even if you’ve not been attached to a diagnosis: one of the aims of Sick Woman Theory is to **resist the notion that one needs to be legitimated by an institution**, so that they can try to fix you. You don’t need to be fixed, my queens – it’s the world that needs the fixing. I offer this as a call to arms and a testimony of recognition. I hope that my thoughts can provide articulation and resonance, as well as tools of survival and resilience. And for those of you who are not chronically ill or disabled, Sick Woman Theory asks you to stretch your empathy this way. To face us, to listen, to see. 5. Sick Woman Theory is an insistence that most modes of political protest are internalized, lived, embodied, suffering, and no doubt invisible. Sick Woman Theory redefines existence in a body as something that is primarily and always vulnerable, following from Judith Butler’s work on precarity and resistance. Because the premise insists that a body is defined by its vulnerability, not temporarily affected by it, the implication is that it is continuously reliant on infrastructures of support in order to endure, and so we need to re-shape the world around this fact. Sick Woman Theory maintains that the body and mind are sensitive and reactive to regimes of oppression – particularly our current regime of neoliberal, white-supremacist, imperial-capitalist, cis-hetero-patriarchy. It is that all of our bodies and minds carry the historical trauma of this, that it is the world itself that is making and keeping us sick. To take the term “woman” as the subject-position of this work is a strategic, all-encompassing embrace and dedication to the particular, rather than the universal. Though the identity of “woman” has erased and excluded many (especially women of color and trans and genderfluid people), I choose to use it because it still represents the un-cared for, the secondary, the oppressed, the non-, the un-, the less-than. The problematics of this term will always require critique, and I hope that Sick Woman Theory can help undo those in its own way.

They add:

6. I used to think that the most anti-capitalist gestures left had to do with love, particularly love poetry: to write a love poem and give it to the one you desired, seemed to me a radical resistance. But now I see I was wrong. The most anti-capitalist protest is to care for another and to care for yourself. To take on the historically feminized and therefore invisible practice of nursing, nurturing, caring. To take seriously each other’s vulnerability and fragility and precarity, and to support it, honor it, empower it. To protect each other, to enact and practice community. A radical kinship, an interdependent sociality, a politics of care. Because, once we are all ill and confined to the bed, **sharing our stories** of therapies and comforts, forming support groups, bearing witness to each other’s tales of trauma, prioritizing the care and love of our sick, pained, expensive, sensitive, fantastic bodies, and there is no one left to go to work, perhaps then, finally, capitalism will screech to its much-needed, long-overdue, and motherfucking glorious halt.

**1 – no perms in a methods debate – it’s the burden of the aff to prove that your method is actively more desirable, not just that two things can happen at once**

**2 – perms against disability oriented positions are a form of footnoting – you engage in ableist practices but then ask for the ballot without doing anything to solve for the harms**

## **Cap da 0:35**

#### [Eidlin] **Strikes put a band-aid on a broken leg – they do nothing to transform the employer-employee relationship.**

**Eidlim – brackets in text**: Eidlin, Barry. [Assistant professor of sociology at McGill University and the author of Labor and the Class Idea in the United States and Canada]. “Why Unions Are Good – But Not Good Enough,” *Jacobin,* January 6, 2020. EM <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2020/01/marxism-trade-unions-socialism-revolutionary-organizing>

Labor unions have long occupied a paradoxical position within Marxist theory. They are an essential expression of the working class taking shape as a collective actor and an essential vehicle for working-class action. When we speak of “the working class” or “working-class activity,” we are often analyzing the actions of workers either organized into unions or trying to organize themselves into unions. At the same time, unions are an imperfect and incomplete vehicle for the working class to achieve one of Marxist theory’s central goals: overthrowing capitalism. Unions by their very existence affirm and reinforce capitalist class society. As organizations which primarily negotiate wages, benefits, and working conditions with employers, unions only exist in relation to capitalists. This makes them almost by definition reformist institutions, designed to mitigate and manage the employment relationship, not transform it. Many unions have adapted to this conservative, managerial role. Others have played key roles in challenging capital’s power. Some have even played insurgent roles at one moment and managerial roles at others. When unions have organized workplace insurgencies, this has sometimes translated into political pressure that expanded democracy and led to large-scale policy reforms. In the few revolutionary historical moments that we can identify, worker organization, whether called unions or something else, has been essential. Thus, labor unions and movements have long been a central focus of Marxist debate. At its core, the debate centers around the role of unions in class formation, the creation of the revolutionary working-class agent. The debate focuses on four key questions. First, to what degree do unions simply reflect existing relations of production and class struggle, or actively shape those relations? Second, if unions actively shape class struggle, why and under what conditions do they enhance or inhibit it? Third, how do unions shape class identities, and how does this affect unions’ scope of action? Fourth, what is the relation between unions and politics? This question is comprised of two sub-questions: to what degree do unions help or hinder struggles in the workplace becoming broader political struggles? And how should unions relate to political parties, the more conventional vehicle for advancing political demands? The following is a chapter from [The Oxford Handbook of Karl Marx](https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190695545.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780190695545) (Oxford University Press, 2019). It assesses Marxist debates surrounding trade unions, oriented by the four questions mentioned previously. It proceeds historically, first examining how Marx and Engels conceived of the roles and limitations of trade unions, then tracing how others within Marxism have pursued these debates as class relations and politics have changed over time. While the chapter includes some history of labor unions and movements themselves, the central focus is on how Marxist theorists thought of and related to those movements. Marx and Engels wrote extensively about the unions of their time, although never systematically. The majority of their writings on unions responded to concrete labor struggles of their time. From their earliest works, they grasped unions’ necessity and limitations in creating a working-class agent capable of advancing class struggle against the bourgeoisie. This [departed](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/wusa.12021) from previous variants of socialism, often based in idealized views of rebuilding a rapidly eroding community of artisanal producers, which did not emphasize class organization or class struggle. Writing in The Condition of the Working Class in England about emerging forms of unionism, Engels observed that even though workers’ primary struggles were over material issues such as wages, they pointed to a deeper social and political conflict: What gives these Unions and the strikes arising from them their real importance is this, that they are the first attempt of the workers to abolish competition. They im ply the recognition of the fact that the supremacy of the bourgeoisie is based wholly upon the competition of the workers among themselves; i.e., upon their want of cohesion. And precisely because the Unions direct themselves against the vital nerve of the present social order, however one-sidedly, in however narrow a way, are they so dangerous to this social order. At the same time, Engels saw that, even as union struggles “[kept alive] the opposition of the workers to the … omnipotence of the bourgeoisie,” so too did they “[compel] the admission that something more is needed than Trades Unions and strikes to break the power of the ruling class.” Here Engels articulates the crux of the problem. First, unions are essential for working-class formation, creating a collective actor both opposed to the bourgeoisie and capable of challenging it for power.

#### [Andrew] **Worker’s investment and management of the industry further entrenches capitalism.**

**Andrew**: Andrew, Edward. [Canadian writer for the journal of political science] “Work and Freedom in Marcuse and Marx”, *Canadian Political Science Association and the Société québécoise de science politique,* June, 1970. EM <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/3231633.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A59b6935b3a9423fc2d414dbd343c575b>

Marcuse is not concerned with "basic" transformations in society; he is not interested in the technical innovations that would make mechanized labour less mechanical: nor does he deal with reorganization of unions nor with workers' participation in industry. Rather, after his violent denunciation of capitalism, in the rather limp conclusion to One-Dimensional Man, he advocates an extension of the welfare state, the elimination of the spurious needs created by ad- vertising, an extension of birth control programs, an increase in privacy so as not to compel the sensitive to be inflicted with the "sounds, sights and smells" of the mass, the prevention of the pollution of air and water, the creation of parks and gardens, and the better treatment of animal life.25 Many of these programs may be worthy objectives, but it is less clear that they would consti- tute basic changes in our economical system, changes which are fundamental to a socialist revolution. The reason that Marcuse does not advocate radical alteration in the economic base of society is because he perceives that capitalist modes of production are well on their way to becoming automated. Automation is "the very base of all forms of human freedom."26 While men have to work, they cannot be free. Hence there is no point in the creation of machinery designed to actualize the human potential in work as human fulfilment can only be found outside the work process. Nor is there any value in substantial alterations in the relations of production, alterations aimed at transferring the power of making technical and policy decisions (including control of training schools and institutes of education) from management to the unions. Radical alterations in the means and relations of production would only be palliatives; complete freedom, the aim of socialism, is only possible through the complete substitution of human labour by machines. Moreover Marcuse sees the workers in modern societies to be so conditioned and manipulated by the ruling class that they are not capable of revolutionary action or industrial self-management. The conservative character of modern workers militates "against the notion that the replacement of the prevailing control over the productive process by 'control from below' would mean the advent of qualitative change.""27 Marcuse opposes the aim of "autogestion" (workers' control or management of industry) which is advocated by French and Italian unionists. This strategy cannot lead to ever-increasing power of the workers and a basis for a transition to socialism. Workers' control of industrial processes and policy would lead to the creation of vested interests of labour within the capitalist system, interests which would further entrench and solidify capitalism.28

#### [Marcuse 1] **THIS MAKES CAP STRONGER – people won’t fight against it if the conditions are better.**

**Marcuse 1**:Marcuse, Herbert. [University of Berlin, University of Freiburg. Author of numerous books. Taught at Columbia, Harvard, and Brandeis universities.] “One – Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society”, *Beacon Press,* 1964. EM

Now it is precisely this new consciousness, this "space within," the space for the transcending historical practice, which is being barred by a society in which subjects as well as objects constitute instrumentalities in a whole that has its raison d'etre in the accomplishments of its overpowering productivity. Its supreme promise is an ever-more-comfortable life for an ever-growing number of people who, in a strict sense, cannot imagine a qualitatively different universe of discourse and action, for the capacity to contain and manipulate subversive imagination and effort is an integral part of the given society. Those whose life is the hell of the Affluent Society are kept in line by a brutality which revives medieval and early modern practices. For the other, less underprivileged people, society takes care of the need for liberation by satisfying the needs which make servitude palatable and perhaps even unnoticeable, and it accomplishes this fact in the process of production itself. Under its impact, the laboring classes in the advanced areas of industrial civilization are undergoing a decisive transformation, which has become the subject of a vast sociological research. I shall enumerate the main factors of this transformation:

## **Case**

#### **Case answers**

Ov –

1 – the aff doesn’t read an explicit rob or value criterion – default to our ROB as the framing mechanism – anything else makes negating impossible bc we don’t have a 2nc to read new offense under a 1ar new ROB

2 – perfcon – the aff engages in the communicative structures it criticizes – reason to drop the debater – premeditated murder – u knew it was bad and u still did it

3 – the aff engages in communicative capitalism – you communicatethis aff in exchange for a ballot – that’s another perfcon and a reason to negate

4 – presumption – the aff has been read in other rounds and hasn’t changed any structures – reason to presume neg bc the aff wont do anything

5 – all the offense from the aff has alr been garnered from reading it – no reason to vote neg bc we have already garnered the aff’s education

6 – the aff doesn’t solve – strikes don’t restructure the relationship between labor and capital bc bosses are still able to subjugate individual workers – strikes only have a chance as a group – means the power dynamic still exists bc one boss is more powerful than one worker

7 – alternative algorithms wont happen within the state – they squash any possibility of radical praxis

8 – independent voter – cruel optimism – you push workers into strikes that you say will create change, but they never do bc of inscribed power differentials – means that strikes will always be cruelly optimistic

9 – race neutrality independent voter – your aff assumes all bodies are impacted the same way and all have equal ability to strike – this ignores racial minorities who are always overpoliced when they strike – rzn to drop them bc they forward an advocacy that kills Black and Brown ppl

PLAN

1 – planflaw – plan fails bc anything that isn’t a legal recognition will always be circumvented and squashed by the state – reason to presume neg

2 – there’s no definition for “communicative strikes” – your aff is too vague to be passed bc everyone has a different interpretation of what that means

Their theory makes no sense

1. Cap existed before computers

2. computation existed before cap, they indict counting.

3. cost-benefit analysis doesn’t inherently lead to this, decisions such as not eating tidepods because of its costs are obviously good, controls the I/L to their framing, they use cost benefit analysis to reject cap/computation.

4. Mischaracterize computation, AI is fundamentally subjective does not claim objectivity/neutrality, why tons of different algorithm types and techniques.

Beller 95 double turns the aff, means the aff itself is a form of innovation in productive efficiency

Dean 5

is just assertions

Turn Beller 95 2,

they are literally selling the strike for its exchange value, turn.

Beller 95 3

Turn, push organic scholarship and movement into excahgne value proceduers i.e. debate.

#### **Beller’s analysis fails to theorize a way to actually escape from the capitalist algorithms that he finds.**

**Shaviro, 07** [Steven Shaviro is an American academic, philosopher and cultural critic whose areas of interest include film theory, time, science fiction, panpsychism, capitalism, affect and subjectivity. He earned a PhD from Yale in 1981, and teaches Film, Culture and English at the University of Washington. “The Cinematic Mode of Production”, February, 27th, 2007, Accessed December 4th, 2021, <http://www.shaviro.com/Blog/?p=561>]

Of course, I don’t think Beller’s book is without flaws. There are things I disagree with, or have difficulty with. One of these concerns forms of response, or resistance. Beller fluctuates between a sense that capital logic is so totalizing, so all-embracing, that it is nearly impossible to escape it; and a contrary insistance, which is (unfortunately) more rhetorically asserted than theoretically articulated, that celebrates the possibility of resistance and revolution. This latter, optimistic strain takes the form of a repetition of Hardt and Negri’s thesis that the creativity of the working class (or, today, of the multitude) is primary, and that all the machinations of capital, which have resulted today in the nightmare of neoliberal, post-Fordist globalization, are merely secondary and defensive recuperations (or, in Nietzschean-Deleuzian parlance, reactive). Yet little of the book’s concrete analysis supports this revolutionary optimism. Through most of the book, when Beller cites the possibility of an oppositional cinematic practice (or image practice) at all, he simply calls (rather lxxxxxx) for works that “relentlessly endeavor to decode the conditions of their own formation” (page 82, note 15) — which is just the old-style idea of self-reflexivity-as-critical-distanciation, something that was beloved of the avant-garde of the first half of the twentieth century, but that “postmodern” image practice has almost entirely co-opted and defanged. Anyone who watches contemporary music videos, for instance, knows that this strategy doesn’t work any more; the image/commodity’s explicit reflection on the the conditions of its own formation, only adds to its fetishistic allure. The book ends with citations from theory (Angela Davis) and cultural practice (Immortal Technique) as examples of alternative, resistant cultural forms. The problem is both that these come across merely as isolated instances, and that the resistance they express seems to be articulated exclusively on the plane of content, so that they do not really address (or provide counter-examples to) the issues of media form that the book as a whole so powerfully addresses. (In fairness, I haven’t seen Beller’s other book, Acquiring Eyes, which he presents as the praxis-oriented companion text to The Cinematic Mode of Production. This other book is published in the Philippines, and is not available in the US through Amazon, Barnes and Noble, or Powell’s — which tells you something about international systems of distribution). I think that the properly “dialectical” answer to this dilemma is not to assert that capital is merely “reactive” after theorizing its nearly omnipotent power; but rather to look at the ambiguities, and points of breakdown, in capital logic (which is also to say, cinematic/image logic) itself. We know today that crisis (whether economic, or aesthetic/affective) no longer provides the leverage Marx thought it would have for dislodging or overthrowing the system, because Capital itself uses its unavoidable crises in order to rejuvenate itself. But this doesn’t mean that what Deleuze and Guattari call lines of flight, or points of undecidability, are impossible. It just means that, when Capital has swallowed, internalized, and extracted surplus value from every conceivable Outside, it is from within its horizon that we can, and must, find (or manufacture) new Outsides, new points of articulation. Beller is very aware of this sort of slippery, ambiguous, yet absolutely necessary margin of slippage within capital logic itself in his wonderful discussion of Vertov; but it seems to vanish when he gets closer to the present moment.

#### **Beller’s revolutionary finance proposal turns his anti-cap theories – proves your method will never solve**

**Galloway, 2021** [Alexander R. Galloway is a writer and computer programmer working on issues in philosophy, technology, and theories of mediation. Professor of [Media, Culture, and Communication](http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/mcc/) at New York University, “the World Computer”, March 22, 2021, Accessed December 4th, 2021, <http://cultureandcommunication.org/galloway/the-world-computer>, removal of ableist metaphor with x’s]

I'm intrigued by Beller's proposal that there might be “communist algorithms" and "communist derivatives” (193). Yet the two ought to be differentiated. An algorithm is merely a step by step process, a recipe to follow. But a derivative, defined as a form of financial speculation designed to manage risk, seems inherently anti-communist in the sense that it works to eliminate socio-political uncertainty. The political is the condition in which one does not know how the future will unfold. In other words I'm not convinced by Beller's proposal for “revolutionary finance,” a proposal taken up more fully at the end of the book. Beller cites the [Economic Space Agency (ECSA)](https://economicspace.agency/) and recent attempts to develop crypto currencies. A number of theorists and computer scientists are also wrapped up in this movement, including Brian Massumi, the Deleuzian who recently published 99 Theses on the Revaluation of Value: A Postcapitalist Manifesto ([which I discussed previously](http://cultureandcommunication.org/galloway/massumis-matheme)**).** For Beller, the prospect of revolutionary finance is part of an historical development toward the decentralization of authority: "Bitcoin...[is] part of an insurrectionary history of the decentralization of authority that includes the French Revolution, decolonization, suffrage, 8 mm film, the portapak, the cheap digital camera, and the easy access to publication on the World Wide Web" (243). Beller thinks that the redesign of economic media has something to offer social struggle. Still, he is nothing like a Bitcoin "maximalist," those staking it all on a technical miracle. Bitcoin “is not the revolution--far from it” (250), as Beller unambiguously puts it. Yet I suspect there is [nothing inherently insurrectionary about decentralization](http://cultureandcommunication.org/galloway/the-reticular-fallacy)--if by "insurrectionary" Beller means politically progressive--decentralization merely marking a shift in the architectonics of power that might favor reactionary tendencies as much as progressive ones. My own contribution to this debate as been around the question of "protocol," a network design style that is both decentralized and distributed, if not also collapsing more and more into centralization with each passing day. Is there a toxic form of money and a non-toxic form of money, our job being merely to distinguish between the two? Beller's book hinges on a political discrimination, where the "good" money is elevated over the bad. Yet if Marx bequeathed anything to us, it was the notion that the money-form itself is toxic. Money is extractive abstraction in hyperbolic form. The solution is not better money built on the blockchain. The solution is the suspension of the infrastructure of extractive abstraction. Indeed blockchain is an ecological abomination if not also a socio-political one; these machines should be nuked forthwith.

#### **Strikes have no impact and hurt workers.**

**Orechwa 19**

Jennifer Orechwa, 2019, "General Motors Strike A Reminder Unions Hurt Workers," UnionProof, <https://projectionsinc.com/unionproof/how-unions-hurt-workers-the-gm-strike-continues/>

**Employees Hurt the Most by a Strike** The reality is that a strike hurts the workers the most. They don’t hurt the union. In fact, union leaders see a strike as a chance to get some nationwide publicity as an organization helping the “little guys” take on the big bad abusive employer. Strikes don’t hurt permanently hurt the company because a large company like GM has a contingency plan and is prepared to keep operating without the striking workers by taking steps like temporarily shutting down some plants and consolidating operations. It’s the workers that are hurt, encouraged by the unions and some politicians to subject themselves to loss of income and job stability. Instead of encouraged, it should read that workers are “used” by the unions and [political parties](https://www.cnbc.com/2019/09/16/2020-election-democrats-cheer-uaw-strike-against-gm-criticize-trump.html) to push their agenda. Unions thrive on making employers look bad, and politicians that believe America’s big businesses take advantage of employees use the strikes as proof. The general line is that, “If employees are willing to suffer a loss of income, benefit and job stability, the workplace policies must be abusive.”

#### **Non Unique- Strikes high right now and more are coming, no reason why aff is key**

**Romero 10-21** Dani Romero (REPORTER, yahoo finance) 10/21/21, ‘Strikes are contagious’: Wave of labor unrest signals crisis in tight job market, <https://news.yahoo.com/strikes-are-contagious-wave-of-labor-unrest-signals-crisis-in-tight-jobs-market-135052770.html>

As employers of all sizes grapple with an acute worker shortage amid what’s being called the pandemic era’s Great Resignation, it’s become increasingly clear that people with jobs aren’t all that happy, either. At an ever-lengthening list of workplaces around the country, workers this year have been getting loud about the state of wages, working hours and conditions. **From healthcare to entertainment, nearly 100,000 U.S. workers are either striking or preparing to strike in a bid to improve working conditions. New data signals that worker unrest is growing: a Cornell Labor Action Tracker shows that more than 180 strikes have been recorded this year, and over 24,000 workers have walked off the job this month.** This all plays out against a backdrop of an economy bouncing back from an economic shutdown during the pandemic. More than 10,000 John Deere workers went on strike Thursday, the first major walkout at the agricultural machinery giant in more than three decades. “**We have noticed a bit of an uptick in late September into early October,** for example, we've already documented 39 strikes on the month of October,” Johnnie Kallas, a Ph.D. student at Cornell University’s School of Industrial and Labor Relations, or ILR, who tracks labor actions across the country, said in an interview. “Those numbers are already the **largest of any month in 2021,**” he added. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, which records only large work stoppages, has documented **12 strikes involving 1,000 or more workers.** That represents a big jump from when the pandemic started over 19 months ago. “What will happen is you'll see **more workers going on strike**,” Kate Bronfenbrenner, director of labor education research and senior lecturer at Cornell school of industrial and labor relations, told Yahoo Finance. “Each time **there's a ripple effect with each one of those**, if the John Deere strike isn’t settled, you're going to see another big group go out,” she said. **“If companies don't move, you're going to see this spread from one group to another. Strikes are contagious,”** Bronfenbrenner added.

# **No highlight**

## **Zapatista 1:00**

#### **Just governments should engage in methods of autonomous self-governance modeled after the Zapatista movement – the CP solves the aff.**

**Briy 2020** (Anya Briy, Anya Briy is a PhD student in Sociology, based in NY, doing a comparative research on the Kurdish movement and indigenous movements in Mexico. She is also a steering committee member of Emergency Committee for Rojava (ECR). June 25 2020, “Zapatistas: Lessons in community self-organisation in Mexico,” OpenDemocracy.net, <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/democraciaabierta/zapatistas-lecciones-de-auto-organizaci%C3%B3n-comunitaria-en/>) //neth

In the 26 years after the initial uprising**, Zapatistas have become a leading voice of Mexico’s indigenous peoples and built a de facto autonomous system of self-governance** in noncontiguous territories of the state of Chiapas, inhabited by the movement’s supporters. A key principle underlying the Zapatista project, which ensures that autonomous institutions serve the people, is mandar obedeciendo, which means to lead by obeying. It implies that **political leaders do not make decisions on behalf of their community** as its representatives, **but rather act as the community's delegates, implementing decisions made in local assemblies**—a traditional decision-making mechanism**. These exist on a village level and**, in contrast to traditional assemblies of Mexico, **include women,** whose empowerment has been at the center of the Zapatista revolution. **Assemblies elect delegates to a municipal council**—the next level in the Zapatista administrative structure. Next, on the regional level, **several autonomous municipalities are represented through delegates** in Juntas of Buen Gobierno (JBG), or Councils of Good Government—called so in contrast to the “bad” Mexican government. JBG members serve for 3 years on a rotating basis in shifts as short as a few weeks. Such **frequent rotation is intended to prevent the emergence of clientelistic networks. Any ideas proposed at** a higher administrative level **go through the consultation process with each community**, after which delegates carry their communities’ opinion back to a municipal meeting. There is a strong emphasis on consensus decision making, although that oftentimes means sitting through day-long meetings where everyone has to be heard, and decision is not taken until a compromise is reached. Leaders are chosen based on the indigenous tradition of cargo—an obligation to serve one’s community—and commit to unremunerated posts of responsibility. Communities have the right to revoke the mandate of those officials who do not fulfill their duty of serving the people. The military-political formation EZLN, which had organized clandestinely since 1983 culminating in the 1994 uprising and land occupations, exists parallel to the three levels of autonomous administration and gives political direction to the movement. While it is hierarchically organized, its highest body is made up of civilians elected by community assemblies. Moreover, its presence in communal affairs has been limited in order to ensure a genuine democratic self-governance of Zapatista communities. Having adopted a position of refusal of any aid from the so called “bad” government**, Zapatistas took on the state's function** of service provision in communities affiliated with the movement. **That meant building their own, community-based justice, education, healthcare and production systems.**

#### **The Zapatista justice system is restorative and built on antiracist ideology**

**Briy 2020** (Anya Briy, Anya Briy is a PhD student in Sociology, based in NY, doing a comparative research on the Kurdish movement and indigenous movements in Mexico. She is also a steering committee member of Emergency Committee for Rojava (ECR). June 25 2020, “Zapatistas: Lessons in community self-organisation in Mexico,” OpenDemocracy.net, <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/democraciaabierta/zapatistas-lecciones-de-auto-organizaci%C3%B3n-comunitaria-en/>) //neth

**The Zapatista justice system has gained trust and legitimacy even beyond the movement's supporter**s. It is free of charge, conducted in indigenous languages and is known to be less corrupt or partial compared to governmental institutions of justice. But more importantly, **it adopts a restorative rather than punitive approach and places an emphasis on the need to find a compromise that satisfies all parties**. Rooted in the community, the system consists of three levels: the first level concerns issues among Zapatista supporters, such as gossip, theft, drunkenness, or domestic disputes. Such cases are resolved by elected authorities or, if necessary, by the communal assembly, based on customary practice. **When resolving conflicts, authorities largely function as mediators,** proposing solutions to the parties involved. If unresolved, cases go up to the next, municipal level where they are dealt with by an elected Honor and Justice Commission. Sentences most of the time involve community service or a fine; jail sentences normally do not exceed several days. As Melissa Forbis explains, community jail is usually just a locked room with a partially open door so that people can stop by to chat and pass food. Since the perpetrator often has to borrow money for a fine from his or her family members, the latter are also involved and their pressure helps prevent further transgression**. Women-related and domestic issues are addressed by women** on the Commission. Mariana Mora provides a telling illustration of the movement’s approach to punishment, documenting a case in which Zapatistas issued a year-long community service sentence for a robbery. Those found guilty were allowed to alternate service with work on their own cornfields so that their families did not have to share in the punishment. The Commission explained their decision as follows: "We thought that if we simply put them in jail, those who really suffer are the family members. The guilty just rest all day in jail and gain weight, but their families are the ones who have to work the cornfield and figure out how to survive." The highest level of the justice system, that of the JBG, deals with cases that primarily involve non-Zapatistas or other local political organizations—usually in disputes over land—as well as local governmental authorities. Non-Zapatistas seek out the autonomous justice system not only when they have disputes with members of Zapatista communities, but also when they experience unjust treatment by the government’s officials, in which case Zapatistas may decide to accompany the claimants to the public office and argue on their behalf. While **Zapatistas** still have **police**, it is quite distinct from how we are used to think of it. As Paulina Fernandez Christlieb documents, they **are neither armed, uniformed, nor professional. Similar to other authorities, police are elected by their community**; they are not remunerated and do not serve in this function permanently. Every community has its own police, while higher administrative levels—those of municipality and region—do not. Decentralized and deprofessionalized, police thus serve and are under control of the community that elects them.

## **Swt 2:00**

#### **[ROB & Dolmage 1] The Role of the Ballot is to Endorse the Debater who Better Challenges the Exclusion of Educational Spaces. Interrogating ableism is key to understanding education itself.**

**Dolmage 1:** Dolmage, Jay Timothy. [Associate Chair, Undergraduate Communication Outcome Initiative at University of Waterloo, Miami University] “Academic Ableism: Disability and Higher Education” *University of Michigan Press*, Chpt. 1, 2017. AZ **Brackets in original text**

Disavowing disability is in no body’s best interest. Teachers recognize the diversity of the students they teach. But **teachers must** **also recognize their roles within institutions**, disciplines, **and** perhaps even **personal pedagogical agendas, in which they may seek to avoid** and disavow **the very idea of disability**—­to give it no place. This avoidance and disavowal brings with it its own spatial metaphors—­I use the steep steps to express this negative force. That these steps are real in the lives of people with disabilities adds to the power of the metaphor. The steps have a strong connotation in the disability community, and not just for people who use wheelchairs and crutches. When I say that **the academy builds steep steps**, I hope that this verb entails many things—­most of all, I want to show that the steep steps are constructed for a reason. As I have already shown, not only did eugenics actually reshape the North American population through things like immigration restriction, not only did it reshape families through its campaigns for “better breeding,” not only did it reshape bodies through medical reinvention, but it reshaped how North Americans thought about bodies and minds. Here, for example, is a diagram of the steps that were created to distinguish between different grades of the “feeble-­minded” in the United States in the heyday of the eugenics movement before the Second World War. The definitions were used to classify a group of humans according to mental age, suggesting that development had been arrested and would proceed no further past the step at which the individual was placed. The mental age was determined based upon variations of a standard test, the Binet test, which asked literally hundreds of standard common-­knowledge questions, of increasing difficulty. The test was also designed to stop the subject once they had reached the stage or step of difficulty at which they could proceed no further. Fig. 3. “Exhibit of Work and Educational Campaign for Juvenile Mental Defectives.” American Philosophical Society, 1906. Fig. 3. “Exhibit of Work and Educational Campaign for Juvenile Mental Defectives.” American Philosophical Society, 1906. This image shows five people, each stationed on one of five very steep steps. The bottom person, slouched on the ground, is labeled an “idiot, mentally 3 yrs. old.” On the next step up, an individual is hunched over, looking downwards, labeled “low-­grade imbecile, 4 to 5 yrs. old.” Next step up, a “medium imbecile, mentally 6 to 8 yrs. old.” Then a “high grade imbecile, mentally 8 to 10 yrs. Old” is pictured on the next step up, now gazing upwards. Finally, we view a person, described in the caption as a “moron, mentally 10 to 12 years old,” attempting to climb above the final and topmost step but only getting halfway up. As the image reveals, the steps were also closely associated with forms of work, and thus classed citizens and linked their value to this labor-­output, but also placed almost all of the feebleminded below reason and judgment, not only in a space of rational vacuity, but deficit. You’ll also notice that the bodily bearing of these individuals conveys a message: the different levels of animation suggest physical and cognitive correlation. These people look tired. The disabled mind equates with the disabled body. These states correspond with affects: the slumped shoulders and downcast eyes suggest or physicalize depression. If these steps in the image on the next page represent the very bottom of the steep set we climb to the ivory tower, they nonetheless cannot be disconnected from the history of North American higher education. In fact, “morons,” “imbeciles,” and “idiots” were both rhetorically (and eugenically) constructed by the “fathers” of higher education, and those individuals who were given these labels were also studied and researched.[10] At the top of the steps were those who taught and studied at premier universities, and these people studied and experimented upon the bodies of those on the bottom steps. We may like to believe that, today, practices of eugenics have not only been rejected but that they’ve also been corrected. Yet the selectivity of this environment **must be continually interrogated** or questioned. **We must all evaluate the ways** in which **we** ourselves continue to **decide which bodies and** which **minds** will **have access to** the considerable resources, **privileges**, and advantages we have and we bestow—and as we ask this question, we must wonder whether what we have to offer is truly worthwhile if it translates into policies of exclusion, programs of incarceration, and reductive definitions of human worth. Interrogating the steep steps metaphor works to highlight not just how space and spatialization are exclusionary but also the ways that the distance between a hypothetical “us” and a “them,” perhaps the able and the disabled, has a particular structure. Yet we must look at the steps from other angles, along other axes. What are the attitudes, requirements, and practices that might represent boundaries, jumps on the graph, risers on the steps? Are there chutes, or are there ladders, set up to speed movement from top to bottom or bottom to top? What forces move up and down, affecting students’ progress? Should we even want to get to the top? How do students go back down the steps or out of the university gates and back to home communities? What makes this journey possible or impossible? What does it mean to skip the steps? Where do the steps actually start?

Links

#### **[hedva 1] The aff’s appeals to change, progress, and revolution equate the political with action – that requires the oppressed to position themselves in the public sphere and “do something.”**

- They claim ONLY a revolution that changes the way we communicate in the debate space can make our words mean something- this is linking debate the public sphere to change

- The framing of revolutionary communication as key to make revolutionary worker movement possible excludes debaters who have anxiety or certain disability and cannot get up and perform this aff in front of others

hedva 1: hedva, johanna. [johanna hedva lives with chronic illness and their sick woman theory is for those who were never meant to survive but did] “Sick Woman Theory.” *Mask* Magazine, January 26, 2016. CH

1. In late 2014, I was sick with a chronic condition that, about every 12 to 18 months, gets bad enough to render me, for about five months each time, unable to walk, drive, do my job, sometimes speak or understand language, take a bath without assistance, and leave the bed. This particular flare coincided with the Black Lives Matter protests, which I would have attended unremittingly, had I been able to. I live one block away from MacArthur Park in Los Angeles, a predominantly Latino neighborhood and one colloquially understood to be the place where many immigrants begin their American lives. The park, then, is not surprisingly one of the most active places of protest in the city. I listened to the sounds of the marches as they drifted up to my window. Attached to the bed, I rose up my sick woman fist, in solidarity. I started to think about what modes of protest are afforded to sick people – it seemed to me that many for whom Black Lives Matter is especially in service, might not be able to be present for the marches because they were imprisoned by a job, the threat of being fired from their job if they marched, or literal incarceration, and of course the threat of violence and police brutality – but also because of illness or disability, or because they were caring for someone with an illness or disability. I thought of all the other invisible bodies, with their fists up, tucked away and out of sight. If we take Hannah Arendt’s definition of the political – which is still one of the most dominant in mainstream discourse – as being any action that is performed in public, we must contend with the implications of what that excludes. **If being present in public is what is required to be political, then whole swathes of the population can be deemed a-political – simply because they are not physically able to get their bodies into the street**. In my graduate program, Arendt was a kind of god, and so I was trained to think that her definition of the political was radically liberating. Of course, I can see that it was, in its own way, in its time (the late 1950s): in one fell swoop she got rid of the need for infrastructures of law, the democratic process of voting, the reliance on individuals who’ve accumulated the power to affect policy – she got rid of the need for policy at all. All of these had been required for an action to be considered political and visible as such. No, Arendt said, just get your body into the street, and bam: political. There are two failures here, though. The first is her reliance on **a “public” – which requires a private, a binary between visible and invisible space. This meant that whatever takes place in private is not political**. So, you can beat your wife in private and it doesn’t matter, for instance. You can send private emails containing racial slurs, but since they weren’t “meant for the public,” you are somehow not racist. Arendt was worried that if everything can be considered political, then nothing will be, which is why she divided the space into one that is political and one that is not. But for the sake of this anxiety, she chose to sacrifice whole groups of people, to continue to banish them to invisibility and political irrelevance. She chose to keep them out of the public sphere. I’m not the first to take Arendt to task for this. The failure of Arendt’s political was immediately exposed in the civil rights activism and feminism of the 1960s and 70s. “The personal is political” can also be read as saying “the private is political.” Because of course, everything you do in private is political: who you have sex with, how long your showers are, if you have access to clean water for a shower at all, and so on.

#### **Further, their framing of the aff as a 6-minute revolution “radical constellation” is a performative link – the aff is only revolutionary because they got up and read it in a public sphere.**

#### **[hedva 2] They adopt a “view from nowhere” – a myth of neutrality that frames the public as an open space for anyone willing to do the work to fight. These reps are rooted in Whiteness – what about people who CAN’T join the public sphere, or those who’ve tried and failed? And assuming progress is possible and things get better is ableist af.**

hedva 2: hedva, johanna. [johanna hedva lives with chronic illness and their sick woman theory is for those who were never meant to survive but did] “Sick Woman Theory.” *Mask* Magazine, January 26, 2016. CH

There is another problem too. As Judith Butler put it in her 2015 lecture, “Vulnerability and Resistance,” Arendt failed to account for who is allowed in to the public space, of who’s in charge of the public. Or, more specifically, who’s in charge of who gets in. Butler says that there is always one thing true about a public demonstration: the police are already there, or they are coming. This resonates with frightening force when considering the context of Black Lives Matter. The inevitability of violence at a demonstration – especially a demonstration that emerged to insist upon the importance of bodies who’ve been violently un-cared for – ensures that a certain amount of people won’t, because they can’t, show up. Couple this with physical and mental illnesses and **disabilities that keep people in bed and at home, and** we must contend with the fact that **many whom these protests are for, are not able to participate in them – which means they are not able to be visible as political activists**. There was a Tumblr post that came across my dash during these weeks of protest, that said something to the effect of: “shout out to all the disabled people, sick people, people with PTSD, anxiety, etc., who can’t protest in the streets with us tonight. Your voices are heard and valued, and with us.” Heart. Reblog. So, as I lay there, unable to march, hold up a sign, shout a slogan that would be heard, or be visible in any traditional capacity as a political being, the central question of Sick Woman Theory formed: **How do you throw a brick through the window of a bank if you can’t get out of bed?** 2. I have chronic illness. For those who don’t know what chronic illness means, let me help: the word “chronic” comes from the Latin chronos, which means “of time” (think of “chronology”), and it specifically means “a lifetime.” So, a chronic illness is an illness that lasts a lifetime. In other words, it does not get better. There is no cure. And think about the weight of time: yes, that means you feel it every day. On very rare occasions, I get caught in a moment, as if something’s plucked me out of the world, where I realize that I haven’t thought about my illnesses for a few minutes, maybe a few precious hours. These blissful moments of oblivion are the closest thing to a miracle that I know. When you have chronic illness, **life is reduced to a relentless rationing of energy. It costs you to do anything:** to get out of bed, to cook for yourself, to get dressed, to answer an email. For those without chronic illness, you can spend and spend without consequence: the cost is not a problem. For those of us with limited funds, we have to ration, we have a limited supply: we often run out before lunch. I’ve come to think about chronic illness in other ways. Ann Cvetkovich writes: “What if depression, in the Americas, at least, could be traced to histories of colonialism, genocide, slavery, legal exclusion, and everyday segregation and isolation that haunt all of our lives, rather than to be biochemical imbalances?” I’d like to change the word “depression” here to be all mental illnesses. Cvetkovich continues: “Most medical literature tends to presume a white and middle-class subject for whom feeling bad is frequently a mystery because it doesn’t fit a life in which privilege and comfort make things seem fine on the surface.” In other words, wellness as it is talked about in America today, is a white and wealthy idea. Let me quote Starhawk, in the preface to the new edition of her 1982 book Dreaming the Dark: “Psychologists have constructed a myth – that somewhere there exists some state of **health which is the norm**, meaning that most people presumably are in that state, **and those who are** anxious, depressed, neurotic, **distressed**, or generally unhappy **are deviant.” I’d** here supplant the word “psychologists” with “white supremacy,” “doctors,” “your boss,” “neoliberalism,” “heteronormativity,” and “America.” There has been a slew of writing in recent years about how “female” pain is treated – or rather, not treated as seriously as men’s in emergency rooms and clinics, by doctors, specialists, insurance companies, families, husbands, friends, the culture at large. In a recent article in The Atlantic, called “How Doctors Take Women’s Pain Less Seriously,” a husband writes about the experience of his wife Rachel’s long wait in the ER before receiving the medical attention her condition warranted (which was an ovarian torsion, where an ovarian cyst grows so large it falls, twisting the fallopian tube). “Nationwide, men wait an average of 49 minutes before receiving an analgesic for acute abdominal pain. Women wait an average of 65 minutes for the same thing. Rachel waited somewhere between 90 minutes and two hours,” he writes. At the end of the ordeal, Rachel had waited nearly fifteen hours before going into the surgery she should have received upon arrival. The article concludes with her physical scars healing, but that “she’s still grappling with the psychic toll – what she calls ‘the trauma of not being seen.’” What the article does not mention is race – which leads me to believe that the writer and his wife are white. **Whiteness is what allows for such oblivious neutrality: it is the premise of blankness, the presumption of the universal**. (Studies have shown that white people will listen to other white people when talking about race, far more openly than they will to a person of color. As someone who is white-passing, let me address white people directly: look at my white face and listen up.) The trauma of not being seen. Again – who is allowed in to the public sphere? Who is allowed to be visible? I don’t mean to diminish Rachel’s horrible experience – I myself once had to wait ten hours in an ER to be diagnosed with a burst ovarian cyst – I only wish to point out the presumptions upon which her horror relies: that our vulnerability should be seen and honored, and that we should all receive care, quickly and in a way that “respects the autonomy of the patient,” as the Four Principles of Biomedical Ethics puts it. Of course, these presumptions are what we all should have. But we must ask the question of who is allowed to have them. In whom does society substantiate such beliefs? And in whom does society enforce the opposite? Compare Rachel’s experience at the hands of the medical establishment with that of Kam Brock’s. In September 2014, Brock, a 32-year-old black woman, born in Jamaica and living in New York City, was driving a BMW when she was pulled over by the police. They accused her of driving under the influence of marijuana, and though her behavior and their search of her car yielded nothing to support this, they nevertheless impounded her car. According to a lawsuit brought against the City of New York and Harlem Hospital by Brock, when Brock appeared the next day to retrieve her car she was arrested by the police for behaving in a way that she calls “emotional,” and involuntarily hospitalized in the Harlem Hospital psych ward. (As someone who has also been involuntarily hospitalized for behaving “too” emotionally, this story feels like a rip of recognition through my brain.) The doctors thought she was “delusional” and suffering from bipolar disorder, because she claimed that Obama followed her on twitter – which was true, but which the medical staff failed to confirm. She was then held for eight days, forcibly injected with sedatives, made to ingest psychiatric medication, attend group therapy, and stripped. The medical records of the hospital – obtained by her lawyers – bear this out: the “master treatment plan” for Brock’s stay reads, “Objective: Patient will verbalize the importance of education for employment and will state that Obama is not following her on Twitter.” It notes her “inability to test reality.” Upon her release, she was given a bill for $13,637.10. The question of why the hospital’s doctors thought Brock “delusional” because of her Obama-follow claim is easily answered: Because, according to this society, a young black woman can’t possibly be that important – and for her to insist that she is must mean she’s “sick.” 3. Before I can speak of the “sick woman” in all of her many guises, I must first speak as an individual, and address you from my particular location. I am antagonistic to the notion that the Western medical-insurance industrial complex understands me in my entirety, though they seem to think they do. They have attached many words to me over the years, and though some of these have provided articulation that was useful – after all, no matter how much we are working to change the world, we must still find ways of coping with the reality at hand – first I want to suggest some other ways of understanding my “illness.” Perhaps it can all be explained by the fact that my Moon’s in Cancer in the 8th House, the House of Death, or that my Mars is in the 12th House, the House of Illness, Secrets, Sorrow, and Self-Undoing. Or, that my father’s mother escaped from North Korea in her childhood and hid this fact from the family until a few years ago, when she accidentally let it slip out, and then swiftly, revealingly, denied it. Or, that my mother suffers from undiagnosed mental illness that was actively denied by her family, and was then exasperated by a 40-year-long drug addiction, sexual trauma, and hepatitis from a dirty needle, and to this day remains untreated, as she makes her way in and out of jails, squats, and homelessness. Or, that I was physically and emotionally abused as a child, raised in an environment of poverty, addiction, and violence, and have been estranged from my parents for 13 years. Perhaps it’s because I’m poor – according to the IRS, in 2014, my adjusted gross income was $5,730 (a result of not being well enough to work full-time) – which means that my health insurance is provided by the state of California (Medi-Cal), that my “primary care doctor” is a group of physician’s assistants and nurses in a clinic on the second floor of a strip mall, and that I rely on food stamps to eat. Perhaps it can be encapsulated in the word “trauma.” Perhaps I’ve just got thin skin, and have had some bad luck. It’s important that I also share the Western medical terminology that’s been attached to me – whether I like it or not, it can provide a common vocabulary: “This is the oppressor’s language,” Adrienne Rich wrote in 1971, “yet I need it to talk to you.” But let me offer another language, too. In the Native American Cree language, the possessive noun and verb of a sentence are structured differently than in English. In Cree, one does not say, “I am sick.” Instead, one says, “The sickness has come to me.” I love that and want to honor it. So, here is what has come to me: Endometriosis, which is a disease of the uterus where the uterine lining grows where it shouldn’t – in the pelvic area mostly, but also anywhere, the legs, abdomen, even the head. It causes chronic pain; gastrointestinal chaos; epic, monstrous bleeding; in some cases, cancer; and means that I have miscarried, can’t have children, and have several surgeries to look forward to. When I explained the disease to a friend who didn’t know about it, she exclaimed: “So your whole body is a uterus!” That’s one way of looking at it, yes. (Imagine what the Ancient Greek doctors – the fathers of the theory of the “wandering womb” – would say about that.) It means that every month, those rogue uterine cells that have implanted themselves throughout my body, “obey their nature and bleed,” to quote fellow endo warrior Hilary Mantel. This causes cysts, which eventually burst, leaving behind bundles of dead tissue like the debris of little bombs. Bipolar disorder, panic disorder, and depersonalization disorder have also come to me. This means that I live between this world and another one, one created by my own brain that has ceased to be contained by a discrete concept of “self.” Because of these “disorders,” I have access to incredibly vivid emotions, flights of thought, and dreamscapes, to the feeling that my mind has been obliterated into stars, to the sensation that I have become nothingness, as well as to intense ecstasies, raptures, sorrows, and nightmarish hallucinations. I have been hospitalized, voluntarily and involuntarily, because of it, and one of the medications I was prescribed once nearly killed me – it produces a rare side effect where one’s skin falls off. Another cost $800 a month – I only took it because my doctor slipped me free samples. If I want to be able to hold a job – which this world has decided I ought to be able to do – I must take an anti-psychotic medication daily that causes short-term memory loss and drooling, among other sexy side effects. These visitors have also brought their friends: nervous breakdowns, mental collapses, or whatever you want to call them, three times in my life. I’m certain they will be guests in my house again. They have motivated attempts at suicide (most of them while dissociated) more than a dozen times, the first one when I was nine years old. That first attempt didn’t work, only because after taking a mouthful of sleeping pills, I somehow woke up the next day and went to school, like nothing had happened. I told no one about it, until my first psychiatric evaluation in my mid 20s. Finally, an autoimmune disease that continues to baffle all the doctors I’ve seen, has come to me and refuses still to be named. As Carolyn Lazard has written about her experiences with autoimmune diseases: “Autoimmune disorders are difficult to diagnose. For ankylosing spondylitis, the average time between the onset of symptoms and diagnosis is eight to twelve years. I was lucky; I only had to wait one year.” Names like “MS,” “fibromyalgia,” and others that I can’t remember have fallen from the mouths of my doctors – but my insurance won’t cover the tests, nor is there a specialist in my insurance plan within one hundred miles of my home. I don’t have enough space here – will I ever? – to describe what living with an autoimmune disease is like. I can say it brings unimaginable fatigue, pain all over all the time, susceptibility to illnesses, a body that performs its “normal” functions monstrously abnormally. The worst symptom that mine brings is chronic shingles. For ten years I’ve gotten shingles in the same place on my back, so that I now have nerve damage there, which results in a ceaseless, searing pain on the skin and a dull, burning ache in the bones.

#### **[hedva 3] Reject their representations of liberation and endorse Sick Woman Theory as a survival strategy for oppressed people. This means re-centering the discussion to oppose incorporation into oppressive structures. It is NOT the burden of the oppressed to fix the world around them – instead, an ethic of care for self and others should replace the call for public protest.**

hedva 3: hedva, johanna. [johanna hedva lives with chronic illness and their sick woman theory is for those who were never meant to survive but did] “Sick Woman Theory.” *Mask* Magazine, January 26, 2016. CH

Despite taking daily medication that is supposed to “suppress” the shingles virus, I still get them – they are my canaries in the coalmine, the harbingers of at least three weeks to be spent in bed. My acupuncturist described it as a little demon steaming black smoke, frothing around, nestling into my bones. 4. With all of these visitors, I started writing Sick Woman Theory as a way to survive in a reality that I find unbearable, and as a way to bear witness to a self that does not feel like it can possibly be “mine.” The early instigation for the project of “Sick Woman Theory,” and how it inherited its name, came from a few sources. One was in response to Audrey Wollen’s “Sad Girl Theory,” which proposes a way of redefining historically feminized pathologies into modes of political protest for girls: I was mainly concerned with the question of what happens to the sad girl when, if, she grows up. Another was incited by reading Kate Zambreno’s fantastic Heroines, and feeling an itch to fuck with the concept of “heroism” at all, and so I wanted to propose a figure with traditionally anti-heroic qualities – namely illness, idleness, and inaction – as capable of being the symbol of a grand Theory. Another was from the 1973 feminist book Complaints and Disorders, which differentiates between the “sick woman” of the white upper class, and the “sickening women” of the non-white working class. **Sick Woman Theory is for those who** are faced with their vulnerability and unbearable fragility, every day, and so have to fight for their experience to be not only honored, but first made visible. For those who, in Audre Lorde’s words, **were never meant to survive**: because this world was built against their survival. It’s for my fellow spoonies. You know who you are, even if you’ve not been attached to a diagnosis: **one of the aims of Sick Woman Theory is to resist the notion that one needs to be legitimated by an institution, so that they can try to fix you. You don’t need to be fixed, my queens – it’s the world that needs the fixing.** I offer this as a call to arms and a testimony of recognition. I hope that my thoughts can provide articulation and resonance, as well as tools of survival and resilience. And for those of you who are not chronically ill or disabled, Sick Woman Theory asks you to stretch your empathy this way. To face us, to listen, to see. 5. Sick Woman Theory is an insistence that most modes of political protest are internalized, lived, embodied, suffering, and no doubt invisible. Sick Woman Theory redefines existence in a body as something that is primarily and always vulnerable, following from Judith Butler’s work on precarity and resistance. Because the premise insists that a body is defined by its vulnerability, not temporarily affected by it, the implication is that it is continuously reliant on infrastructures of support in order to endure, and so we need to re-shape the world around this fact. Sick Woman Theory maintains that the body and mind are sensitive and reactive to regimes of oppression – particularly our current regime of neoliberal, white-supremacist, imperial-capitalist, cis-hetero-patriarchy. It is that all of **our bodies and minds carry** the **historical trauma of this, that it is the world itself that is making and keeping us sick**. To take the term “woman” as the subject-position of this work is a strategic, all-encompassing embrace and dedication to the particular, rather than the universal. Though the identity of “woman” has erased and excluded many (especially women of color and trans and genderfluid people), I choose to use it because it still represents the un-cared for, the secondary, the oppressed, the non-, the un-, the less-than. The problematics of this term will always require critique, and I hope that Sick Woman Theory can help undo those in its own way.

**They add:**

6. I used to think that the most anti-capitalist gestures left had to do with love, particularly love poetry: to write a love poem and give it to the one you desired, seemed to me a radical resistance. But now I see I was wrong. **The most anti-capitalist protest is to care for another and to care for yourself. To take on the historically feminized and therefore invisible practice of nursing, nurturing, caring. To take seriously each other’s vulnerability** and fragility and precarity, **an**d to support it, **honor** it, empower it. To protect each other, to enact and practice community. A **radical kinship,** an interdependent sociality**, a politics of care. Because, once we are all ill** and confined to the bed, **sharing our stories of therapies and comforts**, forming support groups, bearing witness to each other’s tales of trauma, prioritizing the care and love of our sick, pained, expensive, sensitive, fantastic bodies, **and there is no one left to go to work, perhaps** then, finally, capitalism **will screech to its much-needed, long-overdue, and motherfucking glorious halt.**

**1 – no perms in a methods debate – it’s the burden of the aff to prove that your method is actively more desirable, not just that two things can happen at once**

**2 – perms against disability oriented positions are a form of footnoting – you engage in ableist practices but then ask for the ballot without doing anything to solve for the harms**

## **Cap da 0:35**

#### [Eidlin] **Strikes put a band-aid on a broken leg – they do nothing to transform the employer-employee relationship.**

**Eidlim – brackets in text**: Eidlin, Barry. [Assistant professor of sociology at McGill University and the author of Labor and the Class Idea in the United States and Canada]. “Why Unions Are Good – But Not Good Enough,” *Jacobin,* January 6, 2020. EM <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2020/01/marxism-trade-unions-socialism-revolutionary-organizing>

Labor unions have long occupied a paradoxical position within Marxist theory. They are an essential expression of the working class taking shape as a collective actor and an essential vehicle for working-class action. When we speak of “the working class” or “working-class activity,” we are often analyzing the actions of workers either organized into unions or trying to organize themselves into unions. At the same time, unions are an imperfect and incomplete vehicle for the working class to achieve one of Marxist theory’s central goals: overthrowing capitalism. **Unions** by their very existence affirm and **reinforce capitalist class society. As organizations which primarily negotiate wages, benefits, and working conditions with employers, unions only exist in relation to capitalists. This makes them almost by definition reformist institutions, designed to mitigate and manage the employment relationship, not transform** it. Many unions have adapted to this conservative, managerial role. Others have played key roles in challenging capital’s power. Some have even played insurgent roles at one moment and managerial roles at others. When unions have organized workplace insurgencies, this has sometimes translated into political pressure that expanded democracy and led to large-scale policy reforms. In the few revolutionary historical moments that we can identify, worker organization, whether called unions or something else, has been essential. Thus, labor unions and movements have long been a central focus of Marxist debate. At its core, the debate centers around the role of unions in class formation, the creation of the revolutionary working-class agent. The debate focuses on four key questions. First, to what degree do unions simply reflect existing relations of production and class struggle, or actively shape those relations? Second, if unions actively shape class struggle, why and under what conditions do they enhance or inhibit it? Third, how do unions shape class identities, and how does this affect unions’ scope of action? Fourth, what is the relation between unions and politics? This question is comprised of two sub-questions: to what degree do unions help or hinder struggles in the workplace becoming broader political struggles? And how should unions relate to political parties, the more conventional vehicle for advancing political demands? The following is a chapter from [The Oxford Handbook of Karl Marx](https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190695545.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780190695545) (Oxford University Press, 2019). It assesses Marxist debates surrounding trade unions, oriented by the four questions mentioned previously. It proceeds historically, first examining how Marx and Engels conceived of the roles and limitations of trade unions, then tracing how others within Marxism have pursued these debates as class relations and politics have changed over time. While the chapter includes some history of labor unions and movements themselves, the central focus is on how Marxist theorists thought of and related to those movements. Marx and Engels wrote extensively about the unions of their time, although never systematically. The majority of their writings on unions responded to concrete labor struggles of their time. From their earliest works, they grasped unions’ necessity and limitations in creating a working-class agent capable of advancing class struggle against the bourgeoisie. This [departed](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/wusa.12021) from previous variants of socialism, often based in idealized views of rebuilding a rapidly eroding community of artisanal producers, which did not emphasize class organization or class struggle. Writing in The Condition of the Working Class in England about emerging forms of unionism, Engels observed that even though workers’ primary struggles were over material issues such as wages, they pointed to a deeper social and political conflict: What gives these Unions and the strikes arising from them their real importance is this, that they are the first attempt of the workers to abolish competition. They im ply the recognition of the fact that the supremacy of the bourgeoisie is based wholly upon the competition of the workers among themselves; i.e., upon their want of cohesion. And precisely because the Unions direct themselves against the vital nerve of the present social order, however one-sidedly, in however narrow a way, are they so dangerous to this social order. At the same time, Engels saw that, even as union struggles “[kept alive] the opposition of the workers to the … omnipotence of the bourgeoisie,” so too did they “[compel] the admission that something more is needed than Trades Unions and strikes to break the power of the ruling class.” Here Engels articulates the crux of the problem. First, unions are essential for working-class formation, creating a collective actor both opposed to the bourgeoisie and capable of challenging it for power.

#### [Andrew] **Worker’s investment and management of the industry further entrenches capitalism.**

**Andrew**: Andrew, Edward. [Canadian writer for the journal of political science] “Work and Freedom in Marcuse and Marx”, *Canadian Political Science Association and the Société québécoise de science politique,* June, 1970. EM <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/3231633.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A59b6935b3a9423fc2d414dbd343c575b>

Marcuse is not concerned with "basic" transformations in society; he is not interested in the technical innovations that would make mechanized labour less mechanical: nor does he deal with reorganization of unions nor with workers' participation in industry. Rather, after his violent denunciation of capitalism, in the rather limp conclusion to One-Dimensional Man, he advocates an extension of the welfare state, the elimination of the spurious needs created by ad- vertising, an extension of birth control programs, an increase in privacy so as not to compel the sensitive to be inflicted with the "sounds, sights and smells" of the mass, the prevention of the pollution of air and water, the creation of parks and gardens, and the better treatment of animal life.25 Many of these programs may be worthy objectives, but it is less clear that they would consti- tute basic changes in our economical system, changes which are fundamental to a socialist revolution. The reason that Marcuse does not advocate radical alteration in the economic base of society is because he perceives that capitalist modes of production are well on their way to becoming automated. Automation is "the very base of all forms of human freedom."26 While men have to work, they cannot be free. Hence there is no point in the creation of machinery designed to actualize the human potential in work as human fulfilment can only be found outside the work process. Nor is there any value in substantial alterations in the relations of production, alterations aimed at transferring the power of making technical and policy decisions (including control of training schools and institutes of education) from management to the unions. Radical alterations in the means and relations of production would only be palliatives; complete freedom, the aim of socialism, is only possible through the complete substitution of human labour by machines. Moreover **Marcuse sees the workers in modern societies to be so conditioned and manipulated by the ruling class that they are not capable of revolutionary action or** industrial self-management. The conservative character of modern workers militates "against the notion that the replacement of the prevailing control over the productive process by 'control from below' would mean the advent of qualitative change.""27 Marcuse opposes the aim of "autogestion" (workers' control or management of industry) which is advocated by French and Italian unionists. This strategy cannot lead to ever-increasing power of the workers and a basis for a transition to socialism. **Workers' control of industrial processes and policy would lead to the creation of vested interests of labour within the capitalist system, interests which would further entrench and solidify capitalism.28**

#### [Marcuse 1] **THIS MAKES CAP STRONGER – people won’t fight against it if the conditions are better.**

**Marcuse 1**:Marcuse, Herbert. [University of Berlin, University of Freiburg. Author of numerous books. Taught at Columbia, Harvard, and Brandeis universities.] “One – Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society”, *Beacon Press,* 1964. EM

Now it is precisely this new consciousness, this "space within," the space for the transcending historical practice, which is being barred by a society in which subjects as well as objects constitute instrumentalities in a whole that has its raison d'etre in the accomplishments of its overpowering productivity. **Its supreme promise is an ever-more-comfortable life for an ever-growing number of people who, in a strict sense, cannot imagine a qualitatively different universe** of discourse and action, for the capacity to contain and manipulate subversive imagination and effort is an integral part of the given society. Those whose life is the hell of the Affluent Society are kept in line by a brutality which revives medieval and early modern practices. For the other, less underprivileged people, **society takes care of the need for liberation by satisfying the needs which make servitude palatable and perhaps even unnoticeable**, and it accomplishes this fact in the process of production itself. Under its impact, the laboring classes in the advanced areas of industrial civilization are undergoing a decisive transformation, which has become the subject of a vast sociological research. I shall enumerate the main factors of this transformation:

## **Case**

#### **Case answers**

Ov –

1 – the aff doesn’t read an explicit rob or value criterion – default to our ROB as the framing mechanism – anything else makes negating impossible bc we don’t have a 2nc to read new offense under a 1ar new ROB

2 – perfcon – the aff engages in the communicative structures it criticizes – reason to drop the debater – premeditated murder – u knew it was bad and u still did it

3 – the aff engages in communicative capitalism – you communicatethis aff in exchange for a ballot – that’s another perfcon and a reason to negate

4 – presumption – the aff has been read in other rounds and hasn’t changed any structures – reason to presume neg bc the aff wont do anything

5 – all the offense from the aff has alr been garnered from reading it – no reason to vote neg bc we have already garnered the aff’s education

6 – the aff doesn’t solve – strikes don’t restructure the relationship between labor and capital bc bosses are still able to subjugate individual workers – strikes only have a chance as a group – means the power dynamic still exists bc one boss is more powerful than one worker

7 – alternative algorithms wont happen within the state – they squash any possibility of radical praxis

8 – independent voter – cruel optimism – you push workers into strikes that you say will create change, but they never do bc of inscribed power differentials – means that strikes will always be cruelly optimistic

9 – race neutrality independent voter – your aff assumes all bodies are impacted the same way and all have equal ability to strike – this ignores racial minorities who are always overpoliced when they strike – rzn to drop them bc they forward an advocacy that kills Black and Brown ppl

PLAN

1 – planflaw – plan fails bc anything that isn’t a legal recognition will always be circumvented and squashed by the state – reason to presume neg

2 – there’s no definition for “communicative strikes” – your aff is too vague to be passed bc everyone has a different interpretation of what that means

Their theory makes no sense

1. Cap existed before computers

2. computation existed before cap, they indict counting.

3. cost-benefit analysis doesn’t inherently lead to this, decisions such as not eating tidepods because of its costs are obviously good, controls the I/L to their framing, they use cost benefit analysis to reject cap/computation.

4. Mischaracterize computation, AI is fundamentally subjective does not claim objectivity/neutrality, why tons of different algorithm types and techniques.

Beller 95 double turns the aff, means the aff itself is a form of innovation in productive efficiency

Dean 5

a. is just assertions

b. they have commodified the message by leaving out the important connection between sender and receiver, its not just exchange value or content of the message but the affective relationship between sender and receiver that they have excluded from their analysis because it wasn’t productive ---- that’s exactly the cap logic they claim to critique.

Turn Beller 95 2,

they are literally selling the strike for its exchange value, turn.

Beller 95 3

Turn, push organic scholarship and movement into excahgne value proceduers i.e. debate.

#### **Beller’s analysis fails to theorize a way to actually escape from the capitalist algorithms that he finds.**

**Shaviro, 07** [Steven Shaviro is an American academic, philosopher and cultural critic whose areas of interest include film theory, time, science fiction, panpsychism, capitalism, affect and subjectivity. He earned a PhD from Yale in 1981, and teaches Film, Culture and English at the University of Washington. “The Cinematic Mode of Production”, February, 27th, 2007, Accessed December 4th, 2021, <http://www.shaviro.com/Blog/?p=561>]

Of course, I don’t think Beller’s book is without flaws. There are things I disagree with, or have difficulty with. One of these concerns forms of response, or resistance. **Beller fluctuates between a sense that capital logic is so totalizing, so all-embracing, that it is nearly impossible to escape it; and a contrary insistance, which is (unfortunately) more rhetorically asserted than theoretically articulated, that celebrates the possibility of resistance and revolution**. This latter, optimistic strain takes the form of a repetition of Hardt and Negri’s thesis that the creativity of the working class (or, today, of the multitude) is primary, and that all the machinations of capital, which have resulted today in the nightmare of neoliberal, post-Fordist globalization, are merely secondary and defensive recuperations (or, in Nietzschean-Deleuzian parlance, reactive). **Yet little of the book’s concrete analysis supports this revolutionary optimism**. Through most of the book, when Beller cites the possibility of an oppositional cinematic practice (or image practice) at all, he simply calls (rather lxxxxxx) for works that “relentlessly endeavor to decode the conditions of their own formation” (page 82, note 15) — which is just the old-style idea of self-reflexivity-as-critical-distanciation, something that was beloved of the avant-garde of the first half of the twentieth century, but that “postmodern” image practice has almost entirely co-opted and defanged. Anyone who watches contemporary music videos, for instance, knows that **this strategy doesn’t work any more; the image/commodity’s explicit reflection on the the conditions of its own formation, only adds to its fetishistic allure.** The book ends with citations from theory (Angela Davis) and cultural practice (Immortal Technique) as examples of alternative, resistant cultural forms. The problem is both that these come across merely as isolated instances, and that the resistance they express seems to be articulated exclusively on the plane of content, so that they do not really address (or provide counter-examples to) the issues of media form that the book as a whole so powerfully addresses. (In fairness, I haven’t seen Beller’s other book, Acquiring Eyes, which he presents as the praxis-oriented companion text to The Cinematic Mode of Production. This other book is published in the Philippines, and is not available in the US through Amazon, Barnes and Noble, or Powell’s — which tells you something about international systems of distribution). I think that the properly “dialectical” answer to this dilemma is not to assert that capital is merely “reactive” after theorizing its nearly omnipotent power; but rather to look at the ambiguities, and points of breakdown, in capital logic (which is also to say, cinematic/image logic) itself. We know today that crisis (whether economic, or aesthetic/affective) no longer provides the leverage Marx thought it would have for dislodging or overthrowing the system, because Capital itself uses its unavoidable crises in order to rejuvenate itself. But this doesn’t mean that what Deleuze and Guattari call lines of flight, or points of undecidability, are impossible. It just means that, when Capital has swallowed, internalized, and extracted surplus value from every conceivable Outside, it is from within its horizon that we can, and must, find (or manufacture) new Outsides, new points of articulation. Beller is very aware of this sort of slippery, ambiguous, yet absolutely necessary margin of slippage within capital logic itself in his wonderful discussion of Vertov; but it seems to vanish when he gets closer to the present moment.

#### **Beller’s revolutionary finance proposal turns his anti-cap theories – proves your method will never solve**

**Galloway, 2021** [Alexander R. Galloway is a writer and computer programmer working on issues in philosophy, technology, and theories of mediation. Professor of [Media, Culture, and Communication](http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/mcc/) at New York University, “the World Computer”, March 22, 2021, Accessed December 4th, 2021, <http://cultureandcommunication.org/galloway/the-world-computer>, removal of ableist metaphor with x’s]

I'm intrigued by Beller's proposal that there might be “communist algorithms" and "communist derivatives” (193). Yet the two ought to be differentiated. An algorithm is merely a step by step process, a recipe to follow. But a derivative, defined as a form of financial speculation designed to manage risk, seems inherently anti-communist in the sense that it works to eliminate socio-political uncertainty. The political is the condition in which one does not know how the future will unfold. In other words I'm not convinced by **Beller's proposal for “revolutionary finance,”** a proposal taken up more fully at the end of the book. Beller cites the [Economic Space Agency (ECSA)](https://economicspace.agency/) and recent attempts to develop crypto currencies. A number of theorists and computer scientists are also wrapped up in this movement, including Brian Massumi, the Deleuzian who recently published 99 Theses on the Revaluation of Value: A Postcapitalist Manifesto ([which I discussed previously](http://cultureandcommunication.org/galloway/massumis-matheme)**).** For Beller, the prospect of revolutionary **finance is part of an historical development toward the decentralization of authority: "**Bitcoin...[is] part of an insurrectionary history of the decentralization of authority that includes the French Revolution, decolonization, suffrage, 8 mm film, the portapak, the cheap digital camera, and the easy access to publication on the World Wide Web" (243). Beller thinks that the redesign of economic media has something to offer social struggle. Still, he is nothing like a Bitcoin "maximalist," those staking it all on a technical miracle. Bitcoin “is not the revolution--far from it” (250), as Beller unambiguously puts it. Yet I suspect **there is** [**nothing inherently insurrectionary about decentralization**](http://cultureandcommunication.org/galloway/the-reticular-fallacy)--if by "insurrectionary" Beller means politically progressive--decentralization merely marking a shift in the architectonics of power that might favor reactionary tendencies as much as progressive ones. My own contribution to this debate as been around the question of "protocol," a network design style that is both decentralized and distributed, if not also collapsing more and more into centralization with each passing day. Is there a toxic form of money and a non-toxic form of money, our job being merely to distinguish between the two**? Beller's book hinges on a political discrimination, where the "good" money is elevated over the bad. Yet if Marx bequeathed anything to us, it was the notion that the money-form itself is toxic. Money is extractive abstraction in hyperbolic form.** The solution is not better money built on the blockchain. The solution is the suspension of the infrastructure of extractive abstraction. Indeed blockchain is an ecological abomination if not also a socio-political one; these machines should be nuked forthwith.

#### **Strikes have no impact and hurt workers.**

**Orechwa 19**

Jennifer Orechwa, 2019, "General Motors Strike A Reminder Unions Hurt Workers," UnionProof, <https://projectionsinc.com/unionproof/how-unions-hurt-workers-the-gm-strike-continues/>

**Employees Hurt the Most by a Strike** The reality is that a strike hurts the workers the most. They don’t hurt the union. In fact, union **leaders see a strike as a chance to get some nationwide publicity** as an organization helping the “little guys” take on the big bad abusive employer. **Strikes don’t hurt permanently hurt the company because a large company like GM has a contingency plan** and is prepared **to keep operating without the striking workers** by taking steps like temporarily shutting down some plants and consolidating operations. **It’s the workers that are hurt**, encouraged by the unions and some politicians to **subject themselves to loss of income and job stability**. Instead of encouraged, it should read that workers are “used” by the unions and [political parties](https://www.cnbc.com/2019/09/16/2020-election-democrats-cheer-uaw-strike-against-gm-criticize-trump.html) to push their agenda. Unions thrive on making employers look bad, and politicians that believe America’s big businesses take advantage of employees use the strikes as proof. The general line is that, “If employees are willing to suffer a loss of income, benefit and job stability, the workplace policies must be abusive.”

#### **Non Unique- Strikes high right now and more are coming, no reason why aff is key**

**Romero 10-21** Dani Romero (REPORTER, yahoo finance) 10/21/21, ‘Strikes are contagious’: Wave of labor unrest signals crisis in tight job market, <https://news.yahoo.com/strikes-are-contagious-wave-of-labor-unrest-signals-crisis-in-tight-jobs-market-135052770.html>

As employers of all sizes grapple with an acute worker shortage amid what’s being called the pandemic era’s Great Resignation, it’s become increasingly clear that people with jobs aren’t all that happy, either. At an ever-lengthening list of workplaces around the country, workers this year have been getting loud about the state of wages, working hours and conditions. **From healthcare to entertainment, nearly 100,000 U.S. workers are either striking** or preparing to strike in a bid to improve working conditions. New data signals that worker unrest is growing: a Cornell Labor Action Tracker shows that more than 180 strikes have been **recorded this year,** and over 24,000 workers have walked off the job this month. **This all plays out against a backdrop of an economy bouncing back from an economic shutdown during the pandemic. More than 10,000 John Deere workers went on strike Thursday, the first major walkout at the agricultural machinery giant in more than three decades. “**We have noticed a bit of an **uptick** in late September **into early October,** for example, we've already documented 39 strikes on the month of October,” Johnnie Kallas, a Ph.D. student at Cornell University’s School of Industrial and Labor Relations, or ILR, who tracks labor actions across the country, said in an interview. “Those numbers are already the **largest of any month in 2021,**” he added. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, which records only large work stoppages, has documented **12 strikes involving 1,000 or more workers.** That represents a big jump from when the pandemic started over 19 months ago. “What will happen is you'll see **more workers going on strike**,” Kate Bronfenbrenner, director of labor education research and senior lecturer at Cornell school of industrial and labor relations, told Yahoo Finance. “Each time **there's a ripple effect with each one of those**, if the John Deere strike isn’t settled, you're going to see another big group go out,” **she said.** “If companies don't move, you're going to see this **spread from one group to another. Strikes are contagious,”** Bronfenbrenner added.