BECOMING WAR-MACHINES: NEOLIBERALISM, CRITICAL POLITICS,

AND SINGULARITIES OF STRUGGLE

by

Michael K. Middleton

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
The University of Utah
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Communication

The University of Utah

August 2011

The University of Utah Graduate School

STATEMENT OF DISSERTATION APPROVAL

The dissertation of **Michael K. Middleton**

has been approved by the following supervisory committee members:

Leonard C. Hawes	, Chair	**5/3/11** Date Approved
Suhi Choi	, Member	**5/3/11** Date Approved
Marouf A. Hasian, Jr.	, Member	**5/3/11** Date Approved
Thomas N. Huckin	, Member	**5/3/11** Date Approved
Mary S. Strine	, Member	**5/3/11** Date Approved

and by **Ann L. Darling** , Chair of

the Department of **Communication**

and by Charles A. Wight, Dean of The Graduate School.

ABSTRACT

The consequences of half a century of intensified processes of neoliberal globalization announce themselves in growing inequalities in affluent centers of global trade and in impoverished sites populated by exploited communities and resources. Political upheavals, social marginalizations, and economic insecurities introduced by these failures in both the Global South and the Global North constitute a tenuous common ground between diverse collectivities of struggle.

This dissertation takes this potential common ground between disparate communities marginalized by neoliberalism as a terrain on which to explore possible solidarities between these 'singularities of struggle.' It asks how local struggles waged by communities in the Global North and Global South contest and evade the conditions of neoliberalism, and what forms of political identity, collective identifications, and micropolitical power are invented in these struggles.

To answer these questions, Deleuze and Guattari's "State-form" and "war-machine" are mobilized as critical tools for conceptualizing how neoliberalism universalist assumptions are manifested in singular situations. Particular attention is given to the universally-singular expressions of material poverty, differential inclusion, and subordination wrought by neoliberal globalization, and the challenges these conditions create for theorizing common topoi of oppositional discourse, including identity, collectivity, and power.

Critical rhetoric, critical discourse analysis, and cultural studies help focus analysis on local communities in order to contribute to solving these theoretical problems. Taken together, these critical approaches help map the struggles of "SafeGround Sacramento," a group of homeless activists in Sacramento, CA, and the "Zapatista Army of National Liberation" (EZLN), a group of indigenous peasants struggling against neoliberalism in Chiapas, Mexico. The critical perspective developed in this dissertation examines performative and rhetorical interventions invented in each of these communities, and places them in dialogue to identify resonances that might contribute to other efforts at anti-neoliberal collective struggle.

Based on this analysis, conclusions identify these resonances as constituents of an anti-neoliberal war-machine that mobilizes militant semiotics, radical alterity, and minor politics to contest and disrupt machinations of neoliberalism. It also considers how the critical practice pursued in this study supplements extant developments in participatory, critical rhetorical studies.

For my mother,

Betty Ann Middleton

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Countless friends, teachers, and mentors contributed to this dissertation and to my intellectual growth. I identify a few here knowing that any attempt at acknowledging these gifts of wisdom, love, and time will be incomplete.

I would like to thank all of the members of my supervisory committee, Dr. Marouf A. Hasian, Jr., Dr. Thomas N. Huckin, and Dr. Suhi Choi, each of whom have made enormous contributions to the perspectives, interests, and habits of mind that are reflected in this dissertation. I owe a special thanks to Dr. Mary S. Strine and Dr. Leonard C. Hawes for their invaluable moral support and friendship.

Numerous fellow graduate students and friends have provided me with constructive criticism. I owe my gratitude to Adele Bealer, Rosie Russo, Guy McHendry, Samantha Senda-Cook, James Hedges, Dan Lair, Julie Schutten, Joe Anderson, Roger Altizer, Annie Maxfield, and Daren Brabham. I owe an insurmountable debt and my deepest affections to two dear friends, Nicholas Russell and Brian Danielson, with whom I have shared seven years of graduate school.

I would like to thank my dad, Boyd Middleton, for his unwavering support of all my pursuits and my brother, Steve, for his consistent friendship. Most importantly, I thank my mother, Betty A. Middleton, for teaching me the value of struggle and the power of hope, two lessons that shaped my research and continue to challenge me.

CHAPTER ONE

SINGULARITIES OF STRUGGLE: NEOLIBERAL GLOBALIZATION,

RHETORICAL SOCIAL MOVEMENTS, AND

MINOR POLITICS

> "[A]n horizon has to be discovered. And for this we have to refind hope—
> against all the odds of what the new order pretends and perpetrates"
> - John Berger (2003, 214)

> "Without getting to the marginal there can be no question of…
> revolutionary change"
> - Felix Guattari (2009, 229)

The consequences of a half century of intensified processes of neoliberal globalization announce themselves in the growing inequalities experienced by communities around the globe.[1] In the Global South, intensifying integrations of local economies into the global markets hastened by the IMF, the WTO, NAFTA, and other economic agreements contribute to worsening poverty and deepening forms of political marginalization. Likewise, locales once protected by their presence in the Global North find themselves struggling to find ways to live with experiences formerly encountered only by Others. The expanding scope of exploitation and subordination wrought by neoliberal globalization's processes, however, has not been without significant protest. Immanuel Wallerstein observes expanding oppositional responses, forms of protest, and

collective action against global capitalism as signs that "the political balance is swinging back. Neoliberal globalization will be written about ten years from now as a cyclical swing in the history of the capitalist world-economy" (2008, par. 10). Indeed, in the last two decades, protests from the Chiapas to Seattle and from Cancun to Genoa declared the emptiness of neoliberal globalization's pledged "utopia" for workers, the poor, indigenous communities, immigrants, queers, the unemployed, felons, students, ethnic minorities, women, and the environment.

In these protests, collectivities contest the failures of neoliberal globalization's promised "new integration of the human enterprise, of joining diverse cultures and civilizations into one single marketplace, [and of] nudging along governments and elites" to "convert their war-machine" into an engine of economic prosperity transcending borders, markets, ethnicities, and cultures (Kothari 1997, 150; Illich 1997, 94). Political upheavals, social marginalizations, and economic insecurities introduced by these failures in local communities in both the Global South and the Global North constitute a tenuous common ground between diverse collectivities of struggle. These coalitions and singular instances of struggle offer inspiration for activists and critical scholars, *and* generate consternation for critics of non-traditional tactics. Rather than aiming to overtake institutions of power, these struggles build new coalitions and rely on forms of constituent power aimed at changing the world without taking power.

Emerging anti-neoliberal globalization struggles invent innovative forms of coalition-building and solidarity and adopt novel tactics to resist global capitalism. For instance, anti-globalization supporters identify responsiveness to changing contours of capitalism and political organization demonstrated by these efforts as a critical

component and an invaluable strategy for struggles against neoliberal globalization.[2]

These tactics identify new vulnerabilities and new forms of power available to

subordinated communities.[3]

On the other hand, critics of these emergent politics contend that novel forms of

solidarity and creative tactics of anti-neoliberal globalization resistance reflect a failed

approach to collective struggle. First, critical scholars, and some activists, contend that

the global justice movement relies on an ineffective model of collective politics and

social change.[4] These critics contend that efforts to build "non-hierarchical" forms of

collective action (e.g., as enunciated in the first World Social Forum's statement of

principles)[5] and commitments to radical pluralism undermine the discipline necessary to

effectuate long-term or institutional change.[6] Second, critics question anti-neoliberal

globalization politics (supposed) lack of a critical or political methodology to answer the

question 'what is neoliberal globalization?' at an abstract enough level to allow effective

articulations between different (local) struggles.[7] Critics argue that efforts to bring

attention to unfair agricultural, labor, and trade practices are not necessarily ill-conceived,

but they often fail to link the particularities of their efforts to broader problems of

neoliberal globalization.[8] These critical interventions are of little consequence because

multi-national corporations do with their manufacturing capital what global capitalism

allows: move elsewhere.[9] Third, some Marxist critics argue that commitments to non-

hierarchical pluralism contribute to missed opportunities. For instance, while the

worldwide economic crisis at the end of the first decade of the twenty-first century

signaled the endemic failings of a global market economy, an effectively organized

political resistance has been slow to emerge outside of disparate protests by some unions

in North America (e.g., the SEIU) and some more widespread, though equally incoherent, protests in other nations (e.g., Greece) (Zižek 2009, 17-27).[10]

This gap between the novelty and potential glimpsed in the isolated actions of anti-globalization movements and the failure to achieve long-term gains based on these tactics generate the seemingly simple, but difficult questions to answer: Are there alternatives to neoliberal globalization? And, if so, what is to be done? Pessimistically, scholars and critics interested in affirming the first question have done so by suggesting that activists abandon the tactics of contemporary anti-neoliberal globalization movements. This study is aimed at challenging this pessimism. I intend to argue that extant assessments of anti-neoliberal globalization politics fail to take seriously the "minor politics" of resistance these efforts enact (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 291-299; Smith 1997, xlii-xliv).

To develop this argument, I will interrogate rhetorical texts (i.e., letters, folktales, novels, conversations, "everyday talk" and other discourses marginalized in traditional efforts to think about "political" discourse) and practices (i.e., strategies of community-building, 'walking in the city,' and (re)claiming identity) through which the micropolitics of local communities struggling against neoliberal globalization are enunciated, argued over, and reworked. My contention is that by carefully reading these doubly-marginalized tactics---first, in the sense that they are performed by and from subordinated subject positions; second, in the sense that they are pushed by their critics to the margins of "effective" political activity---critical analysis can begin to chart new, expanded horizons of resistance to neoliberal globalization.

My study is organized into five chapters. This chapter discusses in more detail the problems posed by neoliberal globalization for many living within its flows. It identifies how efforts to address these problems intersect with debates about oppositional political collectivities and discourses in critical communication scholarship. And, it describes the sites of struggle that will inform my analysis of neoliberal globalization as a critical problematic. Chapter Two develops in richer detail the theoretical and methodological assumptions framing my analysis. I discuss neoliberalism as the logic that motivates experiences with neoliberal globalization. I also identify theoretical perspectives and methodological approaches I adopt in order to ask how local communities of resistance might disclose new, provocative, or critically-challenging forms of struggle against neoliberal globalization. Chapters Three and Four unpack these theoretical and methodological assumptions to carefully investigate acts of struggle engaged in by homeless activists in Sacramento, CA. I highlight the expanding forms of marginalization wrought by neoliberal globalization in the Global North, and develop my methodological framework to examine local acts of resistance composed of rhetorical interventions and embodied, performative oppositional practices. Chapter Five extends the scope of these assumptions and frameworks to identify how the resistance of the Zapatista Army of National Liberation challenges neoliberalism's machinic assemblage of indigenous identity, modernization, and development. In both analyses, my objective is to ground texts in the lived and historical experiences, respectively, of the communities I examine. Chapter Six considers lessons learned from these local communities of struggle against neoliberal globalization, and how they contribute to theorizing anti-neoliberal globalization politics. My overarching purpose is to challenge the assumptions of critical

communication scholars interested in oppositional discourse and politics. Challenging these assumptions exposes oppositional practices and forms of critical politics marginalized by contemporary research to critical analysis, and more effectively couples critical research with critical political praxis.

These aims are supported by three critical imperatives that guide my study and that frame the critical questions I ask about anti-neoliberal globalization politics. First, I examine local struggles to identify how these particular struggles might reshape extant ways of thinking about collective resistance, social movements, and oppositional collectivities. If an engagement with minor, marginal, or micro-politics discloses, as Guattari suggests, new forms of revolutionary struggle, then I am interested in what forms of struggle are invented in the local communities I examine. Without creating an authoritarian or reductionist model of how-to resist neoliberal globalization, how can these, and other, localized, fixed, sedentary pockets of resistance be refigured as mobile, nomadic, supple constituents of haecceities of struggle?[11]

Second, I am concerned with how logics that motivate local practices of struggle reveal resonances with other instances of resistance to global capitalism. I interrogate what actually-lived experiences of resistance can teach about the tactics, strategies, lines of flight, and axioms of judgment that guide anti-neoliberal globalization politics. This requires careful, critical interpretive readings of how such practices intervene in the conjunctures of local realities and universal discourses of global capitalism through close-textual analysis of literatures, embodied practices, and forms of biopolitical production.[12]

Third, I rely on my critical readings to imagine how disparate instances of anti-neoliberal globalization politics contribute to theorizing social movements, collective struggle, and social change. I ask how these particular struggles conceptualize neoliberal globalization in ways that resonates with pockets of resistance. Addressing this question requires a critical practice that shuttles between the abstract commitments of global capitalism (e.g., flexible, mobile, and, above all, cheap labor) *and* its material manifestations (e.g., increased unemployment in the Global North alongside abundant, but low-paying, exploitative labor in the Global South).[13] Critical analysis must account for the ways universal commitments of neoliberal globalization are experienced differently in its singular instances without, at the same time, failing to record the resonances between differing singularities of anti-neoliberal globalization struggle.[14]

The remainder of this chapter: 1) examines neoliberal globalization as a critical problematic, 2) identifies how critical interrogations of neoliberal globalization resonate with extant debates between critical communication scholars concerned with social movements and oppositional discourses, and 3) identifies the communities of struggle against neoliberalism that I examine. My purpose is to contribute to debates both about resistance to the realities of neoliberal globalization, and about oppositional politics and discourse more generally.

'What Is to Be Done?': Theorizing (Neoliberal) Globalization and Anti-Globalization

Before considering the productive insights to be gained from a close reading of marginal acts of resistance, it is important to characterize the relationship between two of the key terms guiding this study: (Neoliberal) Globalization and anti-globalization. My

aim is to unpack these two terms as useful abstractions for guiding my analysis. In later

chapters, I will focus on the connections between the particularities of individual

situations of resistance and the abstract ideologies and discourses of global capitalism and

neoliberalism.

(Neoliberal) Globalization

Neoliberal globalization is fraught with contestation both as a concept of political

and economic organization, and as a cultural discourse. The difficulty determining when

"globalization" began, what it is, its central characteristics, and its consequences is

underscored by numerous histories, theoretical investigations and other analyses offered

by neoliberal globalization's supporters and dissidents.[15] Accordingly, rather than

becoming entrapped in this debate, I rely on critical globalization theorists, including

Arjun Appadurai, Gilles Deleuze, Arturo Escobar, Gustavo Esteva, Felix Guattari,

Michael Hardt, David Harvey, Antonio Negri, and Saskia Sassen, to inform my

perspective on neoliberal globalization. I focus on the consequences of neoliberal

globalization as an evolving, complex set of economic, social, political, and symbolic

(inter)relationships. For my purposes, neoliberal globalization is more effectively

conceptualized in terms of key concerns it generates for, and the ways these concerns

manifest themselves in relation to the communities of struggle I examine.[16] This critical

shift from neoliberal globalization *as a concept* to neoliberal globalization *as variable*

relationships between universal processes and singular situations supports my interest in

examining how local conditions are articulated to universal processes, and how singular

experiences of struggle signal possibilities for forging alliances of collective opposition.

Globalization's constituent characteristics. It is necessary to take a detour

through contemporary critical globalization studies to appreciate the framing of

neoliberal globalization as a critical problematic.[17] Three characteristics of contemporary

neoliberal globalization's articulations with local communities are crucial to my critical

focus on local practices of resistance. First, contemporary neoliberal globalization is

marked by a lack of boundaries and operates in a context where "its rule has no limits"

(Hardt and Negri 2000, xiv). It pursues a totalizing, all encompassing form of power

filled with moments of domination and resistance. In other words, if traditional concepts

of globalization assume increasingly dense interconnections of *national* economies and

national political processes (e.g., the European Union), then contemporary neoliberal

globalization signals a new epoch marked by the deteriorating ability for national

boundaries to endure the quickening transnational flows of bodies, capital, and ideas.

Consequently, fewer spaces remain unaffected by the intensifying pace and scale of

global capital. As neoliberal globalization spreads horizontally, it encompasses ever more

remote communities. But, neoliberal globalization also intensifies vertically, i.e., the

reach of practices it affects deepens to include the bases for communicative action,

whether individual or collective. This critical shift from neoliberal globalization as

interconnections between nations to a set of (global) relations permeating both supra- and

sub-national social, political, and bio-political realities helps explain how neoliberal

globalization contributes to a variety of economic and social marginalizations.

Second, contemporary neoliberal globalization operates as an "order that

effectively suspends history" (Hardt and Negri 2000, xiv).[18] Naturalizing neoliberal

globalization as a regime at the end of history undermines the ability for critical practice

to conceive of globalization as "neither new, nor necessarily Western, nor a curse" (Sen 1996, 126). Foreclosing these possibilities by claiming to exist outside or at the end of history, contemporary neoliberal globalization attempts to efface moments of productive intervention against globalization's negative consequences. In light of this reality, my analysis works from a critical perspective that is concerned with reclaiming local experiences of survival and resistance to neoliberal globalization. My purpose is to concentrate on how local communities reframe conditions of neoliberal globalization they experience for different, sometimes liberatory, ends.

Third, critical globalization studies highlight that contemporary neoliberal globalization operates on "all registers of the social order," managing not only a population and territory, but also "creat[ing] the very world it inhabits…presenting the paradigmatic form of biopower" (Hardt and Negri 2000, xiv-xv).[19] Neoliberal globalization's penetration of all levels of the social order generates the potential to locate resistance in the everyday practices found in these communities, which is productive of new identities for and spaces of resistance that cannot be contained by neoliberal globalization's regulative regime.[20] This aspect of contemporary neoliberal globalization acknowledges its power to thoroughly embed itself in mundane, everyday rhetorical and performative exchanges on which I focus.

Anti-Globalization

Neoliberal globalization presents a formidable challenge. However, anti-neoliberal globalization activists and militants have taken refuge in the realization that "globalization is a process that generates contradictory spaces…characterized by contestation" and that "the global extension of capitalist power over society corresponds

to the global spread of insubordination" (Sassen 1998, 76; Negri 2008, 21). In this section, my aim is to expand on the characteristics and tensions that frame anti-neoliberal globalization politics.

In his discussion of anti-capitalism and culture, Jeremy Gilbert (2008) isolates a pivotal perspectival assumption that founds anti-globalization politics' optimism about possibilities for resistance.[21] For its proponents, what constitutes good politics is more likely to be guided by "what is feasible at a given juncture" and a willingness to pursue relative gains in collective autonomy and democracy irrespective of their consistency with an imagined, universal, "one-size-fits-all" solution (Gilbert 2008, 77). In other words, anti-globalization, much to the dismay of its critics, commits to a political project that rejects a forced choice between revolutionary and reformist agendas, instead viewing each approach as complementary, rather than mutually-exclusive. Antonio Negri summarizes: "on the one hand, we have *destructuring* struggles: civil disobedience, sabotage, wage struggles that aim at destabilizing the productive structure. …On the other, we have *constituent* struggles in favor of a democracy of the common, which develop autonomous forms of organization, collective self-management, a democratic exercise of the common, etc." (2008, 121). The difficult task, he argues, is understanding the power of the latter without subordinating it to the former. In this study, my concern is to better understand how constituent, micropolitical, disparate struggles might disclose elements of a collective struggle against Globalization, neoliberalism, and development.

Anti-Globalization's constituent characteristics. Examining constituent struggles that characterize anti-neoliberal globalization politics requires sensitivity to the commitments and practices that shape these struggles. Three elements are important for

framing my analysis: the composition of an *internally different, multiple social subject*, the utilization of *minor politics*, and an emphasis on *biopolitical production.*

First, the radical pluralism subscribed to by participants in anti-neoliberal globalization politics departs from traditional models of social change built on an imagined shared consciousness among a class of dissidents, i.e., a properly proletarian revolution. Instead, anti-globalization poses the collective subject of resistance to globalization as composed by all those expressing disaffection with global capitalism. Rather than a politics founded on organizing around a particular identity (i.e., a subjected-group), the global justice movement, when effective, pursues mutually productive identifications between identity groups (i.e., a group-subject). In other words, anti-neoliberal globalization politics privileges an *internally different, multiple social subject* that struggles in common and that "does not [require] sameness or unity" of its participants. Instead, it requires "that no difference of nature or kind" divide a potential becoming-collectivity of resistance (Hardt and Negri 2004, 105). During the 1999 WTO protest in Seattle, the temporary and unpredictable alliance of industrial workers, e.g., Teamsters, and environmentalists rehearsed the ability to forge coalitions of struggle against globalization across substantial differences. Developing theoretical insights from these moments requires critical approaches concerned with close readings of practices of resistance in which "the innumerable specific types of labor, forms of life and geographical locations" that distinguish local experiences with neoliberal globalization "do not prohibit communication, collaboration, and performances in a common political project" of emancipation (Hardt and Negri 2004, 105-106). The role of critical analysis is

to map these strategies of communication, collaboration, and performance between different nodes that are potentially constitutive of collective resistance.

Second, the anti-globalization movement participates in *minor* politics. *Minor politics* assume that politics is the "regulation of a subjective relation to the State," or a "sensible" (read as: makes 'commonsense') distribution of relations between individuals, institutions, and material realities governed by the state (Badiou 2005, 84; Ranciere 2000/2004, 13).[22] Deleuze and Guattari, however, suggest that politics might be conceptualized with more nuance along the lines of *major(ity)* and *minor(ity)* politics. *Majority*, instead of numerical advantage, refers to "a determination of a state or standard" (1987, 291). *Minority* refers to potential "becomings" that seek not to acquire the position of the *majority* (macropolitics), but instead struggle to destabilize all fixed majorities and static conditions, to de-territorialize the plane of power established by an existent *majority* into potentially liberatory lines of flight, i.e., micropolitics (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 291-299). In other words, "the 'minorization' of politics" focuses on acts of resistance insofar as they demonstrate "seeds or crystals of becoming whose value is to trigger uncontrollable movements within the mean or the majority" (Smith 1997, xlii-xliii). What this focus means for a critical engagement with anti-neoliberal globalization politics is that instead of examining a particular site of resistance for its possibility of displacing global capitalism or for providing the model of a substitute with which to replace those relations, critical analysis ought to attend to what becoming-identities or becoming-communities disclose and to ask how those becomings, if pursued as lines of flight, might disrupt the *majority*, i.e., globalization's contemporary hegemony as an ideology/discourse.

Finally, while one side of neoliberal globalization is characterized as the paradigmatic form of biopower, the conditions it produces and requires for its expansion also foster another side of neoliberal globalization: the possibility to forge new coalitions of *biopolitical production*. As Hardt and Negri explain, if under global capitalism "biopower stands above society, transcendent, as a sovereign authority and imposes its order" constructing a totalizing regime of power, then these same conditions can provide the grist for new forms of "biopolitical production" that, "in contrast, [are] immanent to society and create social relationships and [social] forms through collaborative forms of labor" (2004, 94-95).[23] Thinking resistance in terms of biopolitical production does not seek to find its transcendent empirical existence, but rather its conditions of possibility within immanent experiences resisting neoliberal globalization. For example, creating autonomous communities to sustain the needs of indigenous peasants displaced by neoliberalism in the Chiapas and creating spaces to participate in democratic public discourse in urban homeless communities, collectivities engage in immanent forms of resistance that reclaim identity and rhetorical power. Emphasizing bio-political production provides one intersection for thinking about anti-globalization politics in relation to other "new social movements." Movements that are constituted by collective, political efforts that "tend to be segmented, diffuse, and decentralized" and that are "'acted out' in individual actions, rather than through mobilized groups" (Johnston, Larana, and Gusfield 1994, 7-8).

Singularities of Struggle: A Third Way for

Rhetorical Social Movements

Inventive forms of protest enacted by the adherents to anti-neoliberal globalization politics intersect with debates between critical communication scholars about the nature of oppositional political collectivities and discourse. On one side of this debate, advocates of traditional forms of social movements argue that effective opposition to neoliberal globalization, or any regime of marginalization, requires that communities effectively leverage a "social movement" conceptualized as a large, uninsitutionalized collectivity aimed at creating change in dominant institutions and discourses. Several examples, however, demonstrate the relatively narrow quarters that confine the study of "organized, un-institutionalized, and large collectivit[ies] that emerg[e] to promote or resist change in societal norms and values" and that operate primarily through persuasion (Stewart, Smith and Denton 2007, 24). Two perspectives, the historical[24] and sociological,[25] are important insofar as they both reflect these confines and generate productive tensions for contemporary theorists. [26]

Although valuable for the attention they direct toward the definitively rhetorical elements of social movements, these perspectives excessively limit a critic's ability to evaluate movements as rhetorical processes.[27] First, they reify restrictive frames that prohibit opening criticism to communicative processes that are mobilized by makeshift, flexible, and impromptu haecceities of struggle. In other words, traditional approaches confuse the social reality of a movement with the conceptual bias of a critic by forcing evolutionary frames that indicate a social movement's beginning and restricting attention to durable, relatively well-defined collectivities of resistance (Sillars 2001, 17-32).

Because social movements often develop in recursive and at times erratic ways, linear models of explanation are more a matter of analytic convenience than reflections of the experiences of social movements had by their adherents.[28] Second, traditional approaches too strictly constrain the role of rhetoric in social movements. In both historical and sociological approaches, rhetoric operates in exclusively instrumental ways.[29] Rather, the aim should be to ask how we might refigure rhetoric from its status as a tool of social movements to a constituent of social movements themselves. Limiting critical approaches to analyses of specific types of rhetorical transactions or strategies restricts critics' ability to identify the dialectic between material contexts and rhetorical practices that forge social movements.[30] This shift fosters examinations more broadly concerned with rhetorical practices that may potentially reveal "useful linkages of event[s], participants, and environment[s]" and avoid the "assumption that there is…one acceptable view of movement to which an event may be attached" (Sillars 2001, 121).

On the other side of the debate, more recently critics have aimed to theorize an alternative approach to oppositional politics under the rubric of "new social movements." This reconceptualization marks a shift from a focus on organized, enduring, deliberate, and rational collective actions to different dimensions of collective protest and resistance, including the promulgation and maintenance of "beliefs, symbols, values, and meanings related to sentiments of belonging," collective mobilization in response to "members' [constructed] image of themselves," and increased scrutiny of the "meaning of everyday life" for oppositional struggle (Johnston, Larana, and Gusfield 1994, 7).

Acknowledging this reconfigured focus, several rhetorical social movement scholars reflect this new direction and its critical potential by focusing on both non-

traditional forms of political expression, e.g. "image events" (see Deluca 1999a; 1999b)

and largely ignored venues of political action, e.g., mundane "counterpublic

performances" (see Pezzullo 2003). Citing the importance of pursuing this path, Deluca

argues that this shift challenges "Simon's hegemonic rhetorical theory of social

movement" whose excessively rigid confines render "invisible many groups and tactics"

(Deluca 1999a, 27). By adopting a new social movements' perspective that deemphasizes

"gaining legitimacy" or "enforcing change," critical rhetorical analysis of social

movements can embrace a competing set of principles better able to account for

contemporary resistance. In particular, new social movements attend to questions of

identity, social location, and sporadic participation by dissidents that significantly depart

from traditional thinking about social movements (Schutten 2006, 336).[31]

The tension between these approaches maps onto the tensions between neoliberal

globalization and anti-globalization politics. For critical scholars committed to traditional

social movement perspectives, oppositional discourse can only be considered successful

if a large enough collectivity is mobilized to support the persuasive aims of a particular

group of dissidents. In fact, the failure to accomplish these aims is, in the parlance of

Simons, a failure to effectively manage the problems, requirements and strategies faced

by social movements. Likewise, in the same way that anti-globalization's destructuring

struggles are aimed at displacing the hegemony of neoliberal globalization as such,

traditional social movements' perspectives conceptualize effective oppositional discourse

as efforts at resistance that force changes to governmental, institutional, or other

hegemonic regimes. New social movements, on the other hand, in many ways parallel the

constituent struggles to which anti-neoliberal globalization activists commit themselves

by focusing on autonomous organization and forms of oppositional discourse and resistance acted out in individual ways: Actions that often limit the grasp of neoliberal globalization in particular instances, but fail to offer a method of collective politics that can sustain broad based changes in hegemonic relations of power.

My aim in this section is to address these tensions by offering a supplemental perspective to oppositional political collectivities, one that accounts for both the autonomous individual acts of resistance carried out in local communities privileged by new social movements, and, at the same time, one that identifies how such efforts contribute to achieving broad-based institutional change prized by traditional social movements. I aim to develop an approach for analyzing local struggles against neoliberal globalization, and to discuss how this approach contributes to theorizing the contours of collective struggle. By focusing on sites of oppositional political practice as "singularities," I ask how local communities' construct collective, resistant, meaning-making processes and how their effectiveness might be assessed (McGee 2001, 133).[32]

Singularities and Collective Struggle

By theorizing singularities of struggle, I hope to theorize a critical approach that avoids the snares of both approaches to oppositional collectivities. I challenge the disabling assumptions of traditional social movement approaches by resisting the temptation to identify *the* proper form of anti-globalization struggle. Likewise, I examine local sites of struggle with an eye toward potential resonances between homeless and indigenous activism and other acts of resistance to neoliberal globalization as a means to resist the tendency for local, grassroots resistance to be neutralized by dominant discourses and institutions. My objective is to better understand how mundane, everyday

practices of resistance facilitate the formation of oppositional collectivities, how these vernacular acts of resistance shed light on efforts to live with and resist realities of neoliberal globalization, and how these practices disclose oppositional tactics through which broad-based coalitions of struggle can be forged.

To accomplish this aim, I read each of the sites I examine as a "singularity" exploring potential paths of struggle, or lines of flight, toward resisting global capitalism. To the extent that this approach is successful, this study will demonstrate how these "molecular…,singular instances of struggle," of which indigenous struggle and homeless resistance are but two, "transform the relations between individuals and collectivities on the one hand, material nature and linguistic signs (meanings) on the other" (Guattari and Negri 1985/1990, 18). By synthesizing insights about anti-globalization, I utilize these two sites to map "new machines of struggle" in which each "singularity" of resistance "is given impetus by objectives which are not only local but which themselves expand more and more until they begin to define points of…contact nationally and internationally" (Guattari and Negri 1985/1990, 108).[33] I approach these sites of struggle asking: 1) what might be gleaned about resistance to neoliberal globalization from these singularities, 2) how critical analysis might be deployed to begin to map the implications of local acts of resistance, and 3) what this perspective on "singularities of struggle" can contribute to theoretical and critical discussions of social movements by rhetorical scholars.

Addressing singularities of struggle contributes to a vital need in critical globalization studies. In A Brief History of Neoliberalism, David Harvey underlines this importance suggesting that, "to initiate political processes that can lead us to a point where feasible alternatives, real possibilities, become identifiable" there are "two main

paths to take" (2005, 198). Along one path, criticism can "engage with the plethora of oppositional movements actually existing and seek to distil from and through their activism the essence of a broad-based oppositional programme." Along the other path, "we can resort to theoretical and practical inquiries into our existing conditions and seek to derive alternatives through critical analysis" (Harvey 2005, 198-199).

If these are indeed the two possible paths, I am following the latter, the path that Harvey contends leads to the "urgent theoretical and practical task" of identifying "organic link[s] between these different movements" of resistance (Harvey 2005, 203). By examining indigenous communities marginalized by transnational development and free trade, and homeless persons displaced by the global city, I contend, with Amster (2008, 218), that the first moment to consider is when "global forces find expression in localities, communities, or individuals." As the Zapatistas and homeless activists I study and learn from demonstrate, "sometimes the most globally significant movements are those that are most intensely grounded in local and regional concerns" because often, "'global reach depends on local rootedness'" (Amster 2008, 222). With this in mind, I resist the urge to define the *essence* of broad-based, strategic oppositional programs for which Harvey longs. I believe that *careful* and *creative* readings of resistant strategies, aided by CDA and critical rhetoric, offer the opportunity to identify oppositional practices that are constitutive of these local communities of struggle and that suggest links between communication, power, and resistance common across a broad range of experiences with neoliberal globalization.

Although I describe the methodological tools that support my critical analysis in the next chapter, my focus on singularities has crucial implications for rhetorical scholars

thinking about social movements. First, attention to singularities gives presence to mundane, contingent, local, everyday acts of resistance that are valued by new social movement scholars and considers how they contribute to localized efforts to resist forms of hegemony that marginalize communities disadvantaged by neoliberal globalization. Further, it can foreground the forms of struggle that are often marginalized by traditional social movements' research, struggles that play key roles in contesting the dominant meanings of terms like 'development,' 'progress,' 'modernity,' etc. Second, by maintaining an eye toward how these singularities operate as seeds of a minor politics with the potential to resonate with other acts of resistance, a critical analysis motivated by the concept of singularities can begin to theorize how local acts of resistance can combine, work cooperatively with, and inform broad-based acts of struggle valued by traditional social movements. Finally, a focus on singularities can begin to weave together the disparate instances of "destructuring" and "constituent" struggles against neoliberal globalization viewed by critical scholars as at odds with one another. Doing so begins to outline what a "feasible alternative" to neoliberalism and globalization imagined by Harvey might look like in practice.

<div align="center">Global Planes of Struggle, Local Pockets of Resistance:</div>

<div align="center">Indigenous Identity and Urban Homelessness</div>

In this section, I introduce the singularities of struggle I analyze as exemplars of a becoming-politics of anti-globalization. For now, I intend to introduce these sites and identify the recurring (preliminary) problematics faced by efforts to resist neoliberal globalization. I do not mean to imply that globalization affects all, or even any, of its subjects in the same way; each manifestation of neoliberal globalization produces forms

of subordination and marginalization that resonate across disparate struggles. Rather, my intention is to highlight potential points of resonance between these sites of struggle and to set them into dialogue regarding the possibilities of anti-globalization resistance. In my analysis, I will develop the specific rhetorical and material contexts faced by each oppositional collectivity as a means of localizing the abstract commitments of neoliberal globalization against which each community struggles.

The two communities I examine draw together a range of geopolitical, economic, cultural, and social conditions of neoliberal globalization. I begin by mapping the flows of neoliberal globalization in the Global North. Learning from and examining efforts of homeless activists for SafeGround in California, I explore how the economic consequences of neoliberal and transnational capital create the conditions against which nomads seek to establish political visibility, i.e., how they establish 'a place to be.' Through engaged participation in, archival research about, and textual analysis of homeless activism, I unpack how this singularity of struggle reflects "a politics of contestation embedded in specific places but transnational in character." (Sassen 1998, 76). My analysis helps demonstrate how the needs of the global city to attract transnational flows of capital significantly exacerbate the conditions of marginalization faced by homeless populations (Mitchell 2003, 9-11; see also Amster 2008). Not only does this challenge the commonsense assumption that globalization is a "problem" only for those living in developing nations; in this context, acts of homeless resistance become squarely engaged with developing counter-logics that challenge the demands of global capitalism.

Building from these insights, my aim in the second case study is to examine what might be thought of as a classic exemplar of the characteristics and consequences of global capitalism, neoliberalism, and development discourses' spread by focusing on the indigenous rebellion waged by the Zapatistas in Mexico's Chiapas region. The unfolding of neoliberal globalization in the Chiapas reflects the speed with which its promised utopia can become a dystopic nightmare for those caught within its territorializing flows. I focus on folk literatures, letters, novels, documentaries, films and other texts produced by and with the Zapatistas and their representatives to consider how these interventions operate as attempts to carve out an autonomous space in the Chiapas. Further, I ask how the circulation of these practices of resistance in folk culture, literature, and film shape the contours of anti-neoliberal globalization struggle and how they might inform other singularities of struggle.

Synthesizing these sites to draw conclusions about the potential for anti-neoliberal globalization politics is valuable for several reasons. First, coupling these two studies addresses the dearth of attention to relationships between globality and locality in communication scholarship. This is especially important given Shome and Hegde's observation that "local places can influence and enable events with rather significant global effects," and that attention to these local places help map "the shifting faultlines of economic and cultural power…and the scale and speed at which these lines are…producing…new configurations of power, and new places of dis/empowerment that cannot be equated with any other period in history" (Shome and Hegde 2002, 175).

Second, exploring the universally-singular experiences and struggles with neoliberal globalization begins to identify the possibilities for new articulations of

struggle between what might otherwise be viewed as incomparable circumstances. It recognizes that "global relations of capital today are utilizing spaces and places in ways that produce complex planes of exclusion and inclusion, empowerment and disempowerment, that cannot always be mapped by a clear cut and confident distinction between…center/periphery, metropole/colony," and/or Global North/Global South (Shome and Hegde 2002, 177). In other words, neoliberal globalization challenges the commonsense assumptions that globalization operates within a stable set of relationships between those who are dominant (read as: enjoy relative benefit from globalization) and those who are subordinated (read as: suffer from its exploitative and disempowering consequences). To begin more clearly drawing linkages between these two sites, I identify three recurring problems faced by these communities of resistance.

Material (and Rhetorical) Poverty

The first common condition of struggle encountered by the communities I examine is "material impoverishment." Zapatistas and homeless activists must develop tactics and strategies that overcome the barrier posed by possessing very little economic, social, or political capital. For example, the Chiapas represents some of the poorest conditions in all of Mexico and the Global South, while at the same time it provides an overwhelming percentage of commodities and resources traded by Mexico on the global market. One estimate suggests that the Chiapas produces enormous amounts of oil and natural gas, 35% of Mexico's coffee, 55% of its hydroelectric power, 3 million head of cattle, 2.5 million cubic meters of timber, and untold profits for global corporations ranging from Bechtel to Citibank; yet, 70% of its population lives below the poverty line, 62% of the homes have no clean drinking water, 85% no drainage, a 10% infant mortality

rate is the norm, and a malnutrition rate of between 54 and 80% is a daily reality (Vodovnik 2004, 28-29).

A similar material impoverishment frames the conditions of struggle for homeless activists in the greater Sacramento, CA area. Impoverishment here is manifested by a vast range of basic life functions and tasks to which homeless people are denied official or legal access. Legal scholar and homeless advocate Jeremy Waldron explains that, "what is emerging" in homeless communities "is a state of affairs in which a million or more citizens have no place to perform elementary human activities like urinating, washing, sleeping, cooking, eating, and standing around. …[I]t is one of the most callous and tyrannical exercises of power in modern times by a (comparatively) rich and complacent majority against a minority of their less fortunate fellow human beings" (1991, 301-302). In the community of homeless activists that I examine, this 'state of affairs, resonates with the reality that in Sacramento over 1,200 people a night sleep on the streets and three times that or more are considered "homeless" (Kalb 2009, par. 5). The material realities of impoverishment present in each of these sites provide a significant recurring problem with which to frame critical analysis of singular moments of resistance and to locate logics around which oppositional political collectivities might coalesce. [34]

Differential Inclusion

Second, members of each of the communities of struggle I examine encounter barriers to inclusion by dominant social relations. These communities are not necessarily excluded from national and global hierarchies and relations of power by virtue of their marginal economic status. Rather, they are "differentially included" in ways that limit their ability to be recognized as legitimate subjects (Hardt and Negri 2004, 134). For

Zižek (2009, 98-102), this tension between inclusion and exclusion animates the marginalizing experiences faced by both indigenous peasants and homeless nomads. However, as he notes, under global capitalism, exclusion is never complete, but instead a question of keeping "threats" to neoliberal globalization "at a proper distance." That is, global capitalism endeavors to ensure that the inclusion, or visibility, of such groups is managed in ways that support the assumptions of globalization and neoliberalism. As Zižek (2009, 101) summarizes, "the working class [indigenous peasants and the homeless] is visible in multiple ways in the capitalist world." But, "none of these modes of visibility covers up the…role of the proletariat as the 'part of no-part'" that ensures "their exclusion itself is the mode of their inclusion." "[T]heir 'proper place' in the social body is that of exclusion (from the public sphere)" and "is what has to remain invisible [(read as: excluded)] so that the visible [(read as: included)] may be visible" (Zižek 2009, 98-102).

       In the Chiapas, "differential inclusion" shapes the conditions of struggle faced by the Zapatistas. As Collier explains, "economic restructuring brought particular suffering to the inhabitants of the eastern part of Chiapas...and where cultural isolation, political exclusion, and economic depression have combined" people are left in "what is commonly called Mexico's 'last frontier' without hope and without even the most basic necessities of life" (2005, 9). Even though they are aggressively policed and regulated by national politics, the Zapatistas are not entirely outside dominant social relations. Yet, for those living in the Chiapas, the struggle to articulate their identities, interests and needs in meaningful ways reveals the differing levels of inclusion in dominant political and economic forums.

Likewise, homelessness represents an "extreme case of…economic marginalization" and is "worth exploring for what it tells us about political economic norms…and the status of democracy" (Arnold 2004, 3). Arnold contends that intersections between political identity, homelessness, and citizenship produce circumstances not unlike Collier's description of the Chiapas. She notes, "when [homeless people] can no longer inhabit public space, [can] have [their] possessions and [homes]…bulldozed, be arrested for [their] status rather than a crime…, and [can] only exercise political power with extreme difficulty, [homeless people] cannot be said to be…citizen[s]" (Arnold 2004, 1). She continues, "the lack of a home signals an asymmetrical power dynamic: homeless individuals are not merely inconvenienced by their homelessness but culturally stigmatized and politically disenfranchised. …[T]hose who have become homeless also experience exclusion from [normal participation in] the modern nation-state" (Arnold 2004, 5). Like the indigenous communities of the Chiapas rendered politically unintelligible, homeless people and activists are not so much excluded from dominant economic and political relations (the proliferation of public nuisance laws, anti-camping ordinances, and other policies addressing homelessness affirm this), as they are differentially included.

In the following analyses, I examine opposition to these shared and singular conditions of differential inclusion in dominant economic and political orders. My aim is to understand how the practices of resistance and "affirmations of biopolitical power" engaged in by these communities point toward answers to questions posed by critical globalization theorists asking how such differentially-included communities can become

political subjects, and what the characteristics of that subject might be (Hardt and Negri 2000, 135; 294). By examining the communicative practices utilized by resistant communities inventing answers to these questions, I want to contribute to efforts toward theorizing marginal oppositional collectivities.

Political and Rhetorical Agency

The final condition of struggle encountered by these communities centers on the need to develop new tactics for exercising political power and agency. The homeless activists and indigenous dissidents that I study face significant barriers to their efforts to exercise political agency. Escobar's (1995, 87-89) claim is that neoliberal globalization functions as a discursive practice limiting what can be identified as and who can identify a political problem (as well as what solutions might be considered possible). Each of the communities I examine offers a singular, but common example of this process of differential inclusion in political processes and disqualification as stakeholders in political questions.

For instance, if in traditional notions of democratic space and the public sphere, participation in political processes requires access to public spaces where rhetorical negotiations may be made, the shrinking of public space hastened by the advance of neoliberal globalization fundamentally disenfranchises and vacates traditional forms of political agency from homeless communities. Mitchell highlights how this lack of public space in which homeless individuals may appear undermines their ability to exercise political agency. As he notes, although homeless people are nearly always in public, they are "rarely counted as part of *the* public" (Mitchell 2003, 135), that is, homeless individuals are rendered invisible by the rules that allow individuals to appear in public

space. How often do we pass by a homeless person on our way to or from various destinations without acknowledging or recognizing that person? The point, Mitchell contends, is that this inability to access public space speaks to the ability to exercise political agency; "public democracy requires public visibility, and public visibility requires material public spaces" in which all persons can appear (2003, 148).

A similar dynamic emerges among indigenous communities in the Chiapas. Following the overhaul of Mexico's constitution in the early 1990s, and specifically Article 27 governing indigenous property rights, the Zapatistas encountered a similar lack of political agency. Vacated from access to the communal lands that provide the political bindings of the small communities of indigenous peasants who populate much of southeastern Chiapas, George Collier (2005) and Nicholas Higgins (2004) contend that the individuals who formed the Zapatista revolt had been so marginalized by traditional political channels, that by the time they emerged in 1992 their only path to rhetorical and political agency lay in declaring themselves outside the sovereignty of the state.

These brief examples suggest the need to construct new forms of political power and ways of constituting rhetorical agency for traversing the universally-singular manifestations of neoliberal globalization. In seeking answers to the questions introduced in this chapter, my interests lay both in the overt political tactics utilized in these struggles, and in the social relationships and communities that are constituted in and through these resistances to neoliberal globalization. My critical readings of rhetorical and material struggles against neoliberal globalization by homeless and indigenous activists map the contours of these subjectivities and ways of living with global capitalism.

Conclusion

In this chapter, my aim has been three-fold. First, I outlined the basic problematic that guides my study by offering a brief sketch of the tensions between neoliberal globalization and anti-globalization. This sketch identifies the main commitments of these two discourses and practices, and explains how those commitments are translated into the lived experience of those struggling with the consequences of neoliberal globalization. Crucially, this discussion identifies the competing forms of hegemonic power utilized by neoliberal globalization discourses and practices, and the minor politics, multiple social subjects, and forms of biopolitical production that motivate anti-globalization efforts to resist those practices.

Second, I identified how the conflicts within anti-globalization efforts map onto critical debates involving contemporary scholars of social movements. Importantly, this discussion identifies both the excessively narrow range of "effective" resistance imagined by traditional perspectives on social movements, and the sometimes insular and markedly individualistic forms of struggle privileged by new social movements. As an alternative and supplement to these approaches, I briefly outline singularity as a concept for thinking about local acts of resistance in ways that do not lose touch with the commitments to real changes in hegemonic institutions and discourses privileged by the former or the inventiveness prized by the latter.

Last, I introduced the two sites of resistance to neoliberal globalization that I will examine to both test this theoretical approach for thinking about anti-globalization politics and from which I will develop claims regarding practices of resistance to neoliberal globalization. With this in mind, in the next chapter I develop this theoretical

frame more rigorously by addressing the relationships between minor politics,

singularities, and machinic assemblages of the State-form and war-machine varieties.

After describing these theoretical tools and the use I will make of them more extensively,

I outline the methodological tools I use to locate and analyze resistance to neoliberal

globalization in rural Mexico and urban North America.

Notes

[1] For instance, since 1950 the gap between the richest (the United States) and poorest country (Ethiopia) has expanded from 35:1 to 80:1 alongside a doubling of the number of people suffering malnutrition since 1970.

[2] For example, the 1999 WTO protests in Seattle witnessed alliances between "Teamsters" and "turtles," as industrial laborers, specifically automotive industry employees, and environmentalists found common cause against global corporations whose operations simultaneously undermine the economic security of the former and the environmental stability prized by the latter. This is also reflected in actions and events like the World Social Forum; these forms of coalition building and solidarity recognize that global capitalism's more flexible, fluid, and less microscopically managed consumer forms produce untapped reservoirs of political power that reside in lives and lived experience far beyond the factory walls, and necessitate forums aimed at egalitarian dialogue irrespective of one's location in the relations of global capital (Paczynska 2008; see also, Ronfeldt, et al. 1993/2003).

[3] For instance, the power and speed with which the "mediascapes" of global capital circulate images enable environmental groups, human rights advocates, and others to deploy a bevy of tactics, including "image-events," "culture-jamming," "witnessing," silence, "flash-mobs," and other forms of political theater aimed at drawing attention to, criticizing, and, sometimes, disrupting the machinations of global capital they deplore. See, for example, Cohen-Cruz 1998; Deluca 1999a; 1999b; Harold 2004; Peters 2005; Taylor 2003. See also Hardt and Negri 2004, 64-94.

[4] See, for example, Cloud 2006. See also Zizek 2009.

[5] For example, the Forum declares, among other things, that it is a "plural, diversified, non-confessional, non-governmental" organization, "a forum open to pluralism," and that it is "opposed to all totalitarian and reductionist views of economy, development, and history" (aqi. Gilbert 2008, 92).

[6] Citing the inability to gain access to political institutions capable of creating structural economic and political change, critics of anti-neoliberal globalization point to Latin American countries where governments more closely committed to principles of social democracy have been elected (e.g., Chavez in Venezuela, Morales in Bolivia, Lula in Brazil). These changes, they argue, have done little to upset an international balance of power that prefers continued intensifications of global capitalism. For closer analysis of Morales' and others victory in the context of anti-neoliberal globalization, see Gilbert 2008, 89-94.

[7] For instance, while students and others in the United States may call for and participate in boycotts against maquiladoras along their nation's southern border, and while this action may culminate in temporary or permanent improvements to those economic relationships, these actions, critics suggest, often fail to link their efforts either to the immediate instruments of global capital that foster those conditions (e.g., NAFTA) or to the broader practices and institutions of neoliberal globalization with which they intersect (i.e., the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), WTO, IMF, World Bank, etc.). See, for example, Zizek's (2009, 53-56) critique of "cultural capitalism.

[8] For instance, while they conclude that neoliberal globalization provides a context in which these problems might be productively engaged, Hardt and Negri (2000, 362) acknowledge this critique, explaining that, "Today's celebration of the local can be regressive and even fascistic when they oppose circulation and mixture, and thus reinforce the walls of nation, ethnicity, race, people, and the like. The concept of the local, however, need not be defined by isolation and purity. In fact, if one breaks down the walls that surround the local, one can link it directly to the universal."

[9] Other examples, critics suggest, further bear out the inability for anti-neoliberal globalization efforts' local focus to respond to the resilient ways in which global capital evades or eliminates protest. For example, following attention to global labor practices brought about by a series of books focused on labor practices specifically (e.g., Naomi Klein's *No Logo*) and global mega-corporations generally (e.g., Robert Greenwald's *The High Cost of Low Prices)*, global capitalism responded, and large portions of the "resistance" was placated, by creating a new market of "responsibly," often "locally" produced goods that both quieted dissenters and restabilized profits for the same industries and corporations at the center of these controversies. Numerous critics suggest that these practices simply serve as a cover for global capitalism's "business-as-usual." See, for example, Zizek 2009, 51-65.

[10] Likewise, given the rarefied media focus and widespread public disaffection toward the 2010 BP oil spill, even more troubling is the lack of efforts by the environmental and other sectors of the anti-neoliberal globalization movement to effectively respond to a situation that encapsulates the reality of multinational corporations, international finance, and global capitalism. Yet, as corporations stationed in three countries (only one of which is based in the affected nation) circulate blame as quickly as they circulate capital, an effective grassroots response remains to be seen. See Zizek 2009, 18-19 for an analysis of a prescient prediction of the implications of the BP disaster. For a discussion of the anti-neoliberal globalization activists' failure to capitalize on this disaster, see Hayden 2010.

[11] In other words, how might these struggles be thought of not based on their failure or success at moving from one point to another, i.e., from exploitation by global capitalism to proletarian revolution, but, instead, as forms of struggle that are "perpetual, without aim or destination, without departure or arrival" aimed at "holding space, of maintaining the possibility of springing up at any moment" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 353)?

[12] As Esteva and Prakash (1998, 25) argue, these readings are indispensable because "global forces can only achieve concrete existence at some local level, it is only there…that they can be most effectively and wisely be opposed."

[13] In other words, my examination of local instances of resistance aims to understand those resistances as they emerge in the "conjuncture" of "Globalization" (read as: the discourses and ideology of neoliberalism and global capitalism) and "globalization" (read as: the lived, local experiences of those discourses by resistive collectivities). This conceptualization of neoliberal globalization extends Harvey's (2005) thinking about the pliant nature of neoliberalism to describe a similar operation among G/globalization discourses.

[14] In other words, such an analysis must proceed with Hardt and Negri's consideration of both the risk and potential of local resistance in mind, aiming for ways to eliminate barriers between local nodes of struggle. See note 13.

[15] For instance, if one understands neoliberal globalization as economic integration between nations, then the brightline marking its emergence can extend anywhere from the first forms of economic exchange and trade between early nation-states, to the establishment of a basic structure of international economic and financial relations in the post-World War II Bretton-Woods Agreement, to the emergence of international monetary and financial institutions (e.g., the IMF and World Bank), to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) that set in motion the emergence of the World Trade Organization. Similarly, if neoliberal globalization refers to increased cultural interaction and hybridization, then one is similarly tied to a long history of emigration, immigration, and forced displacement for which any of several moments could mark the "beginning" of globalization. Finally, as numerous scholars have debated, at what level of analysis consideration of neoliberal globalization should occur varies widely as well, from the transnational flows of bodies and capital described by Appadurai's (1996, 27-48) global "scapes" to the subnational reconfigurations of public space wrought by these flows (e.g., Sassen's (1998) analysis of the changing dimensions of urban space). While these are valuable debates to be had and the positions that emerge offer useful insights on neoliberal globalization as a cultural phenomenon, the more important lesson to draw from this conceptual contestation is the fluidity with which neoliberal globalization develops and responds to changing historical, social, political, and economic contexts. Neoliberal globalization's "evolutionary dynamic…has been such as to force adaptations that have varied greatly from place to place as well as over time" (Harvey 2005, 70). These adaptations make it difficult to determine with any certainty what neoliberal globalization is.

[16] Framing neoliberal globalization as a process or set of relationships, instead of in terms of what it is, opens space for thinking about the relationships of universal singularity, or the singular-common, it generates (Badiou 2001, 15-17). Neoliberal globalization operates through a set of broad universal processes indifferent to the particular situations it encounters; nevertheless, every experience with neoliberal globalization is a product of the interaction between these broad, universal processes and the particular, unique, situated, contextual, specific--in short, singular--economic, political, cultural, and social circumstances constitutive of a situation.

[17] Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2000) rely on the concept "Empire" to articulate a new frame for examining the disparate experiences of neoliberal globalization with a focus toward forging novels forms of collective struggle.

[18] As Hardt and Negri (2000, xiv) explain, it "presents its rule not as a transitory moment in the movement of history, but as a regime with no temporal boundaries and in this sense it is outside of history, or at the end of history."

[19] In this particular usage, Hardt and Negri echo Foucault's formulation of biopower as technologies of power for managing a population, or "an explosion of numerous and diverse techniques for achieving the subjugations of bodies and the control of populations" (Foucault 1998, 140).

[20] Hardt and Negri (2004) envision the Multitude as the concept for efforts to capture this productive underside of a totalizing regulation of the social world. While I utilize Hardt and Negri's thinking throughout this study, I avoid adopting the conceptual frame of "multitude" for reasons I will attend to in later chapters.

[21] For Gilbert (2008), anti-globalization poses critical questions about what capitalism means, and, as a consequence, what types of resistance are necessitated to combat capitalism as each

group defines it. On the one hand, (global) capitalism can be thought of in terms of a "particular set of socio-economic practices and the social relations they engender, reproduce, and come to depend on." In this case, "to be anti-capitalist [or anti-globalization] might simply be to be opposed to the hegemony" of (global) capitalism's practices within all areas of social life, i.e., opposition toward basing social, political, and economic relationships on a consumer model. On the other hand, (global) capitalism might be thought of as a "total social, cultural, economic, and political system to which those practices are central but which cannot be reduced to them." In this sense, "to oppose capitalism must mean to oppose an entire social system and to seek to replace it with an alternative" (Gilbert 2008, 77). In other words, anti-neoliberal globalization efforts are caught within a battle over what are viewed traditionally as "revolutionary" versus "reformist" aims. The critical error in this dispute, argues Gilbert following Robert Unger, is that it proposes that the only alternative to political resignation is the "total substitution of one 'system' by another" (Unger aqi. Gilbert 2008, 77). Anti-neoliberal globalization then is marked by a central tension over how resistance and power might best be conceptualized.

[22] As Ranciere (2000/2004) elaborates, "Politics revolves around what is seen and what can be said about it, around who has the ability to see and the talent to speak, around the properties of spaces and the possibilities of time" (13).

[23] Biopolitical production, for Hardt and Negri, emphasizes the possibility for new relationships and forms of production hastened by the immaterial, affective labor of contemporary capitalism. In other words, while Hardt and Negri draw on Foucault's development of biopower, they are interested in focusing on the productive, and unpredictable, relationships that emerge without being able to be entirely disciplined. Biopolitical production provides a concept for naming this reconfigured interest that I draw on throughout this study.

[24] In "The Rhetoric of Historical Movements," Griffin elaborates the historical approach framing early and some contemporary examinations of rhetorical movements. For Griffin, the rhetorical critic of social movements describes and analyzes the "pattern of public discussion, the configuration of discourse, and the physiognomy of persuasion, peculiar to a movement" (Griffin 2001, 6). While not necessarily a confining set of questions to pose toward a social movement, Griffin's commitment to "social movement" as a stable object of analysis with a linear development, and relatively narrow range of possible rhetorical options is revealed in his effort to explain how a scholar of social movements might "isolat[e] and analyz[e] the rhetorical movement." Developing the historical perspective on movements, he argues that all movements will be distinguished by "two broad categories:" "pro movements" and "anti movements," composed of two types of rhetors: "aggressor orators" and "defendant rhetoricians." What is more, movements in the historical perspective outlined by Griffin pursue in linear and rational fashion a three-stage evolutionary pattern from "inception" to "crisis" and, finally, "consummation" (2001, 6-7). In this view, social movements are identifiable phenomena with fixed characteristics. By examining their use of rhetoric, one can begin to assign evaluative claims to their rhetorical choices and describe the patterns that illuminate those choices.

[25] Simons' sociological perspective on social movements commits to a similar overreliance on assumptions of linearity, cause-effect relationships, and intentional action when thinking about social movements. Moving beyond the description of rhetorical patterns common to a social movement, Simons claims to provide theorists and critics with ways to predict the "requirements," rhetorical "means," and "problems" a social movement is likely to encounter (Simons 2001, 35). Focusing on an admittedly "leader-centered conception" of movements, Simons reinforces the assumptions of intentionality, hierarchical structures and linear progress

that characterize early rhetorical criticism of social movements. Revealing this he notes, "the primary rhetorical test of a leader [and, indirectly, the movement itself]…is his [sic] capacity to fulfill the requirements of his [sic] movement by resolving or reducing rhetorical problems." What is more, Simons analogizes social movements to corporate structures, e.g., members as "workers" and ideology/social change as "product," and their rhetorical practice to a cost-benefit analysis of three strategic choices: moderate, militant, and intermediate tactics (Simons 2001, 35-42). However, Simons leaves theorists with a quite narrow and unnecessarily rigid view of social movements. These approaches are illustrated in much rhetorical criticism and analysis of the Civil Rights Movement, early environmental movements, and labor movements. Despite noting struggles over leadership, internal cleavages, and rogue tactics, rhetorical scholarship has tended to focus on these movements' relatively hierarchical models of organization, efforts to recruit/sustain a stable membership, and their adversarial relationship to institutions of power. Left unexamined are how the mundane everyday practices engaged by local communities that fostered collective identities of resistance, how these networks of communication supported the creation of parallel discursive and social communities in which political identity was (re)constituted, and how these grassroots processes contributed to forging alliances of local communities engaged in more overt rhetorical and political social movement.

[26] For additional analysis on the influence of these two perspectives for shaping thinking about social movements, see Schutten 2006.

[27] As Morris and Browne explain, these approaches are both generative and limiting insofar as movements are first and foremost conceived as efforts to "claim a reality of [their] own" through the collective "management of symbolic resources" (Morris and Browne 2001, 1-2). However, as critics suggests, this focus on rhetoric as a resource of movements proved a significant challenge for accounting for less traditional forms of social protest.

[28] Instead, Sillars suggests an organic approach to identifying movements for analysis suggesting that "movements …are collective actions which are perceived by a critic. They are defined by that critic in terms of the most useful rhetorical events, conflicts, or strategies which will best explain the critic's view of the movement" (2001, 122).

[29] For instance, in Simons' view rhetoric is a tool or resource to be used by the social movement leader to solve predictable problems; following Griffin, rhetoric is the tool which helps propel the movement from one stage of development to the next.

[30] For example, Catchart's (2001) contention that confrontation is the necessary rhetorical transaction for identifying and critiquing a social movement is reflective of these excessively narrow limits (Sillars 2001, 119).

[31] Schutten identifies three characteristics that are critical to identifying the differences between new and traditional social movements. First, new social movements focus on the constitutive role of rhetoric and are concerned with claims of identity as an increasingly important property of progressive collective action (see Schutten 2006). Social movements in the past faced goals of gaining access to power-centers and marshalling rhetorical resources to influence those centers of power, contemporary collectivities often face a prior barrier to collective action as they seek to become intelligible subjects. For new social movements, creating these spaces and (re)claiming politically intelligible identities takes place in the intra-group processes outside conventional venues of politics, which shifts critical concern to micro-political forms of resistance. Second, new social movements criticism recognizes that social locations, as sites for resistance to power

require a conceptual vocabulary that accounts for the politicization of everyday life (Schutten 2006, 337; see also Buechler 2000, 156). Accordingly, critical analysis develops perspectives sensitive to the growing importance of everyday, mundane, and less overtly political forms of communication for understanding oppositional collectivities. Finally, a focus on new social movements rejects the notion that "movements," or even less formal oppositional collectivities, can form a premise of rhetorical research. New social movements are not identifiable in terms of ideological unity, well-disciplined membership, or clearly identifiable organizational structures. Rather, they become identifiable in terms of experimenting with what oppositional collectivities may become, seeking identifications, and developing tactics that forecast the possibility of an oppositional collectivity aimed at reshaping oppressive relations of power on a plane of everyday, immanent practice.

[32] In this way, my approach to the rhetoric of social movements practiced by these communities adopts the turn to thinking about constitutive and non-traditional approaches to social movements introduced by the critical turn and the focus on new social movements by rhetorical scholars. In particular, unlike the emphatically rational, realpolitik models of social movements developed by, for example Griffin (2001) and Simons (2001), my aim is to pursue a perspective on social movements emerging from the critical foment generated by efforts on the part of rhetorical scholars (e.g., Sillars 2001; McGee 2001) that aim at problematizing the assumptions about social movements' form that challenges these perspectives. For a brief summary of these distinctions, see Schutten 2006. For a more developed discussion of this shift among rhetorical scholars, the theoretical developments marking this shift, and key essays articulating its commitments and exemplar essays, see Morris and Browne's (2001) collection of essays and commentary.

[33] A focus on singularities of struggle views the cooperative, plural, anti-centralist collectivities of opposition to neoliberal globalization as a "non-place" in terms of dominant discourses, e.g., neoliberal globalization, in which the "world of life" (i.e., social relationships, networks of collaboration, forms of cooperation in survival and social struggle, and forms of communication that articulate disparate communities) may be produced and reproduced (Guattari and Negri 1985/1990, 102-130; Hardt and Negri 2004, 128).

[34] Hardt and Negri (2004, 156) underscore the importance of focusing on resistance born from these conditions of poverty noting that "the poor is destitute, excluded, repressed, exploited---and yet living! It is the common denominator of life, the foundation of the multitude."

CHAPTER TWO

MACHINES OF DOMINATION, MACHINES OF STRUGGLE:

NEOLIBERALISM, MACHINIC ASSEMBLAGES,

AND STRATEGIC CONJUNCTURES

> "The neoliberal utopia tends to embody itself
> in the reality of a kind of *infernal machine*."
> -Pierre Bourdieu (1998, para. 11)

> "It is…necessary to construct *machines of struggle…*which are open to…
> deepen[ing] the singularity of the collective situation from which they emanate."
> -Felix Guattari and Toni Negri (1985/1990, 111-117)

Both indigenous communities in southern Mexico and homeless communities in

the United States are marginalized and subordinated by practices of neoliberal

globalization that reshape the political, cultural, and social sites they inhabit. In the

Chiapas, globalization supports the termination of indigenous ways of performing

community, mobilize the specter of (State) violence levied at these communities, and

hasten the erosion of viable ways of sustaining economic stability relied on for

generations in Mexico's indigenous cultures. In urban spaces in the United States,

similar practices reinforce homeless communities shrinking access to public space (and

the public sphere) and their decreasing access to resources that lessen homelessness'

brutalizing consequences.

In my analysis, I more precisely describe how neoliberal globalization shapes the planes of struggle on which each of these communities operate. Additionally, I consider how the efforts to invent new forms of struggle in these disparate communities challenge conventional wisdom about collective struggle, and how they resist the forms of marginalization and subordination experienced in these local spaces. However, in this chapter, I want to think about how the universal logics of neoliberalism motivate singular experiences with neoliberal globalization. A critical framework that facilitates shuttling between the scales of neoliberal globalization can sharpen the contributions to be realized by placing these two communities in dialogue. Likewise, it aids in identifying how the conditions of struggle each community encounters share significant similarities. Taken together, adopting this interpretive lens emphasizes the intersecting social *and* political *and* cultural planes on which neoliberal politics exert influence.[1]

This chapter is organized into three sections that support this aim. First, I develop a working definition of neoliberalism. My aim here is to identify the origins, commitments, and implications of neoliberalism as a discourse and logic that exerts influence on and reterritorializes social, political, and cultural spaces. More specifically, I am less concerned with what neoliberalism is, and more concerned with what it does and how it is resisted. I utilize Deleuze and Guattari's theorizing of machinic assemblages to develop a set of conceptual tools oriented to this purpose. Second, I consider how thinking about neoliberalism as a machinic assemblage of bodies, discourses, and institutions aids in identifying how it operates as a regime of domination, as well as how oppositional machines can effectively challenge it. Pressing the contributions of Deleuze and Guattari's theorization of the "machinic" further, I consider their distinction between

State-form machines and war-machines. This critical distinction enables me to map the

possibility for oppositional collectivities to construct war-machines capable of inventive

forms of resistance. Third, I outline the methodological concerns raised by an effort to

examine rhetorical war-machines. I survey the methods I use to access the local,

micropolitical forms of struggle that I analyze, what approaches inform my critical

analysis of those texts, and what aims motivate my analysis of local acts of struggle.

<p align="center">The 'Infernal Machine': Neoliberalism</p>

<p align="center">and Machinic Assemblages</p>

Neoliberalism is an assemblage of political, social, and economic practices that

emerged from the economic turmoil that gripped developed and developing countries at

the end of the 1970s. Wallerstein explains that neoliberalism "took advantage of the

worldwide profit stagnation that began after a long period of unprecedented global

expansion in the post-1945 period up to the beginning of the 1970s, which had

encouraged…Keynesian and/or socialist views" of economic, social and political

relations (2008, para. 3).[2] Based on the economic, social and political theories

popularized by Friedrich von Hayek and the Mont Pelerin society as the antidote for

capitalism's ills following World War II, neoliberalism rejected these post-WWII

practices of social, political and economic organization (Wallerstein 2008, para. 2).

Beginning in 1978, newly elected governments of the United Kingdom (Thatcher) and

the United States (Reagan) displaced the post-World War II economic and social policies

that had fostered decades of unprecedented economic growth. Indeed, as Harvey argues,

"from these several epicenters, revolutionary impulses…spread and reverberated to

[re]make the world…in a totally different image" (Harvey 2005/2007, 1).

Neoliberalism: Theoretical Commitments and Critical Implications

In the time since this revolutionary shift, neoliberalism has emerged as a central problematic animating the concerns of critically-minded scholars, advocates for social justice, and the lives of communities far from the epicenters of power that enforce a neoliberal consensus. Despite its failings as an economic system (including further skewing distributions of income toward the top 10% of the world's population, weakening national economies due to risky financial speculations, and creating a decline in real income for much of the world's population), "neoliberalism has…become hegemonic as a mode of discourse" exerting "pervasive effects on ways of thought to the point where it has become incorporated into the common-sense way many of us interpret, live in, and understand the world" (Harvey 2005/2007, 3; Wallerstein 2008, para. 5).[3] This confounding reality of neoliberalism's political success on the one hand and its lackluster, if not disastrous, results as a tool for reorganizing political, social, and economic institutions and relationships on the other hand presents an intriguing problematic for critical scholars. Understanding neoliberalism as a machinic assemblage begins to illuminate this critical problematic.

However, before I develop this conceptualization of neoliberalism, it is important to account for the theoretical assumptions and practical realities of neoliberalism. Neoliberalism is, "*in the first instance*[,] *a theory* of political and economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade" (Gilbert 2008, 32). But, neoliberalism, in practice, varies widely from "one state and social formation to another."

This variation between contexts "testifies to the…complex ways in which political forces, historical traditions, and existing institutional arrangements…shaped…how the process of neoliberalization actually occurred" (Harvey 2005/2007, 3; 13). Recognizing the pliability of neoliberalism in the face of differing contexts of articulation offers several useful insights.[4] Acknowledging that neoliberalism is immanently contingent and protean shifts the critical focus from stable, universal definitions of neoliberalism to a consideration of the effects it produces in singular situations. As Harvey argues, what defines the "neoliberal state" is not a set of identical institutions and discourses (although those are sometimes present). Rather, it is a variable configuration of bodies, discourses, (social) capital, and institutions *organized* to "reflect [and support] the interests of private property owners, businesses, multinational corporations, and financial capital" (Harvey 2005/2007, 7).

    Theoretical commitments. Four commitments guide neoliberalism and the practices it informs and enforces, e.g., globalization, development, modernization, etc. First, neoliberalism holds "that the individual in competition with other individuals for resources is the irreducible unit of human experience" (Gilbert 2008, 32). Describing this commitment as one of the "sacred cows" of modernity, Esteva and Prakash (1998, 11) argue that neoliberalism's enforcement of the "myth of the individual self" is critical for individuals to be "incorporated into the 'global economy,' a member with full rights and privileges of the club, joining the society and culture of *Homo oeconomicus*." For example, communities in the Chiapas once organized around communal ways of life and collective economies are reterritorialized by trade agreements and internal reforms that

efface, and sometimes criminalize, efforts at collective politics and group identifications by Mexico's indigenous populations.

Second, neoliberalism posits, "that the first purpose of politics is to protect the autonomy of the private individual" (Gilbert 2008, 32). In this regime of politics, individuals are both freed from collective obligations and, as a consequence, "held responsible and accountable for his or her own actions and well-being…[in the] realms of welfare, education, health care, and even pensions" (Harvey 2005/2007, 65). However, this is not without sometimes disastrous consequences. As Esteva and Prakash argue, neoliberalism seems "[in]capable of even conceiving 'the good life' other than that being defined or sought by the individual self" and creates "more and more suffering with the unbearable straitjacket of loneliness, [and] the dis-ease of homelessness" (1998, 11).[5] In Sacramento, urban homeless populations encounter this reality as they face increasing levels of displacement and stricter modes of regulation that localize the causes of homelessness onto failings of individual homeless persons.

The third commitment of neoliberalism holds "that the right to accumulate, possess and dispose of property at will is the most fundamental right" of neoliberal individuals (Gilbert 2008, 32). However, this commitment's consequences reach far beyond the parameters of economic exchange and the mobility of capital. Harvey emphasizes that this principle is critical to understanding how neoliberalism reshapes the types of relations that can exist between individual political subjects. Neoliberalism "values market exchange as 'an ethic in itself, capable of acting as a guide to all human action, and substituting for all previously held ethical beliefs'. …It seeks to bring all human action into the domain of the market" (Harvey 2005/2007, 3). For instance, in

urban space the ability to access the public sphere is limited for homeless persons by a proliferation of fee-based parks, commercial space, and other "pleasure spaces" that I describe in my analysis of homeless activism in Chapters Three and Four.

Finally, neoliberalism's fourth commitment posits that "the role of the [neoliberal] state is…to ensure that nothing interferes with the capacity of private individuals to accumulate and enjoy property" (Gilbert 2008, 32). As a consequence, neoliberal states tend "to favour government by experts and elites" and "prefer to insulate key institutions…from democratic pressures. Solutions and remedies to any problems have to be sought by individuals through the legal system" where the competitive logic that drives neoliberalism is privileged over the collaborative, collective, and cooperative decision-making possible in democratic, non-judicial forums (Harvey 2005/2007, 66). This limits the potential for collective relationships and introduces curtailments of collective agency through a 'profound suspicion' of democracy that Bourdieu argues intersect to create a "a programme [for] the methodical destruction of collectives" (1998, para. 4).

Critical implications. Neoliberalism's theoretical commitments generate several important implications for critical scholars. First, neoliberalism embraces individual freedom and the private individual in competition with other individuals. As Harvey argues, "competition…is held to be a primary virtue" at all social planes of abstraction such that contexts driven by its influence often resort to "coercive…tactics…to disperse or repress collective forms of opposition" (Harvey 2005/2007, 65, 77). For example, increasing rates of incarceration that paralleled growing rates of unemployment during the second half of the twentieth century are reflective of the coercive ways neoliberal

states create checks against collective opposition born of increasing levels of poverty. For neoliberalism, collective action demonstrates an imperfection in the system of competition valorized by its commitment to the individual.

 Accordingly, consideration of collective responsibilities or systemically inequitable relations of economic, political, or social power fall on deaf ears within a neoliberal logic. The most efficient, wisest, and most strategic individuals, corporations, and states will excel and others will fail, but only due to their own limitations and not because of systemic conditions of racism, sexism, classism, ableism, and other forms of subordination integrated into social structures, including the competitive market. Individuals or collectives who interrupt or challenge this assumption of neoliberalism are subjected to forms of differential inclusion. As Giroux (2006, 175-181) argues, societies are "now organized around the best way to remove or make invisible those individuals and groups who are either seen as a drain or stand in the way of market freedoms, free trade, [and] consumerism."[6] As a consequence, neoliberalism strictly regulates what types of social subjects may or may not appear.

Second, neoliberalism models social relationships that limit possibilities for forming oppositional political collectivities at local, national, or supra-national planes of abstraction. As Bourdieu explains, neoliberalism marketizes social relationships

> through the transformative and…destructive action of all of the political measures…that aim to call into question any and all collective structures that could serve as an obstacle to the logic of the pure market: the nation, whose space to manoeuvre continually decreases; work groups, for example through the individualisation of salaries and of careers as a function of individual competences, with the consequent atomisation of workers; collectives for the defence of the rights of workers, unions, associations, cooperatives; even the family, which loses part of its control over consumption through the constitution of markets by age groups. (1998, para. 6)

Said differently, neoliberalism evacuates the potential sources of political power relied on by individuals and collectives. For example, neoliberalism erodes the ability for nation-states, national sovereignty, and a collective national identity to exert power against the problematic of neoliberal globalization and development.[7] Similarly, workers, through anti-picketing ordinances; homeless individuals, through anti-camping ordinances; and indigenous communities in Mexico, through the repeal of access to communally-held land and agriculture, reveal how neoliberalism's market logics create barriers to collective opposition. Thus, as Harvey, Gilbert, Hardt and Negri, and others observe, neoliberalism lays the groundwork for undermining the possibility of collective action based in traditional reservoirs of political power for the "larger and larger segments of the population exposed to impoverishment" under neoliberal hegemony (Bourdieu 1998, para. 3).[8]

Third, neoliberalism eschews the commitments to democracy that characterized the liberal tradition on which it relies. Harvey argues that "behind the shifts in social policy" described above "lie important structural changes in the nature of governance." As he explains, "the neoliberal suspicion of democracy…has entailed…increasing reliance on public-private partnerships" where "businesses and corporations not only collaborate intimately with state actors but even…writ[e] legislation, determin[e] public policies, and se[t] regulatory frameworks" (Harvey 2005/2007, 76).[9] In other words, neoliberalism limits the ability of oppositional voices to access democratic forums.

In both the Chiapas and in the urban United States, marginalization and subordination are inextricably tied to the strong impulse toward privatizing social spaces and capital. For instance, in the Chiapas, the demands of neoliberalism, explicitly made

in the provisions of NAFTA and by U.S.-based banks with interests in Mexico, led to the

disestablishment of decades old rights to communal land ownership. The elimination of

rights guaranteed to Mexico's indigenous populations in the nation's constitution is

symptomatic of neoliberalism's erosion of democratic self-determination more broadly.

Likewise, homeless communities in the urban United States encounter a similar dilemma

where anti-camping ordinances, fee-based public parks, and development-minded local

governments exclude homeless persons from accessing the public sphere, i.e., civic parks,

city council meetings, public bathrooms, etc. Giroux summarizes these dire consequences

of neoliberalism noting that "underneath neoliberalism's corporate ethic and market-

based fundamentalism, the idea of democracy is disappearing. Democratic values,

identities, and social relations…are slowly being overtaken by a market based notion of

freedom…in which it becomes more difficult to translate private woes into social issues

and collective action or to insist on a language of the public good" (Giroux 2006, 186).

Observing these consequences, Bourdieu argued that "the neoliberal utopia tends

to embody itself as a kind of *infernal machine*" and that political struggle would require

"working to invent and construct a new social order…oriented toward the rational pursuit

of ends collectively arrived at and collectively ratified" (1998, para. 10). My aim in the

next section is to revisit Bourdieu's evocative description of neoliberalism as an 'infernal

machine.' The critical framework of machinic production developed by Gilles Deleuze

and Felix Guattari extends Bourdieu's critical interrogation of neoliberalism by providing

a means to more carefully identify the operations of power, control, and domination that

fuel neoliberalism's 'infernal machine.' Further, this perspective helps theorize how

forms of collective struggle against neoliberalism can be constructed, and what the characteristics of those oppositional political collectivities are.

Neoliberal Machines: Machinic Assemblages and the Three Syntheses

In *A Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze and Guattari explain,

> we will never ask what a [machine] means, as signified or signifier; we will not look for anything to understand in it. We will ask what it functions with, in connection with what other things it does or does not transmit intensities, [and] with what other multiplicities are its own inserted. (Deleuze and Guattari 1980/1987, 4)

By describing machines not in terms of meanings or as a metaphor, but as a way of describing the productive relations between (machinic) assemblages of bodies, discourses, and institutions, Deleuze and Guattari provide a useful tool to critique neoliberalism, especially insofar as neoliberalism operates as a "logical *machine* that presents itself as a chain of constraints regulating the relations between economic agents" (Bourdieu 1998, para. 6). For Deleuze and Guattari, these constraints are interruptions, or breaks, in local communities' singular flows of desiring-production. (Desiring-production describes the non-coded flows of desire, those productive desires that do not enter into neoliberalism's machine, but rather that pursue lines of flight. If desiring-production describes a immanent, shifting productive process , i.e, productive of discourses, identities, meanings, etc., then neoliberalism aims to channel productive processes into a schema that supports its theoretical commitments outlined above, i.e., no collective identities, etc.). Interrupting these local communities desiring-production "has nothing to do with ideology. There is no ideology and never has been" (Deleuze and Guattari 1980/1987, 4). Instead, neoliberalism's machinic assemblage "draws its social power

from the political and economic power of those whose interests it expresses" (Bourdieu 1998, para. 6). "The only question is which other machine the [neoliberal] machine can be plugged into, must be plugged into in order to work" and how those couplings are constructed and deconstructed (Deleuze and Guattari 1980/1987, 4).

Bourdieu's description of neoliberalism as an 'infernal machine' points toward the provocative insights that can be gained from interpreting neoliberalism as a machinic assemblage.[10] Importantly, a machinic perspective provides a means through which to apprehend neoliberalism as something other than an ideology with which particular subjects in particular social contexts must contend. Instead, a machinic perspective insists that neoliberalism, as with any other machine, is forged not by relations *between* it and an existent form of social reality, but by how it couples with, interrupts, and breaks open social realities to produce relations between elements on a plane of struggle. As they note, "every machine functions as a break in the flow [of] relation[s]" to which it is connected" (Ibid.). At the same time that the neoliberal machine interrupts the desiring-production of local communities, it "is also a flow itself, or the production of a flow" that redistributes bodies and (social) capital in the service of neoliberalism, i.e., in a manner that presences individual subjects and structures market relationships to govern everyday life (Ibid.). In other words, neoliberalism *both* operates as a machinic assemblage that disrupts social realities and the stability of extant forms of political subjectivity in local communities, *and* creates a set of productive, predetermined flows, or relations, that control the political subjects within those spaces. These consequences of neoliberalism's machinic assemblage are the product of three syntheses, i.e., the connective, disjunctive,

and conjunctive syntheses, that organize "a field of visibility and invisibility and, in conjunction with that, an economy of sayability and unsayability" (2001, 825).

Utilizing Deleuze and Guattari's theorizing of machinic assemblages and its three synthesis, as well as desiring-production, helps bring in to critical focus the challenge presented by neoliberalism. Neoliberalism reterritorializes social, political, and economic planes of becoming- and channels those becomings- through a series of conduits and flows toward the production of neoliberal subjects that support its theoretical commitments and material consequences. Communities' desiring-production of alternative subjectivities, of collective identifications, and of anti-neoliberal machines are disciplined, i.e., made invisible and unsayable. In other words, neoliberalism engages in machinic production; its product is the limited possibilities of living otherwise under neoliberalism. The engine driving neoliberalism's machinic assemblage across its many singular variations is composed through the three synthesis by which it produces, records, and consummates the becoming-identities, collective identifications, and political communities it constructs on an immanent plane of social struggle. Focusing on each helps clarify how they provide a set of concepts for mapping neoliberalism's forms of power and means of control.

The connective synthesis. The first synthesis constitutive of a machinic assemblage concerns the production of and connections between part-objects. Deleuze and Guattari explain that "everything begins with nebulae, statistical wholes whose outlines are blurred, molar or collective formations comprising singularities distributed haphazardly" (Deleuze and Guattari 1972, 77). In other words, the social plane territorialized by neoliberalism begins as singularities whose boundaries are blurred and

whose differentiations are indeterminate. The connective synthesis describes the productive desire (animated by neoliberalism) that forges connections through couplings between these singularities, or part-objects (i.e., "within these nebulae or *these collectives*, 'sides' take shape, series are arranged, persons figure in these series, under strange laws of lack, absence, asymmetry, exclusion, noncommunication, vice, and guilt") (Ibid.). In other words, neoliberalism territorializes political spaces and produces social subjects by yoking together bodies, discourses, material practices, technologies, and (market) logics. For example, indigenous bodies are connected to and are coupled with development discourses that "charge" those bodies with *archaic* and *backward* valences. However, the "connections made by the [connective] synthesis of production are multiple, heterogeneous, and continual" (Holland 1999, 26), that is, the connective synthesis remains open to new connections between bodies, discourses, practices, logics, etc., constitutive of a social field "whereby one [part-object] connects with another, and then another, and then another" (Holland 1999, 26). As a consequence, the connective synthesis isolates both how elements of a plane of struggle are connected in ways that constrain their potential, and how those elements may be "re-organ-ized" to produce unexhausted potentialities embedded in the material conditions that form a singularity.

For instance, in the Chiapas, neoliberalism reterritorializes the plane of struggle occupied by indigenous communities by yoking ideas of development with indigenous peoples in a manner that confines their emergence within the boundaries of modern forms of economic organization. At the same time, this connective synthesis excludes other possible connections between indigenous persons and other forms of economic organization and productivity. For example, coupling indigenous communities and

development discourses eliminates collective identifications sustained by communal, or *ejido*, farming practices. The couplings that sustain this synthesis marginalize, discipline, and subordinate indigenous persons by denying access to processes of governance and eliminating means with which to produce new meanings for the connections with social practices labeled as 'backward,' 'superstitious' or 'archaic.' Likewise, in urban North America, neoliberalism decouples homeless persons from group identifications that produce systemic analyses of inequality that drive laborers, the poor, and immigrant populations into life on the streets. Correspondingly, neoliberalism connects homeless bodies with discourses of personal responsibility that "charge" homeless bodies with individual failings and personal guilt for their conditions of marginalization. In other words, neoliberalism enacts a connective synthesis that couples elements of a social plane in a manner that produces limits that resist alternative couplings capable of fostering identifications that challenge these valences and that pursue other (oppositional) productive desires.

The disjunctive synthesis. The second synthesis constitutive of neoliberalism's machinic assemblage records "abstract categories that constitute a hierarchy of values" and "tell the body which value has been assigned it and makes a record of that fact for future reference" (Massumi 2001, 825) In other words, the second synthesis produces an operation that "selects and networks signs…produced by [the] connective synthesis" (Holland 1999, 31).Where the connective synthesis is linked to production and is open to a continual reworking of couplings ("with another, and then another, and then another" element of an immanent social plane") between bodies, discourses, technologies, etc., the disjunctive synthesis *records* a strict distribution of elements on a plane of struggle. In

other words, it distributes, or records, the part-objects, i.e., the bodies, discourses, technologies, logics, etc., onto a "surface…[of] coordinates, like a grid" (Delueze and Guattari 1972, 13). These distributions enacted by the disjunctive synthesis produce "a grid of mutually exclusive, ranked terms that can only couple with one another in preestablished ways" (Massumi 2001, 825). As Holland explains, the open couplings characteristic of the connective synthesis (and…and then…and then) are reconfigured and 'closed down' by the distributions of the disjunctive synthesis (either…or…or) (1999, 31). For example, homeless bodies in urban North American could potentially couple with clinical and criminal discourses or, equally likely, yoke themselves to discourses of resistance and radical freedom. The disjunctive synthesis signals a break from this radical multiplicity by recording, or marking, homeless bodies as "out-of-place" and located within a grid of exclusions mapped by polarized urban topographies.[11] As a consequence, the disjunctive synthesis of neoliberalism undermines the potential to organize oppositional, collective identifications by distributing individual bodies into fixed logics of social organization.[12]

The conjunctive synthesis. The third synthesis constitutive of neoliberalism's machinic production is composed by "mechanisms of oversight…of surveillance, policing, and normalization" (Massumi 2001, 825-6). "[T]he conjunctive synthesis" constructs the connections produced and distributions recorded by the first two syntheses into a social field "crisscrossed with axes, banded with zones, localized with areas and fields, measured off by gradients, traversed by potentials, [and] marked by thresholds" (Deleuze and Guattari 1972, 115). In other words, the couplings and hierarchies forged by the production and recording of flows of productive desire are operationalized as an

assemblage of identities, discourses and institutions.[13] For instance, in indigenous

communities in Mexico and homeless communities in North America, connections

forged by the discourses that organize indigenous communities relations to national and

supra-national governments produce identities and promulgate policies that limit how and

in what ways those communities may appear publicly. In other words, what identities

may be claimed by those communities as a consequence of the couplings produced and

recorded by neoliberalism.[14]

The power of the conjunctive synthesis resides in the modes of policing that

ensure individuals and local communities (re)produce and consume the identifications

recorded by the disjunctive synthesis. The conjunctive synthesis reveals that

(mis)recognizing oneself as "backward," "archaic," "criminal," or "deviant" is not simply

a problem of ideology or false consciousness. As Deleuze and Guattari note, "when

subjects, individual or groups, act manifestly counter to their class interests…it is not

enough to say: they were fooled. …It is not an ideological problem, a problem of failing

to recognize…an illusion." Instead, the conjunctive synthesis posits that such

(mis)recognitions are "problem[s] of desire" recognizing that "desire is part of the

infrastructure" of neoliberalism's machinic assemblage that is set into motion by the

charges produced by its connective synthesis (1972, 114).[15] For example, homeless

persons' submission to dominant constructions of homeless identity is constituted in and

through an interruption of productive desire that couples homeless bodies with deviance

and decay. Similarly, in the Chiapas, neoliberalism "cuts" and "segregates" the social

field through discourses of development and modernization that record indigenous

communities connections with backward and archaic discourses and produce a forced choice between consummating indigenous *or* Mexican identity.

Nonetheless, while my aim in this section has been to work between the three synthesis that constitute an abstract machine and their manifestations within what I am calling the neoliberal machine, this is not to suggest that desires, collectivities, and social fields cannot orient themselves along different lines of development, paths of production, and modes of sociality. In other words, if, as Deleuze and Guattari argue, it makes little sense to "ask what a [machine] means" or to "look for anything to understand in it," but rather only to "ask what it functions with," then my purpose in the next section is to consider how machines might be constructed otherwise in the face of the realities that enable the construction of a neoliberal machine (Deleuze and Guattari 1980/1987, 4).

<div style="text-align:center">

Machines of Domination, Machines of Struggle:

The State-form and the War-machine

</div>

Efforts to theorize nomadology, the war-machine and micropolitics provide a useful set of conceptual tools for interrogating neoliberalism's machinic assemblage. Micro-politics emerges in the interstices of struggle formed by confrontations between political orders, collectivities, and institutions.[16] The conditions of this confrontation develop out of the differing commitments that inform the political logics of the State-form machines and nomadic war-machines.[17] Deleuze and Guattari argue that the differing political theorems that inform these two machines can clarify struggles over social being and help identify ways to produce identifications that challenge the neoliberal machine.[18]

The State-form, or the Logic of the Neoliberal Machine

The State-form relies on controlling the relationships between its constituent elements, i.e., discourses, institutions, bodies, identities, desires, wealth, etc.; it strives toward a "striated," or strictly regulated, space that limits the conditions of emergence, the relative value, and the possible relationships that may exist between each of its constituent parts.[19] Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1987, 359-361) summarize: "The State[-form] is what makes the distinction between governors and governed possible…but sovereignty only reigns over what it is capable of internalizing, of appropriating locally."[20] Conceptualizing these acts of appropriation as the harnessing of flows, Deleuze and Guattari suggest the game of chess as an apt conceptual analogue to the State-form. Chess produces a system of control that names particular identities, i.e., unique game pieces (connective synthesis), particular relations between identities, i.e., the relative value of a pawn versus a knight reflective of a fixed hierarchy (disjunctive synthesis), and the means and modes of power/agency available to those identities, i.e., rules of movement that differ across different stations on the hierarchy of subject relations (conjunctive synthesis). In the same way, the State-form charges political bodies with particular values, i.e., competitive, individual neoliberal subjectives versus "backward" or "deviant" subjects, records a set of relations between identities, i.e., dependency, and produces a proscribed range of permissible means and modes of consummating political identities and political power, i.e., restrictions on traditional collective identifications and organic communities.

The State-form clarifies neoliberalism's operations by mapping its efforts to: determine what persons can appear as legitimate subjects (versus the "undeveloped"),

establish what can be identified as a social problem, identify what solutions are or are not intelligible to redress problems with neoliberalism. Specifically, the State-form provides a conceptual device that identifies the material, productive operations that sustain neoliberalism and helps theorize the commonalities between disparate experiences with the neoliberal state. The State-form expands critical focus beyond the expression of political identities in particular situations (i.e., primarily questions of content) to include the ways those identities are produced and regulated in their interactions with other identities, institutions, discourses, and desires (i.e., primarily a question of form).

The War-machine, or the Logic of Anti-Neoliberal Struggle

The war-machine, on the other hand, describes a conceptual tool for thinking about antagonisms implicit in neoliberalism's State-form, and describes a set of political relationships and theorems with the potential to resist the neoliberal (State-form) machine. It describes the opposite pole in the field of social organization, or a productive, antagonistic relationship to the State-form. Compared to the restrictions of chess, Deleuze and Guattari associate the war-machine with the game "Go." Contra chess, "Go" presents a set of undifferentiated game pieces with no pre-established connections, but instead an immanent plane of productive desire, i.e., flat, non-descript disks in place of unique knights, rooks, and pawns; records a set of relations and hierarchies between pieces that is always unfolding and recomposing, i.e., no hierarchy exists between pieces, and players may appropriate their opponent's disks as part of their strategic operations on the game board; and reconfigures agency not as the consummation of a set of established rules, i.e., toppling the king, but as the ability to produce/consume new configurations of collective identification on an open plane of struggle, i.e., seizing

(temporary) control of enough space to exert new forms of power. This reconfiguration is critical to theorizing oppositional politics targeting neoliberalism's 'infernal machine'.

First, the war-machine assumes an antagonistic relation to the State-form's production of (political) space. If the state is sedentary, aiming to create boundaries that separate the space it governs from the space of the ungoverned, the war-machine assumes a mobile, fluid, indeterminate, active—in short, nomadic—relation to space. Contra the State-form, the war-machine is a question of "arraying oneself in open space, of holding space, of maintaining the possibility of springing up at any point: the movement is not from one point to another, but becomes perpetual, without aim or destination, without departure or arrival" (Deleuze and Guattari 1980/1987, 353). It resists the closing down of connections forged out of the desiring-production of local communities, or singularities of struggle.

Second, the war-machine resists the anti-production of the State-form machine's constraints on movement and new, unforeseen couplings. It "is not confined to the form in which it is realized" in a particular case, but instead operates as a conceptual haecceity, which is a "configuration of qualities which serves to make certain distinctions or to register certain oppositions, only to disperse upon closer examination into the several determinations which make it up" (Patton 2001, 1293). If the State-form of neoliberalism aims to regulate identities and collectivities by constraining political subjects (individual or collective) and channeling the relationships between those subjects, then the war-machine aims at proliferating these identities and contingent relationships in the pursuit of new forms of antagonism and new political-becomings.[21] In sum, the war-machine provides a way of more productively theorizing struggles with neoliberalism. Thinking

about the particular acts of resistance as the production of (rhetorical) war-machines

provides a way of addressing the concerns raised by critics of neoliberalism,

globalization, and development.

Critical Contributions

In particular, a focus on (rhetorical) war-machines generates three productive

critical distinctions. First, war-machines discriminate between collective politics that

operate in ways easily appropriated by the neoliberal machine versus those that depart

from its political theorems. For instance, collective politics that rely on an interiorizing

logic and principles of unity operate in a manner consistent with the State-form and are

easily appropriated. This approach to politics, they argue, produces a particular type of

group subject, the "subjected group."[22] Subjected groups "capture…the energies of the

human body and…channe[l] [it] toward activities defined as socially useful" (Massumi

2001, 825). Efforts to enlist consensus around a particular political program, to mediate a

diverse range of complaints within that program, and to discipline supporters are

characteristic of oppositional collectivities organized as subjected groups.[23]

The war-machine rejects the subjected group by embracing the exteriorizing

logic and perpetual variations of the "subject-group" (Massumi 2001, 825). The subject-

group opposes unity and discipline by respecting "the heterogeneity of its component

parts." Likewise, the subject-group is a "group *in process* that explores and changes as

conditions change" (re)opening the multiple, heterogeneous potential of machinic

assemblages' desiring-productions.[24] In other words, whereas the subjected group

demands that new component parts, i.e., bodies, discourses, or institutions, be remolded

to fit the model of identification it records and consummates, the subject-group contends

that collective identification must productively harness the lines of flight introduced by new participants in the composition of the subject-group. For instance, the supple and changing form of protest witnessed at the 1999 WTO protests in Seattle illuminate this possibility. Whereas multiple subjected groups arrived to protest the WTO, i.e., group-subjects defined by their primary identification as laborer, environmentalist, etc., the conditions encountered by anti-globalization activists initiated the composition of a subject-group through the unruly couplings between industrial laborers and green environmentalists that 're-organ-ized' struggles against global capital.

Second, the war-machine mediates conflicts over "reform"-oriented versus "revolutionary politics" that polarize struggles against neoliberalism. Paul Patton argues that "the essence" of nomadic micropolitics is found neither in "the incorporation of minority demands by adjustment to the axioms of the social code [i.e., reform in the parlance of anti-globalization's critics], nor in the reconstitution of another code [i.e., anti-globalization critics' revolution]." Micropolitics, instead, embraces "the process of becoming-minor, of widening the gap between oneself and the norm" (Patton 2001, 1283). In other words, micropolitics invents processes of mutation and differentiation that depart from dominant social codes and eschews "models" for political struggle in favor of a radically contingent form of politics.[25] Patton summarizes this implication for thinking about the aims of resistance arguing that the war-machine renames the goal of (critical) politics as an effort to "construct a positive figure defined by a different function," one that "affirms the power of creativity, free movement, and transmutation which properly belongs to the war-machine" (Patton 2001, 1293).

Third, the war-machine mediates relationships between destructuring and constituent struggles. On the one hand, the war-machine functions primarily as a productive, affirmative figure.[26] However, war-machines also engage in destructuring struggles when these operations are fettered by State-form machines. As Goh observes, the war-machine "conducts war with the State[-form]…because the State[-form]" restricts "movement and thought that the nomad[ic] war-machine has taken to be [its] freedom" (Goh 2006, 220). This disposition enables the war-machine to resist dismissal as a violent or militaristic concept for theorizing progressive collective politics.[27] While the war-machine is unabashedly militant, i.e., "an expression of working on the [individual or collective] self in the service of revolutionary change" (Thoburn 2008, 98), "it is only when the war-machine has been appropriated by the state that war [i.e., militarism,] becomes its primary object" (Delueze and Guattari 1980/1987, 418). In other words, the war-machine contributes to mediating disputes between types of struggle by organizing productive relantions between the two approaches.

Examining communities experimenting with resistance to differing faces of neoliberalism provides an opportunity to utilize these conceptual frames to unpack oppositional political and rhetorical struggles. Moreover, this conceptual framework helps to situate these isolated efforts in relation to a larger set of discourses about and acts of resistance to neoliberalism. Left unasked, however, is what types of logics, identities, tactics, and strategies of rhetorical practice contribute to or undermine the formation of (rhetorical) war-machines that can challenge the universally-singular realities of global capitalism? Analyzing the forces of neoliberalism and the forms of resistance to them invented by communities of struggle is an important step toward answering this question.

In the next section, I outline the approach I adopt to begin unpacking these local logics and tactics of resistance.

<center>Strategic Conjunctures: Productive Criticism, Vernacular Discourse,</center>

<center>and Singularities of Struggle</center>

The radical pluralism, micropolitical strategies and tactics, and reliance on forms of biopolitical production characteristic of anti-neoliberal struggles challenge efforts to develop a critical approach for their analysis. First, given the marginal status of many struggles with neoliberalism, the texts, performances, and other productions that form these resistances are often fleeting and difficult to locate as compared to the traditional texts of formal social movements, e.g., manifestos of the IWW, the Communist Party, etc. Compounding this challenge, many of these efforts are disciplined, domesticated, or defeated before being circulated among wider populations.[28] Thus, part of the requirement for any critical method interested in anti-neoliberal politics necessitates locating resistive practices, examining their effects, and contributing the resulting insights and strategies to a wider audience.[29]

Second, the localized character of anti-neoliberal struggles requires a critical approach concerned with creatively and productively unpacking marginal politics to theorize oppositional politics more broadly. For example, how can the *singular* struggles of indigenous communities in Southern Mexico and homeless communities in the urban United States teach critical lessons about resisting neoliberalism's *universal* assumptions? In the following sections, I address each of these concerns by explaining why I focus on and how I locate anti-neoliberal collectivities, by describing the critical

approach I use to analyze singularities of struggle, and by outlining how this approach contributes to efforts to theorize collective struggle.

Locating Practices of Resistance:

The Critique of Vernacular Discourse

To identify and access the rhetorical texts, performances of resistance, and material practices engaged in by anti-neoliberal struggles, I adopt the analytic commitments of scholars interested in the "critique of vernacular discourse."[30] Vernacular discourses are "discourses that grow from smaller communities, are spoken with in-group purposes in mind, and are directed to audiences composed of members of the smaller community" (Ono and Sloop 2002, 13). In particular, my interest centers on micro-political rhetoric and "speech that resonates in local communities" (Ono and Sloop 1995, 20).[31] This necessitates analyzing the newspapers, radio broadcasts, and television shows aimed at and produced by local communities; "reading pamphlets printed by community organizations, watching films by independent filmmakers, or talking about orations given on the street"; and, "engaging in talk about everyday speech, conversations in homes, restaurants, and 'on the corner'" (Ono and Sloop 1995, 20). I utilize a mixture of rhetorical and ethnographic techniques for gathering and reading (mundane) texts, including participating in and observing one of the local communities I examine. As Pezzullo, Dickinson (2002), Endres (2009a; 2009b), Fenske (2007) and others have demonstrated, this approach generates critical insights by supplementing traditional close-readings with participant-observation and efforts to capture live discourse that reveals the processual, embodied elements of mundane rhetorics.[32]

Similarly, CDA helps focus attention on how these practices are instances of "social actors" who "produce representations" and "performances" in an effort to "shape social processes and practices" (Fairclough 2001, 123). In other words, CDA helps orient critical analysis "to structure and to interaction," i.e., "to the social resource, [or context(s)]…which enables and constrains" local rhetoric, "and to the way that resource, [or context(s)] is interactively worked" (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999, 63). By orienting my critique of vernacular discourse in this manner, I work to avoid problems of traditional perspectives that limit their attention to documents available to the widest possible audience "missing out on and writing 'out of history,' important texts that gird and influence local cultures first and then affect, through the sheer number of local communities, cultures at large" (Ono and Sloop 1995, 19). Examining vernacular discourse as a way to focus closely on local instances of struggle allows me to ask "how a community is constructed and how that community functions" to foster or forestall coalitions of broad-based, collective resistance.[33] Consistent with the critical perspective developed by CDA theorists, these vernacular discourses provide critical sites that, when located within their material and rhetorical contexts, can reveal insights into how oppositional collectivities successfully and unsuccessfully "dra[w] selectively" on the potential of that context to "articulate" an oppositional discourse (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999, 63).

Local moments of resistance are central to thinking about efforts to create productive spaces for communities marginalized and subordinated by neoliberalism. By taking this position, I am joining the project of grassroots postmodernists and political activists who argue that these local actions map pathways toward effective challenges to

the totalizing logics of neoliberalism.[34] Esteva and Prakash forcefully argue for this orientation explaining that "by clearly defining the limits of intelligent, sensible action, it encourages decentralized, communal power. To make 'a difference' actions should not be grandiosely global, but [ingeniously and] humbly local" (1998, 21).[35] Second, evaluating local instances of resistance begins to journey an important, but unfamiliar, path of inquiry in communication. Shome and Hegde argue that "[neoliberal] globalization…pose[s] something new for the study of culture, it…present[s] new configurations that call for a rethinking of the communication of cultural politics" (2002, 173).[36] But, failures to embrace local texts or participate in vernacular discursive communities oriented against neoliberalism sediments efforts to "understand[d] how [neoliberal] globalization is experienced [and resisted] locally" as "a largely impalpable goal for…communication theory and research" (Murphy and Kraidy 2003, 304). I analyze local experiences in indigenous and homeless communities in the Global North and Global South in an effort to "articulate the relationship between globality and locality" critical to addressing this blindspot in communication research (Murphy and Kraidy 2003, 319).

Reading Practices of Resistance: Conjunctural Analysis and

Critical Research Methods

Locating local experiences with neoliberalism helps access the micropolitics of struggle that inform resistance to the neoliberal state, but developing critical interpretations that link them to abstract discourses of neoliberal globalization requires effectively situating these moments within the field of power constructed by those discourses. Efforts of critical theorists, critical discourse analysts, and students of

cultural studies to develop "conjunctural" forms of analysis provide a useful tool for this purpose. These thinkers draw on Gramsci and Bourdieu to theorize 'conjuncture' as the complex set of power relations that operate within a particular historical moment, or situation (Bourdieu 1972/2008, 78, 81-83; Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999, 60-65; Fiske 1991, 472-473; Gilbert 2008, 53; Gramsci 1973/2007, 175-185; see also Grossberg 2010 for a discussion of the importance of "conjunctural analysis" for contemporary cultural studies).[37] As Chouliaraki and Fairclough explain (1999, 62), "analysis of the conjuncture" refers to "a specification of the configuration of practices," of, in this case, neoliberalism, globalization, and development, "which the discourse in focus is located within."[38] As they note, "conjunctures can be more or less complex in terms of the number and range of practices they link together, more or less extended in time and social space." While there is no clear line demarcating when or if one has attended to the full range of influences that shape the rhetorical interventions of a particular individual or collective, "the point…is to have at least a broad sense of the overall frame of social practice in which the discourse in focus is located within." It poses questions about how the variable, contextual configuration of discourses, institutions, economic relations, history, and other factors influence "how the [oppositional] discourse is interpreted," i.e., what it means for its producers and potential consumers (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999, 62). In other words, CDA privileges an approach to analysis that views oppositional rhetorical interventions within the "local contexts," or "in terms of properties of the immediate, interactional situation in which a communicative event takes place" (van Dijk 2001, 108). Analysis of anti-neoliberal politics that adopts the perspective of the "conjuncture" as described by these thinkers aims to understand the

field of power within which political subjects act, and to ask to what extent those subjects' actions reinforce or challenge the conditions of experience shaped by neoliberalism.

Examining anti-neoliberal politics requires this approach to situate local acts of resistance within the de- and re-territorializing flows of neoliberalism. Rather than identifying how neoliberal politics operate abstractly to regulate political and economic relations between, for example, the Global North and the Global South, the aim is to take account of the multiple forces neoliberal globalization contributes to these singular experiences of marginalization and subordination. When analyzing the Chiapas this means asking how neoliberalism has influenced political, economic, and social realities for those living in Mexico's least developed and poorest province. This approach maps neoliberalism's influences in such a way that critical analysis can begin to ask how local moments of resistance interact with those relationships and with what consequences.[39] As part of an analysis of anti-neoliberal war-machines, 'conjunctural analysis' can "reveal the points of least resistance, at which the force of will can be most fruitfully applied; they suggest immediate tactical operations; they indicate how a campaign of political agitation may best be launched, what language will best be understood" (Gramsci 1973/2007, 185).

I carry out this analysis of anti-neoliberal politics by weaving together critical rhetoric and critical discourse analysis (CDA). Each of these complementary methodological frameworks contributes different assumptions and analytic perspectives that guide my efforts to make sense of communities of struggle, and both approaches share foundational commitments that support my research aims. Huckin argues that

critical discourse analysis and critical rhetoric converge around the four critical assumptions outlined by McKerrow: (1) "they share 'the same critical spirit' that is held in common among" divergent perspectives on post-Marxist and post-structuralist critique; (2) "they 'serve a demystifying function…by demonstrating the…ways in which rhetoric…[operates] through its relationship with power/knowledge'"; (3) "they are not "detached," but rather "have as their object something which they are 'against'"; and (4) they have consequences by identifying "possibilities of future action" for those implicated by the discourses they analyze (Huckin 1992, 156; see also McKerrow 1989, 92). Given these characteristics that "name the enterprise and determine [the] overall telos" of these two approaches, combined they offer a framework appropriate for the critical questions I aim to explore (McKerrow 1989, 92).

On the one hand, CDA is well-suited to examining the rhetorical *contexts* I identify in my analysis. In both the Chiapas and in urban homeless communities, the 'conjuncture' each oppositional community encounters creates barriers to its rhetorical success. While critical rhetoric values contexts as a pivotal dimension of critical analysis, CDA provides a set of steps and considerations that can more robustly inform the influences that I map to situate my analysis of each of these struggles. Fairclough (2001) and Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) identify the importance of accounting for the elements of rhetorical interventions that exceed the actual symbolic interventions of particular rhetors. Fairclough (2001) encourages critics to attend to the productive activity, means of production, social histories, and other factors in a particular situation that shape meaning. Similarly, Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) map three stages of analysis that guide critics from the broad 'conjuncture' a symbolic or rhetorical

intervention inhabits, to the immanent practices of subordination and marginalization the

intervention contests, to the analysis of the rhetorical intervention itself (60-65). In the

case of the Chiapas, this means examining the history of the Chiapas region broadly to

position the indigenous communities that inhabit it within the social history of Mexico,

the immanent articulations of neoliberalism to the Chiapas and its history, and, finally,

the actual rhetorical interventions engaged in by the Zapatistas. This careful mapping of

context enriches my analysis by acknowledging that what local, oppositional

communities "say" depends on "who is speaking to whom, when and where, and with

what purposes" (van Dijk 2001, 108).

On the other hand, critical rhetoric is well suited to the forms of rhetorical

practice that emerge in the local communities I examine. Whereas traditional approaches

to rhetorical criticism focus on "finished" texts of key orators and leaders of oppositional

struggles, critical rhetoric aims at drawing together the broad array of rhetorical acts and

material logics that constitute the vernacular discourses of singularities of struggle. As

McKerrow insists, critical rhetoric is "geared to uncovering the 'dense web' [of

meanings, identities, and logics relied on by a rhetorical community], not by means of a

simple speaker-audience interaction, but…by means of a 'pulling together' of disparate

scraps of discourse which, when constructed as an argument, serve to illuminate

otherwise hidden or taken for granted social practices" (1989, 101-102). This approach

to critical analysis focuses on identifying elements of cultural sites that constitute "a text

suitable for criticism," i.e., offering insights into a particular rhetorical context (McGee

1990, 288). In short, critical rhetoric operates as a "perspective" or "orientation" that

both guides analysis and "maximizes the possibilities of what will 'count' as evidence for critical judgment" (McKerrow 1989, 100-102; see also McGee 1990, 284-289).

Additionally, critical discourse analysis provides an analytic framework for explaining how vernacular texts function to contest dominant relationships of power sustained by neoliberalism. First, critical readings guided by CDA are deliberately "problem-based," meaning they are motivated by concern with "contributing resources which people may be able to draw upon in tackling and overcoming problems" that they are confronted with in particular forms of social life under neoliberalism (Fairclough 2001, 125). In other words, CDA asks, "What is it about the way social life is structured and organized" by neoliberalism's machine that undermines oppositional collectivities (Fairclough 2001, 125; see also Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999, 60-65)? Second, CDA examines how vernacular rhetorical practices defuse or entrench these problems once they are identified. As Fairclough argues, rhetorical action is an element of social practice that is both constituting of and constituted by social practice.[40] By analyzing this "dialectical relationship", CDA sharpens insights into how vernacular texts contribute to re-shaping neoliberalism's social practices (Fairclough 2001, 123).

Finally, critical rhetoric and CDA share a commitment to criticism as a *performative intervention*, i.e., as a means of intervention on the part of the critic in an inequality sustained by discourse. Illustrating this commitment, Chouliaraki and Fairclough explain that the "basic motivation" of CDA is a "critical engagement with the contemporary world recognizing that the existing state of affairs does not exhaust what is possible" (1999, 35). They, as do other CDA scholars, contend that criticism can open space to experiment with new possibilities. Critical rhetoric similarly conceives of

criticism as "a performance of a rhetor advocating a critique as a sensible reading of the discourse of power" (1989, 108). With this in mind, my aim is to deploy criticism as a *critical peformance* in a doubled-sense. First is the sense of a mode of reading rhetorical exchanges while accounting for them as processual, ongoing, multi-dimensional, affective, embodied events. Second is the sense of an undertaking embedded in, and aimed at destabilizing discourses and material circumstances of power, and envisioning possibilities for critical intervention. To do otherwise, Gramsci contends, renders criticism an "end" in itself only useful for those interested in a "chapter of past history" as opposed to the possibilities of future interventions (Gramsci 1973/2007, 185).

<u>Singularities of Struggle and Productive Criticism</u>

Singularities of struggle benefit from criticism that widens the frame for thinking about practices of resistance. Accordingly, I pursue a "productive criticism" of these sites of vernacular rhetorical practice. "Productive criticism" requires critics to retool their approach to criticism by trading the "reconstruction of rhetorical reality" for a desire to "invent realistic alternatives" to those realities (Ivie 1995, par. 2-4). In other words, productive criticism encourages critics to examine local instances of opposition by unpacking their strategic and tactical choices as new frames and conceptual vocabularies with which to engage in oppositional struggles by asking how potential articulations between differently marginalized or subordinated communities can be constructed. [41]

I use this approach to analyze efforts by communities of homeless and indigenous peoples in the Global North and Global South to invent their own alternatives to life under neoliberalism. I use their insights to "invent" rather than "discover" social knowledge produced by these singular struggles (Ivie 1995, par. 2-5; see also Ivie 2001,

par. 9-11). Rather than confirming a perspective on rhetorical action, productive criticism shifts my focus to rhetorical interventions that build new bases of rhetorical agency and political power. These interventions offer "curious texts" that construct new "'attitudinal' terms" for confronting "the recurring quandaries of human conflict" and for conceptualizing the "complexities of social life and political problems" posed by neoliberalism (Foss 2004, 411-413; Ivie 2001, par. 7-9).

To summarize, "productive criticism" aims at enriching the social imaginary by "drawing on rhetoric as a source of invention" (Ivie 1995, 4-5). Plumbing rhetorical performances as a "resource" for theory offers significant benefit to critics. Informed by critical rhetoric and CDA, productive criticism shifts the critical project from theory illustration to artifact illumination and theory extension. It supports an approach where "bad fits" and "disrupted patterns" revealed in oppositional struggles, both successful and unsuccessful, offer significant contributions to constructing an anti-neoliberal war-machine (Foss 2004, 411-413; see also Ivie 2001, par. 12-13).

Conclusion

In this chapter, my aim has been to develop a working definition and critical perspective on neoliberalism that links its singular manifestations in the Global North and Global South to a set of universal assumptions that drive its machinations. By casting neoliberalism in terms of Deleuze and Guattari's machinic assemblage, and the three syntheses that compose it, my intention has been to identify the processual dimensions of neoliberal politics that reshape the planes of struggle occupied by local communities of struggle. Given this focus on local communities, or singularities, of struggle, in the second half of this chapter I outlined the analytic perspective I intend to deploy in my

analysis of oppositional collectivities. My contention is that coupling CDA and critical rhetoric supports an approach to criticism that is both concerned with diagnosing the symbolic and rhetorical means by which communities are marginalized by neoliberalism, and with identifying possibilities for future anti-neoliberal struggle invented in these communities. In the following chapters, I mobilize this critical apparatus to identify some of the specific strategies disclosed by homeless and indigenous activists engaged in oppositional struggles with neoliberalism's 'infernal machine'.

<u>Notes</u>

[1] Consistent with Deleuze and Guattari (1972; 1987), on whom I rely heavily in this and later chapters, it is important to understand neoliberalism as an abstract machine always seeking out new spaces to be territorialized by its desiring-productions. In other words, not all spaces at one time, or in a consistent way, but the political and the social and the cultural "and…and…" in an ongoing movement toward, as Hardt and Negri (2004) argue, penetrating the most intimate and quotidian arenas of affective, intellectual, social, and other forms of immaterial labor.

[2] In this post-WWII framework, programs of social welfare, strident oversight/ownership of portions of the market by national governments, and collective rights and protections for workers aimed to foster a minimal system of social stability, economic equality, and wealth redistribution with the goal of equalizing access to social goods.

[3] Evidence of the taken-for-granted nature of neoliberalism and its influence on common-sense ways of interpreting the world have, in recent years, been abundant. For instance, during the 2008 presidential elections (and 2010 midterm elections) in the United States, the deeply-ingrained neoliberal assumptions Harvey describes were exposed in the resistance to any governmental interference in what appeared at the time, and in reality proved to be, the worst economic catastrophe in the United States in over fifty years, a crisis that was hastened by the demands of a neoliberal model guiding the United States' economy.

[4] First, it helps identify how neoliberalism, despite its overtures toward maximizing individual freedom, reinforces the execution of practices of globalization and development by state and supra-state institutions that limit the freedoms of individuals affected by these practices. Second, the pliability and revisions of neoliberal theory this reveals helps to understand neoliberalism's proliferation as an economic, social, and political doctrine.

[5] As Harvey (2005/2007, 76) argues, "The social safety net is reduced to a bare minimum [under neoliberalism] in favour of personal responsibility. Personal failure is generally attributed to personal failings, and the victim is all too often blamed."

[6] Founding what he calls a "biopolitics of disposability," Giroux argues that neoliberalism "relegates entire populations to spaces of invisibility and disposability" (2006, 175; 181). This politics of neoliberalism, Giroux (2006) continues, ensures that the poor, especially people of color, not only have to fend for themselves in the face of life's tragedies but are also supposed to do it without being seen by the dominant society.

[7] As Gilbert observes, neoliberal theory assumes that law, and especially international law, should ensure that national governments and local communities cannot interfere with the rights of corporations (which neoliberalism treats as tantamount to individuals) to pursue profits within and beyond their own borders (2008, 32).

[8] This reality is manifested in special trade zones, supranational, economic planning organizations, e.g., the G-8, and agencies with the authority to legislate in ways that overrule the sovereignty of individual states, e.g., the WTO. The consequences of these shifts in the loci of political power include worsening environmental health, eroding labor protections, and decreasing self-determination among unions, local communities, and nation-states.

[9] For example, in the recent years, political scandals at state and federal levels in the United States ranging from the Enron scandal to irregularities in governmental contracts around the country evoke symptoms of this interpenetration of what were formerly democratically-governed state interests by corporate interests. As Harvey argues, "what remains of representative democracy is overwhelmed, if not totally…corrupted by money power" (Harvey 2005/2007, 78).

[10] For Deleuze and Guattari, machines "may be defined as a system of interruptions or breaks….Every machine…is related to a continual material flow that it cuts into" (Deleuze and Guattari 1972, 38-39).

[11] As Bourdieu argues, the "transformative and…destructive action of all of the political measures…that could serve as an obstacle to the logic of the pure market [of neoliberalism]" are disabled by the disjunctive synthesis of recording (Bourdieu 1998, para. 10). As Bourdieu observes, the disjunctive synthesis of neoliberalism enforces the absence of collective subjects in the neoliberal machine and demands that autonomous individuals only interact in pre-established, competitive ways.

[12] Revealing this consequence is the decreasing ability for the nation-state to appear as a legitimate actor, for workers to resist the atomization of their interests, and for other collective identities to exert control over the flows of production and consumption in which they become enmeshed under neoliberalism. For instance, in the Chiapas, the ability for indigenous communities to seek recourse to national protections is eliminated as neoliberalism (re)distributes those subjects into a market without borders, and the nation-state is reduced from an institution aimed at protecting a mixture of individual and collective rights to an agency for facilitating that market. Similarly, in homeless communities in North America, neoliberalism's disjunctive synthesis reorganizes the struggles of homeless communities in relation to personal failings and limits the ability for those personal complaints to be articulated as social issues that warrant collective action.

[13] Within neoliberalism's abstract machine, this synthesis emerges in the forms of governance that promise to ensure the conditions of a pure, free market on which autonomous individuals may compete, e.g., "well-being for all," and that, at the same time, eliminates the ability for particular collectivities to participate in those forms of governance, e.g., "the restoration of class power" (see Harvey 2005/2007).

[14] Harvey describes the effect of this third synthesis explaining that it has created a "radical reconfiguration of state institutions and practices[,] particularly with respect to the balance between coercion and consent, between the powers of capital and of popular movements, and between executive and judicial power…and powers of representative democracy" (Harvey 2005/2007, 78).

[15] As they note, this infrastructure "ensure[s] the general submission to a dominant class by making cuts and segregations pass over the social field" (1972, 114).

[16] The conceptual tools developed by Deleuze and Guattari are especially prescient for thinking about neoliberalism.This resonance is not completely without cause. Guattari, in his own writings (Guattari 2009) and with Negri (Guattari and Negri 1985/1990), developed a theory of "integrated world capitalism" as a field of political struggle for thinking through the consequences of nomadology.

[17] Whether individual actors or collective subjects is not relevant for Deleuze and Guattari who propose that even at the individual level of analysis political subjects are a group composition, i.e., an assemblage of desires and discourses, through which the effects of agency and identity are exercised. For more, see Massumi (2001).

[18] As an orienting frame for the following discussion, it is important to clarify the difference between a concern for a particular form of the state which is primarily a question of content, i.e., what mode of governance is adopted by a state, its economic nature, its body of laws, etc., and the State-form as a conceptual tool for thinking about forms of power on a more abstract register. In other words, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) are careful to note that their apprehension is not necessarily with the content of a particular political body per say, i.e., democratic vs. dictatorial, but with the *form* of power, or the way of territorializing a socio-political plane of experience, on which it relies. Thus, Deleuze and Guattari do not take the side of any particular movement, form of governance, or collective struggle, but instead focus on how flows of identities, desires, bodies, and discourses are positioned within those assemblages.

[19] The distinction between "discipline" and "control" is an important one reflective of multiple debates between Deleuze, Guattari, and Deleuze and Guattari, and others concerned with similar ideas, especially Foucault. Deleuze and Guattari posit control as a concept for thinking through relationships of power and desire as a way of moving away from Foucault's investment in power that is both productive and repressive. For Deleuze and Guattari, power/desire is only ever productive in so far as attempts to exercise power are ultimately only ever efforts to channel subjective desire. In other words, the State-form does not attempt to repress desire, but rather to control its flows so that it stays within the boundaries of well-defined paths. A more tangible example: environmentalists may desire an ecologically friendly corporate environment and have a number of more or less destructive options (lines of flight) for acting on that desire. The State-form of power, in this instance enacted by corporate policy, is equally satisfied channeling that desire into "green consumption," "recycling," and "social responsibility" as it is repressing the dissent. The intolerable line of flight, on the other hand, is the line that continues gaining in intensity and density resulting in a less acceptable form of resistance. See Harold (2004) for a detailed discussion of this distinction relative to political resistance.

[20] Deleuze and Guattari note that "[T]he State needs to subordinate hydraulic force to conduits, pipes, embankments, which prevent turbulence, which constrain movement from one point to another, and space itself to be striated and measured, which makes fluid depend on the solid, and flows proceed by parallel, laminar layers" (1987, 363).

[21] For instance, one might compare the tendency of some oppositional collectives that demand the subordination of certain attributes, i.e., gender, in favor of politicizing around others, i.e., race, to more open, dynamic organizations that aim at building ad hoc moments of solidarity among differently positioned members as an example of the differences in relationships to identities (individual or collective) that obtain in the two forms of doing politics that Deleuze and Guattari (1987) describe.

[22] The "subjected group" reflects a group subject/collective politics in which the "autonomous individual and its personal identity only exist as the dominated term in a relation of power: it is that which is mirrored and recorded and whose couplings are disciplined and surveilled" (Massumi 2001, 825).

[23] For instance, while many consumer protests register complaints against global capital, they rely on a set of uniform, unified demands that are easily integrated as part of already existing consumer relationships, i.e., providing consumers organic, and other "responsible choices."

[24] The subject-group "multiplies potential" and "begins as the dominated term in a relation of power," but "instead of surrendering or trying to reverse the situation and become dominating instead of dominated [as with the subjected group], it tries heroically to abolish the very fact of domination" (Massumi 2001, 826).

[25] Rethinking the struggles between globalization and anti-globalization activists, as well as the conflicts between the anti-globalization movement and its critics, through the lens of Deleuze and Guattari's nomadology and micropolitics reshapes several of the key questions underpinning these debates. First, approaching globalization from the perspective of the war-machine eschews notions that globalization can be displaced or reinvented wholesale. Whereas numerous critics of global capitalism have suggested that the answer lies not in a rejection of globalization as such but a rejection of the particular content of contemporary practices of globalization, Deleuze and Guattari help identify the manner in which such pursuits re-entrench the striated spaces of globalization with only slightly different contours. In other words, the point isn't to replace the current global order with a new global order, but instead to emphasize movement, i.e., perpetual experimentation with how to do community, democracy, etc., over order, i.e., locating the "right" model of any of these concepts.

[26] Goh (2006) explains further, noting that while war-machines take as their primary function a "becoming-politics" composed of "tangential trajectories," "a space where heterogeneous elements are free to come together by desire," and "are equally free to break away without causing spatial anxiety."

[27] As Buchanan argues, "It is true, throughout history, that nomads are regularly to be found in conflict situations, but this is because history is studded with collisions between war-machines and the states and cities which would grind them into the dust. War is thrust upon the war-machine, but its actual occupation is quite different" (Buchanan 2006, 37).

[28] Pezullo (2003) addresses this from the perspective of communication research in her discussion of cultural performances, counterpublics, and cultural politics. Following her assessment of the vitality of these forms of cultural politics for the possibility of future transformative change, this study adopts the commitment that she outlines aimed at using critical analysis to work against efforts to discipline or domesticate these unruly discourses.

[29] Further, as Pezzullo explains, recovering vernacular rhetorics "affirms the importance of these cultural performances and…offers a record of them" as part of an effort to understand the formation of contemporary oppositional collectivities (2003, 350).

[30] See Ono and Sloop (1995; 2002) and Sloop and Ono (1997) for pivotal discussions of this concept for the present study. See also Hauser 1999.

[31] As a consequence, a range of cultural forms, including films, dramas, novels, art, music, criticism, conversations, and other mundane practices replace key orations, position papers, or pamphlets as the acts of social protests that guide my analysis (see Hauser 1999). Ono and Sloop explain, "[Vernacular] discourse is neither accessible in its entirety, nor is it discoverable, except through texts. However, vernacular discourse is also culture: the music, art, criticism, dance, and

architecture of local communities. In addition to being discourse operating within local communities rather than speeches preserved in history textbooks, vernacular discourse is unique to specific communities" (1995, 20).

[32] For example, Endres, Sprain and Peterson (2008) illustrate, by attending, observing, participating in, and interviewing participants engaged in the rhetorical actions of social movements, critical analysis can develop more subtle insights about how audience members' identities, cultural values, social relations, and other characteristics shape oppositional rhetorics' influence.

[33] Nonetheless, this should not suggest that a vernacular discourse is *necessarily* reflective of a "positive political, cultural, and social agenda," that is, "uncovering vernacular discourse is not, by itself, a liberatory practice" (Ono and Sloop 1995, 21). However, by submitting discourses of local communities to critical suspicion it is possible to "render power relations among subjects [marginalized by globalization] visible," to develop "new concepts of how community relations are interwoven and how communities are contingent," and to engage in critical reflection that illustrates how these local practices might undermine broader oppositional coalitions despite their "profound effects on vernacular communities" (Ono and Sloop 1995, 21-27, 37-40; see also Ono and Sloop 2002, 19-25).

[34] Several critical globalization scholars endorse this view. See Badiou 2001; Esteva and Prakash 1998; Hardt and Negri 2000, 2004; and Sassen 1998. For a more general warrant for this approach, see also Foucault (1991) on "eventalization."

[35] Illustrating the realities that motivate this position, numerous examples illustrate universalizing logics that inform Illich's critique of globalization's ethical imperative to ensure access to technologies in the developing world, while ignoring the specificities of the peoples those interventions serve. He notes, "Rich nations benevolently impose a straitjacket of traffic jams, hospital confinements and classrooms on poor nations, and by international agreement call this 'development' (Illich 1997, 94). This reality reflects the critical imperative to embrace thinking about opposition at a local level.

   Paralleling this, other theorists illustrate how globalization's discourses of liberal democracy and human rights create conditions where certain political subjects, e.g., the indigenous, the poor, and the immigrant, are rendered as *passive political subjects* at best or, at worst, discursively constructed as backward, marginal, and/or unintelligible political subjects (whose marginalized status begins to resonate with Agamben's (1993) articulation of *"bare life"*). For example, Escobar critiques globalization as a "discursive practice that sets the rules of the game: who can speak, from what points of view, with what authority, and according to what criteria of expertise; it sets the rules that must be followed for this or that [social] problem" to be named (Escobar 1995, 87-89).

[36] But, while globalization is not new to communication scholars, critical projects have engaged profitably, but narrowly adopting a scope of inquiry focused on decidedly non-vernacular discourses, e.g., important trials, films, novels, and political events, such as the War on Terror. See Hasian (2001) for an extended version of this critique. For examples, see Shome (2001); Murphy (2007). See also Gunn and Brummett (2004).

[37] In particular, Fiske (1991) explicitly suggests conjunctural analysis as a means for examining marginalized and subordinated communities. Likewise, he uses this approach to ask questions about homeless communities in ways that illuminate my own interest in homeless activists in later

chapters. However, Fiske is primarily concerned with the "conjuncture" of micro-environments, i.e., institutions, physical space, etc., and macro-environments, i.e., circulating discourses and ideologies, as a means for locating the complex of influences that shape homeless interpretations of media texts. My approach to "conjunctural analysis" parallels Fiske's interests in shuttling between macro- and micro-contexts that influence rhetorical practice. However, I am more concerned with how this conjuncture informs political protests, oppositional politics, and resistant struggle. As a consequence, my view of micro-contexts parallels Fiske's in that I am interested in the local communities and conditions that inform activists' struggles. Similarly, my concern with macro-contexts focuses on the circulating discourses of neoliberalism and globalization. However, I depart from Fiske in that my aim is to ask how these conditions enable and limit political struggle, rather than how they enable and limit polysemic interpretations of media and other texts.

[38] For Fairclough, every moment of discourse is situated within a larger set of social and contextual practices whose influences include, but are not limited to: productive activity, means of production, social relations, social identities, cultural values, consciousness, and semiosis (or the actual production of symbolic interventions) (Fairclough 2001, 122-123).

[39] Gramsci (1973/2007, 178; fn. 79) describes the contribution of a focus on conjuncture to thinking about minor, or micro-, politics noting that, "study of the conjuncture is…closely linked to immediate politics, to 'tactics' and agitation."

[40] See Fairclough 2001, 122-124; Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999, 21-29, 37-41. For secondary analysis of the impact of this reasoning for CDA, see Jorgensen and Phillips 2002, 60-64.

[41] See Ivie (2007) for an example of this perspective demonstrated through a broad collection of case studies of protest against the Iraq War/War on Terror. In doing so, Ivie identifies key barriers and moments of potential for articulating these disparate acts of protest into an oppositional coalition.

CHAPTER THREE

URBAN NOMADS AND THE 'RIGHT TO THE CITY': RETHINKING

RESISTANCE FROM SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA'S

"HOMELESS WORLD"

> *"The homeless are often simply not addressed but ignored,*
> *treated as objects blocking the free movement of the proper public citizen."*
> -Leonard Feldman (2004, 91)

The struggles of homeless, urban nomads in the "neoliberal city" map one set of

realities wrought by neoliberalism's State-form (Mitchell 2003; see also Sassen 1998).

Experiences with neoliberalism faced by the poor in the urban United States reveal how

the universal assumptions of neoliberalism produce barriers to oppositional identities,

collectivities, and political agency. Recognizing the resonances between homelessness

and neoliberalism, Amster argues that "homelessness is an issue that touches on all of the

scales" on which neoliberalism and globalization operate and offers "an instructive

moment for perceiving connections between local experiences and global regimes"

(2008, 217). Through my analysis I intend to identify the rigid identity constructions that

are repeated in the ways that the urban poor and the Zapatistas are represented and

perceived in popular and public discourses. In this chapter I engage in critical analysis of

homeless activism to highlight that neoliberalism is "not merely a First World versus

Third World situation." Following Amster, I argue that demonstrates that "some people

 living in First World countries suffer the negative consequences of globalization as starkly as many in the Third World do" (2008, 215).

My aim in this chapter is to ask how the oppositional rhetorical practices of a community of homeless activists in the Global North can contribute to constructing a war-machine against neoliberalism's State-form. Specifically, I will analyze the oppositional struggle of one collectivity of political activists, "SafeGround Sacramento," forged from within a community of homeless persons living in the urban United States (e.g., Sacramento, CA). By examining this community's forms of marginalization and practices of resistance, and placing them in dialogue with the efforts of the EZLN, my analysis will contribute to the "urgent theoretical and practical task" of exploring oppositional efforts in order to locate "organic links between these different [local] movements (Harvey 2005/2007, 203). In addition, analyzing local communities living with and responding to noliberalism's State-form in disparate political contexts supports my efforts to problematize theorizations of globalization and neoliberalism more generally. Comparing disparate experiences with neoliberalism and globalization emphasizes that whereas earlier modes of economic exploitation relied on "non-capitalist markets" to realize surplus value and to displace "destabilizing inequality" (e.g., neo-colonial relations), contemporary economic practices produce a plane of exploitation in which "space is always open." Accordingly, exploitation is an immanent reality (e.g., the "global market/village") along all planes of experience with neoliberalism's State-form (Hardt and Negri 2004, 166-167; 228-232). This expansion of communities and locales re-territorialized by globalization and neoliberalism lays the groundwork for an "accumulation of struggles…that overlap precisely because, despite their radical

diversity, they [are] all directed against the international disciplinary regime of capital" (Hardt and Negri 2001, 263). My intention is to ask how the strategies and tactics adopted successfully by "SafeGround" and "Zapatista" war-machines map areas of overlap in their oppositional practice.

To sustain my analysis, I examine rhetorical practices engaged in by "SafeGround" that participate both within the purview of rhetorical activity engaged in by traditional oppositional communities (i.e., speeches, letters to the editor, slogans, etc.), as well as less conventional texts and rhetorical performances (i.e., live street protests, everyday life, and interviews). I develop my critical corpus by drawing together discursive fragments from across this range of oppositional strategies adopted by "SafeGround" activists. I deploy sensibilities of critical rhetoric and critical discourse analysis best suited to the utterances, everyday activities, performances at protest events, public speeches, letters to the editor, documentaries made by independent filmmakers allied with "SafeGround," testimony given by homeless activists, and other vernacular texts through which their oppositional struggle is invented. Doing so helps to locate instances of rhetorical, performative, and symbolic interventions in the dominant codes of neoliberalism and globalization that map urban space in the United States.

My analysis of these texts is contextualized against the backdrop of several weeks of fieldwork over a nine-month period. Specifically, I visited SafeGround during October 2009 (twice for a total of one and half weeks of participant observation), November 2009 (once for a week), December 2009/January 2010 (once for half a week), February 2010 (for half a week), March 2010 (for a weekend), April 2010 (for a week), and July 2010 (for a week). Taken together, I spent about six weeks with and among "SafeGround"

activists. During this time, and currently, I continued to stay in contact with homeless protestors and their allies by email and phone conversation. These intermittent visits coupled with regular phone and email conversations helped maintain relationships and contextual understandings of happenings in "SafeGround" during my absences. Some of these visits were planned well in advance; others were spur of the moment in response to particular happenings in the homeless community. In April 2010, I made an unplanned trip to Sacramento to support my homeless friends and attend memorial services for one of the "SafeGround" elders who had been critical to my introduction to and participation in their community. On the other hand, many trips were more deliberately planned to coincide with significant happenings in the community. My December 2009 trip corresponded with a significant protest event, the "Winter Pilgrimage Kick-Off" that I discuss below in more detail. Nonetheless, during each of these trips I learned about the machinations of "SafeGround's" anti-neoliberal war-machine through a combination of researching primary texts in local libraries, interviewing members of the community of homeless activists and allies, attending organizing meetings, hanging out in camp, and protesting with my homeless friends. During these visits, I learned from, was regularly puzzled by, and observed the growth of the "SafeGround" movement. These texts that I gathered and that I analyze in the next chapter, which span both a broad range of genres and a broad range of time in the life of the "SafeGround" movement, expand the range of rhetorical activity constitutive of a anti-neoliberal globalization war-machine, and demonstrate how local communities shift between specialized rhetorical activity and mundane rhetorics of "everyday life" as they construct an oppositional praxis. In this

sense, I examine "SafeGround" both as a cultural site and as a series of discursive interventions into conditions of neoliberalism broadly, and homelessness specifically.[1]

My analysis in this chapter is driven by several interrelated questions stemming from my concern with the consequences of singular articulations of neoliberalism's universal discourses with local communities of struggle. Given my focus on homeless activists, these questions include: how do homeless communities disrupt the constructions of homeless identity reinforced by neoliberal discourses? How do homeless persons overcome the barriers to building a homeless community enforced by the topographies of urban space? And, through what means is political agency or power exerted by homeless communities in their struggles with neoliberalism and globalization? Additionally, as a critical site to contrast with the EZLN, my aim in this analysis chapter is to begin to identify some of the common characteristics and shared strategies around which singularities of struggle might begin to forge an "accumulation of struggles." I develop insights into these critical questions by focusing on the rhetorical means through which "SafeGround" enacts the claim that "being homeless, being in need, should not be a crime. And it can no longer be an invisible problem that we just turn away from, or that we assume can never be 'solved.'"

To support my consideration of these questions, this chapter is organized into three main parts. First, I describe the articulations between neoliberalism's State-form and conditions of urban poverty and homelessness in the United States. My aim in this section is to identify the predominant symptoms of neoliberalism present in urban spaces like Sacramento, and to identify how these symptoms resonate with my description of neoliberalism's State-form. Second, I introduce "SafeGround Sacramento" as an

exemplar of a homeless community whose oppositional practices reveal potential

resonances between singular efforts to resist neoliberalism and globalization. In addition,

I provide an overview of the corpus of rhetorical practices that I examine in my

evaluation of the "SafeGround" war-machine. Third, I describe my experience 'searching

for SafeGround,' and introduce some of the homeless activists who helped navigate my

journey through Sacramento's homeless topography. In the next chapter, I shift to an

examination of the rhetorical practices deployed by "SafeGround" as a means of

intervening in and challenging homeless experiences with neoliberalism's State-form.

Taken together, I argue that this array of interventions against the conditions of

marginalization experienced by "SafeGround" construct an anti-neoliberalism war-

machine. I conclude my analysis of "SafeGround" by evaluating the implications of these

rhetorical practices for efforts to theorize oppositional political collectivities.

"Citizens Without Shelter": Misrecognition, Polarized Topographies

and Neoliberalism's State-form in 'Homeless Sacramento'

On March 26, 2009, the *New York Times* linked a growing phenomenon of

makeshift homeless communities emerging in Sacramento (CA), Fresno (CA), Portland

(OR), Seattle (WA), Boise (ID), Portland (ME), Nashville (TN) and other urban areas

around the United States to the continuing consequences of the worst economic collapse

since the Great Depression. Investigating these tent cities, the *Times* argued that this

growing population of displaced citizens reflected an economic situation that "pushed

normally blue-collar people to the brink." The *Times* report explained that "tent cities

arise and spread" as the "recession's grip" expands to include "homeowners and families

that were intact…, [but] lost their jobs and homes" (McKinley 2009, A1, A15).

Confirming this grim scene, the National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty

issued a 2009 report that estimated 3 million people experience homelessness yearly, and

predicted that this number would nearly double by the end of 2011 given current

economic trends (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty 2009, 5).

  Making matters worse, homeless populations who face collapsing economies and

dwindling levels of social services also are forced to confront challenges to political

participation. Social justice researcher and homeless advocate Don Mitchell argues that

homeless persons rarely enjoy opportunities for democratic participation or involvement

in the political processes that both decide the fate of services on which they rely and

promulgate laws that constrain or enable their survival in urban spaces (2003).[2] Similarly,

Feldman argues that the dominant frames through which homelessness is represented

reflect the systematic and "legal abandonment of the homeless" by society-at-large (2004,

101). In this section, I examine how these conditions of disempowerment and

marginalization are realized in contemporary experiences with urban homelessness, and

how they constrain efforts to challenge neoliberalism's articulations to urban poverty and

homelessness.

'Housing, not Handcuffs': Homeless Misrecognition,

Polarized Topographies, and Political Exclusion

  Several factors contribute to the challenge faced by the urban nomads who aim to

map and challenge the articulations of neoliberalism and globalization to urban poverty

and homelessness. Neoliberal discourses position homeless persons on the margins of

social and political space. This marginalization is enacted through practices that invest

urban space and the populations that occupy them with differing meanings, identities and

forms of agency. Under neoliberalism, "municipalities…compete with one another both to attract new investment and to keep local investment" in place, they aim at the "constant production and reproduction of certain kinds of spaces," and they seek to produce a "constant increase in urban order" (Mitchell 2003, 164-66, 9). In such a context, urban environments must create a "seemingly stable, ordered landscape" attractive to the fleeting forms of capital that characterize neoliberal globalization. Critically, neoliberal cities eliminate the rights and abilities of homeless communities "to inhabit, to appropriate, and to control" urban space (2003, 9). This elimination of homeless persons 'right to the city' is enacted through three practices that assist in constructing the 'neoliberal' city: acts of homeless misrecognition, production of polarized topographies, and enforcement of political exclusion.

First, researchers concerned with the problematic of homelessness identify the limitations placed on homeless individuals' ability to self-determine their appearance as political subjects. Exclusions from the public sphere and social stigmas associated with the common representation of homeless bodies as 'degenerate bodies' play a critical role in constructing these limitations (Arnold 2004; see also Amster 2008, Feldman 2004, Mitchell 2003, Wright 1997).[3] Taken together, these researchers contend that homeless communities face barriers to political participation similar to those encountered by myriad oppositional communities who must struggle against "symbolic hurdles" and "doubly disabling tendencies of representation" that sustain their marginalization (Asen 2002, 360). Political scientist Leonard Feldman contends that these 'symbolic hurdles,' in the case of homelessness, are constructed through systematic practices of misrecognition.[4] In other words, compounding the non-recognition constructed by the

invisibility of being homeless, "media discourses often *mis*recognize the homeless by stigmatizing them as disorderly, out-of-place subjects" (Feldman 2004, 94; see also Wright 1997).[5]

More specifically, Feldman identifies four frames of misrecognition that contribute to limiting the range of political identities available to homeless communities. First, echoing non-recognition, is "the homeless as non-persons," a construction that "separate[s] [the homeless]…from the categories of personhood and citizenship[,] and [that] align[s] [them] with the abject." This construct plays a pivotal role in marking homeless persons as, in Talmadge Wright's terms, "out-of-place." Second, homeless persons are constructed as "disruptive subjects responsible for their plight," or as the "unconstrained, profane outlaws of public space." This representational frame positions homeless persons as the deserving victims of police harassment and civic ordinances that banish them from public view. Third is the symbolic frame of homeless persons as "helpless victims," who are simultaneously denied full personhood (i.e., autonomy and self-determination) and made the object of charity. This rhetorical frame animates effort to position homeless persons as individuals in need of charity, without agency, and incapable of self-determination. Fourth is the image of the homeless as "clients with pathologies," or "persons in the making" who, properly constrained from their own agency, can be made whole (i.e., "normalized") again (Feldman 2004, 92).[6] This frame re-entrenches the institutionalization of homeless persons and supports efforts to limit their "visibility" and participation in urban spaces. These representational frames, Feldman argues, inform how homelessness is perceived and how these frames shape a public consensus about how homelessness should be addressed, a consensus that is

shared by broader publics. By considering how Sacramento's homeless populations generally and "SafeGround" activists specifically were represented within the confines of this frame, my aim is to interrogate how these dominant frames of misrecognition are reproduced in local communities.

Local media coverage in Sacramento commonly introduced the topic of homelessness through a focus on acts of violence and, as a consequence, reinforced disruptive, deviant images of homelessness. *Sacramento News & Review* columnist R.V. Scheide provides an illustrative example; he quipped that Sacramento's homeless population had been "dragged down by drug and alcohol abuse, mental illness and disease, or just plain dumb luck." Scheide continued, noting that "It makes for a volatile mix, and navigating through this no man's land of poverty, depredation and occasional violence can be a daunting prospect" (2008, n.p.). Likewise, one letter to the editor reflected the degree to which the view of the homeless as disruptive subjects had gained footing in the Sacramento media and in public perspectives on homelessness shared by Sacramentans. Echoing Scheide, the letter-writer summarized that "The real problem is not 'homelessness.' It is mainly drug addiction, alcohol abuse, mental illness, or a combination of these. The rational solution for these individuals is drug rehab [and] psychological counseling (Thompson 2009, A10)."

Similarly, local media often targeted the political efforts of "SafeGround" activists specifically. This coverage framed "SafeGround" as an example of disruptive homeless persons unconstrained by the law. During the fall of 2009, approximately thirty members of "SafeGround" established an encampment near the historic Alkali Flats district of Sacramento. The lot was empty and owned by an ally who had invited the

encampment to be established. While an illegal encampment according to anti-camping ordinances in Sacramento, the camp stayed in place for several weeks as legal battles unfolded. Likewise, while the frame established by "SafeGround" was that the encampment was a deliberate act of political protest, the media used the opportunity to articulate the actions of "SafeGround" as consistent with the view of homeless persons as disruptive subjects. *Sacramento Bee* editorialist Marcos Breton, in one particularly vehement assault on "SafeGround," both identified the activists with "unconstrained, profane outlaws in public space" (Wright 1997), and linked them to the forms of disruption with which the broader homeless population was identified. Breton explained of "SafeGround,"

> They want an open lot where 40 or so homeless people can camp full time, relieve themselves in portable toilets, shower in portable showers and receive charity from do-gooders everywhere. It's bad public policy, a health hazard and a liability nightmare. And it does nothing to "solve" the core issues of homelessness…It's time to go back to [tough love]. (Breton 2009, B1)

Joining the chorus, another community member reinforced the image of homeless individuals as disruptive subjects. Demonstrating the traction of this view among a broader public, the writer argued that "Having people living on our streets is nothing short of a preventable disaster…. Undoubtedly the latest homeless encampment [(i.e., the efforts of SafeGround)]…is "a step," but in what direction does it lead us?" (Tobin 2009, A14). Likewise, another editorial contended that the activists aimed only to "continue to enable an unhealthy lifestyle" (Zoulas and Cooper 2009, E2). As a consequence, media coverage addressing homelessness in Sacramento generally, and "SafeGround" more specifically, demonstrates instances where the dominant frames described by Feldman are reinforced in public discourse. Such frames create a situation in which homeless

persons share a "status…that marks them as different from the unmarked norm of home-dwelling citizens" (2004, 103), a status that precludes them from participating within a larger community responsible for their own or the public interests.

Second, homeless persons facing acts of misrecognition like those present in Sacramento also encounter urban spaces polarized around the presence (or absence) of 'degenerate homeless bodies.' As Wright argues, "urban spaces are not 'neutral' backdrops to individual actions of the poor, but socially produced disciplinary spaces" (1997, 6). Urban spaces, refigured as disciplinary spaces, "redefine[e] what is acceptable behavior in public space" and institute "police practices designed to restrict the movements of those thought of as 'out of place'" (Mitchell 2003, 167; see also Wright 1997, 46). For homeless persons, these "polarized topographies" identify critical boundaries that map what public spaces they may appear in, with what parts of the community they may identify, and, as a consequence, place restrictions on the sorts of collective identifications homeless persons are permitted to access.

> Developing this line of thinking further, Wright (1997) argues that,
>
> polarized topograph[ies]…become evident, not when one is in the center of a particular site, but rather as one crosses the border from one site into another. These *subjective* and often physical *borders are often those areas subject to the greatest community struggles* – who will define their uses, where are they to be placed, and who will benefit or suffer from their location. (99-100)

In particular, Wright identifies three types of space that are struggled over by housed and homeless citizens of urban space. These spaces include "pleasure spaces," or spaces constituted through "a wide variety of guises" that construct, police, and enforce a particular "aesthetic" aimed at attracting, circulating, and retaining the capital of residents and visitors in urban space (Wright, 1997, 101)[7], "refuse spaces," or spaces "defined as

space that is excluded from development, held in reserve for future development, or residual space from a particular development" and "in which one is refused—refused services, refused dignity, refused human rights, refused the basics of food, clothing, and shelter, and refused medical care" (Wright 1997, 106),[8] and "functional spaces," or "spaces through which one moves to get to a particular destination, or a space planned for moving through to get to a particular destination" (Wright 1997, 109).[9] However, these spaces are demarcated through "fluid boundaries" that "means that such pleasure [and other] spaces may be produced by planners and designers only to change with new uses by the public in ways planners have never" considered (Wright 1997, 102).[10] Critically then, Wright identifies two realities faced in the context of a 'neoliberal city' pursuing the constant increases in order, as Mitchell highlights: first, urban space is organized into territories of homeless invisibility, and, second, the subjective borders demarcating these spaces are constructed through symbolic and material rhetorical practices.

Materially, borders between homeless communities and housed persons in urban space are enforced through expanding local ordinances and means of enforcement that construct homeless persons at 'out-of-place' in those spaces. For example, the National Coalition for the Homeless and the National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty issued a 2002 report that identified a growing pattern of shifting resources from support services for homeless communities to the enforcement of laws that restricted access to and participation in public space by homeless individuals. Among these laws, they noted a pattern of laws regulating public parks as "family parks" that prohibited admittance without children, the installation of obstructions to prevent napping by homeless individuals in public parks, and even more draconian laws that outlawed sitting on public

sidewalks.[11] Sacramento's anti-camping ordinance provided a material means through which homeless identity could be policed and marked as 'out-of-place' in the city's pleasure spaces. Among the law's critical provisions, Sacramento City Code 12.52.030 declares a misdemeanor and enforces that "It is *unlawful and a public nuisance* for any person to camp, occupy camp facilities, or use camp paraphernalia in the following areas: (a) *any public property*; or (b) *any private property*" (italics added).

Similarly, Sacramento's struggles with homelessness reveal a microcosm of the "community struggles" over who will define, locate and benefit from particular urban spaces caught in civic efforts to "re-creat[e] the city as a playground for…global capital" (Mitchell 2004, 167). In Sacramento, this conflict is animated by the struggles involving homeless populations and city developers over what has historically been Sacramento's 'refuse' space. On the one hand, most of Sacramento's contemporary homeless population concentrates itself along the floodplains of Sacramento's two main waterways: the American and Sacramento Rivers. As historians of homelessness in Sacramento observe, these locations, owing to their limited usefulness as development tracts and proximity to the city, have provided attractive space for homeless populations since as early as the 1930s (Reis 1993, 2; see also Henley 1993). On the other hand, the unrelenting need for urban environments to create new spaces attractive to local and mobile capital has placed what was once refuse space where homeless persons could seek shelter squarely within the city's effort to develop its "River District" (Mitchell 2003, 167). Reterritorialized as "the best that Sacramento has to offer," Sacramento's "River District" reflects how urban space is fluidly manipulated to serve the needs of global capital.[12]

Reactions to Sacramento's changing topographical polarizations reveal the recalcitrance of both parties to this "community struggle" over urban space. For homeless advocates, the city ordinance supports a "repetitive pattern of giving tickets to homeless folks for sleeping outside" that is equivalent to "discrimination against those who are homeless" and whose enforcement constitutes "cruel and unusual punishment." Likewise, they argue, the "River District" provides a necessary space for homeless persons to establish a place to live because its proximity to "services, stores, and potential employment" makes it a rare location where being homeless is not an "insurmountable task" (Reis 1993, 2). For critics of homeless populations, on the other hand, the "River District" offers a lucrative development opportunity in which homelessness is not just a nuisance, but is simply 'out-of-place.' As one board member remarked in an editorial in the local press, "the River District…[has] accepted more than our fair share of homeless…services….This issue is about quality of life…for our community, businesses and residents. We must find solutions…that don't negatively affect our businesses and neighborhoods" (Ayers 2009). For these individuals, anti-camping ordinances and other enforcement efforts provide the minimum means necessary to avoid the risks of a homeless encampment described in the local media (see above). This seemingly irreconcilable conflict underscores how polarized topographies contribute to the conditions of the 'neoliberal city' that "by…annihilating the spaces in which homeless people must live" also may "simply… annihilate[e] homeless people themselves" (Mitchell 2003, 167). My concern is with how these spatial boundaries are enforced through rhetorical and material practices.

Third, homeless populations attempting to survive the realities of neoliberal urban space are also beset by practices of political exclusion that limit and mute their ability to exert political agency in response to their marginalization and subordination. As Arnold argues, "the lack of a home signals an asymmetrical power dynamic: homeless individuals are not merely inconvenienced by their homelessness but culturally stigmatized and politically disenfranchised…[and] experience exclusion from the modern nation-state" (Arnold 2004, 5). Paralleling the barriers to political participation faced by the EZLN, efforts at oppositional politics by homeless communities must contend with forms of political exclusion "that either demand assimilation or attempt to extinguish their presence" (Arnold 2004, 3-5).

Both Leonard Feldman and Don Mitchell agree that it is imperative to analyze these explicitly political dimensions of homeless marginalization, not just those constituted by cultural stigma and misrecognition, and de facto (economic) segregation and polarized topographies. For instance, Mitchell explains that in contemporary urban spaces homeless persons are "rarely counted as part of the public," (Mitchell 2003, 135) while Feldman agrees that "neither the category of cultural stigma nor the category of economic deprivation can adequately encompass th[e] legal abandonment of the homeless" (2004, 101). As they explain, if publicity (or visibility) is a critical engine of democratic practice, then fundamental exclusion from counting as political subjects enforced by passive (i.e., legal ordinances and manipulation of public forums) and active (i.e., policing and arrest of homeless persons) strategies constitutes an act of *political exclusion* suffered by homeless persons. Feldman further differentiates political exclusion (from misrecognition and spatial exclusion) arguing that it subjects homeless persons to a

"civil death." When homeless persons are "deprived of the right of action and of opinion," "[i]t is not easy," he contends "to challenge more particular deprivations, economic or cultural" (2004, 102). Civic ordinances and public discourses do shape how homeless persons are perceived and map the terrain of their (in)visibility, but they also *categorically* "turn the homeless into outlaws, non-citizens whose everyday coping strategies *place them outside the law*" (Feldman 2004, 101).

In Sacramento, economic and political realities create an imposed requirement that homeless persons operate outside the law to perform 'everyday coping' and 'survival' strategies that echo these observations. Despite a 2009 report by the City and County of Sacramento that estimated its total homeless population to be between 3,000 and 5,000 persons, homeless persons enjoyed access to just over 169 regularly available shelter beds throughout the greater Sacramento area. Reflecting this dearth of resources supporting legal options for homeless persons to appear in public, one transitional housing center in Sacramento experienced a publicly supported budget of $2.5 million dwindle to $400,000 between 2007 and 2009 (Lewis 2010, 1). Likewise, in Sacramento, the numbers of people forced onto the streets correlated directly with these declines in community support for homeless populations. Coupled with the city's anti-camping ordinance that banished homeless presence in both public and private spaces, this reality quite literally ensured that homeless persons' presence, at any time, placed them outside the law. For instance, should a homeless person find themselves lounging in one of the City's many parks with their sleeping bag, Sacramento's anti-camping ordinance ensured that such actions could be read as a violation, or intent to violate, civic codes of 'acceptable behavior.' As a consequence, Sacramento demonstrates the dynamic of

political exclusion that homeless persons encounter, a dynamic fostered by the "de facto criminalization of a person's existence" that "turns the homeless into persons who are simultaneously community members and outlaws" (Feldman 2004, 102).

However, the urban environment encountered by homeless populations in Sacramento also demonstrates that political exclusion need not rely only on criminalization. It can also be created through more subtle means that limit the political agency of marginalized populations. Beyond being subjects outside the law and, thus, the privilege of democratic participation, 'disruptive' homeless subjects also are excluded as a barrier to, or disruption of, democratic forums. For example, during the summer of 2010, after enduring over a year of weekly public comment from Sacramento's homeless population, the Sacramento City Council voted 5-3 to move the forum appropriated by homeless communities to make their voices heard to the end of the council's weekly proceedings. For homeless persons, this action made it "virtually impossible" to make their voices heard; it tells homeless people they "have to go to the back of the bus," and it denies a "very pure form of democracy" where "ordinary people have the opportunity" to engage in democratic participation. Consequently, Sacramento through both the abandonment of homeless persons to the status of 'outlaw' and through the institution of subtle means of denying access to the public forums, demonstrates how the organization of urban space in relationship to homeless populations "constitutes an injustice of political exclusion" (Feldman 2004, 102).

Taken together, acts of political misrecognition, the production of polarized topographies, and the enforcement of political exclusions faced by homeless populations in relation to neoliberal urban spaces create constraints on the political identities

homeless persons may occupy, they limit the ability for homeless persons to participate in broader collectivities, and they dampen the influence of homeless efforts to exert political agency. Consequently, homeless persons in Sacramento, caught within the requirements of urban space to keep up with the demands of global capital, face challenges that resonate with the indigenous peasants of the EZLN that I analyze in chapter five. To better understand how this conjuncture of neoliberal urban space and homeless experiences with marginalization participate in and are produced by the same commitments of neoliberalism that inform other experiences with subordination, it is important to understand how these conditions of marginalization reflect a State-form resonant with the commitments of neoliberalism I outlined in chapter two.

"Where Am I Supposed to Go?": Urban Homelessness and
Neoliberalism's State-form

Neoliberal globalization articulates to urban homelessness, reterritorializing and remapping urban spaces. As a consequence, neoliberalism's State-form exerts powerful influences on who may appear, what sort of identities may be occupied, what utterances are or are not intelligible, the forms of community that may exist, and the forms of agency that can be exercised in urban spaces. These mappings of urban space and (re)territorializing the populations that occupy those spaces reveal how the neoliberal city's desire for a 'constant increase in urban order' resonates with the machinations of the State-form's three syntheses.

As Deleuze and Guattari argue, the State-form's connective synthesis arranges an abstract collective into particular "sides," "series," and "persons," that are constituted under "strange laws of lack, absence, symmetry, exclusion, noncommunication, vice, and

guilt" (1972, 77).[13] In the case of homelessness, neoliberalism's connective synthesis

articulates homeless populations to criminal and clinical discourses, and with particular

institutions (e.g., shelters and clinics). An expanding range of local laws that criminalize

homelessness aids efforts to couple homeless communities with criminal discourses. In

Sacramento, attempts to eliminate homeless participation in city council meetings, as

well as the enforcement of anti-camping ordinances, yoked the city's homeless citizens to

constructions of criminal or deviant behavior. Similarly, popular media sustains these

articulations of homeless populations to discourses of mental illness and criminal

behavior.[14] These articulations 'charge' homeless populations with specific, often

disabling values, and limit other articulations, that position homeless persons otherwise in

urban space. As Wright argues

> The homeless body in the public imagination represents the body of decay, the
> degenerate body, a body that is constantly rejected by the public as "sick,"
> "scary," "dirty" and "smelly," and a host of other pejoratives used to create social
> distance between housed and unhoused persons. (1997, 69)

Taken together, the material consequences of laws that criminalize homelessness and of

popular representations that re-entrench deviance, decay, and illness as markers of

homeless identity are that neoliberalism's State-form distributes homeless populations

into rigid relationships with other elements on planes of struggle constructed by

contemporary urban space.

Second, neoliberalism's disjunctive synthesis enforces the production of homeless

populations as populations of deviant subjects by recording strict divisions between

homeless and housed populations. As Deleuze and Guattari (1977, 13) explain, the

disjunctive synthesis 'records' the articulations produced by a connective synthesis into a

system of "abstract categories" and "hierarch[ies] of values." As a consequence, if the

connective synthesis couples particular populations, discourses, and institutions to produce particular meanings or valences, then the disjunctive synthesis in neoliberal urban space helps to sort urban populations into those who may readily navigate its pleasure spaces and those who, by being required to engage in practices of survival in public, are marked as 'out-of-place' in public spaces.[15] In other words, neoliberalism's disjunctive synthesis in urban space limits access to urban space for homeless populations coupled with criminal and clinical discourses and, as a consequence, curtails the forms of political collectivity available to homeless communities, limiting homeless communities' access to urban spaces occupied by broader (housed) publics.

The rigid grid of mutually-ranked terms (i.e., housed and homeless) constitutive of neoliberalism's disjunctive synthesis is recorded through civic ordinances and public discourses that reinforce the articulations produced by connective syntheses. Views of homeless persons framed as individual failings (i.e., criminal acts, illness, and other forms of 'vice' and 'guilt') create a strict separation between housed and homeless persons that frees the former from identifying with the latter. In other words, if homelessness is a consequence of individual failings, then housed persons (whose status is evidence that they are free of such failings) need not identify with the structural conditions of inequality that contribute to conditions of homelessness in the United States.[16] Wright explains this operation of the disjunctive synthesis by arguing that homeless misrecognition enables homelessness to be perceived "primarily as an individual problem," it displaces "concern over structural inequalities," and it treats "[s]ocial failures…as moral failures" (1997, 12). Recording these divisions between homeless and housed populations discourages efforts to view homeless individuals as

members of a community, or as a concern that warrants a collective response.

Constructing homelessness as an individual problem insulates neoliberalism by discouraging recognition that "homelessness is intrinsically linked with city, region, and national underdevelopment" (Wright 1997, 12). Neoliberalism's disjunctive synthesis establishes homeless individuals as a population marked and set apart, or politically excluded, from "normal" society in a manner that neutralizes critiques made by homeless communities and that constructs homelessness as an individual problem that emboldens efforts to police homeless identities.[17]

Finally, neoliberalism's conjunctive synthesis polices homeless (becoming-) identities through the production of highly regulated public space that deters challenges to the divisions mapped by its connective and disjunctive syntheses.[18] Neoliberalism's State-form facilitates this policing of homeless identities by insisting that cities reshape their public spaces in ways that are responsive to increasingly mobile forms of global capital.[19] This imperative contributes to constructing striated urban spaces; "downtown spaces are produced to facilitate financial exchanges, light manufacturing, and the reproduction of middle-class lifestyles. …Other urban spaces become repositories for throwaway populations. …[O]the[r] [spaces are reserved] for segments of the privileged and well heeled" (Wright 1997, 46). However, despite these differences, all are enforced through disciplinary practices that mark (i.e., record and register through the work of disjunctive syntheses) homeless persons as 'out of place' (Wright 1997, 46). Through the implementation of anti-camping ordinances and the reconfiguration of public space to "family-," or "fee-based," space, neoliberalism creates an interlocking set of ordinances and forms of enforcement that consummate the divisions between homeless and housed

populations constructed by its connective and disjunctive syntheses. Similarly, neoliberalism's conjunctive synthesis eliminates the ability for homeless persons to appear outside the rigid couplings produced by neoliberalism's connective synthesis. The conditions of visibility for urban homeless populations are based on the willingness for homeless persons to participate in (consume in Deleuze and Guattari's terms) the constructions of homeless identity that neoliberalism's State-form produces. As a consequence, neoliberal urban topographies limit the everyday practices of homeless communities through mechanisms of oversight, surveillance, and normalization that annihilate homeless persons/communities efforts to construct oppositional identities and that neutralize their potential forms of political power.[20]

My interest in this chapter is to identify ways that homeless communities might challenge the constraints on political identity, limitations on political collectivity, and annihilations of the spaces where political power might be exercised in order to produce a different kind of urban topography. By thinking with the concept of a war-machine, my analysis works toward mapping the lines of opposition drawn by homeless activists. My aim is to demonstrate how the homeless encampment and political advocacy enacted by "SafeGround Sacramento" offers an exemplar of the potential of such a challenge and the insights it might offer to other efforts at oppositional collective politics concerned with neoliberal economic and political regimes. In the next section, I support this aim by introducing the "SafeGround Sacramento" movement and briefly describing the range of rhetorical and performative practices in which they engage.

‘Everyone Deserves a Place to Be’:

Resisting Homelessness with the

“SafeGround” Movement

The frames of misrecognition, polarized topographies, and political exclusions encountered by homeless persons also shape popular responses to homeless communities and their political efforts. First, the proliferating range of laws criminalizing homelessness and the reduction of services for homeless populations on the assumption that homelessness is a chosen, or voluntaristic, condition reflect how these realities shape public views and elicit policy responses to homeless populations (National Coalition for the Homeless 2002; see also National Law Center for Homelessness and Poverty 2009). Second, as Feldman (2004) and Arnold (2004) argue, these realities of urban homelessness contribute to negatively shaping the self-perceptions of homeless persons who experience the reification of stigmas in everyday face-to-face encounters with housed persons in public spaces, as well as in interactions with government agencies and other support services who interact with homeless populations. “SafeGround” aims to challenge these representations and their outcomes by disrupting neoliberalism’s State-form in Sacramento.

“SafeGround Sacramento’s” Oppositional War-machine

“SafeGround Sacramento” is a collection of homeless activists, formerly homeless persons, homeless advocates and allies, and others who are struggling to address the gross lack of services for Sacramento’s homeless population, and the disregard for homeless persons as represented in various civic practices and ordinances enacted by Sacramento. Consider, for example, the implementation of a city-wide

"camping ordinance" that prevents any person from erecting a "campsite" (broadly interpreted, to include anything from a blanket spread on the ground to a tent and sleeping bag) on private or public property, and that effectively criminalizes homelessness. These practices of criminalization and the police harassment that accompanies them are viewed by "SafeGround" as critical challenges in their efforts to "protec[t] the human rights of homeless people" (SafeGroundsac.org 2011).

"SafeGround" emerged in the summer of 2009 after the City of Sacramento razed a tent city that had emerged on a vacant lot owned by Sacramento on marginal land adjacent to the watershed of the community's two main waterways, the American and Sacramento Rivers. After the nearly 200-person tent city gained national media attention, including visits from *The Oprah Winfrey Show* and *The Nation* newsmagazine, Sacramento authorities dispersed the campers and eliminated the waste and supplies left behind. Homeless persons were faced with only two options: abandon their "homes" or face arrest. Following this police action, between fifteen and twenty-five homeless persons, along with a group of service workers and other allies disenchanted with Sacramento's failure to provide a viable alternative for the displaced homeless community, founded what would become the "SafeGround" movement. The movement aimed to accomplish three goals: increase the visibility of homelessness and homeless issues, secure a repeal of the anti-camping ordinance that criminalized homeless survival, and gain approval for an autonomous and democratic homeless encampment as an alternative to the lack of facilities supported by Sacramento's public officials.

In the time since its founding, "SafeGround" has fluctuated between thirty and nearly one hundred members depending largely on the amount of police scrutiny being

visited on the homeless activists. On a day-to-day basis, "SafeGround" brings together homeless persons, community members, and social activists to secure safe camping sites out of sight of police interference and to provide the security that being a member of a community offers as compared to living alone on the streets. Notably, these "SafeGround" camps are governed by a three-member committee of democratically elected "elders" who are re-elected or recalled on a monthly basis and who come from the homeless population of "SafeGround." Guided by these elders and supported by allies from the broader community, "SafeGround" offers a community infrastructure, including holding weekly meetings where plans are made, problems are identified and solutions are found; enforcing democratically implemented rules for camp behavior that prohibit drugs, alcohol, or violence in camps; and providing for community needs such as food, shelter (e.g., tents), and other supplies (e.g., tarps, sleeping bags, etc.).

However, beyond addressing the immediate material needs of members of the "SafeGround" community, the community of homeless persons participating in "SafeGround" also sustains an elaborate campaign of political advocacy on behalf of homeless issues and aimed at changing perceptions of homelessness held by local community members and leaders. Directed toward the goals I outline above, this political campaign has relied on both traditional and innovative strategies of agitation on behalf of homeless persons. Critical to this political struggle have been numerous rhetorical efforts, including street protests, letters to local media, teach-ins, interviews with local media, informal conversations, direct actions, and other tactics aimed at garnering visibility, fair legal treatment, and material concessions critical to homeless survival (i.e., the ability to camp/sleep within the city). While these rhetorical practices are highly local and rarely

recorded, they offer critical insights into efforts to challenge the material conditions and rhetorical constructions associated with homeless identity in dominant discourse.

As a consequence, "SafeGround" provides a context to evaluate how homeless encampments challenge the forms of marginalization and exclusion faced by homeless individuals. Specifically, homeless encampments like "SafeGround" can potentially support collective spaces where homeless individuals can begin to challenge stigmatization sustained by criminal and clinical discourses, as well as begin to reclaim authority over the narratives that shape their identities (Feldman 2004, 106). As I will argue in later chapters, members of "SafeGround" participate in "resistant forms of placemaking" that produce "new, nonstigmatized collective identities" and challenge public constructions of homelessness. This strategy shifts the political subjectivity of homeless individuals from victims to political agents in a larger community. Second, homeless encampments and advocacy projects like "SafeGround" can potentially alter how homelessness is perceived in the public imagination. By engaging in public protests and hosting public gatherings to raise awareness about homelessness, "SafeGround" challenges efforts to push homelessness to the margins. At the same time, by protesting alongside other political organizations (e.g., Veterans for Peace), participating in public service (e.g., Habitat for Humanity projects that build low-income housing), and engaging in other elements of civic life (e.g., community clean-ups), "SafeGround" also creates links with non-homeless citizens, community organizations, and other potential allies that can support their oppositional efforts. In my analysis, my goal is to isolate instances of the rhetorical and performative practices of "SafeGround" that work toward

these outcomes, and to offer a careful reading of how these aims are accomplished

rhetorically.

<u>Traversing Urban Topographies, 'Searching for SafeGround'</u>

Beyond supporting my access to the rhetorical and performative practices that I

analyze in the next chapter, my participant observation (described logistically above) also

illustrates how "SafeGround's" anti-neoliberal war-machine engages in "affective labor,"

or "biopolitical production" that "produces social relationships and forms of life" (Hardt

and Negri 2004, 110). By inviting observers (e.g., media, including the Sacramento Bee,

the Nation, Atlantic Magazine, CNN, the Oprah Winfrey Show, and independent

filmmakers), researchers (i.e., during and before my research, scholars from Sacramento

State University, UC-Riverside, and UC-Davis also spent time with "SafeGround"

activists studying various dimensions of their research), and activists (e.g., allies from

other housing rights groups, activists for homeless youth, labor activists, and others), the

"SafeGround" war-machine "produc[ed] affects, relationships, and forms of

communication and cooperation" among a wide-ranging network of communities (Hardt

and Negri 2004, 110).

My first encounter with "SafeGround" followed a similar pattern to many of the

other researchers, filmmakers, and journalists who researched, observed or chronicled the

efforts of the homeless activists. I learned about "SafeGround" during the media

coverage of the "tent city" that gained national attention before being razed by

Sacramento officials in July 2009. Following this action by city officials, Sacramento's

local media included limited reporting about homeless activists that had organized

following the elimination of their former community. I gained access to "SafeGround" by

contacting a director of advocacy at a local homeless support center who was regularly quoted in the media coverage of the activist effort beginning to form in Sacramento. In October 2009, I made an initial visit to familiarize myself with Sacramento, explore resources in local libraries, and locate the parts of Sacramento's urban topography that were home to its citizens without shelter. A week later I made another visit and the director of advocacy with whom I made contact introduced me to the members of "SafeGround" who were serving as elders.

Over the next nine months, "SafeGround" elders, activists, and their allies invited me into their camp, shared meals prepared in the camp, ensured my safety as I navigated Sacramento's "refuse spaces," included me in planning meetings, quizzed my thoughts about their plans, and accepted my participation in their protest actions. Alongside these experiences shared with "SafeGround" members, some individuals told me their stories about becoming homeless, identified the struggles they faced working to contest the conditions of homeless marginalization, and described the political goals that motivated their participation in the "SafeGround" efforts. Likewise, "SafeGround" members with whom I became well-acquainted, and the collective camp, also recruited my support in ways that I could offer it. Sometimes, this meant sharing my rental car as transportation for campers and gear when unexpected weather happened upon the camp. At other times, this meant helping make protest signs, marshalling protestors, and transporting people back from protest actions.

My experiences with "SafeGround" as a researcher, participant-observer, and ally were both formally and informally organized. During some visits, I would go to Sacramento to "hang out" with "SafeGround." Often the visits were comprised of very

long days passing the time walking in Sacramento, finding supplies for the camp (my

occasional access to a rental vehicle made errands a regular coincidence with my visits),

and building rapport with "SafeGround" members. On some days (usually about three a

week), this would also include attendance at one or more hours of planning meetings that

included either camp elders or all members of the "SafeGround" camp(s) who could

attend. Large portions of these visits were spent with elders and members of

"SafeGround" dedicating significant amounts of their time and energies to its political

efforts. In the evenings, the community would expand to include others of varying

commitments who spent their nights in solidarity with, and in the safety of,

"SafeGround" camps. These visits provided invaluable insights into the practices of

community-building and collective identification that happen during everyday life in

"SafeGround" (see my discussion of *comida* in the next chapter). Similarly, these visits

provided the foundation for me to gain access to and learn the languages with which

"SafeGround" members described their political struggles and exclusions from broader

publics. For example, the distinction between "campers" and "normies" with which

homeless activists describe the hierarchies that neoliberalism enforces between the

housed and those without homes, a distinction that resonates with the operations of

neoliberalism's disjunctive synthesis.

Other periods of participant-observation were more formal. I planned some trips

with the aims of attending particular political actions being organized by "SafeGround"

and to conduct more or less formal interviews with "SafeGround" activists. On December

29, 2009, I participated in the "SafeGround Winter Pilgrimage Kick-off." During this

protest, I marched with "SafeGround activists," listened to and recorded "protest"

speeches, and talked with others participating in the protest march. During a more informal visit in April 2010, I visited a benefit screening of a documentary being produced by an independent filmmaker who had been working with "SafeGround" concurrently with my research. Finally, in July 2010, I attended the "SafeGround Jubilee," a protest action that marked the war-machine's one-year anniversary. During these visits, I had the opportunity to interact with a broad range of supporters of "SafeGround" from throughout Sacramento. For example, I interacted with college students, tradespersons, veterans, social workers, lawyers, doctors, business people, and others who supported the efforts by "SafeGround" to create a homeless encampment capable of challenging the conditions of homelessness and the representational frames that sustain it. Likewise, these visits provided forums to gather more formal texts that enunciated "SafeGround's" political identity and aims through protests speeches.

Over nine months and several visits, I began to develop close relationships with some members of "SafeGround" whose participation spanned all or most of my time there as a researcher. These individuals proved to be invaluable resources with whom I interacted by phone and email to stay abreast of the developments in "SafeGround." Crucially, these interactions provided a medium through which I and others were invited to participate in the "expressive interactions of individuals experimenting with new cultural codes, forms of relationships, and alternative perceptions of the world" (Mueller 1994, 236). In other words, they fostered the construction of a relationship recognizing that "the production of [resistant] ideas, images, and knowledges is not only conducted in common…but also each new idea and image invites and opens new collaborations" (Hardt and Negri 2004, 147). In the next section, I introduce some of the homeless

activists with whom I shared these relationships and who helped me navigate my journey

through Sacramento's homeless urban topography, as well as the range and

characteristics of the oppositional, vernacular discourses that I collected from my

interactions with and participation in "SafeGround's" anti-neoliberal struggle.

<div align="center">

Critiquing Vernacular Discourse in "Homeless Sacramento":

'Some Lives' and Some Texts

</div>

In this section, my aim is to introduce a few of the individuals who helped me

navigate homeless Sacramento, gain access to the oppositional efforts of "SafeGround,"

and gain insights into how the relatively modest aims of "SafeGround" constituted a

significant act of resistance against marginalization experienced by homeless persons. In

his examination of revolutionary struggle in Nicaragua, Roger Lancaster argues that

insights into the individual lives of members of community or collective struggle are not

valuable as "complete depictions of any given person," or even as "exhaustive 'oral life

histories." Instead, their value is to be found in their utility as a means to follow the

impact of oppositional struggle, "its hopes, its successes, and its failures through the lives

of individuals" (1992, 110). Like Lancaster, the individuals I introduce provide neither a

complete nor representative sample of the "SafeGround" movement, or the broader

homeless community in Sacramento.[21] Likewise, the rhetorical strategies and

performative interventions that I introduce in this chapter (and analyze in the next) are a

small, but evocative sampling of "SafeGround's" range of oppositional efforts. However,

these individuals and texts are not atypical of the range of homeless activists and

rhetorical interventions that I observed and in which I participated during my research

with "SafeGround."

Some Lives: Narratives of Struggle in "SafeGround Sacramento"

During my research with "SafeGround," I had the opportunity to get to know a range of individuals who were involved with various degrees of commitment in the homeless activism organized by "SafeGround." Spending time walking in Sacramento with these homeless, formerly homeless, and housed activists, I listened to stories of economic hardship and marginalization, domestic abuse, substance abuse, foreclosure, bad luck, identity theft, and other experiences that were the catalyst for many individuals' encounters with homelessness. During one of my first visits to a "SafeGround," "Ento," an African-American homeless man who at 18 was the youngest activist I met during my research, described how he became homeless after fleeing an abusive foster-care environment in which he had been placed during the last year of his high school education. Similarly, the overwhelming majority of women I interviewed pointed to domestic abuse (physical or psychological) as one of the key catalysts that contributed to their homelessness.

On the other hand, I also listened to stories from "SafeGround" members about how their participation in the oppositional collectivity had "saved their life," made them feel secure, and offered a source of "hope," something that my homeless friends universally agreed was vital to facing the realities of homelessness and the challenges of homeless activism. For example, one homeless woman in her later sixties or early seventies explained that prior to finding "SafeGround," she lived in constant fear on the streets and was particular afraid that if she went to sleep she would be sexually assaulted by another homeless person. Similarly, other homeless persons remarked that participation in "SafeGround" provided an environment where individuals "looked out

for another." For one homeless man named "Michael," this meant both a community of committed activists who protected one another from the dangers of homeless life, and a community that he could trust (both with his security and belongings, and with his homeless identity that he worked to keep hidden in order to protect his job). While dozens of long-term and short-term members of "SafeGround" shared their insights about the community with me, in the remainder of this section I want to focus on three "homeless lives" that together traverse a range of experiences had by "SafeGround" members, and that underscore the precariousness that shapes the lives of homeless activists.

John. Despite his initial appearance as a caricature of homelessness, John is one of the oldest members and most compelling spokesperons for "SafeGround." In his late fifties or early sixties, John's fifteen-year tenure in Sacramento has been plagued by homelessness. During our first interview, he indicated that over half his time in Sacramento had been spent on the streets. Describing how he found himself in Sacramento's "refuse spaces" and living in its makeshift homeless communities, John revealed the clarity with which he assessed the crisis facing his homeless allies. Homelessness for him and other allies, John argued, was the simple product of "falling wages colliding with rising rents."

I first met John at a "SafeGround" planning meeting during my first visit to Sacramento. Dressed in fraying cargo pants and a "SafeGround" t-shirt, donning a stringy, gray beard and hair to his mid-back, and moving about the city on a bicycle with nearly flat tires, one could mistake John for a homeless person overwhelmed by bad choices or failing (mental) health with which dominant discourses cast homeless

individuals. However, watching John speak about the challenges the winter would bring to "SafeGround" activists and the ways that the community might strengthen its message, I began to understand what other "SafeGround" members meant when they suggested that "John" was the group's "soapbox" elder. By this, they meant that, while not always an elected leader of the camp (i.e., a "camp elder"), John was a clear and compelling speaker on the behalf of homelessness and homeless activism.

Over the following months, as I interacted with John, I learned first-hand why his fellow campers placed so much faith in him. During my regular visits, our conversations ranged from the causes of homelessness in Sacramento to the causes of the economic recession that gripped the United States during the Fall of 2009 and the Spring of 2010, and from the immediate needs of "SafeGround" to the particularities (and flaws) of Sacramento's "ten year plan to end homelessness" (I would also learn that John, despite his homelessness, was a member of the task force and a tenacious critic of the city's unwillingness to support what he saw as "real solutions" to the problem).

During these conversations, John described what he viewed as the key problem with how homelessness was viewed by the broader community in Sacramento. The homeless, he argued, are viewed "as a problem, and not as a resource. It's the problem with our whole country, you know, the people are our best resource" and "we are not letting them speak." This enforced silence, John passionately argued, prevented broader communities from understanding that homelessness was the result of increasing numbers of the population, including laborers like himself, being pushed to the margins of the economy. "SafeGround," he argued, was a way for homeless individuals to say "enough

is enough" to the economic conditions and social conditions that subjected him and other

homeless persons to what Giroux describes as the "biopolitics of disposability."

Against these conditions, John argued that "SafeGround" was a place where

people who had "hit the bricks" and been "disempowered" can rebuild a sense of

autonomy and agency. "SafeGround's intention," he explained, "is to empower the

disempowered." This begins by getting "City Hall to realize that these people [(i.e., the

homeless)] are not garbage." In "SafeGround," building a community that supports the

needs of homeless persons unavailable in urban spaces becomes a means of

accomplishing this goal. Materially, he explained, "no one ever goes hungry in

SafeGround camps,…no one freezes to death,…if we see someone with medical trouble,

we try to find them some assistance. All of these are things that cannot be accessed by the

typical homeless person in Sacramento." More critically, John revealed that

"SafeGround" fostered a set of intimate relationships and expressive interactions where

homeless individuals stories are valued, and where those individual stories contribute to

collective grievances levied at the local city government. In "SafeGround" camps, he

explained, "the first thing you have to learn is how to talk to people, how to communicate

back and forth because people aren't used to that. They are used to one-way

communication [like television and political leaders]…that isolate them from human

contact." In "SafeGround," "people start talking to each other…and identify what their

needs are and what the solutions might be, whether they realize that's what they are doing

or not." This, he argued, provided a critical means by which "SafeGround" members and

allies disrupted the images of homelessness circulated in media representations, and

instead built "identification" with other people. Through this communication, John

believed homeless marginalization could be challenged. Instead of "looking to city hall for a solution," homeless activism, like "SafeGround," provides a means to "get the rest of the community involved." Instead of a context where "the homeless break themselves up" such that "they're homeless and everyone else is 'normies,'" John argued that "SafeGround" helps the homeless engage "the 'normie' community" and "a lot of misconceptions about homelessness" held by housed populations. "SafeGround" has tried to "bring awareness" to the broader community, and "to the homeless population[,] that there are other ways to get things done" and to organize efforts that traverse these boundaries

Tracy. If John is a long-term member of "SafeGround" who has decided to live on the streets as a homeless activist, other members of "SafeGround" orient to its efforts as a community of support they participated in during their time on the streets and with whom they remain allied after finding housing. Tracy, whom I met on my first trip to Sacramento and have stayed in touch with since, is an example of this latter relationship to the homeless struggle. In her late forties or early fifties, Tracy regularly arrived to "SafeGround" meetings dressed in beaded jewelry, jeans, and a "SafeGround" t-shirt adorned with tassels crafted from the sleeves. With long, graying hair and deep lines carved in her face, Tracy, like many other women, bore witness to the hardships of life on the street through these common markers of homeless persons. On the other hand, this mixture between a "typical" homeless person and an aging-hippie belied a passionate, committed, and knowledgeable ally to the "SafeGround" struggle. Married to a songwriter who was the balladeer of the "SafeGround" movement, Tracy could be found

every day, sometimes for a brief few minutes and sometimes for hours, working with, visiting with, and giving support to members of the "SafeGround" community.

Tracy, like some other members of "SafeGround," lived in Sacramento her whole life. Her path to homelessness, like many of the other women I met, was punctuated by a series of relationships marked by brutalizing acts of domestic violence, involvement in drug culture, and other periods of bad luck. During this time before homelessness, Tracy also found herself hospitalized from gunshot wounds she sustained from a shooting outside her local Laundromat. Recovering from this, Tracy determined to leave the situations contributing to her lack of safety. Her only choice: take up a life on the streets. During this time, Tracy spent time living in abandoned homes, an abandoned boat, shelters, and tents along Sacramento's floodplains. Just a few short years before "SafeGround" was founded, Tracy met John (introduced above) who helped her find her way off the streets. In the time since, Tracy married a local folk musician who had also adopted "SafeGround" as the muse for his Dylan-esque songs of social struggle.

As a homeless person, Tracy's experiences ran the gamut from relative safety, to domestic abuse, to drug abuse, to sobriety, and finally back into a stable environment. Since leaving her life as a homeless person, Tracy has determined that no person ought to share in the experience that she encountered, that "camping should be for recreation," and that she can support efforts to accomplish both these aims finding ways to support homeless activists from a "homeless perspective." By this, she meant a "perspective" that departs from county and city services that seek to identify, catalog, and, often, arrest homeless persons. "SafeGround," she argued, provides a space "where people can have a

little spot of their own." It's a "safe place" where "people learn to mesh and work together, and bring themselves out of homelessness."

However, echoing John, Tracy explained that "SafeGround" also participates in an emerging anti-homeless politics. She argued that it offered a "real viable solution" that eliminates the need to treat a person "as a criminal just because [s]he needs a place to sleep" and demands recognition from public officials. Taking pride in this success, Tracy explains, in this city "SafeGround" has helped make it such that "city officials have to look at you [(i.e., the homeless)] when you speak,…they didn't always do that." Moreover, for Tracy, "SafeGround" provides a space where participation in a community is valued. For individuals excluded from Sacramento's "pleasure spaces," "SafeGround" provided a place where homeless persons could begin to build the collective identifications and articulate the collective goals taken-for-granted by Sacramento's 'normies.' As she explained, "I believe that SafeGround will enable a lot of people" to begin to find access to reasonable housing, resist images circulated by media, and create change in Sacramento's urban topographies. Summarizing her perspective, Tracy would often describe her beliefs about "SafeGround" by explaining that "Rosa Parks sat down, and we are standing up. This is our struggle for human rights." She elaborated, "SafeGround enables a unity of mind and a unity of spirit…that it takes to stand up and make a difference…I truly believe we will overturn this law, we will make a humane law, and there will be a camp" where homeless persons can begin to reclaim their individual identities and their autonomy. As she regularly reminded city council leaders and others to whom she spoke, "People need a sense of worth, a sense of something to go on. And,

[SafeGround] gives people something to hang on to, something that's gonna make a difference for everybody."

Cowboy Bill. Not every member of "SafeGround" was a long-term member of the struggle and a resident of Sacramento. Many of the "activists" I met in "SafeGround" had traveled for one reason or another from places as far away as Kentucky, North Carolina, Texas, and elsewhere. Once in Sacramento, the realities of homelessness brought together this diverse array of backgrounds and histories along a few mile stretch of river, and within a few city blocks, that constituted "homeless Sacramento." Bill was one of these individuals, and was the camp elder who introduced me to "SafeGround." "Cowboy Bill," when I met him, was in his early forties and had been working with the "SafeGround" camp since the August before my first visit in fall 2009. Strongly influenced by his identifications with Native American culture, Bill also was the only person of color who served in a leadership role in SafeGround during my periods of most intense involvement.

In many ways, Bill defied the appearance of a "typical" homeless person. Regularly dressed in jeans, western shirts, and his characteristic black cowboy hat, Bill violated expectations of the disheveled, unshaven, and unclean homeless body that inform the frames of homeless misrecognition. Similarly, during meetings that Bill attended as a camp elder, he kept copious notes, regularly took on and followed through on significant planning tasks (i.e., soliciting bids for discounted camping supplies to outfit the campers), and managed the community's supplies with the precision of a military quartermaster. On the other hand, Bill also struggled against some of the most rigid of the constraints on identity imposed by homelessness. Like John, Bill found

himself unable to find work in an economy with less and less room for tradespersons. However, Bill also faced the challenges created by his checkered history with the justice system. Bill was convicted as a sex offender nearly ten years prior to arriving at "SafeGround," and coupled with his homelessness, regularly experienced the isolation from broader communities that inscribe such histories.

For Bill, "SafeGround" provided a space where he could begin to invent a new identity and to find access to a community where he was no longer, as Esteva and Prakash (1998, 55-60) put it, an "I" in search of its "we." During our visits, Bill often shared with me why he felt "SafeGround" was so valuable for both his personal struggles with homelessness and for the community of which he was part. As he explained, one way of approaching homelessness is, "I have nothing to lose. Why wouldn't I get drunk" because "they [(homeless people without a community)] don't have the resources, the training, or the guidance" to do otherwise. But, "if you have a community…like we are trying to build," then "you can begin to help people find tools" that "are solutions to these little problems." By solving these little problems, there are "no excuses" because they are the supports that are necessary for "solving the bigger homeless problem." The faith that Bill had in "SafeGround" was demonstrated both in his commitments to the struggle of his homeless allies and in the efforts he made to open the community to others experiencing homelessness. In support of the struggle, Bill regularly participated in the weekly campaign speaking in front of city hall, helped locate camping sites that would protect his allies from the elements and from detection by the police, and repaired the tents and other supplies that helped solve what he referred to as the "small problems" of homelessness. "SafeGround," he believed, refused to accept that "homeless people

weren't worth the trouble" to try to help. "I worked on a farm as a kid," Bill explained.
"We used to say similar things about horses that we had to put down (euthanize)," but "I
never heard people described that way [(with as much frequency)] 'til I became
homeless. I am not willing to treat people that way. Being involved in "SafeGround"
gives me a way to rejoin society and a way to help others find a way to rejoin society."
Identifying how "SafeGround" differs from other resources that promise similar
outcomes for homeless persons, Bill explained that "SafeGround" refuses to "warehouse
people" as a means of addressing homelessness; instead it helps promote homeless
autonomy.

On the other hand, Bill was also a key figure who helped expand the range of
participants in the "SafeGround" struggle. Perhaps as a means of participating in his
personal efforts to build a new identity, Bill regularly recruited new members into the
camp. One such recruit, "Gladys," was nearly sixty-five when she became homeless. Her
second night on the street she met Bill who invited her to join "SafeGround." "Gladys"
explained that, before that night, 'I was terrified. I didn't know where to sleep. I was
afraid of being raped, beaten, or worse. Bill gave me a tent, he invited me to camp in the
collective encampment, and he has helped make sure I am safe since then.'

I never had the opportunity to ask Bill what motivated these efforts. I learned of
his history with the justice system well into our relationships and long after he had helped
ensure my safety on dozens of journeys into and out of "SafeGround" campsites, but
before we had a chance to discuss this and many other topics, Bill was struck by a car
while helping other homeless people find their way to a warm meal. While Bill's fate is
one that is experienced by scores of homeless persons each year in Sacramento, his

misfortune was especially tragic because he was scheduled to start his first job in over

five years the day after he was hit by a driver failing to yield for homeless persons as they

crossed the street. Instead, Bill's short history with "SafeGround" from August 2009 until

April 2010 revealed its compelling power (i.e., the ability to help homeless persons find

their way back into positions of self-determination and autonomy through stable

employment, etc.), and the life-and-death consequences of the invisibility and

precariousness that defines life on the streets in contemporary urban spaces.

These three "homeless lives" each differ from one another in significant ways:

each person's path to homelessness is unique, the challenges that sustain each person's

marginalization are inflected by different social institutions, and the aims each has are

slightly different. At the same time, each demonstrates a common recognition of the

forms of homeless exclusion described by theorists of contemporary urban homelessness,

identifies a common desire to create spaces where homeless persons can reclaim

autonomy, and recognizes the work of "SafeGround" as a means of reclaiming political

power in neoliberal urban spaces. These shared commitments that emerge across the

experiences of long- and short-term members of "SafeGround" contribute to the

construction of an impressive oeuvre of oppositional tactics. In the next section, I identify

some of "SafeGround's" rhetorical and performative interventions on which I concentrate

my critical focus in the next chapter.

"SafeGround Sacramento's" Vernacular Opposition: Witnessing,

 'Walking in the City,' and Protesting

For nearly two years, homeless activists and their allies participating in the

"SafeGround" movement have engaged in a robust campaign of self-organizing, political

lobbying, and other oppositional practices aimed at challenging the marginalization of homeless communities in Sacramento specifically. Taken together, "SafeGround's" oppositional strategies reflect what rhetorical scholars have variously described as "vernacular discourse" and "counterpublic performance" (Ono and Sloop 1995; Pezzullo 2003). By this, I mean to suggest that "SafeGround" reflects the emergence and circulation of rhetorical practices in local communities that affirm and critique identities reified in dominant discourse and that draw on a *pastiche* of rhetorical resources (Ono and Sloop 1995; Pezzullo 2003). Accordingly, in my analysis of "SafeGround," I focus on rhetors and rhetorical artifacts that are often "systematically ignored" and that emerge from the mundane and everyday experiences of local communities. Due to this, most of my texts are a product of my participant observation and data collection conducted during visits (described above) over a nine-month period in Sacramento and among members of "SafeGround." As a consequence, my analysis highlights evocative passages and rhetorical maneuvers developed in "minor" discourses produced by "SafeGround" that highlight how their efforts challenge the realities of homelessness and urban space. By functioning as "interventions" in, or "interruptions" of, dominant discourses about homelessness, I am interested in how "SafeGround's" oppositional practices work toward exerting "profound effects on…vernacular communities" and equally significant "effects on…*communitas*" between homeless and housed persons (Ono and Sloop 1995, 20). Given these constraints, I focus on three primary rhetorical strategies that organize "SafeGround's" oppositional rhetorical practice: witnessing, 'walking in the city,' and protesting.

First, I focus on practices of witnessing engaged in by "SafeGround's" homeless activists as a means by which they both challenge circulating images of homeless identity that sustain their marginalization, *and* construct alternative perspectives on homelessness and homeless identity that expands the political subject positions they may occupy. As a primary strategy adopted by the "SafeGround" activists, witnessing informs both the specialized and informal rhetorical contexts in which the activists interact. By this I mean to suggest that many of the deliberate rhetorical texts produced by "SafeGround" rely on the circulation of narratives that describe how a particular homeless individual's experience with homelessness began, what challenges are presented by urban space to homeless survival, why extant solutions are inadequate, and what benefits would be garnered from integrating homeless persons as agents within a larger political community. On the other hand, "witnessing" also informs the mundane and everyday interactions between homeless persons belonging to "SafeGround" and housed persons living in Sacramento, including interviews with researchers like the ones I conducted.[22]

These acts of witnessing make several critical contributions to my analysis of local communities of struggle. First, archiving mundane rhetorics that fail to gain the status of objectified text contributes to gaining more developed insights into the processes which guide the development of oppositional political collectivities.[23] Second, witnessing provides a means through which the boundaries that bifurcate housed and homeless communities in urban space can be eroded. As Peters (2005, 250) explains, witnessing is a "means by which experience is supplied to others who lack access to the original" experience. Against the power relations that hold in place particular identities and representations of homeless individuals, witnessing, Peters elaborates, blurs the lines

between becoming informed about homelessness and participating in a homeless community, while, at the same time, "it reorients our conception of what [homeless] citizens can do" (2005, 249).

Witnessing is also a critical concept for identifying the interconnections between the embodied and discursive dimensions of "SafeGround's" efforts. Because "one can witness with the eyes, the voice, or the body," the oppositional interventions in public space, the struggles surviving the polarized topographies of Sacramento revealed in the well-worn faces of the homeless activists, and the embodied acts of building a homeless community all reveal how witnesses "serve as surrogate sense organs for the absent" (Peters 2005, 249). Much of my understanding of homelessness in Sacramento, and many of the texts I examine in the next chapter, emerge from my opportunities to interact with homeless persons who generously shared with me their experiences with becoming homeless and resisting the conditions of marginalization they encountered in Sacramento. Many of the stories and events I describe in this and the next chapter is informed by their testimony. Most of my homeless friends remain nameless or bear pseudonyms because I agreed to do so, a few agreed to share their first names, and I introduced some them and their stories above. These acts of witnessing by "SafeGround" activists perform a two-fold critical function: first, they enact a rhetorical strategy in which "information and participation are one" (Peter 2005, 249). By sharing the experiences of resistance to homeless marginalization, these acts of witnessing invite outsiders (allies, and potential researchers) into community struggles over urban space. Second, these acts of witnessing make moral claims on their audiences (Peters 2005, 244-265; see also Pollock 2006). These claims become the foundation of collective identifications and acts of solidarity.

Second, I focus on homeless practices of 'walking in the city' as a means by which homeless activists challenge the neoliberal mappings of urban space that construct boundaries to homeless participation in democratic forums and broader publics. By focusing on how homeless individuals interact with the polarized urban topographies they encounter, the rhetorical focus shifts to the import of "embodied" rhetorics for challenging conditions of subordination faced by marginalized communities. These rhetorical strategies, characterized by improvisational, enacted practices, complement the planned oppositional strategies that I describe above.[24]

Examining the embodied dimensions of "SafeGround's" oppositional practices is critical for several reasons. If, as Ono and Sloop argue, vernacular discourse is inaccessible via texts alone, then participation in and interpretation of the embodied, improvisational activities of oppositional collectivities is vital to understanding the dimensions of "culture" that are implicit in the formation and circulation of vernacular discourse. More directly, these practices reveal embodied dimensions of rhetoric that intertwine with textual dimensions in meaningful ways, and that cannot be "determined or limited by verbal frames" (DeLuca 1999b, 12; see also McKerrow, 1998; Whitson and Poulakos, 1993; Poulakos and Whitson, 1995). In other words, where neoliberalism's State-form seeks a well-ordered city with circumscribed zones of (in)visibility, the improvisational re-mappings of urban space enacted by "SafeGround's" embodied practice potentially "constitute[s] a 'wandering of the semantic' produced by masses that make some parts of the city disappear and exaggerate others, distorting it, fragmenting it, and *diverting it from its immobile order*" (de Certeau 1984, 98-102).

Third, I focus on how "SafeGround" activists mobilize the political identities and forms of collectivity generated by practices of witnessing and place-making to engage in public protest and agitation. Specifically, I am concerned with asking how homeless strategies of protest mobilize a "militant semiotics" directed at making homelessness a visible reality and to enunciate alternative solutions for homeless communities. In particular, I focus on how rhetorical interventions engaged in by homeless activists and allies at city council meetings they attend and at protest events they organize invent collective identifications with other marginalized communities. These collective identifications, traditional forms of protest rhetoric, other tactics of resistance "compose an imaginary and affective field of resistance" potentially "constitutive of progressive political effects beyond…[a] particular" situation (Thoburn 2008, 106).

Likewise, "SafeGround's" "militant semiotics" combat the conditions of political exclusion that frame homeless experience. Whereas the other two rhetorical strategies on which I focus are directed at reshaping homeless identity or reconfiguring relationships with urban space and community, "SafeGround" protests make claims on a broader political community and build articulations to a set of political commitments that exceed the immediate material needs of homeless communities. In other words, if politics is an intervention on the visible and the sayable, it is this final rhetorical strategy that activates the "generative power" of the critical politics of a war-machine whose aim is to "develo[p] experimental image[s] and practice[s]" of homeless "resistance and cultural expression" (Thoburn 2008, 106). Given this range of rhetorical texts and contexts, in the next chapter I draw together disparate fragments of oppositional rhetoric to highlight how "SafeGround" challenges the dominant codes that shape homeless marginalization in

urban spaces. Based on these insights, I ask how this encounter between neoliberalism's State-form and an anti-neoliberal war-machine points toward new ways of conceptualizing and engaging in oppositional political collectivity.

<center>Conclusion</center>

In this chapter, my aim was to examine how the universal assumptions of neoliberalism's State-form articulate to the singular conditions of struggle experienced by homeless communities in contemporary urban space. To demonstrate this, I traced the experiences of homeless misrecognition, polarized topographies, and political exclusions encountered by Sacramento's homeless population, and how these experiences resonate with the three synthesis that compose a State-form machine. In particular, I focused on how these modes of political marginalization constrain the ways homeless communities are represented and, as a consequence, the ability of homeless communities to exert political power.

"SafeGround Sacramento's" oppositional strategies provide one critical site and set of rhetorical strategies with which to explore how rhetorical and performative interventions can contest the forms of control exerted by the neoliberalism's State-form. By both creating spaces where homeless persons can build communities that foster self-determination and autonomy denied by homeless marginalization, and by engaging in forms of political advocacy that reclaim rights to homeless participation in urban space, "SafeGround" resists dominant efforts to domesticate, criminalize, and clinically-isolate homeless persons. More broadly, "SafeGround" offers a site to interrogate how singularities of struggle against neoliberalism might disclose new ways of practicing collective politics and to invent new bases of collective identification.

To support these conclusions, in this chapter I developed the material and rhetorical contexts that frame the oppositional strategies I examine in the next chapter. First, I identified the configuration of economic, political, and legal conditions that framed the emergence of the "SafeGround" movement and how I gained access to their efforts to build an anti-neoliberal struggle. Second, I introduced some of the individuals who participated in "SafeGround" and helped cultivate my insights into their political struggles. Grounding political demands homeless activists make on broader publics in lived experiences of homelessness helps sharpen critical insights about those rhetorical interventions. Likewise, highlighting the experiences with instability and trauma that contribute to individual experiences with homelessness helps emphasize the importance of the embodied acts of community building I analyze in the next chapter. In particular, I ask how these practices contribute to restoring autonomy and self-determination to homeless persons and communities. Finally, I introduced the range of vernacular rhetorical practices from which I draw my critical artifacts for the next chapter. Developing this discursive context helps to situate "SafeGround's" political power within a framework of vernacular discourse and to highlight how that framework is mobilized to accomplish the aims of "SafeGround" activists.

<u>Notes</u>

[1] For my purposes, homelessness is one problem, a synecdoche of sorts for a growing range of experiences of marginalization and inequality encountered in spaces and places once thought to be secure from the ravages of neoliberalism.

[2] For instance, Mitchell explains that in contemporary urban spaces homeless persons are "rarely counted as part of the public." As he argues, if publicity (or visibility) is a critical engine of democratic practice, this fundamental exclusion from counting as political subjects that is enforced by passive (i.e., legal ordinances and manipulation of public forums) and active (i.e., policing and arrests of homeless persons) strategies undermines the democratic participation of homeless persons (Mitchell 2003, 135).

[3] Similarly, other scholars have noted that even media aimed at offering pedagogical, or educational, insights into the problem of homelessness contribute to constructing a misguided view of homelessness. For example, Huckin (2002) highlights the use of elisions of some key topics explaining homelessness, or textual silences, as a means through which representations of homelessness take on an "ideological slant" that reinforces conservative or liberal frames through which homeless identities are represented in popular media (366-369).

[4] More specifically, he contends that beyond any forms of economic marginalization or structural inequality, "misrecognition" sustains homelessness as a social problem and homeless persons as a subordinated population by circulating social stigmas about, and enforcing the invisibility of, homeless identities (Feldman 2004, 91).

[5] Invisibility, Feldman argues, emerges from the homeless experience of being "addressless." If "address…indicates both a spatial location" (i.e., "a place of residence") "and a mode of intersubjective recognition" (i.e., "to be…recognized as a human subject in dialog"), then homelessness "risks being addressless in both senses" (Ibid.). Most obviously, homeless persons lack access to a 'place of residence,' or a place from which one can exclude others and engage in practices of self-cultivation. On the other hand, homeless persons' lack of 'address' also manifests itself in everyday practices of (mis)recognition; "the homeless are often simply not addressed but ignored, treated as objects blocking the free movement of the proper public citizen, denied identification in media reports...[and] face-to-face interactions between homeless citizens and domiciled citizens in public spaces" (Feldman 2004, 91-93).

[6] This misrecognition of homelessness is accomplished through rhetorical constructions, i.e., "the mobilization of signs, images, and discourses for the articulation of identities" (Deluca 1999b, 10), of homeless identity that create articulations between homeless persons and 'deviance,' 'disease,' 'decay,' 'dirt,' and other signs of 'degenerate bodies.'

[7] Wright indicates that such places include "commercial tourists, club, and dining complexes that satisfy food, drink, touch, visual, or acoustic cravings, to private residences with 'historical' themes, to theme parks, museums (cultural capital), beaches and parks, and shopping malls" (Wright 1997, 101). In these spaces, homeless persons are disallowed from appearing, marked as 'out-of-place' by signs of deviance, decay, and dirt that frame their identities.

[8] Critically, these spaces communicate the conditions of marginality that characterize their users and that reinforce the values associated with those users' identities. In other words, by using or

living in these spaces, homeless communities and others are associated with signifiers of "threat," "crime," and "untamed nature" that contribute to the low social status of refuse space.

[9] In other words, functional spaces are those spaces designed to move persons between pleasure spaces and through (often as quickly as possible) refuse spaces. Because these spaces often offer a range of amenities, e.g., bathrooms, shelter, warmth, security, etc., functional spaces often are appropriated by homeless persons as makeshift pleasure spaces by defying the specific functions for which they are designed.

[10] For example, Wright cites "the public appropriation of private pleasure spaces is one such possibility." However, "what is more common with people living on the street is the appropriation of a…space for private uses" (1997, 102).

[11] In one of the most egregious examples of criminalizing and excluding from public space those without homes, the report issued by the United States' largest homeless advocacy organizations reported that at least one city in Georgia had made it illegal for individuals to appear on sidewalks at all in communities where they did not own property.

[12] According to its developer's website, the development promises "room to develop and grow," "open space," and a "dynamic…mix of urban uses" for Sacramentans interested in satisfying their needs to "live," "work," and "play" in one convenient location.

[13] For example, in relation to the EZLN, the connective synthesis as enacted through neoliberalism-as-development constructs indigenous populations within a framework of lack and exclusion, i.e., 'backward,' 'illiterate,' and 'impoverished' subjects.

[14] Media coverage reinforces these popular imaginings of homeless issues, as does popular documentary and film. For example, the recent documentary, *Reversal of Fortune,* depicts a homeless man who, after finding a planted briefcase containing $100,000, succumbs to the challenges of addiction and mental illness that lead him to eventually squander the money and fail to rejoin 'normal' society.

[15] As Massumi explains, the disjunctive synthesis records a "grid of mutually-exclusive, ranked terms [i.e., identities] that can only couple with one another in pre-established ways" (2001, 825).

[16] As Chapter Two suggests, in material spaces that articulate with neoliberalism, political identities and relationships are reformed along what Pierre Bourdieu and David Harvey argue is the "first purpose" of neoliberal political and economic regimes: protecting and valorizing "the autonomy of the private individual" who is "held responsible and accountable for his or her own actions and well-being…[in the] realms of welfare, education, health care, and even pensions" (Harvey 2005/2007, 65).

[17] This politics of neoliberalism, Giroux continues, ensures that the poor, especially people of color, not only have to fend for themselves in the face of life's tragedies but are also supposed to do it without being seen by the dominant society. Likewise, Leonard C. Feldman argues that this form of (bio)politics is enacted through the intersection of legal mandates and popular discourses. He explains that, "the overall effect of these laws [and representations] is to turn the homeless into outlaws, non-citizens whose everyday coping strategies place them outside the law." Invisibility and disposability, he argues, are accomplished through laws that by "banning public sleeping[,] *place a ban on homeless persons themselves*" (2004, 101).

[18] As Deleuze and Guattari, along with Massumi, explain, the disjunctive synthesis describes the "mechanisms of oversight…of surveillance, policing, and normalization" through which urban space is "crisscrossed" with "zones," "potentials," and "thresholds" and that sustain modes of governance capable of regulating the political subjectivities and types of political relationships, or collectivities, authorized by its connective and disjunctive syntheses.

[19] As Mitchell explains, "when capital is seen to have no need for any particular place, then cities do what they can to make themselves so attractive that capital will want to locate there" (2003, 166).

[20] Mitchell explains this assertion, noting that by "redefining what is acceptable behavior in public space, by in effect annihilating the spaces in which homeless people must live, …laws [and mechanisms of oversight] seek simply to annihilate homeless people themselves, all in the name of re-creating the city as a playground for a seemingly global capital" (2003, 167).

[21] Additionally, my focus on "some lives" is adapted directly from Lancaster's critical practice in his 1992 ethnography in Nicaragua.

[22] For example, during my time as a participant-observer with "SafeGround Sacramento," I had the opportunity to take fieldnotes and conduct interviews of varying degrees of formality with members of the oppositional efforts. Because these texts were often gathered in informal environments, i.e., in camp, while walking, during the completion of some other tasks, they are comparatively less formal or pre-planned than the specialized rhetorical practices I describe above. For example, some of the conversations I recorded or made notes about are as brief as a few provocative utterances that capture a way of perceiving or challenging a dominant representation of homeless individuals and their interests. On the other hand, some of the informal interviews I conducted range from twenty minutes to an hour or more and include extended assessments of homelessness, economic inequality, and political exclusion.

[23] As Mueller (1994) argues, it is at this level of discourse, i.e., the intimate, face-to-face interaction, that nascent social movements construct conceptualizations of their oppositional identity, the goals of their collective struggle, and the rhetorical and political means, as well as alliances, necessary to accomplish those aims.

[24] These rhetorical practices include the techniques utilized by "SafeGround" to evade the scrutiny of institutions that criminalize their visibility, the tactics with which "SafeGround" reterritorializes the "neoliberal city" through both direct challenges to dominant institutions and discourses *and* through indirect appropriations of urban space, and the ways of organizing a homeless community, including systems of self-governance and networks of social relationships, enacted by "SafeGround." These rhetorical practices are developed largely from my fieldnotes and observations of the everyday practices of "SafeGround" activists and are developed through vignettes that contextualize and highlight the critical implications of these rhetorical, or counterpublic, performances (Pezzullo 2003). However, I also supplement my description and analysis of the rhetorical import of these oppositional practices based on insights gained through conversations with members of the "SafeGround" homeless community.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE "SAFEGROUND" WAR-MACHINE: IDENTITY, COLLECTIVITY,

AND POWER IN "HOMELESS SACRAMENTO"

Politics is first and foremost
an intervention upon the visible and the sayable
Jacques Ranciere (2001, para. 20)

In the preceding chapter, I described the range of rhetorical practices adopted by

"SafeGround" and from which I now draw evocative texts for analysis. In this chapter,

my aim is to examine how "SafeGround Sacramento's" rhetorical practices contribute to

constructing an anti-neoliberalism war-machine. In particular, I am interested in how the

oppositional efforts of "SafeGround" manipulate, mobilize, and make use of the

articulation of neoliberalism's State-form to Sacramento's polarized urban topography. I

tether my analysis to Deleuze and Guattari's theorization of the war-machine as a means

for thinking through oppositional collectivities as assemblages of resistance that are

"perpetually in construction or collapsing, and of a process that is perpetually prolonging

itself [via connective syntheses], breaking off [via disjunctive syntheses,] and starting up

again [via conjunctive syntheses]" (Deleuze and Guattari aqi. Goh 2006, 225). Informed

by this perspective, I identify acts of struggle from across a variety of "SafeGround's"

performative (embodied) and rhetorical (textual) interventions with an interest in how

they disrupt the dominant codes of urban homelessness. My aim is to identify productive rhetorical practices invented by "SafeGround" for thinking about oppositional political collectivities, and how those strategies challenge what is visible and sayable within the logic of control sustained by neoliberalism's State-form. As suggested in Chapters One and Two, my analysis is guided by three conceptual terms emphasized by a focus on neoliberalism's State-form and anti-neoliberal war-machines: 1) identity, or tensions over what identities may appear in neoliberal space, 2) collectivity, or what relationship/collective identifications neoliberalism permits, and 3) power, or what ways neoliberalism polices and normalizes marginalized communities. Guided by these foci, I interrogate how "SafeGround" contests homeless misrecognition, participates in homeless-placemaking, and invents a homeless, "militant semiotics."

<div align="center">

"Listen": Challenging Homeless Misrecognition through

Homeless Witnessing

</div>

As I suggest above, homeless populations face 'symbolic hurdles' and 'disabling tendencies' of representation sustained through acts of misrecognition that constrain the political subject positions that homeless persons may occupy. As Asen (2002) explains, these hurdles include the negative stigmas, stereotypes, and identities through which collectivities are perceived by broader publics and that constitute a barrier to be overcome prior to achieving political gains (i.e., political recognition). This requires that oppositional collectives, like "SafeGround," cultivate "mutual recognition of exclusions in wider publics, set themselves against exclusionary wider publics, and resolve to overcome these exclusions" (Asen 2002, 358). In the analysis below, I examine some of

the rhetorical tactics through which "SafeGround" advocates set about accomplishing these goals.

<u>"Listen:" SafeGround's UN Testimony</u>

In this section, I will analyze an exemplar of the weaving together of narrative and testimony with which "SafeGround" challenges the dominant frames of representation and attendant barriers to political participation they encounter. Specifically, my analysis focuses on a short video appropriately titled, "Listen," produced by a combination of homeless activists, advocates for the homeless, and an independent filmmaker working with the homeless in Sacramento. The film was produced in the winter of 2009-2010 and submitted by "SafeGround" activists to the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Adequate Housing, Raquel Rolnick. Accompanying the film, "SafeGround" submitted a three-page letter further describing the conditions of homelessness faced in Sacramento, the efforts being made by homeless activists to ameliorate these circumstances, and what sorts of solutions ought to guide efforts to address this problem by local, national, and international agencies. This letter, along with other supplementary texts, help guide my primary analysis of the short film, "Listen."

"Listen" runs approximately nine minutes and features scenes from homeless life in Sacramento, voiceovers describing the homeless situation in Sacramento, and interviews with a half dozen homeless activists and allies. Formally, the film follows the pattern of a persuasive appeal. It begins by identifying the causes of the homeless problem in Sacramento and placing it within a historical context, a purpose that is reinforced by the accompanying letter. Next, the film introduces a solution to the immediate problems facing homeless persons in Sacramento. Specifically, "SafeGround"

uses "Listen" to lobby for an encampment that recognizes the dignity of homeless persons and engages them as participants in the solution to homelessness. Finally, the film concludes by arguing that "SafeGround" enacts this (re)imagining or (re)envisioning of homelessness as a problem, homeless persons as members of a broader community, and how homelessness might be effectively solved in ways that are responsive to the needs of homeless populations. In terms of content, the film's narrative and testimony are compiled by interlacing the insights of "SafeGround" members' acts of witnessing. This testimony emphasizes the importance of the problem of homelessness and "SafeGround's" efforts to address it. In this sense, the homeless activists use witnessing to share experience and invite participation in a shared community identified by Peters (2005). However, challenging dominant codes of homelessness and expanding the boundaries of political community to include homeless persons necessitates that oppositional collectivities attend to three requirements of the rhetorical situation produced by neoliberalism's State-form: they must assert alternative identities or explanations in response to negative images circulated by dominant frames; they must reframe historical narratives and animosities that reinforce dominant frames; and they must offer counsel aimed at shaping subsequent rhetorical interactions (Asen 2002, 358).

Challenging circulating images of homelessness. Each of the frames of misrecognition that shape representations of homeless persons identified in the last chapter rely on an assumption that homelessness as a social problem is highly individualized. In other words, homelessness, by these accounts, is either the consequence of a voluntaristic choice made by someone to be homeless or is the effect of some failing on the part of the individual. In the former instance, the appropriate response

is to hold the homeless person accountable for their criminal or anti-social behaviors. In the latter case, the appropriate response is to divest the homeless person of their agency in the hopes that charity and rehabilitation can restore the homeless person to "normal" society. Critically, this focus on the individual homeless person and their choices as the root cause of homelessness both diverts attention away from other factors contributing to homelessness and sustains stigmatized images of homeless persons as addicts, criminals, and mentally-ill. My argument is not that homeless persons do not suffer, often in great numbers, from these conditions. Rather, my argument is that frames that focus attention on the individual as the root cause of homelessness both silence critiques of extant responses and limit serious consideration of alternative solutions. The testimony and narratives offered in "Listen" by "SafeGround" activists challenges this circulating image of homelessness on two fronts.

First, "Listen" challenges the assumptions that localize homelessness's causes with individuals by identifying structural causes of growing crises of homelessness. The film begins by offering a montage of images from the city of Sacramento while the voiceover begins to reinforce what the scenes of dilapidated businesses and unkempt homes make visually clear to audiences. As the narrator explains, "on any given night, 1200 people are forced to sleep on the streets, parks, or along the riverbanks of Sacramento" where the number of homeless approaches 3,000-5,000. The film and the letter that accompanies it reinforces that this reality is not one caused by choices, but instead by the collapse of economic safety nets relied on by low-income and other economically "at-risk" populations (i.e., the mentally-ill). Where the film suggests that Sacramento reflects some of the worst consequences of a nationwide recession, the letter

specifies: Sacramento has experienced 47,000 foreclosures (placing it in the top 10-20 jurisdictions nationally), 15,000 renter households (low-income) have been foreclosed, unemployment is 12% (compared to 10% nationally), budget cuts have forced the mentally-ill out of needed transitional care onto the streets without medications or regular attention from medical professionals, and that for an estimated 3,000-5,000 homeless persons only 169 shelter beds are available. Reinforcing this reconfiguration of how homelessness is represented, the letter accompanying the film analogizes homeless persons to refugees explaining that "were a devastating earthquake or flood to displace 1,200 Sacramento residents, neither the City [n]or the public would think of arresting the residents" and that the "ongoing severe lack of housing…has been no less devastating and has caused no less displacement than would a significant natural disaster."

Likewise, the film traces systematic practices of police harassment and shelter protocols that prevent homeless persons from attempting to participate in a broader community. On the one hand, as the film notes, with "hundreds of homeless people…left out in the cold,…Sacramento marches forward with plans to enforce its so-called 'anti-camping law;' a law that treats people who must sleep outside [as criminals] using whatever they have to protect themselves from the elements." On the other hand, those who can find access to the paltry number of shelter beds encounter a situation where "they have a bed only for a night" and that "because of the way many shelters operate,…often forcing [homeless persons] to choose between a job and a shelter space." As one advocate summarizes in the film, the forms of exclusion these laws and shelter practices represent create a situation where "the homeless are tolerated so long as they remain invisible."

Second, "SafeGround" advocates utilize rhetorical strategies of witnessing and testimony to reframe the representation of individual homeless persons circulated by dominant frames. As Pollock notes, narratives, especially oral histories like those that are included in the stories of homelessness that are presented in "Listen," contain the possibility of promoting differentiation, or "the familiar becoming strange…tuned to the strangeness of a sudden familiarity" (2006, 91). The narratives from "SafeGround" in the film accomplish this task by challenging the familiarity of homeless frames of misrecognition with stories that problematize the assumptions on which they rely. At the same time, the stories' explanations of the causes of homelessness evoke a sudden familiarity on the part of audiences by locating the reality of "becoming homeless" in common experiences. Over the course of the film, documentary-style interviews introduce viewers to several "SafeGround" activists. As Regina, Tip, Carlos, John, Libby, Costa, and Angela describe the experiences that contributed to their homelessness, narratives of domestic abuse, job loss, stolen identities, and other "hitches in life" are revealed that challenge the assumptions of homelessness as an individual choice made by homeless persons.

Likewise, by giving names and histories to normally "invisible" homeless persons, the testimonies provided by these activists make homelessness an immanent problem (Deluca 1999b, 14-15). This strategy shifts homelessness from a generic problem caused by the poor choices of faceless individuals to a problem affecting "this person" who had "these experiences." In other words, homeless acts of witnessing challenge the circulating images of homelessness both by disrupting familiar frames for perceiving homelessness through stories that challenge assumptions about its causes, and

offers the basis for identification with homeless communities by isolating experiences that contribute to homelessness likely to evoke a "sudden familiarity" with "becoming homeless." However, most importantly, by localizing the structural problems and personal experiences that contribute to homelessness, "SafeGround" advocates provide warrants to their claim that homelessness is not just an individual problem and that, as John, one of the advocates interviewed in the film, argued, "you can't arrest your way out of poverty."

   Reframing historical narratives about homelessness. Challenging circulating images that preclude the participation of marginalized communities from broader publics does not always overcome the tenacity of dominant representational frames. As Asen argues, circulating images gain their rhetorical power from "historical animosities" that are "concentrate[d]…in conflicts over representation" (2002, 361). In the case of "SafeGround," the influence of these historical animosities was and remains palpable. As I suggest above, numerous editorialists in the local media and community members submitting letters to the editor reinforced historical animosities cultivated by Sacramento's long history of homelessness that stretches as far back as at least the Great Depression. Alluded to through references to the "preventable disaster," "step in the wrong direction," and public policy disaster that conceding to the aims of "SafeGround," might entail, these popular responses both reflected these animosities and sedimented the recalcitrance of dominant frames encountered by Sacramento's homeless populations.

   Making matters worse, the demand for an autonomous homeless encampment made by "SafeGround" (described above) further stoked historical animosities growing out of the tent city that both drew unwanted (national and international) media attention

to Sacramento's homeless problem and birthed the "SafeGround" movement during the spring of 2009. Several reports suggested that the members of "SafeGround" operated out of bad motives, proposed a solution that would only recreate the debacle of the nearly 500-person tent city that created an international embarrassment for Sacramento, and would divide public support at a time when real solutions were needed most. In the Sacramento lifestyle magazine, *Inside the City,* publisher Cecily Hastings argued that attention being given to homelessness in Sacramento was misleading as she sought to refocus attention from the ways structural conditions contributed to homelessness to the fact that most homeless persons in the camp and comprising "SafeGround" were chronically homeless for over a decade (Hastings 2009, n.p.). Similarly, in addition to bad motives, others suggested that establishing another homeless encampment would recreate the problems of the old tent city while wasting "precious tax dollars and resources on an expensive solution that will serve…few," and that the plan would likely prove "divisive when [Sacramento] must unite around real solutions to difficult problems (Ayers 2009, E2; Tobin 2010, A17). Against these historical animosities, "Listen" and the "SafeGround" advocates who offer testimony differentiate their efforts from the tent city that stoked public animosity against the homeless, and challenge the conditions with which community is constructed and enacted by the broader public.

Visually, "SafeGround" utilizes their testimonial video to challenge the criticisms levied at the possibility of a homeless encampment. Against a chorus of claims in the media that such a camp would lead to a public health disaster, contribute to lawlessness like that encountered in the previous tent city, and worsen the problems of homelessness, the film introduces audiences to the "illegal" encampments where "SafeGround"

members have been piloting their vision of homeless autonomy. In these encampments, viewers encounter rows of tents set up in makeshift campsites that are meticulously cleaned. Within the camp, common areas for cooking, socializing, and performing other tasks necessary for survival are clearly delineated by the actions of "SafeGround" members whose everyday practices are captured in the film and by the distribution of camp materials (e.g., stoves, camp chairs, etc.), that mark the boundaries between private and public space. In doing so, the camp challenges the image of "a patch of land" covered with "tarps, tents, mattresses, used needles and other leavings of some 150 homeless people" associated with previous homeless encampments in Sacramento (aqi. Hastings 2009, n.p.).

Likewise, the film and the testimony provided by "SafeGround" members reinforces that, unlike previous encampments, SafeGround's advocacy is aimed at stabilizing living conditions for homeless persons and providing the tools that allow homeless persons to regain autonomy over their lives. Doing so, as one "SafeGround" leader explained in his testimony, means recognizing that "there is an awful lot of fear about the homeless and some of it is justified, most of it is not." To accomplish this, "SafeGround" members explain in the description of their advocacy that their aim is to create an encampment where "everyone agrees…when they come into 'SafeGround'" that they will support an environment that disallows "drugs, alcohol, and violence or threats of violence." As they explain, "what 'SafeGround' is trying to do" is recognize that "there are a lot of good working people out here, and they want to work and we need to help them find a way to do that" other than existing support services that offer a shortage of shelter beds and enforce rules that ensure "a homeless person is forced to

choose between a job and a shelter space." Additionally, in an effort to allay fears that "SafeGround" is a step back in the direction of an unruly and expansive tent city, "SafeGround" advocates explain that the encampment offers an important contribution to efforts to build a "larger system or continuum that addresses, rather than criminalizes homelessness."

Finally, in addition to directly responding to public concerns and historical animosities growing out of past experiences with homeless populations, the testimony offered by "SafeGround" also contends that homeless persons are capable of constructing community more inclusively than those constructed by broader publics. Observing the basis for these exclusions, Wright argues that "urban spaces are not 'neutral' backdrops to individual actions of the poor, but socially produced disciplinary spaces" that are enforced through "police practices designed to restrict the movements of those thought of as 'out of place'" (Wright 1997, 6, 46). Recognizing this reality, one "SafeGround" member explained the barriers to community that plague broader publics noting that "community is disappearing as we all go hide in our little boxes and segregate from one another." On the other hand, homeless activists participating in "SafeGround" offer a vision of community that eschews these "polarized topographies" that map the boundaries of who is or is not "out-of-place." As they explain, in homeless communities "you couldn't segregate. People were right next to each other. They talked. We didn't have a way to plug in a television so we replaced it with conversation."

However, beyond simply rejecting the segregation that is enacted by polarized topographies that create "spaces that become repositories for throwaway populations" or the "privileged and well heeled," "SafeGround" similarly identifies the potential for their

communities to activate "conflict networks" with the potential for creating transformative change within homeless communities and beyond. Conflict networks, Mueller argues, are "cultural laboratories" where oppositional collectivities construct collective identities from the "expressive interactions of individuals experimenting with new cultural codes, forms of relationships, and alternative perceptions of the world." They "connect the sense of personal misfortune that people experience in their everyday lives with a collective interpretation of these conditions as injustice or grievance that justify collective action" (Mueller 1994, 236-7). In other words, beyond meeting the material needs of providing homeless persons "a place to go so that I could survive" homelessness, "SafeGround" provides spaces where the face-to-face interactions that transform personal trauma into collective grievance can occur. As one "SafeGround" elder named "Tip" explained, "SafeGround means…community. There is more community in this group than when I lived in a house. We sit and actually talk to each other" in an effort to construct solutions to problems facing "our community."

Shaping subsequent rhetorical interactions about homelessness. Collectively developing ways of addressing the conditions of homelessness contributes the third element of "SafeGround's" oppositional rhetorical practices presented in their testimony to the United Nations. As I illustrate above, one of the critical elements that "SafeGround" members identify that differentiates them from stigmatized images of homelessness is the vibrant community of mutual solidarity that exists in their encampments and that informs how their community thinks about efforts to "solve" homelessness. These collective efforts to develop solutions that respond to the on-the-ground experience of homelessness inform the testimony of "SafeGround" members and

are revealed by the acts of witnessing that work to (re)shape subsequent rhetorical interactions around the topic of homelessness. Specifically, "SafeGround" members' testimony challenges the universalizing images of homelessness that are sustained by misrecognition and the equally universal "solutions" provided by local governments to address homelessness. Solutions that homeless persons and their allies suggest militate against the agency and autonomy of homeless persons, and undermine efforts for homeless persons to address the circumstances of their own experience with homelessness.

Identifying the universalizing images and solutions implied by extant efforts to address homelessness, Feldman (2004) argues that such efforts "constitute an injustice of misrecognition in the sense that they result in the production of stigma and the construction of a deviant 'homeless' subject against which the 'normal' subject stands" (97). Critical to this is a universalizing assumption of dependency that runs through each of the frames of misrecognition that Feldman describes. Whether homeless persons are interpreted through the frame of criminality that leaves them to be 'kept alive,' or through the frames of disaffiliated and damaged 'subjects-in-the-making' that leaves them to be reformed or reintegrated into society, efforts to address homelessness assume a generic *dependent* subject and propose a universal solution of *institutionalized* shelter. However, as Feldman notes, shelters are the "main institution for keeping the homeless alive" and are also the critical site where "community affiliations and networks that exist among homeless persons" are neglected, or "actively broken down" (Feldman 2004, 97). Echoing this reality, Wright argues that criminal and clinical discourses that are articulated with homeless bodies in a near universal fashion actually help enforce shelters

as universal solutions and efface the singular factors that contribute to homelessness in individual experiences (Wright 1997, 17-31).

In Sacramento, mainstream efforts to address homelessness often echoed this perspective on homeless persons as a universal problem of self-generated dependencies and pathologies that required the response of institutional shelter. Local media coverage, as suggested above, regularly associated homelessness with the images of dependency described by Feldman and Wright by citing the need for psychological counseling, patterns of substance abuse among homeless populations, and unconstrained disregard for order allegedly engaged in by homeless communities. Similarly, editorials that identified the flaws of "SafeGround's" efforts to address homelessness did so alongside claims that the work of "SafeGround" undermined the one legitimate solution: a unified effort to build more institutional shelter beds (Tobin 2010; Breton 2009; Ayers 2009; Zoulas and Cooper 2009).

As a consequence, "these images constitute a cumulative imaginary field that constrains the choices of successive participants" in debates about how to address issues of homelessness. Against these efforts to narrowly "shape subsequent rhetorical [and political] interactions" aimed at addressing homelessness (Asen 2002, 362), testimony by members of "SafeGround" directed itself toward ensuring that "leaders and society as a whole…take care not to hold up shelters as the ultimate solution" and to facilitate "a shift in public policy that views…shelters as an important part of the solution puzzle…, but not as an adequate response" to all experiences with homelessness. Supporting this aim, the testimony of "SafeGround" members reconstructed homelessness *both* as the product

of a singular combination of structural causes and individual challenges, *and* solutions to homelessness as grounded in efforts to productively engage these singularities.

First, members of "SafeGround" reconstructed homelessness as a product of the singular combination of environmental conditions, experiences of trauma, and individual challenges. Amster (2008, 220) argues that "issues such as homelessness…are local matters with global origins and implications." "SafeGround" members' oppositional politics mapped this intersection onto their appeals for homeless encampments and camping ordinance moratoriums. These concessions, they argued, would recognize the articulations of local/individual experiences with homelessness to structural/global conditions that contribute to those experiences. As one of the first elders of the "SafeGround" movement explained in his testimony, "it would just be so much simpler to create a piece of SafeGround" because it would provide "a safe place to go where we can stabilize the situation and start to adjust the individual problems that contribute to homelessness, and those are as varied as there are individual problems in our society-at-large." Coupled with the written testimony accompanying the video and other testimonials by homeless persons describing why shelters were not a viable solution for their experience with homelessness, this testimony shapes future rhetorical interactions by introducing perspectives on the causes of experiences with homeless life that are obfuscated by dominant frames of homeless misrecognition.

Second, "SafeGround" members' testimony responds to the claim that their efforts undermine "real" solutions to homelessness by framing their response as a local action that demonstrates a way to productively engage the singular experiences with trauma, poverty, and individual struggles that produce homelessness. By identifying their

efforts as an instance of "local processes" with the potential to exert broader influence, "SafeGround" members deflect claims that they are only a limited solution and affirm their participation in expanding the continuum of support options available to homeless persons. As the film "Listen" concludes, another "SafeGround" elder explains this perspective noting that:

> I used to go to a little church…on every exit…they had a little plaque that said "now entering the mission field." The mission field is not some other country; it is in your own back yard. If you start in your own back yard and work your way out, eventually you will cover the whole world because you are always in somebody's back yard.

In doing so, the efforts of "SafeGround" are framed as an expansion of contemporary approaches to homelessness, a strategy that simultaneously expands the range of images through which homeless persons can be apprehended and contributes new options on the continuum of solutions that inform public discourse about homelessness. In this respect, the testimony of "SafeGround" members configures their effort as an act of "minor politics," or a politics that operates as "seeds or crystals of becoming whose value is to trigger uncontrollable movements within the mean or the majority" (Smith 1997, xlii-xliii). As a consequence, "SafeGround" reveals a politics that works toward eschewing the narrow subject positions and rigid articulations enforced on homeless persons in urban space by neoliberalism's State-form.

'This Is SafeGround': 'Walking in the City,' (Resistant) Homeless

Place-making, and Oppositional Collectives

Marginalization of homeless communities does not end with practices of misrecognition that position homeless persons as disruptive and dependent political subjects. Material practices through which spaces are constructed and further invested

with meaning also contribute to these realities. Visible and invisible boundaries produce polarized topographies in urban space that reinforce the forms of subordination and marginalization experienced by the homeless. In the last chapter, I considered how Sacramento enforces its polarized topography and the consequences of those practices for homeless Sacramentans. By relegating homeless bodies to the margins of urban "refuse" spaces and creating impediments to homeless participation in urban "pleasure" spaces, urban topographies create subtle constraints that subordinate homeless persons and limit the ability of homeless populations to articulate their identities, interests, and needs with cities animated by neoliberal logics.

In this section, I examine how "SafeGround" members enact resistant forms of homeless place-making to challenge these constraints and refigure the boundaries that shape homeless experiences and interactions with housed populations. Examining these efforts is important because urban topographies create uses/meanings of space that prefigure the potential for homeless communities to engage in collective resistance and collective solidarity. In particular, I am concerned with what insights might be gained from the "emergent" forms of resistance enacted through "SafeGround's" embodied practices. By focusing my analysis on practices of everyday life in "SafeGround," my aim is two-fold: first, to complement my focus on rhetorical practices with a recognition that oppositional "activities…include but are not limited to talk," and, second, to consider Pezullo's contention that analysis of embodied rhetorical practices affirms the importance of "cultural performances unrecognized by mainstream culture," offers a record of them through the process of interpretation, and "grasp[s] more fully the complexity" of oppositional rhetorics and rhetorical communities (2003, 347-348, 350).

‘You Are Now Entering SafeGround’: Critical Characteristics

Sacramento struggles with some of the most grinding realities of homelessness of any community in the United States. Confronted with above average unemployment and rates of foreclosure, scores of Sacramentans find themselves either precariously avoiding homelessness or besieged by a lack of resources with which to survive homelessness. In response to these realities, “SafeGround” was founded in 2009 by homeless activists and their allies, including social support workers from several non-profit, independent homeless advocacy groups (e.g., Francis House, Loaves & Fishes, and others). “SafeGround” describes its goals thusly:

> The movement views a safe ground area as part of a larger system or continuum that addresses, rather than criminalizes homelessness…Sacramento ‘Safe Ground’ members and their supporters seek the following, in order that Sacramento live up to the principle of housing as a human right: 1) repeal of…the anti-camping ordinance; 2) creation of a designated safe ground area; 3) a shift in public policy that views emergency and temporary shelters as an important part of the solution puzzle…but not as an adequate response to the crisis.

“Safeground’s” primary effort has been aimed at two purposes. First, “SafeGround” has organized a nomadic camp of homeless activists who practice the movement’s commitment to a self-governed homeless encampment free from drugs, alcohol, and violence. Importantly, this encampment operates in open violation of city ordinances and is viewed by members as an act of civil disobedience. For instance, during my observations, before joining “SafeGround” new members are informed and asked whether they agree to abide by the rules and agree to cooperate with police, including potential arrests. Second, “SafeGround” has sustained a political advocacy campaign that includes protest actions, participation in community councils and taskforces concerned with homelessness, interviews and editorials in local media, and

grassroots advocacy (i.e., hosting interested members of the public as "guest" campers).

These efforts have solicited a high degree of visibility for "SafeGround" in the

Sacramento area and have mobilized significant attention by local media and government

to homelessness.[1]

Nonetheless, media coverage and other secondary accounts of "SafeGround" offer

a one-dimensional and ideologically-inflected portrayal of the complexity and

consequence of "SafeGround's" rhetorical practices. To enrich the critical insights into

"SafeGround's" discursive efforts and to identify the embodied and nondiscursive

dimensions of "SafeGround's" rhetorical practices, I visited Sacramento on eight

different occasions between October 2009 and July 2010 spending about six weeks with

"SafeGround" activists.[2] Although my fieldwork occurred over a relatively brief period

of time, focusing on some evocative moments and events during my participation with

Sacramento's homeless community offers a means to develop "a more detailed and

textured account" of "SafeGround" as an anti-neoliberal war-machine (Pezzullo 2003,

354).

During my fieldwork, "SafeGround" activists contended with the polarized urban

topography that I describe in Chapter Three. While Sacramento, for its housed

population, is the "indomitable city" that benefits from its strategic relationships to

California's mineral, agricultural, and political wealth. For its homeless population,

Sacramento offers a dearth of support and leaves homeless persons seeking shelter and

safety in what one "SafeGround" activist described as a "wasteland." Sacramento's

housed population enjoys the opulence of California's state capitol, a revitalized historic

district, and ample commercial and leisure spaces constitutive of the neoliberal's city's

"pleasure spaces" (Mitchell 2003; see also Wright 1997). "Homeless Sacramento," on the other hand, is situated at the periphery of Sacramento's wealth. Two and a quarter miles north of California's state capitol and the heart of Sacramento, homeless Sacramentans live literally on the 'wrong side of the tracks' that separate Sacramento's commercial and residential wealth from its decaying industrial and rail yards. There, in the floodplains of the American and Sacramento Rivers, "SafeGround" activists and other homeless persons occupy Sacramento's "refuse spaces."

The homeless encampments "SafeGround" organized were nomadic of necessity. Packing up each morning before five and not setting camp until after six helped reduce the chances that the campers would be as quickly detected by police in what one activist described as their ongoing "game of cat and mouse" with local authorities. As a consequence, each night "SafeGround" activists gathered on the premises of a local homeless soup kitchen whose staff were allies of the activists' efforts and allowed the campers to store their gear there during the day. Elders elected on a monthly basis from among the membership determined the camping location to be utilized. Following this decision, a pilgrimage of homeless persons with gear and other possessions in tow marched up to a mile to establish that night's "SafeGround" encampment. In the morning, the grueling process of taking down, packing up, and hauling one's home and other belongings back to storage occupied the activities of "SafeGround" members.

Over the nine months I spent with and among "SafeGround" activists, their encampment evolved and morphed in a variety of ways. Geographically, it ranged over a two-mile stretch of the American River. Demographically, the population of "SafeGround" ranged from around a dozen activists to seventy or more campers. While

predominantly European American, "SafeGround" activists acknowledged the need for diversity in their effort, and by the time my fieldwork ended approximately a third of their members were ethnic minorities. Likewise, while "SafeGround" was predominantly comprised of male members, between one-third and half of its members were women. Across these groups, the majority of activists were in their thirties or forties with some members being a few years younger or several years older. Depending on leadership and location, the camps were given several names over the course of my fieldwork, including "Camp Hope," "La Familia," "Sherwood Forest," and "Township 9."

Nonetheless, despite changing leadership, membership, locations and names, each camp was organized in a similar fashion. "SafeGround" members camped in split-pole, two-four person tents that were either the personal belongings of individual members or donated by allies of "SafeGround" (Donated tents were distributed and collected by a camp elder placed in charge of community supplies). These tents were usually established in clearings hidden from well-worn trails and out of eyeshot by passersby who might alert Sacramento police or park rangers to the homeless encampments. During my visits, the tent encampments were arranged either in rows or in small clusters of three to five tents belonging to subgroups of friends within the "SafeGround" community. Centrally located in each camp, "SafeGround" members kept a campfire pit or propane stove to make coffee, boil water, and prepare food for the camp. Additionally, camp members helped supply, and elders managed a community food bank maintained in a shopping cart that campers transported to and from camp each day.

However, beyond providing for material needs of food, shelter, and security, "SafeGround" also provided a collective identification for its homeless members that

refused the forms of misrecognition circulating in broader publics and built foundations for collective action by homeless persons. "SafeGround" encampments fostered relationships of consistency, solidarity, and trust characteristic of "homeless placemaking" (Wright 1997, 232). "Homeless place-making occurs," Wright argues, "when homeless persons redefine the meaning of social-physical space and then act on those redefinitions" (255). "SafeGround" encampments redefine Sacramento's "refuse space" as homeless "pleasure space" where community is built, collective identification is produced, and forms of agency are created. By focusing my analysis on two of "SafeGround's" practices of homeless placemaking, my aim is to identify how their cultural performances contribute to resisting the conditions of homeless marginalization I describe above. This focus on embodied practices of collective opposition also complements my interest in vernacular discourse by providing a more complete analysis of the range of "SafeGround's" oppositional repertoire.

'Feed the Multitude': *Comida* and (Re)Appropriating Urban Space

One of the few ways that homeless persons may traverse the boundaries into public space is through accessing services provided by homeless advocates and shelters. However, accessing these services is not without its costs. Shelters and other homeless services facilities require that homeless persons submit to dominant frames of homeless misrecognition. Shelters, in particular, treat homeless persons as "a soul to be saved or a body to be repaired" and "reproduc[e] networks of domination and power through excessive rules, regulations, and procedures designed to effect the smooth operation of the institution" at the expense of homeless persons (Wright 1997, 216). Illustrative of this experience, one homeless person unaffiliated with "SafeGround" explained that

homelessness in Sacramento was characterized by "standing in line." Describing this experience as we sought shelter from the rain in a local train station, "Tom" explained to me that "when you are homeless, you experience a loss over the control of your life." "You are awakened at 6 AM," "there is a bit of a race to get things done," and "whole days are taken up by waiting in line for food," medical care, the opportunity for a shower, or the chance to sleep in a bed. After a few weeks or months, "you forget how to be independent" because you are taught "to rely on others to provide for your needs." And, what is worse, if you choose not to "stand in line" you also choose not to get services which, for people like "Tom," meant that each day was a choice between the certainty of a meal and the uncertainty of a job.

These practices that reduce homelessness to the provision of services to 'degenerate' individuals govern access to food, shelter, medical care, and other necessary services at many homeless support providers in Sacramento and elsewhere. At one of the largest homeless service centers in Sacramento, the soup kitchen requires that homeless persons arrive hours in advance to secure a numbered meal ticket. As each homeless person passes through the line to collect their meal, their number is collected allowing the service center to precisely count the numbers of persons fed. As a consequence, these types of institutional homeless support reinforce dominant frames for apprehending homelessness, and erode the agency of homeless persons by "discourag[ing] autonomous self-directed behavior on the part of the homeless" (Wright 1997, 216).

"SafeGround" resists these consequences by constructing alternatives to the provision of support on an individual basis. In the place of institutionalized access to food, shelter, and other needs, "SafeGround" creates a space where homeless persons can

begin to rebuild collective identification and agency eroded by dominant representations

through participation in acts of community. For instance, one of the critical ways that

"SafeGround" begins to restore community among homeless persons is through the

provision of food to all the campers. Produced from the central food cart I described

earlier, this practice of collective eating is one of the central means through which

members of and visitors to "SafeGround" recognize their efforts at building oppositional

community. For members, these practices are means by which the community builds

solidarity and a context in which homeless persons can demonstrate agency denied by

dominant misrecognitions. During one visit to SafeGround, I had the opportunity to

prepare a meal with an elder named "Matt" shortly after Thanksgiving. We had the good

fortune of finding some leftover turkey secured in a cooler. With this, some raw potatoes,

and ample helpings of butter searing in a cast-iron skillet, "Matt" explained that this

practice played a critical role in the "SafeGround" community because it was "how we

feed the multitude." Similarly, for other members of camp, collective participation in the

provision of camp meals provided a way to demonstrate independence and autonomy

denied by dominant representations of homelessness. Another camper named "Ento"

insisted on making all of the camps' meals during my visits on another occasion. "Ento"

had training as a chef before becoming homeless and his participation in the camp's

collective meals provided a means to demonstrate that he had skills valuable to the rest of

the community.

For visitors to "SafeGround," these practices constituted a rebuttal to the

contention that homeless persons were 'degenerate,' 'deviant,' or 'disruptive' individuals

who posed a threat to the "pleasure spaces" that "facilitate…the reproduction of middle-

class lifestyles" enjoyed by broader publics (Wright 1997, 46). After spending an evening with "SafeGround" campers, Mayor of Sacramento Kevin Johnson explained,

> what I learned though is that these people living along the river illegally, they have more of a sense of community than most American families. They make sure that they look after each other,… that their grounds are governed properly, that they are clean, they are sanitized to the best that they can do. And what touched me more than anything is that they took their foodstamps went to the grocery store and bought groceries where they were able to cook a hamburger, buns, ketchup, Arizona iced tea to feed me when I was out there that particular night and that was really heart-warming.

As a consequence, these practices reveal how acts of "homeless placemaking" challenge the socially-constructed boundaries that shape urban topographies and the images of those who occupy them. While "refuse spaces," like those along the American River floodplain, where "SafeGround" resides are 'repositories for throwaway populations' and urban spaces where being "out of place" also means being "without respect, and hence without the ability to summon the power, the resources, to change one's conditions" (Wright 1997, 70), "SafeGround" activists challenge these socially constructed boundaries and their consequences by re-appropriating Sacramento's "refuse space" as "pleasure space" where homeless persons participate in acts of "communication, collaboration, and performance in a common political project" (Hardt and Negri 2004, 105-106).

However, beyond these consequences, these acts of homeless placemaking constituted through "SafeGround" practices of collective meals also challenge the conditions of neoliberalism that articulate with homeless experience. Homeless support services that reduce the needs of homeless communities to the failings of homeless individuals and to the provision of individualized services reify neoliberalism's desire to hold individuals accountable and responsible for all dimensions of their fortune or

misfortune. As Esteva and Prakash argue, neoliberalism refigures the most basic processes of life into its machinations; "individual[s] are dependent on the private or public institutional apparatus that creates the addiction to food 'services'; where needs are delinked from capacities; where capacities are considered equivalent to buying power" (1998, 59). "SafeGround's" collective food provisions function as homeless practices of *comida*, or "an ethnos, [that] can never be reduced to…food," but that "connects affectionate people, full of neighborliness; not 'managed' by institutions, but free, alive and autonomous precisely because of their personal bonds" (Esteva and Prakash 1998, 63). By rejecting institutionalized food provided by homeless services in favor of food collectively secured, "SafeGround" rejects the "hunger of 'I's' who lack their 'we'" in favor of "creat[ing] 'we's' in and through the communion of food" that builds consistency, trust, and solidarity in homeless communities (Esteva and Prakash 1998, 60). Doing so builds foundations on which homeless placemaking creates and acts on new meanings of spaces, as well as the means through which homeless communities build collective forms of solidarity and agency.

"SafeGround Now!": 'Walking in the City' and

Transgressing Polarized Space

One of the primary means through which "SafeGround" activists protested exclusions from Sacramento's urban space was protest marches from the floodplains of the American River to the Sacramento city hall. During my fieldwork in Sacramento, I had the opportunity to participate in two of these protest actions. "SafeGround" activists also transgressed the boundaries of Sacramento's "pleasure spaces" by attending weekly city council meetings (analyzed below), participating in community dialogues about

homelessness held at local churches and schools, selling the local homeless newspaper, the "Homeward Street Journal," and interacting with Sacramento's housed populations. However, the protest actions held by "SafeGround" were by far the most organized of their mobilizations on Sacramento's polarized topography. What is more, these events were significant both for their discursive and non-discursive elements. In this section, I focus on the latter as means for considering how "SafeGround's" embodied rhetoric, or cultural performance, transgresses urban topographies. In the next section, I evaluate the discursive dimensions of these protest actions by examining some of the protest speeches delivered at these events.

The two protests I participated in with "SafeGround" followed the same route through the city and occurred six months apart. The first, "SafeGround's Winter Pilgrimage Kick-Off," was held on December 29, 2009 and had both a specific and general purpose. Generally, the event aimed to draw attention to the homeless crisis in Sacramento; specifically, it aimed to gain support from local churches to which "SafeGround" had appealed for sleeping space during the worst of Sacramento's winter season. The second, "SafeGround's Jubilee" was held on July 20, 2010 and aimed to reconsolidate the movement that had been operating intensely for over a year. The Jubilee was also a celebration of the year's accomplishments and a time to rally for an upcoming winter struggle. As a consequence, the summer event included music, food, and other activities; the winter march featured only protest speeches and other spoken testimony on behalf of "SafeGround."

On each occasion, in excess of 200 people marched just over a mile in support of Sacramento's homeless population. The marches began in the parking lot of a homeless

service center allied with the activists and located about a mile from "SafeGround's" campsite. From there, "SafeGround" activists and allies walked, biked, and wheeled themselves south across the train tracks that separate Sacramento's commercial and residential centers from its declining industrial areas and railyards. Each time, the march concluded in Sacramento's Plaza and Cesar Chavez parks directly across the street from Sacramento city hall. During the summer march, "SafeGround" protestors also chose to take their message to the city hall meeting scheduled for the same evening. As these protests moved through the city, protestors encountered, interacted with, and disrupted other pedestrians, businesses, and the daily circulation of capital that animates the "pleasure spaces" of neoliberal cities. As hundreds of protestors and allies stretched across intersections in the bustling business district in downtown Sacramento, the invisibility of homeless communities became palpable to the city's housed population attempting to navigate the city's streets. Similarly, other pedestrians caught in the path of the homeless protestors faced a similar fate. But, on some occasions, these pedestrians stopped to ask the marchers what they were protesting about and to listen to the protestors explain their political efforts. Instances like these reaffirm how protest marchers enable marginalized communities to witness-in-public in ways that invite broader communities to understand, empathize with, and participate in an oppositional struggle. Alongside these disruptions, scores of homeless people and their allies stretched along the length of city blocks. The visual dimensions of this display of collective protest helped visually to reinforce the magnitude and commitment of the oppositional collectivity living in the shadows of Sacramento's wealth.

Pezzullo contends that protest events like these can create "an inventive, spontaneous, persuasive, and risky mobile theater for cultural performance by communicating physically, visually, emotionally, corporeally, and aurally" (2003, 355). The "SafeGround" protestors and their allies transgressed the boundaries between "refuse" and "pleasure" space with their bodies and challenged the stigmas about and forms of control experienced by homeless persons. Marching in well-managed crowds and obeying pedestrian laws, the homeless protestors challenged images of homeless persons as lawless and disorderly. All of the activists, and many of the allies, marched wearing "SafeGround's" signature hunter or lime green shirts depicting a winding road/trail leading to a house. As they marched, the activists and allies chanted slogans in unison, including "WHAT DO WE WANT? SAFEGROUND. WHEN DO WE WANT IT? NOW!," "TAKE PART IN YOUR FUTURE," and "HOUSING, NOT HANDCUFFS." Reinforcing this message, protestors carried printed posters (donated by a local printing company) and home-made marker posters. In addition to repeating the claim for "HOUSING, NOT HANDCUFFS," these colorful posters drew attention to the structural causes of homelessness in Sacramento by asking simply, "WHERE AM I SUPPOSED TO GO?" Leading this crowd of protestors dotted with signs, brightly-colored shirts, and loud voices, two "SafeGround" elders carried the collectivity's banner that proclaimed the group's name and cause, "SAFEGROUND," in thick black letters against a woven background of orange and red. However, not only did "SafeGround's" marches transgress the taboo against homeless visibility in urban "pleasure spaces" and disrupt the orderly flow of capital in the city by creating impediments to foot and car traffic, they also gained significant local media coverage, including interviews with

members of "SafeGround." As a consequence, these rhetorical interventions by homeless activists and their allies are illustrative of Wright's contention that "skillful transgressing of these [polarized, urban] boundaries is essential for securing any real power for marginalized groups" (1997, 70).

However, beyond cultivating "SafeGround's" power as an oppositional collectivity, these transgressions of Sacramento's "pleasure spaces" also provided an opportunity for "SafeGround" to forge broader collectivities. As homeless persons, allies, and sympathizers joining the group for the first time marched across Sacramento, the diverse collection of students, homeless persons, queers, lawyers, teachers, social workers, the elderly, doctors, and others had an opportunity to share perspectives about homelessness and to participate in exchanges precluded by the polarizing boundaries normally separating housed and homeless communities. Protestors walking nearby me in the march exchanged stories about how they became homeless, why they were being denied social support, and how they came to learn about "SafeGround." By constructing moments where emotional connections can be forged and empathy can be shared between housed and homeless persons, these interactions expand the "conflict networks" built within homeless communities (that I describe in the previous analysis section) to include community members outside the homeless community, networks that, Mueller contends, "connect…personal misfortune...with…collective action" (1994, 236-7).

In *The Practice of Everyday Life,* Michel de Certeau contends that, "the city [is] founded by utopian and urbanistic discourse" and "is defined by the possibility of a three-fold operation:" 1) "rational organization [that] must suppress all the physical, mental, and political pollutions that would compromise it," 2) "strategies" that "flatte[n]" and

"replace the tactics of users" of the city who take advantage of the opportunities offered by its spaces, and 3) "a way of conceiving and constructing space on the basis of a finite number of stable, isolatable, and interconnected properties" (1984, 94).[3] Wright and Mitchell capture the reality of these operations in their consideration of the efforts made to maintain the boundaries between urban spaces challenged by conflicts that erupt in community struggles, and of the tactics of policing through which appropriate behaviors are coupled with certain types of public spaces in neoliberal cities. However, despite the effort to maintain these boundaries and police "out-of-place" behaviors, nomadic practices of 'walking in the city' transgress these boundaries and evade efforts to police public space by introducing "contradictory movements that counterbalance and combine themselves" in opposition to the dominant codes that polarize urban topographies (de Certeau 1984, 95). As de Certeau explains, "the act of walking [in the city] is to the urban system what the speech act is to language or to the statements uttered." It exerts a "triple 'enunciative' function": "it is a process of appropriation of the topographical system…," "it is a spatial acting-out of the place," "and it implies relations among differentiated positions" (de Certeau 1984, 97-98). This perspective on the city and the 'contradictory movements' introduced by the collective uses made of urban space illuminate the protest marches engaged in by "SafeGround" activists and allies. Interpretations of these cultural performances within and outside of "SafeGround" camps underscore the challenge that they constitute for Sacramento's polarized topography and for circulating images of homelessness. As acts of homeless placemaking, "SafeGround's" practices of *comida* and 'walking in the city' transgress boundaries that regulate acceptable behavior in urban space. They enact an oppositional collectivity that "foster[s] relations of mutual

recognition among their homeless [participants]," "alter[s] the ways in which the housed public views the homeless," and forg[es] links through affinity groups to non-homeless citizens" (Feldman 2004, 105).

<div align="center">

‘Gotta Stand Up (For the Right to Lay Down)’: Critical Interruptions,

Militant Semiotics, and "SafeGround's" Public Protest

</div>

Challenging homeless misrecognition and transgressing polarized landscapes erode the barriers to homeless visibility in the neoliberal city. But, visibility alone does not constitute inclusion within broader publics and political forums. In the same manner that "symbolic hurdles" of misrecognition necessitate shaping subsequent rhetorical situations, political inclusion requires that homeless communities engage in rhetorical interventions that create spaces where homeless populations can exert political power in support of decisions collectively arrived at and ratified. Inclusion also requires, in Mitchell's words, strategies that effect a "fuller democratization of public space" and that secure homeless persons the right "to inhabit, to appropriate, and to control" urban spaces (2003, 9). In this section, I focus on rhetorical practices invented by "SafeGround" to accomplish these ends.

Examining these efforts is important because "democratic participation" and the right to, at least partially, appropriate and control urban spaces are critical to the ability for homeless collectivities to exert political power in defense of their interests. Acts of homeless citizenship and democratic participation have "the potential to contest the position of sacred outsiderhood by fostering links between homeless and housed, engaging in collective action, politicizing housing and shelter policy, and breaking down the strict separations between public and private that produce" the homeless predicament

(Feldman 2004, 107). However, these goals require that "resisting logics of placelessness and creating a space of dwelling" accomplished by acts of homeless placemaking be accompanied by efforts to "'establish[h] a place in the world which makes [homeless persons'] opinions significant and actions effective'" (Feldman 2004, 106). In Sacramento, structural barriers to democratic participation and domesticating narratives that cast "SafeGround" as 'homeless radicals' combined to sustain limitations on the political inclusion of homeless persons. Despite increased visibility and growing conflict networks produced by their acts of witnessing and homeless placemaking, homeless communities still lack the freedom to inhabit, appropriate or control urban space. Recognizing that "only by contesting political exclusion have homeless citizens challenged particular injustices of misrecognition (by shelter agencies and housed publics) and maldistribution (of housing resources)," in this section I focus on rhetorical interventions through which "SafeGround" activists challenge conditions of political exclusion from broader publics (Feldman 2004, 108).

Asserting a 'Right to the City': "SafeGround's" Critical Interruptions

In the summer of 2010 shortly after my last visit to Sacramento, "SafeGround" activists learned that the city planned to alter its standing agenda to move public comment from the beginning to the end of its meetings on an 'as time permits' basis. On August 17, 2010, the Sacramento City Council acted on this intention and voted 5-3 to change the council's policy. "SafeGround" activists interpreted this move on the part of the city council as a direct attack on homeless participation in public forums. This act, they argued, eliminated one of the venues critical to making their 'opinion significant' and 'actions effective.'[4] Supporting the first allegation, only a few weeks earlier one

council member chastised the ongoing campaign of homeless speakers at council meeting by asking them why they 'bothered' to attend the meetings in the first place. Nonetheless, early comment meant that campers could attend the meeting, inefficaciously or not, with time to return to and set up camp without the danger of traveling the trails of Sacramento's "refuse spaces" at night. Moving comment to the end of the meeting meant more campers would face the dangers of traveling in those areas after dark. During my time learning from "SafeGround," several campers were *either* struck by cars traveling to and from service centers or meetings in the city and their camping areas *or* victims of violent acts ranging from assault to rape to (attempted) murder. As a consequence, the actions of the city made political inclusion quite literally a life-or-death choice.

Given these realities, "SafeGround" activists mobilized a campaign of dissent aimed at disrupting the decision by the city council to move the public comment period. Comprising this rhetorical campaign were letters to the editor of local newspapers, interviews on local talk radio stations (e.g., *Capitol Radio*) and a series of speeches delivered by "SafeGround" members and allies at a city hall meeting immediately following the decision to move the public comment period to the end of meetings. It is this final effort, the live rhetorical intervention in public (rhetorical) forums on which I want to focus my analysis. As Pezzullo observes, "spaces for mediation" of public conflicts "are important" because "'a rhetorical forum provides a provisionally constrained context and an avenue of mediation among discourses that might otherwise be self-confirming, incommensurable, or perhaps not even heard at all'" (2001, 5). These spaces, she argues, are potentially powerful because they offer sites where dominant discourses can be critiqued. Specifically, such spaces provide forums where "taken-for-

granted" discourses can be "interrupted." These "interruptions" can unleash

"opportunities for constructive dialogue" and "continue process[es] of reinventing"

dominant discourses by providing a means "capable of resisting oppressive hierarchies"

(Pezzullo 2001, 6-7).

On August 24, 2010, sixteen "SafeGround" activists and allies spoke against the

decision of the city council to eliminate one of the few means by which homeless persons

could engage in democratic participation. These speeches critically interrupted the

narrative popularized by the measures' supporters on the council. These supporters had

suggested that the change in public comment would streamline the meetings without

limiting access by the public. "SafeGround" activists challenged these claims by

(re)defining the purpose of public comment, identifying its importance as a political act,

and ascribing meaning/motive to the city council that made sustaining the rescheduling of

public comment untenable (Pezzullo 2001, 6). First, "SafeGround" established public

comment as a vital democratic forum where homeless persons, and "SafeGround"

specifically, could have their voices heard. One ally of the "SafeGround" activists pled

with the city council by explaining the importance of early public comment for the

homeless communities sense of political inclusion. As she noted, "SafeGround's"

> advocacy…includes engaging their elected representatives at every opportunity. It helps them to come out of their *very small invisible world*, hold their heads up, stand up straight and know that no matter how poor they have gotten or how broad the brush society paints them with that they can still come here and say what they have to say without interruption, to feel heard by the only people other than themselves who can help change their circumstances. IT'S A VERY BIG DEAL.

Critically, these comments reveal the acknowledgment among "SafeGround" activists

that political exclusion/inclusion is a critical barrier to the ability of their community to

challenge homeless misrecognition and the maldistribution of housing resources cited by

Feldman and others. Similarly, another "SafeGround" ally reinforced the importance of

homeless participation in city council meetings noting that "every time I [hear] public

comment I am moved to see a very pure form of democracy in action. People, ordinary

people, have the opportunity to look you in the eye and tell you what they think. Please

treasure this. Please do it at the start of the meeting."

Likewise, homeless community members attacked the decision of the city by

explaining the importance of the meetings for their efforts to improve their lives and the

meaning of the new exclusions created by the council's decision. As one homeless

activists in his mid-thirties explained,

> You guys ask what you can do for us and then you want to take us and stick us [at
> back].… It's hard when you read in the paper that you think some of our
> comments are foolish or it takes up too much time. Well, why don't you guys try
> being homeless,… try having to stay away from your families. Its hard and its
> rough. …You guys always ask what can you do. Our comments are valuable, our
> comments mean something. And it means a lot to me when people say we need
> help and you guys feel like our comments don't mean nothing. …I think you
> should open up your eyes and…don't just stuff us in the back corner and say our
> comments…don't matter.

Indeed, reaffirming that the public comment was one of the few means by which

homeless persons could exercise influence in political life, an activist reinforced their

fellow "SafeGround" members' thoughts by explaining, "It upsets me that you have

moved public comment. …I feel that public comment should be more important to you

than that…and given a higher priority. If you are truly public servants as I thought you

were supposed to be, I ask that you listen to us first and please reconsider your decision."

Taken together, this element of the "SafeGround" critique engages with the need to create

discursive spaces where the voices of marginalized communities are significant and their

calls for action can be effective. Likewise, these interventions in traditional democratic spaces demonstrate how interruptions of rhetorical forums provide one strategy through which marginalized communities can begin to challenge extant hierarchies and 'taken-for-granted assumtpions' that shape experiences with homelessness. As one homeless community member eloquently summarized, they are forums whose accessibility is the difference between being 'stuffed in the corner' and being able to live in a city that works for everyone.

"SafeGround" reinforced their critiques of the exclusions embedded in the city council's decision by linking the consequences for the homeless population in Sacramento to other marginalized, and mainstream members of the community. As a long-time leader of the "SafeGround" movement explained,

> That you would stop or discourage them [homeless persons] from relating their issues and concerns because you find their homelessness inconvenient is disenfranchisement and a targeted action against a group of citizens…with very little other means of influence. …The fact that you would punish the rest of the residents of Sacramento to sideline one group of already marginalized people is beyond my comprehension.

Buttressing claims about how this decision punished not only homeless persons, but others in the community, an ally of "SafeGround" from Sacramento's disabled community explained the consequences of the decision for members of both Sacramento's "neighborhoods." He explained that, "We are here in solidarity with SafeGround…and asking that public comment…be placed back at the beginning of the agenda. If you are a person with a disability…, *this could mean the difference between participating and not participating in the political process*." Likewise, comments from another long-time supporter of "SafeGround" further solidified the tropes of discrimination and political exclusion that were identified by these speakers. As they

challenged the city council's decision-making, they connected the homeless struggle to a long history of efforts to gain equal political access by marginalized communities. "Reconsider your vote about moving public comment," this speaker implored the council, because "it sends a very unfortunate message. It's the same exact message as when you told people you have to go to the back of the bus. I know you have multiple reasons and thoughts, but that's the message and it's just plain wrong."[5] Identifying the broad-based political exclusions risked by the city's decision, the songwriter of the "SafeGround" movement summarized the complaints of the homeless activists and their allies in terms of the overall inclusiveness of the urban community. He explained that, if the council's decision stands, "many will be unable to speak at these meetings. If…you want a 'Sacramento that works for everybody,' then you need to hear everybody." Both within and without the homeless community, he argued, "we already have enough deterrence. …People need to be encouraged to be here, not driven away."

Third, "SafeGround" speakers demanded action by the council by ascribing meaning/motive to the rescheduling decision that made sustaining the move untenable. As the comments from multiple speakers above suggest, the members of "SafeGround" and the larger community interpreted the city's decision as a political move tantamount to the segregation of the Civil Rights' era and an abrogation of the public trust held by the council members. Indeed, as several members commented, "if you don't want to listen to the public, then perhaps you need to reconsider your job." One speaker connected directly the issues of when the public was allowed to speak and larger questions of civil rights by arguing that the council's action was a sign of inconsistent values. A

representative of Sacramento's La Raza Council and larger Chicano/Latino community

noted that,

> less than a month ago, the Latino community…applauded you for standing up…for democracy. …A month goes by and you decide our [homeless neighbors'] voice is not important. That bothers people like us who are involved in civil rights. …How long does it take for people…to come and talk to you?
> You've heard it, your public servants[,]…but you are also elected by people who can't vote[,]…people who don't have a house. …[T]hose are your constituents, too. …And, it saddens us that things happened this way. …We will fill this house again with people like us…who want to be treated differently. That's what the people need.

In fact, so powerful was the "critical interruption" of Sacramento's city council meeting

by homeless advocates and allies that the Mayor of Sacramento, Kevin Johnson, publicly

criticized the decision by his fellow council members and called for a reversal of the

decision on the grounds of political inclusion cited by the homeless constituents at the

meeting. Following the last homeless speaker, the Mayor noted,

> Last week council members voted on moving public comment[,]…I would like my council members to…reconsider that vote in a respectful way….We have heard from a lot of people…for a variety of reasons, [including] disability, transportation, low-income, seniors. We want to a be body that is about transparency, about accessibility, about really engaging the public to meet their needs and asking for their input. …I do think participating in a political process is of the upmost importance for all of us. …We have an opportunity to do the right thing. And, sometimes doing the right thing is reconsidering and correcting something that wasn't as good in the past.

In response to this pressure, on September 7, 2010 (just three weeks after initially

changing the public comment rules of procedure), the Sacramento City Council reversed

its decision in a 6-3 vote. However, not only did the council determine that it would hold

at least half an hour of public comment at each meeting. The council took action

responsive to the demands of the homeless community by agreeing to hold at least one

meeting per month with public comment that would begin at 2:00 p.m. As a consequence,

"SafeGround's" interruption of the rhetorical forum provided by the city council

meetings not only led to opening a discussion about the importance of those forums for

marginalized communities, it also created a material increase in the spaces and times

where homeless opinions could be heard and where homeless political action could gain

the significance associated with delivering their message directly to civic leaders. These

accomplishments are demonstrative of how the activists composing "SafeGround"

utilized rhetorical interventions to create "opportunities for constructive dialogue" and

develop means for "resisting oppressive hierarchies" enforced by their political exclusion

from Sacramento's democratic spheres (Pezzullo 2001). However, beyond mobilizing

their own voices in support of greater political inclusion, "SafeGround's" public protests

and other rhetorical practices also broadened the base and strength "SafeGround's"

political influence.

Forging Coalitions: "SafeGround's" 'Militant Semiotics'

        As I suggest above, the rhetorical import of "SafeGround's" protest actions lay

neither exclusively with its non-discursive transversals of polarized topographies nor with

the protest speeches that are made by "SafeGround" activists. Instead, the combination of

these two dimensions of these protest events evokes a "militant semiotics" of

homelessness. As Thoburn (2008) contends, "militant semiotics" is a key constituent of a

war-machine of struggle forged out of a haecceity of minor political tactics that is "not

confined to words, but subtends gesture, phoneme, tone, and image" (106). Both Thoburn

(2008) and Peters (2005) cite the Black Panthers as an exemplar of a militant politics

communicated through word, attire, and action that challenged extant images of Black

communities, mobilized collective action by Black collectivities of resistance, and

expanded the forms of (Black) power available in those communities. Taken together, these elements of "militant semiotics" "compose an imaginary and affective field of resistance" potentially "constitutive of progressive political effects beyond those determined by… [a] particular practice" and that are performed as part of a rich enunciative texture and a complex psychic formation that ha[s] especial generative power" for homeless communities "developing [an] experimental image and practice" of homeless resistance and cultural expression (Thoburn 2008, 106).

Coupled with my analysis in the last section (i.e., the embodied dimensions of the protest actions enacted by "SafeGround"), my aim in this section is to illuminate a militant semiotics of homelessness invented in and through "SafeGround" rhetorical interventions. My contention is that these protest events reveal moments of resonance with disparate political communities that widen the base of collective opposition that participates in the struggle against homelessness in Sacramento. To demonstrate these moments of resonance, I analyze in two steps the protest speeches at the two "SafeGround" events I attended. First, I examine the arguments made by "SafeGround" activists regarding the challenges and possibilities for political action and struggle they faced. Second, I examine the speeches of allies and supporters of "SafeGround" at these rallies for "bases of resonance" between homeless communities and housed persons that demonstrate the potential for producing "profound shifts in the ways in which radical socio-political and cultural change is imagined, pursued, and manifested" (Khasnabish 2008, 124). "Resonance," argues Khasnabish, occurs (and collective identifications and political agency are forged) when oppositional communities and broader publics share experiences "by which people are able to engage with political struggles that have

emerged far from the contexts within which they live and work and, more significantly, through which they are able to find those struggles meaningful within their own spaces and places" (Ibid., 123).[6] Examining moments of resonance is important because they "often produc[e] effects that are not at all predictable and, in their most powerful forms, are capable of producing new imaginations, repertoires, and even landscapes of socio-political and cultural struggle" (Ibid., 124).

"SafeGround" activists' speeches at protest events reinforce the conflict networks they establish in their intimate interactions with fellow protestors by outlining potential bases of resonance with housed populations. First, "SafeGround" advocates recognize that the lack of support and dignity available for homeless communities is a problem directly tied to the realities of an increasingly neoliberal economy with a shrinking number of social supports for those struggling, or in need of assistance. During the December 29, 2009 rally that I attended, one SafeGround advocate explained that

> I am here to tell you that homelessness is a disease. A disease of a sick government that is prepared to bailout banks with 700 billion of taxpayers' money, but that won't pass a bailout for people thrown out of their houses onto the street. It's a disease of a government that won't provide a national healthcare system. It's a disease of social system that closes down shelters, shuts down community clinics, closes state and community mental health facilities, and criminalizes homelessness.

For "SafeGround" activists, the problem of homelessness exceeds the bad choices of a few persons who could not find ways to productively exist in mainstream societies, and it extends beyond the failure to find treatment or to effectively manage the mental illness experience by many who live lives on the street. Indeed, while some, or even a large number, of individuals are pushed onto the street by these causes, the real problem, advocates argued, is that society has been reconfigured in ways that ensure that people

"stay" on the streets, that they have no place to be, and that the measures of a community's well-being do not rely on metrics that recognize the magnitude or the grinding realities of homeless experience. As one "SafeGround" advocate explained at the same protest, "what makes this city great is not the number of high rises in our skyline" and those factors are not what will accomplish the mayor's "intention to make this a city that works for everyone." Instead, "SafeGround" proposed that addressing such problems requires recognizing that Sacramento is "one community" that can "provide an example to the world of how to care for the basic human needs of everyone." Doing so, they argued, will begin to recognize the real root causes of homelessness, will stabilize homeless lives and set them on the path to self-determined becomings-, and begin to shift metrics from neoliberal metrics of individual competition and success to measures of success that are based on how "we care for those that have the least among us."

Second, "SafeGround" advocates identified housing as a fundamental human right that all persons ought to have access to and that is the basis for other forms of political, social, and economic self determination.[7] As one advocate explained,

> everything human being shares a need for three things: a place to be, something to do, and something to achieve or aspire to. Without a place to be, the other needs are impossible to meet on a sustainable basis. A place to be that is safe, clean, legal, restful and unperturbed.

Echoing the claim that housing, or a place to be, represented a prerequisite to other efforts to address conditions that contribute to and sustain homelessness, another SafeGround advocate, John, whom I introduced in Chapter Three, explained to attendees at another protest on July 10, 2010 that "sleeping out every night takes all your time, all your energy, and makes it very difficult for you to deal with the deeper issues that brought you into homelessness."

Third, "SafeGround" advocates invite others to participate in their struggle against the immediate problems of homelessness by identifying it as a symptom of a larger problem with society, and their struggle as one aimed at more than simply a limited amount of housing for a few homeless activists in Sacramento. First, highlighting that homelessness is the symptom of a larger problem with the social, economic, and political realities that shape contemporary life, "SafeGround" advocates argued that the realities of homeless life provide an insight into a larger set of social problems where particular groups are rendered disposable by dominant social institutions. As one advocate explained, a society where "insane policies and ordinances deny a person's right to exist in time and space." Echoing this recognition, another advocate argued that while "SafeGround's" primary mission is to address homelessness, its broader understanding of the problems faced by homelessness grows from recognition that "society…has become toxic to the poor." Indeed, as several of the speakers highlighted, the issues raised by homeless activists are not simply about "a place to be," the failure of political institutions to recognize "the reality of homeless persons in the streets and in the parks," or "that there are 22,000 empty houses and apartments in Sacramento and only a few thousand homeless people," but rather are about basic questions of human rights. Summarizing this perspective, Rabbi Mona Alfi, an ally of the "SafeGround" movement, explained at the December 29, 2009 protest that "every single one of [us] are working not only to make [o]ur own life better, but everyone else's life better. [We] are fighting for [o]ur basic human rights."

By broadening the scope of their struggle, "SafeGround" creates a discursive space where others affected by economies that support fewer and fewer laborers, by

governments that address the needs of a smaller and smaller range of constituents, and by

communities less and less open to a broad range of participants can invent new collective

identifications and oppositional politics. On December 29, 2009, Mark Merin, a local

attorney who provides free legal services to the homeless activists, reminded protestors

that there is a cure to the (social) disease of homelessness that isolates individuals and

enforces poverty. That cure, he argued, is "demonstrations, organization, and demand for

political change." Six months later, John, "SafeGround's" indomitable spokesperson,

underscored the importance of this perspective for the members of the community at

another protest on July 10, 2010. Celebrating the fact that "it has been a year and we're

still here," he reminded activists, allies, and interested observers that, "SafeGround is a

community." And, echoing the possibility for communities like "SafeGround" to activate

conflict networks and create spaces where collective opposition can be collectively

constructed and political goals collectively ratified, he added,

> It is a group of people who have gathered together with the idea of creating social change. 'SafeGround can become a bridge between the housed community and the homeless community. So, we can get to know each other and see that we are really not so different. We have all the same desires, and needs, and cares. And, if we just take care of each other we can solve this thing.

And, in a rhetorical move that both reaffirmed the openness of the "SafeGround" struggle

and suggested his recognition of the power of vernacular communities, he closed the last

major political event held by SafeGround since summer 2010, noting that, "Maybe we

can make this 'SafeGround' thing go worldwide, and find real 'SafeGround.'"

Audiences, and other participants, at these protest rallies demonstrate a similar

optimism. Their responses map resonances between housed populations and homeless

populations and identify ways of making homeless political exclusion meaningful in their

own lives and experiences.[8] Similarly, they identify connections activated by

"SafeGround" activists that hold the potential to produce affective bonds that proliferate

the bases of power from which the "SafeGround" war-machine draws. Focusing on a few

of these resonances is valuable because examining the discursive dimensions of

"SafeGround's" protest events complement my critique in the last section of their

performative interventions on urban space. Likewise, it highlights how singularities of

struggle uncover resonances with other singular, marginalized communities militating

against the universal forms of marginalization circulated by neoliberalism.

Numerous supporters of "SafeGround" identified resonances between the

homeless struggle in Sacramento and their own political investments. At the December

29, 2009 protest, religious leaders from Jewish, Islamic, Christian (Catholic and

Protestant), and nonreligious communities acknowledged affective investments in and

mutual solidarity with the "SafeGround" movement. For example, Rabbi Mona Alfi

identified this resonance by connecting the political exclusion of homeless persons to

other experiences with political exclusion. She explained,

> I am here because I am a Jew. I am here because my people have known what it is
> like to see our neighbors and fellow citizens turn away from our pain and our
> suffering and say it's not my problem. But, it is our problem. If someone in our
> community, in our midst, is suffering, then it is all our responsibility to address
> that.

Likewise, others suggested a similar resonance between their own forms of

marginalization and the marginalization articulated by the "SafeGround" activists. One

student activist linked the shrinking support for homeless persons by state and national

governments to other cuts in basic social services and other forms of support critical in

his community, and that struggling against these realities collectively held the possibility

of building a struggle with the political power to exert meaningful influence. He

explained, "students are pissed that our tuition [is] going up 15 times faster than inflation

in one semester. But these cuts go deeper,…they affect social services that so many of us

depend on,…this city has nowhere for people to go." As this participant observed, these

struggles cut deeper than just homelessness. They render unstable, and unsafe, the ground

on which scores of communities stand, whether students, laborers, the poor, or the

elderly. Reflecting the ability for "SafeGround's" message, that *everyone* deserves a

place to be, to activate collective identifications, he concluded by arguing that, "if we

stand here and stand united, we can get SafeGround for all of us."

Similarly, others identified resonances with homeless persons and their activism

by identifying structural realities that brought homelessness closer to the experience of

non-homeless persons. At both protests, labor unions pledged their support for

"SafeGround" by identifying with the precariousness that separates laborers from the

homeless. On December 29, 2009, a representative from a communications and

technology workers' union explained, ahead of layoffs at a local employer, that "The

workers are there to support the homeless, too. We represent workers at AT&T. Two

hundred forty-nine are gonna be out of a job. They could be homeless and [t]hat's a

serious problem." A problem that the unionists argued identified resonances between

laborers and homeless persons. Explaining further, he noted that the problems faced in

his union "speak to a larger problem." They demonstrate that "businesses are turning

their back on people [and that] government is turning its back on people. Any of us, any

of us, could be homeless. Most people are just one paycheck away. More and more

people are becoming homeless. This is a problem that faces everybody." Identifying new

bases of solidarity that include homeless persons, he argued, was a vital first step to addressing this problem. As he explained, after listening to the "SafeGround" speakers, "what we cannot do is turn our backs and say I can't help out, there's nothing I can do about it. …We will always have problems. We have to stand together, in unity, united together to fight this. We'll be there for you ("SafeGround"). On July 10, 2010, the regional director for AFL-CIO unions in California reaffirmed this support declaring: "Sisters and brothers, on behalf of the 160,000 AFL-CIO families in Sacramento, we're with you. Your fight's our fight, an injury to anybody that's homeless is an injury to every working family in America. Your struggle is our struggle."

Remarkably, by July 2010, these bases of resonance activated new bases of political power that "SafeGround" protest events had unleashed. On December 29, 2009, only a few dozen protestors remained until the end of the protest action. In July, hundreds of observers, allies, and others spent nearly three hours in a local Sacramento park listening to protest music, hearing speeches, and building expressive, personal bonds with homeless activists. However, beyond the crowd, the additions to December's list of speakers also suggested that "SafeGround" had activated new "imaginations," "repertoires," and "landscapes of social and political struggle" envisioned by Khashnabish. At this rally, Veterans for Peace participated, drawing clear links between veterans' issues and homeless issues. As they noted, homelessness is "something we have been very much aware of. There are more and more veterans that are homeless these days. National and local surveys have shown that 25% of homeless are veterans of one kind or another, and 10% of them are women. It's sorta a natural thing for us."

However, what is most remarkable, and a testament to the political power derived from expanding the collective identifications that participate in anti-neoliberal war-machines, is that at their July protest, "SafeGound" received legitimate attention as a political actor in Sacramento and beyond. Locally, several political figures, including at least one candidate for city council, attended the meeting and addressed the broad audience of laborers, homeless persons, activists, students, and others who had organized in support of "SafeGround's" struggle. However, reflecting their broader influence, "SafeGround" also, for the first time, attracted meaningful attention from state-wide political figures. Their first encounter with Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger had been during the time of the infamous tent city when the then governor would take media and other guest on "tours" of the homeless encampment. This time, the President of the California State Senate, Darrel Steinberg, made an appearance to acknowledge the broad scope of issues that "SafeGround" had drawn attention to and acknowledged the broad-based, organic, and formidable political alliance the homeless community had built during their year of struggle. He explained, "This campaign represents a lot. It represents the power of people to organize themselves. It represents the basic American notion that everybody has a right to safe, decent place to live." And, it also demonstrates that this is not "a law enforcement issue. This is a human rights' issue. …SafeGround…reminds me" that politics is "not just numbers, not just spreadsheets, not just budgets. It's about people who need and deserve our [support]." Creating a "militant semiotic" activated affective relationships between disparate communities, and identified common bases of marginalization across political identities. Further, that "militant semiotic" identified a common set of goals in which dissidents could participate. "SafeGround" demonstrated

how its political exclusion and the political exclusion of collectivities such as itself by neoliberalism could be eroded. Those acts of struggle laid the foundations for new forms of political power that can be wielded by, as one homeless activists put it, "the least among us." Taken together, the forms of resonance between homeless communities and communities composed of minorities, the elderly, the dis- and differently- abled, military veterans, victims of domestic abuse, and others revealed in these speeches are critically important to the political potency of the "SafeGround" war-machine because they enable homeless persons to cross a critical threshold from conditions of political (in)visibility to the status of "*citizens with 'the right to have rights'*" (Feldman 2004, 109).

<div align="center">Conclusion</div>

In a recent essay in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* Melanie Loehwing argues that "identifying the rhetorical means by which homelessness is constructed and perpetuated remains more important than ever" (2010, 399). My analysis of "SafeGround" affirms this reality by asking how homelessness is constructed and perpetuated through local forms of power and the universally-singular articulations of neoliberalism and urban space in Sacramento. However, unlike Loehwing's, my analysis responds to the doubled-purpose of the project of critical rhetoricians by examining *both* these conditions of "domination" *and* the possibilities for "freedom" constructed in these local communities. Such an examination is important for several reasons.

First, as Loehwing notes, "until and unless advocacy for the homeless resists perpetuating the rhetorical reduction of homeless life to a problem of present-centeredness,…millions of Americans suffering" homelessness "may continue to be denied both their place in the physical shelter of housing *and* their inclusion in the

rhetorical home of citizenship." My analysis contributes to both of these concerns. On the

one hand, my analysis identifies the means (i.e., misrecognition, polarized topographies,

and political exclusion) through which homeless persons are rendered as dependent

subjects without individual agency. By identifying the ways in which shelters, urban

spaces, and public representations criminalize, institutionalize, and infantilize homeless

persons, my analysis locates material practices and everyday experiences through which

homeless persons' interests and desires are reshaped toward the "present-centeredness"

Loehwing critiques. On the other hand, my analysis also helps to identify some of the

forms of advocacy developing in local, vernacular communities that avoid the very risks

that Loehwing fears. By repositioning homeless persons as members of their community,

by building homeless community in Sacramento's refuse spaces, and by lobbying the city

for changes to its disposition toward homelessness that will speed the journeys out of life

on the streets, "SafeGround" activists *both* contribute to reducing the material facts of

suffering that constitute homeless life *and* to reconstructing homeless persons as

contributing members of democratic society. Also, by identifying how these efforts have

influenced larger parts of Sacramento's non-homeless community this analysis has shown

the power for these vernacular discourses to begin locally, but to also exert influence on

"cultures at large" (Ono and Sloop 1995).

Second, my analysis suggests that the suspicion about "embodied arguments"

expressed by Loehwing is ill-founded (2010, 398). Loehwing examines a rhetorical

documentary about homelessness and concludes that as "embodied argument" it reveals

how "certain bodies are rhetorically shaped as undesirable or unsuited from democratic

life" and calls for attention to be directed toward sites where the "reinvention of typically

excluded bodies" might occur. My analysis suggests that this requires returning to the work of embodied rhetorics engaged in by local communities. Through the simple acts of preparing collective meals and 'walking in the city,' homeless communities in Sacramento and elsewhere activate daily challenges to the discourses Loehwing rejects and offer exemplars of 'lines of flight' available to other marginalized, homeless communities. If, as she implores, critics are ever to find a means of challenging the appeal of conventional approaches that aim to deliver goods (e.g., food) or services (e.g., shelter) to the homeless, arguments committed to eroding the boundaries between "housed" and "homelessness" must acknowledge the reality of homeless experiences that challenge these views. Take seriously the claims of homeless persons who contend that "there is more community in tent city than there ever was when I was living in a house." Doing so means critiquing homeless rhetorics that reveal these realities and identifying the rhetorical tropes and inventive means by which homeless communities challenge the conditions of their exclusions.

My aim in the previous two chapters has been to contribute to this effort. Nonetheless, my dissertation poses a broader set of questions. Specifically, it asks how local communities experiencing universally-singular forms of neoliberalism might contribute to helping theorizing oppositional struggles more broadly. To develop answers to these questions, it is necessary to compare the compelling contestations of "SafeGround" activists to other singularities of struggle. In the next chapter, I undertake this aim by focusing my attention on another community proclaiming "enough is enough" in the face of neoliberalism's grinding realities. Three thousand miles removed from the struggles of Sacramento's homeless populations, the Zapatistas, or EZLN, enact their

own version of an anti-neoliberal war-machine. By examining this remarkably different struggle, my hope is to identify some resonances between communities that neoliberalism marks as "out-of-place."

Notes

[1] For instance, between October 2009 and August 2010 during which time I conducted the majority of my research related to the "SafeGround" effort, the local daily newspaper, the *Sacramento Bee*, included over 500 pieces of news or editorial content addressing homelessness, homeless persons, the "SafeGround" movement, or other news items related to the homeless community. More anecdotally, during this same period, local television media and talk radio also regularly reported on Sacramento's homeless population.

[2] During this time, I gathered insights as a participant-observer, interviewed members of "SafeGround" to collect their impressions and thoughts about "SafeGround's" efforts, and enjoyed access to many of the primary texts of the movement, including meeting minutes, draft materials, and other documents circulated among members of the oppositional effort.

[3] Importantly, these three operations parallel the connective, disjunctive, and conjunctive synthesis of neoliberalism's State-form in that they allow for the production of certain subjects, regulate the couplings of those subjects, and enforce modes of surveillance for ensuring those relations are not transgressed.

[4] For most homeless persons, the only way to attend city council meetings was by foot and, if fortunate, by bicycle. Since city hall was nearly two miles from the nearest of "SafeGround's" regular camping areas, rescheduling public comment meant that a key forum where homeless persons made their voices heard to a broader public sphere would be limited. What is more, this motive was only partially concealed by some city council members.

[5] Explaining the breadth of communities who interpreted the situation similarly, she notes that at the council meeting alone, "about two dozen…,a large number of people are concerned about this [tonight]" and supporting this concern she explained that "the Sacramento Bee has written an editorial asking you to reconsider. The ACLU has written a letter asking you to reconsider. The League of Women Voters…has ask[ed] you to reconsider."

[6] Khasnabish continues noting that "In this sense, resonance refers neither to the act of 'projecting' a struggle nor to the act of 'receiving' it; rather it is the non-linear process and experience of making new political connections and new political meanings out of an encounter with another (2008, 123).

[7] In this respect, "SafeGround's" demands reflect the principles established in the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 25, which states: "Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control."

[8] Several speakers at other "SafeGround" events that I attended also demonstrated this resonance. For example, at a church where depictions of "SafeGround" advocates hung alongside the Stations of the Cross during Lent celebrations, parishioners and priests commented that the struggles of homeless persons resonated with and made present the experiences of homeless exclusion operating in their own community. Including the images of homeless persons alongside the most sacred images of their faith provided a means to engage with political struggles waged by homeless persons. However, in this analysis, I focus on these moments as enunciated in the protest events hosted by "SafeGround."

CHAPTER FIVE

THE ZAPATISTA WAR-MACHINE: RETHINKING RESISTANCE

FROM 'BASEMENT' MEXICO

> "In our dreams we have seen another world."
> -Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos (1994/2002, 18)

In Chapter Two, I identified how neoliberalism's State-form machine regulates

economic relations and shapes cultural experiences. In this chapter, I focus on a singular

articulation of neoliberalism's 'infernal machine' to identify how resistant communities

mobilize oppositional politics responsive to neoliberalism's specific manifestations.

Neoliberalism requires the reconfiguration of relationships on all social and political

planes. Singular manifestations of neoliberalism (re)configure efforts to police the

visibility of political subjects and the boundaries of collectivity with which those subjects

must contend. Penetrating "all registers of the social order," the tools of resistance

adopted by oppositional communities include both mundane and extraordinary acts, both

strategic and tactical considerations. Oppositional struggle faces the challenge of

disrupting, intervening in, and experimenting with lines of flight that contest

neoliberalism's State-form machine. In this chapter, I mobilize the war-machine as a

critical concept for pursuing anti-neoliberal lines of flight and for unpacking the

complexities and implications of oppositional politics, in particular the politics practiced

 by the Zapatista Army of National Liberation, or EZLN.

Guided by this critical perspective, my analysis departs from some of the traditional assumptions and the conventional aims of rhetorical scholars interested in oppositional discourse and social movements. Conventional social movement scholarship asks how an "un-institutionalized collectivity" implements a program of social change within the institutional structures that govern a particular political context. For example, "What tactics and strategies aided the Civil Rights Movement in their successful effort to implement a Civil Rights Act?" Or, "What barriers and strategies of control prevented feminist movements from successfully implementing the Equal Rights Amendment?" Critical scholarship of oppositional politics from the perspective of the war-machine, however, attends to symbolic operations, rhetorical maneuvers, and performative interventions that subordinated, resistant communities deploy. This scholarship asks: "How do subordinated communities reveal, disrupt, and/or elide assumptions of neoliberalism (or other problematic discourses, technologies of power and economic relations)?" "How do these oppositional interventions envision new ways of practicing collective oppositional politics?" And, "how do they construct new ways of framing identity, collectivity and rhetorical-political power?"

A war-machine perspective surveys minor politics and their micropolitical (or "molecular" in Deleuzean terms) consequences, as opposed to traditional perspectives that focus on institutional change brought about (or not) by a movement, campaign, or organization. As such, my goal is not to assess oppositional politics in terms of particular institutional gains or losses (though such events are important and merit consideration), but rather to evaluate collective politics for generative possibilities for engaging in social

struggle and for seeds of alternative political relations invented by the EZLN's singular struggle. I am concerned with practices of resistance that oppositional collectivities adopt to contest neoliberalism's State-form and its organization of economic, social, and political relationships. Specifically, I examine neoliberalism's articulation to the Chiapas, and how that articulation structures the available forms identity, collectivity, and rhetorical-political power for that region's indigenous communities. This focus generates three theoretically interrelated questions. First, how do the politics of oppositional collectivities disrupt subject positions, forms of agency, and relationships that neoliberal globalization makes available? Second, what characteristics of an (oppositional) becoming-identity are enunciated by oppositional collectivities in a context of neoliberal globalization? Third, in what ways do anti-neoliberal collectivities mobilize "minor politics" to map new political relationships and activate new forms of political-rhetorical power?

In this chapter, I interpret political, cultural, and literary texts characteristic of the EZLN's two decades of struggle. These texts enunciate the Zapatistas' rhetorical, symbolic, and cultural interventions against neoliberalism and map new ways of thinking about and engaging in collective politics. I focus on both traditionally political texts (i.e., declarations of political sentiments) and less conventional movement texts (i.e., letters and short stories) as instances of rhetorical action where the Zapatistas' "minor politics" are invented and constructed.[1] This corpus demonstrates the wide range of rhetorical activity that constitutes vernacular discourse and highlights how resistant communities deploy literary and performative interventions to challenge "the system of sensible coordinates" that sustain neoliberalism's "social inequalities" (Ranciere 2004, 3). The

EZLN presents a formidable political and cultural event for critical scholars.[2] As Noam Chomsky and Naomi Klein observed, the Zapatistas offer a "new symbol of resistance" representing two forces at once: "first, rebels struggling against grinding poverty and humiliation in the mountains of Chiapas; and, on top of this, theorists of a new movement, another way to think about power, resistance, and globalization" (Chomsky 2003/2004, 13; Klein 2001/2004, 18). As a consequence of this doubled-purpose, the Zapatistas goad their critics to ask: What can the EZLN contribute to theorizing anti-neoliberal struggles? Critically unpacking the Zapatistas' acts of resistance helps illuminate their rhetorical significance and helps to theorize their influence on the political imagination of dissidents around the globe.

I argue that the rhetorical practices, performative interventions, and symbolic constructions of the Zapatistas outline new contours of collective struggle that challenge and supplement extant models of social movements, counterpublics, and oppositional discourse. By suggesting that the Zapatistas' interventions operate with a performative dimension, I mean to emphasize that the EZLN's oppositional politics self-reflexively improvise with, disrupt, and enact new identifications, political relationships, and forms of power.[3] As rhetorical interventions, I mean to highlight the EZLN's war-machine as a means through which bodies, institutions, discourses, images, and texts are (re)distributed within a field of power.[4] Finally, insofar as the Zapatista struggle is admittedly a 'war of ideas' where 'words are weapons,' the metaphors used to describe oppositional politics and the relationships that construct them are central to identifying what can be learned from the EZLN by other oppositional collectivities.[5] Examining these dimensions of the

EZLN's oppositional struggles helps demonstrate the complex texture of anti-neoliberal war-machines.

I place these texts in dialogue with theories from critical globalization studies, cultural studies, critical discourse analysis, performance studies, and critical rhetoric to interpret how the Zapatistas mobilize the conditions of neoliberalism against which they are embattled. Although these texts illuminate both the disposition of the Zapatistas to the immediate challenges they face in Chiapas and the relationships between those challenges and hurdles faced by other movements, my interpretation of the EZLN's rhetorical interventions focuses on them to gain insights into common topoi of concern to critical communication scholars of oppositional discourse, social movements, and counterpublics. Taken together, the EZLN's rhetorical interventions construct a war-machine in response to neoliberalism's State-form; they make a critical contribution to revitalizing efforts to think about collective, oppositional politics. To develop this argument, I situate the Zapatista struggle within a historical and contemporary context of subordination and marginalization of indigenous communities in order to highlight the articulation of neoliberalism's State-form to the Chiapas. Next, I introduce the EZLN by describing their oppositional politics and contextualizing their critical texts. Third, I examine the Zapatistas' rhetorical interventions. I attend to how these acts of resistance construct new "attitudinal' terms" for confronting "the recurring quandaries of human conflict" and for conceptualizing the "complexities of social life and political problems" neoliberalism poses (Foss 2004, 411-413; Ivie 2001, par. 7-9). In particular, I identify and analyze how the EZLN's oppositional practice challenges neoliberalism's constraints on identity, collectivity, and rhetorical-political power. I conclude by considering some of

the implications of the EZLN war-machine for the rhetoric of oppositional political collectivities.

Subordinated, Invisible, and Marginalized: Histories of Struggle, Discourses of Development, and Neoliberalism's State-form in the Chiapas

Shortly after midnight on January 1, 1994, indigenous revolutionaries seized control of at least four major towns and several hundred ranches in southern Mexico's Chiapas region. Following this revolt, Mexican military, police, and other paramilitary groups responded to the rebels with tanks, planes, and over 15,000 troops. In the days and months that followed, a number of press releases emerged from this group calling themselves the Zapatista Army of National Liberation, or EZLN. The rebels explained their uprising as a revolt against the president and army of Mexico, and against "500 years of oppression" and 40 years of "development" that had impoverished the Chiapas. Since 1994, the Zapatistas have sustained their advocacy through local autonomous communities in the Chiapas that enact the political goals enunciated by the EZLN. Internationally, their struggle has inspired intellectuals and activists, including Noam Chomsky, Naomi Klein, Mumia Abu-Jamal, and Leonard Peltier. Nonetheless, informal advisor to the Zapatistas Gustavo Esteva notes, "to challenge the rhetoric of development [and neoliberalism]...is not easy" (2001, 303). In this section, I identify some of these challenges faced by the EZLN war-machine.

'Sometimes It Takes More Than 500 Years': Historical Origins of the Zapatista Rebellion

Both critical scholars and EZLN members argue that the Chiapas endures economic realities reminiscent of the systems of "tribute" and subordination that defined the earliest encounters between indigenous communities and Spanish conquistadors (Collier 2005; Higgins 2004; Vodovnik 2004). In this section, I survey the economic and political history of the Chiapas to identify their influence on the EZLN's struggle for humanity and against neoliberalism.[6] Rather than reprise these histories, I identify key elements of this context that shape the plane of rhetorical struggle occupied by the EZLN.[7] Higgins (2004) argues that this plane of struggle is influenced by "modernist visions" enforced in communities out of which the EZLN uprising developed. Collier (2005) agrees, arguing that prior to the 1982 debt crisis that ushered in a new neoliberal regime for Mexico, the nation's development was punctuated by three distinct periods: the Colonial/Bourbon (early sixteenth century-1810), the post-Independence (1810-1910), and the Revolutionary (1910-1982). Each of these governmental, economic, and social regimes (re)configured the subordination, invisibility, and marginalization experienced by indigenous communities in the Chiapas.

During the Colonial period (early sixteenth century-1810), the Spanish Empire's conquest of Mexico and South America avoided the explicit implementation of slavery in indigenous communities.[8] Instead, the *encomienda* system (the system of regional management of the educational, religious, economic, and cultural development of indigenous communities established by Spain's colonial authorities) created a structure through which indigenous labor could be captured in the service of the Spanish Crown's twin goals: extracting "labor and tribute from the Indians assigned to [the encomiendas]," and ensuring "the control and welfare of these Indians" (Higgins 2004, 41-49). To

reinforce these goals, a policy of *reducción* (a policy of creating Indian communities set up under ecclesiastical or royal authority to facilitate colonization) concentrated indigenous populations more densely into fewer communities and opened more land for colonial development. To aid in the processes of colonial authority and to hasten the production of proper (indigenous) political subjects, "the Spanish governed Indians as *subordinates* whom they viewed as less than fully adult." As Collier argues, "Indians did not even have control over so-called 'Indian Republics'…where everything down to the grid pattern of the streets was decided by colonists" (2005, 21).[9]

Mexico's Independence period (1810-1910) worsened these realities for the nation's indigenous communities by initiating a system of political relations that eliminated indigenous identity as an intelligible political or cultural category. Under the leadership of Porfirio Diaz (whom the Zapatistas target directly in their historical analyses), land reforms besieged indigenous agricultural traditions and eliminated the practice of communally-held land. As a consequence, this economic reform dismantled the social and political practices that sustained indigenous identities and ways of life in the Chiapas. Echoing Mexico's Colonial rulers, government officials sought the containment and invisibility of indigenous identities and communities. Supporting this effort, officials argued that political recognition locked indigenous communities in a state of "stationary infancy." To combat this, Mexico's government promulgated policies to "insist that by law Indians no longer exist" (Higgins 2004, 76).

At the same time, the Mexican government also intensified efforts to eradicate indigenous communities in response to pressures for economic reform. Following its independence, Mexico reoriented its economy to fuel growth through trade with North

America, especially the United States (a practice that would repeat itself several times before 1994 when the EZLN emerged). Under this economic regime, the Chiapas became an invaluable contributor of lumber and coffee, and began to develop as a *de facto* internal colony in Mexico. As Collier explains, this relationship created a context where "indigenous people of the Chiapas were often the pawns and victims" in battles between competing economic interests (Collier 2005, 25-27). As a consequence, Mexico's Independence period (1810-1910) intensified the economic exploitation of colonial rule and deepened indigenous marginalization through a refusal of political recognition.

By 1911, the Liberal/Independence period gave way to Mexico's Revolutionary period (1910-1982). The revolution led by Emiliano Zapata, Pancho Villa, Miguel Hidalgo, and others drew heavily on indigenous support to achieve its success and held out the promise to improve the living conditions experienced in Mexico's indigenous communities, but the results of the revolution would fall far short of restoring equality and dignity denied indigenous communities by previous regimes. On the one hand, Mexico's Revolutionary constitution did include specific provisions regarding indigenous communities.[10] Among these reforms, Mexico's "institutionalized revolution" (re)established rights to communal land ownership and the creation of a rurally-focused education system aimed at addressing economic inequality in the Chiapas and other indigenous communities.

On the other hand, as Mexico's revolution aged, problems of industrialization and urbanization placed indigenous communities back in jeopardy. In the face of these challenges, indigenous farmers became a prime source of marginal, reserve labor that could help keep the costs of economic growth low. What began as a concession of the

revolution to reestablish indigenous, communal agriculture became a means by which the

Mexican government (re)colonized indigenous labor. As Collier explains, the abundance

of indigenous labor at depressed wages meant that "inexpensive food translated into a

subsidy for industrial employers" who could pay lower wages, but "it was a subsidy

provided by peasants" (2005, 28-34).[11] As a consequence, Mexico's Revolutionary period

sustained a strictly enforced cultural, economic, and political hierarchy that marginalized

Mexico's indigenous community in ways resonant with its Colonial history.

In 1982, two events mobilized by Mexico's debt crisis marked the beginning of

Mexico's neoliberal political sequence and the breaking point for indigenous

communities in the Chiapas. First, Mexico's neoliberal sequence culminated in the 1994

implementation of NAFTA, which included economic reforms, foreign investment, and

structural adjustment programs that dismantled the minimal political protections for

indigenous communities articulated in Mexico's constitution. Most notably, it eliminated

(for a second time) the communal farming practices that were the economic and social

linchpin in Chiapas' indigenous communities. Additionally, by annulling the

constitutional ban against foreign land ownership, NAFTA opened land traditionally held

by indigenous communities to appropriation by foreign investment and MNC's. This is

especially important given the close relationship between indigenous identity, agricultural

labor, and land in Mayan and other cultures of southern Mexico. In Mayan culture, the

relationship to agricultural production, and corn in particular, provides the symbolic basis

for numerous narratives that explain cultural identity and community values. In the

economic context of the Chiapas, the most common occupation is agricultural; access to

education or job-training is minimal. Finally, agricultural subsidies for indigenous

communities were also dismantled. As a consequence, Mexico's neoliberal transition eliminated indigenous access to the only means (communally-held land) and modes (subsistence agriculture) of production historically accessible to Chiapas' indigenous communities.[12]

Second, in the 1982 presidential elections, Mexico elected the first of three presidents (de La Madrid, 1982; Salinas, 1988; and Zedillo, 1994) trained in the US and sped a national reconfiguration in the direction of neoliberalism. This political transition intensified experiences with globalization and development (Higgins 2004, 135; see also Coote 1995; Villers 1996). Demonstrating the investment this new political regime had in neoliberalism and Mexico's neoliberalization, Salinas (the president who oversaw NAFTA's negotiations) later sought the presidency of the World Trade Organization. This shift in political leadership and NAFTA's implementation ensured that "as the trade barriers fall, so will the culture and customs of Mexico" only "more rapidly and with greater magnitude" as neoliberalism's influence in Mexico deepens (Simmen 1996, 149).

Collier (2005) identifies two consequences of this pattern of relationships between greater Mexico and the Chiapas. First, the relationship between peasant farmers in the Chiapas and Mexico's development highlights the region's role as a resource base for Mexico and its economic maneuvering, a historical legacy announced in all manner of mundane characteristics of the region. For instance, living conditions in the Chiapas resonate with most third world nations because "most of the development money that has been funneled into Chiapas has been used to build infrastructure such as roads and dams that will help transport products from the state to the rest of Mexico" (Collier 2005, 16). This limited internal integration of the state via roads and communication infrastructure

at the expense of alternative developments reflects a political and economic situation that favored the expropriation of resources from the Chiapas in the service of Mexico's elites. Second, the uncertain and unstable social programs delivered by Mexico's federal government contributed to unpredictable economies and to patterns of debt and wage dependency that stunted the Chiapas' economic growth. As result of this history and the arbitrary restructurings of the Chiapas' economy, "cultural isolation, political exclusion, and economic depression" constitute the 'conjuncture' of material and discursive forces that collided to frame the Zapatista anti-neoliberal war-machine (Collier 2005, 9).[13] Examining how the conditions in the Chiapas resonate with my description of neoliberalism's State-form machine provides a basis from which to examine how the EZLN mobilizes a war-machine in response to these conditions.

'Ya Basta!': Development and Neoliberalism's State-form in the Chiapas

In Chapter Two, I argued that neoliberalism operates as a State-form machine and that it aims to strictly police and normalize the identities, relationships, and paths of becoming open to individual and collective bodies. My aim in this section is to identify how the three syntheses that compose neoliberalism's State-form articulate to the Chiapas through neoliberal discourses. First, 500 years of subordination and economic development strategies prior to Mexico's neoliberalization, and the twelve years of neoliberal economic and political restructurings ushered in by the 1982 debt crisis, charged the connective synthesis shaping the Zapatistas' plane of struggle. By 1994, generations of development constructed a social and political plane of part objects defined in terms of neoliberalism's penchant for individual subjects and development's interpretive lens that apprehended indigenous communities as backward, archaic and

superstitious. On January 1, 1994, the Zapatistas' proclamation of "Ya Basta!," or "enough is enough!,"[14] signaled the disjunctive moment of rupture between the sedimentations of these neoliberal realities and the EZLN war-machine. To more thoroughly illustrate the intersection of a neoliberal State-form and an anti-neoliberal war-machine in the Chiapas, I briefly identify how each synthesis I describe in Chapter Two articulates to the conditions of struggle faced by the Zapatistas.

As I suggest in the description of neoliberalism's State-form, its reterritorialization of material and symbolic planes of struggle is enunciated through a *connective* synthesis that infuses part objects with values, valences, desires, and (structured) potentialities (see Holland 1999, 26). Applied to the Chiapas, this synthesis is mobilized through historical discourses of subordination and marginalization, and contemporary discourses of development and modernization that exert powerful influences on the possible meanings of, and ways of imagining, indigenous populations. For example, Escobar (1996, 85) highlights this machination of neoliberalism's State-form, arguing that development discourse distributes "indigenous," and other "underdeveloped" populations within a representational frame and regulatory schema that produces "a space in which only certain things could be said and even imagined." In other words, development yokes indigenous populations to signifiers of "underdevelop[ment]," "impoverish[ment]," "backward[ness]," "illitera[cy]," and arcane attitudes (Escobar 1996, 86). The consequences of this for the "part-objects" that populate the Chiapas are pronounced; when the Zapatistas announced their rebellion in 1994, the Mexican government sought to restabilize the productive force of these couplings by describing the EZLN as an indigenous "'political force in formation.'" (aqi.

Collier 2005, 15). The label reinvested indigenous populations with a status accorded

them for over 500 years as "not fully adult," or "adults in formation" (aqi. Collier 2005,

15). Consequently, neoliberalism's *connective* synthesis, enforced through these

discourses, produces couplings that limit the forms of desiring-production available to

indigenous subjects. Summarizing the tenacity of the machinations of neoliberalism's

State-form, Escobar explains that, by the time of the Zapatista rebellion, the coupling of

indigenous populations (part-objects) and neoliberal discourses (part-objects) had

"already achieved a fixity as signifieds" that seemed beyond challenge (Escobar 1996,

93).

      Second, neoliberalism's disjunctive synthesis stabilized and, in Deleuze and

Guattari's terms, recorded these relationships that locked indigenous communities within

a "ranked," "mutually exclusive" relation to other populations, discourses, and

institutions. On the one hand, neoliberalism's articulations to the Chiapas coupled the

struggles of the regions' indigenous communities with the universal assumptions of

neoliberalism, a coupling that effectuates the "erasure of the complexity and diversity of

Third World peoples, so that the squatter in Mexico City, a Nepalese peasant, and a

Tuareg nomad become equivalent to each other as poor and underdeveloped" (Escobar

1996, 92-93). On the other hand, institutions invested in development (i.e., MNC's

foreign investments) are coupled with ideas of modernity and development, and

"obligated" to assist indigenous communities.[15] Practically, this experience in the Chiapas

fostered the misrecognition of cultural differences between the Tzotzil, Tzetzal, Chol, and

Mayan Indians native to the region, and whose differences are effaced by the recording of

political identities and relationships carried out by neoliberalism's disjunctive synthesis.

Critically, this neoliberal machination effaced the unique ways of sustaining community developed by these indigenous populations and echoes the misrecognition of homeless identities I describe in Chapter Three.

Finally, neoliberalism's conjunctive synthesis consummated the territorializations of the Chiapas symbolic and economic planes of struggle through 'mechanisms of oversight.' By framing Third World narratives as archaic and articulating "industrialization and urbanization...as the inevitable...routes to modernization," neoliberal discourses implement a "cultural model" that demands the (re)production/consumption of the social representations it constructs. Escobar explains this manifestation of neoliberalism, noting that it sets in place a "discursive practice that sets the rules of the game: who can speak, from what points of view, with what authority, and according to what criteria of expertise; it sets the rules that must be followed for this or that [social] problem" to be named (1996, 87). In other words, neoliberalism's conjunctive synthesis structures a forced choice between consummating the identities mobilized by its disjunctive synthesis or rejecting those identities at the costs of political invisibility.

On January 1, 1994, the Zapatistas' proclamation of "Ya Basta!" (Enough!) rejected this double-bind as a false choice foisted on indigenous communities. Mechanisms of control enforced neoliberalism's State-form and constituted a formidable challenge to the group of peasants carrying sticks and rifles, wearing traditional indigenous attire, and masking their identities in simple black pasamontañas (masks that cover the whole face with openings for the eyes and mouth). Against these realities, I intend to examine how the Zapatistas' rhetorical interventions sought to reterritorialize

the Chiapas symbolic and material economies with possibilities for new connective synthesis, recorded new lines of collective flight through alternative disjunctive synthesis, and forged new ways of consummating political power held by those subjects. Through these rhetorical interventions, the EZLN recast the topoi that challenge critical scholars of oppositional discourses (i.e., identity, collectivity, and power). Before examining how these rhetorical interventions were unleashed by the EZLN, I briefly describe the features of the rhetorical and performative strategies invented by the Zapatistas. My aim is to further elaborate the rhetorical context of these interventions as a means of enriching the interpretive frame I mobilize in my analysis.

<u>The Long Journey from Despair to Hope: The Zapatista National</u>

<u>Army of Liberation and the Writings of</u>

<u>Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos</u>

In Chapter One, I introduced the Zapatistas as an anti-neoliberal struggle on two fronts: first, as an effort to defend indigenous autonomy and dignity in the face of economic and political restructurings in Mexico; and, second, as an interlocutor in efforts to shape the contours of diverse struggles against the problematics of neoliberalism. With that background in mind, I focus on some of the central characteristics and forms of the oppositional rhetoric that I examine in my analysis.[16]

<u>'Without a Face': Characteristics of the Zapatistas' (Rhetorical) Struggle</u>

Most critically, the Zapatistas' rhetorical interventions constitute an oppositional "vernacular discourse" (see Ono and Sloop, 1995). First, vernacular discourses enact "cultural syncretism" by affirming certain aspects of cultural expression while

simultaneously protesting against dominant cultural ideologies (Ono and Sloop 1995, 21).[17] The EZLN opposes dominant ideologies and affirms possibilities of inclusive (national) community through strident criticisms of Mexico's government alongside strong identifications with national heroes, and through efforts to "be Mexican" without disavowing indigenous identity. Second, "vernacular discourses" construct rhetorical interventions through a pastiche of symbolic resources (Ono and Sloop 1995).[18] By drawing together signifiers of past revolutionary movements (i.e., Marcos' beret reminiscent of Che Guevara), national heroes (i.e., Emiliano Zapata as a name-sake), and indigenous cosmologies (i.e., references to Mayan deities), the EZLN mobilizes vernacular discourse by cobbling together "unique [symbolic] forms that implicitly and often explicitly challenge mainstream discourse" (Ono and Sloop 1995, 23).

Second, the EZLN's oppositional discourse relies on the deliberative processes that privilege the construction of "oppositional identities, interests, and needs" valued by rhetorical scholars of resistant politics (Fraser 1989, 14; see also Hauser 1999, Pezzullo 2003). As I discuss in the analysis below, the Zapatistas depart from the efforts to reinforce a *particular* oppositional identity that figures centrally into counterpublic minded rhetorical theory. Nonetheless, the Zapatistas echo these scholars' commitments to spheres that allow negotiations about oppositional identity and politics. For instance, direct deliberative processes invite every member of every Zapatista community to participate in decision-making; practices of "command-obeying" ensure that the EZLN's rhetorical strategies reflect a decision taken collectively. As Marcos has commented, this commitment sustains the EZLN's "indianization" (i.e., its responsiveness to the will of the indigenous communities of the Chiapas) and supports the claim made by Marcos and

other EZLN spokespersons that "through my voice speaks the Zapatista Army for National Liberation" (Higgins 2004, 155-168).

Finally, the Zapatistas mobilize the potential for vernacular communities to influence cultures at large by aggressively distributing proclamations, letters, and other writings through a network of websites, solidarity groups, newspapers, and other technologies. Conant (2010) argues that this practice has had two important consequences for the Zapatistas' anti-neoliberal politics. Practically, he argues, this strategy has "prevented the Zapatistas from suffering the same fate as the multitudes slaughtered in neighboring Guatemala in the 1980s" (2010, 41). By drawing international attention to their local struggle, the Zapatistas acquire the security afforded by visibility. Also, as I discuss below, by articulating that "we are you," they recruit allies necessary to forging a power bloc capable of disrupting neoliberalism's intensifications. Critically, this strategy "inspire[s] and represent[s] global popular resistance" by creating "a liberatory space to be filled by collective acts of insurgent imagination" (Conant 2010, 43). By drawing together a range of the communiqués issued by the EZLN rebellion, I aim to understand how the Zapatista's rhetorical interventions participate in this collective imagining, and how other local communities are invited and integrated into an anti-neoliberal war-machine.

'Our Word Is Our Weapon': Declarations, Folktales, and Letters of Resistance

For nearly two decades, a discontented, former lecturer of communication and philosophy, Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos, has enunciated the EZLN's rhetorical interventions against neoliberalism.[19] Arriving in the Chiapas in 1982 (or 1983), Marcos

(aka Rafael Guillen) joined a small group of indigenous and *ladino* activists committed to developing a new way of doing politics in the Chiapas. At the time, the indigenous peasants were participating in loosely organized agricultural cooperatives and working to sustain indigenous communities against the grinding poverty that characterized the region. Along with Marcos, a handful of other activists from leftist organizations that had operated in Mexico during the 1970s had migrated to the Chiapas as a place to avoid government harassment. Characterized as an outside agitator, seeker of fame, and bourgeois intellectual, Marcos consistently maintains that his role is to serve the EZLN's struggle as the voice of the Zapatista Army for National Liberation. As a subcomandante, Marcos follows the orders of the EZLN's command structure, or comandantes, comprised of indigenous leaders from each of the Chiapas' major cultural communities (Chol, Maya, Tzotzal, Tzetzal, and Tojolabal) and each of its major geographic regions. In this capacity, Marcos, or El Sup, serves as a translator, military commander, spokesperson, and icon for the EZLN. Over two decades in this role, Marcos has issued thousands of pages of declarations, letters, proclamations, communiqués, short stories, novels, poems, and other texts on behalf of the EZLN's war-machine. By interpreting a range of these rhetorical interventions, I map the oppositional lines of flight journeyed by the EZLN and consider what their efforts can contribute to theorizing collective struggle.

The declarations of the EZLN are the central texts that describe the focus of the Zapatistas' efforts, and that outline their political commitments and aims. There are eight declarations that are included in my analysis of the Zapatistas: the six declarations of the Lacandon Jungle (two issued in 1994, and one each in 1995, 1996, 1998, and 2005) and two declarations of La Realidad (issued in 1996). The former are the texts that describe

the EZLN's political efforts and were released between January 1, 1994 and June 2005; the latter two are the primary texts issued before and after the 1996 *Encuentra against Neoliberalism and for Humanity* held in La Realidad, Chiapas. The *Encuentra* (encounter) featured delegates from dozens of nations and subnational groups engaging in a forerunner of later World Social Forums. The participants engaged in collective analysis of the problems of and solutions to regimes of neoliberal globalization. The declarations describe the *encuentra's* goals, outcomes, and processes. Each of these texts is between two and ten pages long, is addressed to national and international audiences, and is signed by the Clandestine Revolutionary Indigenous Committee, or General Command of the EZLN.

The EZLN distributed these declarations through a variety of media, and they have since been republished in anthologies, social movement readers, and other texts.[20] During their initial circulation, these texts were released internationally via a network of web-based resources organized by Zapatista sympathizers, activists' networks, and others (for example, the U.S.-based *Mexico Solidarity Network*). Domestically, the left-leaning daily newspaper, *La Jornada*, distributed the declarations to over 200,000 readers.

Structurally, the EZLN communiqués follow a similar pattern. They begin by addressing "brothers and sisters" in Mexico, and sometimes extended "oppositional" families around the globe. In each, the EZLN describes in varying ways "where we are coming from" (i.e., an analysis of the history of a particular cultural or historical moment from the indigenous perspective), "who are we now" (i.e., an examination of how the Zapatista struggle has shifted in response to the conditions of marginalization faced by indigenous communities), "how we see Mexico…and the World" (i.e., the problems that

continue to trouble the Zapatistas locally and globally), "what we want for Mexico…and the World" (i.e., the contributions to collective struggle envisioned by the Zapatistas), and "how we will go about it" (i.e., an action plan that explains how the Zapatistas will work singly and collectively to accomplish their aims) (see Ross 2006, 302-303). The sixth declaration explicitly organizes itself around these themes; however, each declaration follows a pattern that resonates with the "SafeGround" documentary "Listen" in that each describes the problems created by, causes of, and solutions to (as perceived by a singular community of struggle) neoliberalism's State-form.

Substantively, the declarations directly address both Mexican nationals and international audiences. For example, in the first declaration, the EZLN deliberately addressed a section of their communiqué to international observers, organizations, and sympathizers, while focusing primarily on justifying their rebellion to a domestic audience. The third, fourth, and fifth declarations of La Realidad described and explained the EZLN's ongoing transition from a revolutionary, *military* force to an oppositional, *militant* force. Other declarations, especially the Sixth Declaration of the Lacandon Jungle that explained "what [the EZLN] wants for the world," the second declaration that signaled the EZLN's attention to invite the outside world into the Chiapas, and two declarations from La Realidad that invited and described the deliberations over anti-neoliberal politics struggles between the EZLN and allies, focused more heavily on international audiences. Each declaration is constructed in a collective voice and informed by local knowledges (i.e., particular individuals, like Comandante Esther or Comandante David, are cited as contributors to the ideas or facilitators of community dialogues from which contributions were cultivated).

The declarations are significant for several reasons. Practically, the declarations announce the official collective will of the Zapatistas determined through their deliberative processes. For instance, in the first declaration, the Zapatistas describe the causes of their rebellion, their demands, and their plan to fulfill those demands by force. More critically, these declarations constitute a "thrusting outward" in search of new ways of revising the political commitments and strategies with which to resist neoliberalism (Ross 2006, 301-303).

The other two textual forms I examine clarify and revise the commitments of the Zapatistas. Letters and other communiqués of the Zapatistas address a wide range of immediate and indirect audiences. For instance, letters and communiqués delivered by the EZLN have addressed activists ranging from John Berger to Leonard Peltier,[21] and organizations ranging from the Basque revolutionary front (the ETA) to Palestinian liberation efforts.[22] Others are written to a broader audience of sympathizers or potential sympathizers invited to participate in anti-neoliberal struggles.

These letters and other communiqués vary widely substantively and structurally. Some constitute only a few short lines, others are several pages. Many are in response to an event in the international community of anti-neoliberal activists, including the Balkan War lead by the United States in the late 1990s and the WTO Trade Rounds in Cancun in the early part of the twenty-first century. Others focus on issues local to Mexico, including the abrogation of the *San Andres Accords* by Vincente Fox (a negotiated settlement between the ELZN and the government of Mexico) and the lackluster candidates in Mexico's presidential elections. Still others focus on more localized

concerns inside and outside of Mexico, including the trials and incarceration of U.S. activists and student strikes at universities in Mexico City.

As a consequence, the letters and communiqués vary widely in terms of both structure and substance. Commonly, the main topic of a letter is expanded by a string of post-scripts that relate the larger message to additional topics, or that introduce altogether new topics. Some are addressed to specific persons, others are penned to collective bodies, and a few are directed to whomever it pleases. Their content varies widely from poetry to prose narrative, and from aphorisms to essay-length statements. Like the declarations, these texts are circulated both through the Zapatistas' media network and published in *La Jornada* and other daily publications within Mexico. Critically, these texts demonstrate the cooperative, interactive, and dialogic efforts at oppositional politics envisioned by the EZLN.

Finally, the folktales or short stories circulated by the EZLN depart from traditional social movement strategies and enunciate the values and ways of knowing that motivate the Zapatistas' oppositional politics. During the nearly twenty-year Zapatista rebellion, the EZLN has collaborated with cultural workers and others to circulate dozens of folktales. These tales are accredited to Marcos' pet beetle, Don Durito, or to "Old Don Antonio," a figure Marcos suggests provided aid and insight during the early years of the Zapatista rebellion and who died just before the 1994 rebellion. These tales differ from the more overtly political texts of the Zapatistas that are populated by references to contemporary political figures and institutions, and that address in detail specific actions taken or supported by the EZLN. Instead, these tales construct anti-neoliberal politics through references to Mayan deities, mythologies, cosmologies, and lifeways. For

instance, Mayan gods (e.g., I'kal and Votan) operate as allegories to emerging collective struggles, and *dia de los muertos* rituals that traverse the boundaries between life and death provide metaphors for struggles that surmount differences in experience between the Global North and Global South. For example, in "The Story of the False Light, the Stone, and the Corn," Marcos describes an Icarus-like Mayan deity whose lust for the worship of others and promise to bring light to a newly-created world provides an analogy for neoliberalism's promise that "gold, money, and political power" are the "path and destiny" for all persons (Marcos 2002d, 406). Avoiding political doctrines in favor of allegories, these tales explain, rationalize, and justify the values of resistance, patience, cooperation, autonomy, diversity, and justice that are keywords in other more traditional Zapatista texts.

Similarly, cooperative relationships with publishers outside of the Chiapas ensure that these texts are circulated expansively to a broader audience of domestic readers, as well as a broad international audience of adults and children. Shortly after the Zapatista uprising in 1994, the EZLN and their allies founded *Enlace Civil*, an NGO in San Cristobal, Chiapas, Mexico as a central node to link NGO's from around the globe with the Zapatistas. This decision provided a remarkable resource and has fostered several relationships that have helped circulate EZLN texts. For example, the volume of texts compiled by Ponce de Leon (2002; on which I rely heavily) and much of the support for John Ross's long-term residency with the EZLN were, in part, facilitated through the auspices of *Enlace Civil.* Similarly, Cincos Puntos Press in El Paso, Texas has published several Zapatista folktales in both Spanish and English in an effort to support the Zapatista war-machine. Likewise, in 2002, Juana Ponce de Leon published a volume of

texts entitled, "Our Word is Our Weapon." De Leon worked cooperatively as a "cultural worker" with Marcos and the EZLN command structure (and recounts the interactions in the preface) in efforts to access, translate, and organize the tales into part of the anthology. Beyond these examples, Khasnabish observes that several activist organizations in Mexico and beyond also helped facilitate the translation and circulation of Zapatista communiqués, stories, and folktales, including the organizations *Building Bridges, the Chiapas Media Project, Global Exchange, People's Global Action* and others; he argues that, in many ways, the Zapatistas' relationships became a catalyst for a new generation of mediated solidarity networks (2008, 122-151). As a consequence, EZLN folktales contribute to a radically cooperative form of oppositional politics that invites differently-situated sympathizers to participate in "collective acts of insurgent imagination."

<div align="center">

The Zapatista War-machine:

Identity, Collectivity, and

Agency in the Chiapas

</div>

By proposing that the Zapatistas' rhetorical interventions construct an anti-neoliberalism war-machine, I mean to emphasize how the EZLN manipulates, mobilizes, and makes use of the political and symbolic economies enforced by neoliberalism's State-form. Remembering from Chapter Two that the war-machine describes an oppositional collectivity that is "perpetually in construction or collapsing, and of a process that is perpetually prolonging itself, breaking off and starting up again" (Deleuze and Guattari aqi. Goh 2006, 225), I identify oppositional strategies from across a variety of performative and rhetorical interventions (rather than focusing on the success or failure

of a particular intervention). I intend to ask how rhetorical practices included in the EZLN oeuvre help to theorize anti-neoliberal struggle more broadly, not to assess the fidelity to a particular theoretical perspective or the reasons for success or failure of the EZLN and its particular campaigns. Guiding this analysis are three conceptual terms: identity, collectivity, and rhetorical-political power that allow me to focus my analysis on the problematics revealed in the struggle between neoliberalism's State-form and anti-neoliberalism war-machines. In particular, these units of analysis help focus critical attention on struggles against neoliberalism's regulation of what identities may appear, what relationships may exist between those identities, and in what ways those relations and identities are policed and normalized.

(Re)Imagining Identity: Masks, Myths, and Metaphors of Resistance

Identity provides a productive thematic for examining the Zapatista war-machine on several levels. First, neoliberalim's State-form articulates to the Chiapas by regulating what identities may appear and what meanings may be ascribed to them (e.g., the underdeveloped/indigenous as "backward," "illiterate," and "archaic"). A war-machine approach to critical analysis asks how the EZLN's strategies reconstruct (oppositional) identities through a recognition that identity "begins as the dominated term in a [neoliberal] relation of power." However, such a perspective asks how collective struggles can, "instead of surrendering or trying to reverse the situation" presented by neoliberalism, "tr[y] heroically to abolish the very fact of domination" (Massumi 2001, 826). Second, rhetorical scholars interested in collective politics struggle with identity as a critical problematic for oppositional politics. A focus on the war-machine contributes to this analysis by asking how identity can be rethought as a pliant concept "that explores

and changes as conditions change" and "that multiplies potential" bases of political

subjectivity (Ibid.).

In the case of the Zapatistas, political representation and power are made more

difficult by the "doubly disabling tendencies of representation" sustained by neoliberal

globalization (Asen 2002, 360). Neoliberalism enforces a double bind that ensures that

"voices and bodies largely absent from public discourses [are] made present through

disabling images" (Ibid.). In other words, neoliberalism's State-form constitutes a set of

"symbolic hurdles" to be overcome by oppositional struggles (Ibid.). In this section, I

argue that the EZLN deploys masking as a performative intervention against

neoliberalism, and as a means to invent new ways of "imagining" oppositional politics to

mobilize an anti-neoliberal war-machine.

Masked performance and (in)visible identities. The Zapatista struggle deploys

masking to disrupt and overcome neoliberalism's symbolic hurdles. In particular, this

performative intervention is captured in the iconic use of black *pasamontañas* that signify

the Zapatistas in Mexican and international contexts. If the "energizing, destabilizing"

qualities of performance emerge from the improvisational, contingent "embodied

thinking" present in performative interventions (Strine 1998, 313), then my aim is to

demonstrate how the EZLN fuses anonymity (enforced on indigenous communities by

neoliberalism) and the cultural import of masked performance in Mexico. I contend that

the Zapatistas' use of masking enacts a performative strategy that mobilizes

neoliberalism as a resource for (new) collective identities/identifications. I develop this

argument by describing the cultural importance and uses of masks in Mexico, identifying

how this EZLN improvises with this history of masked performance, and evaluating how this enactment of identity constructs the 'becoming-identities' of a war-machine.

The use of masks within a broader cultural history in Mexico helps frame a critical understanding of the Zapatistas' use of masking to mobilize the anonymity/invisibility imposed on their communities by neoliberalism. Helping to build this context, a number of scholars have interrogated cultural rituals in South America and Mexico and, in particular, masks' relation to national identity, visibility and political efficacy in those contexts (see Levi 2008; see also Brandes 2007; Rodriguez 1993/1997). Levi extends arguments about the centrality of masking to questions of identity, explaining that "masked performance" in Mexico generates conversations about "social agency" and images of "empowered identities" (2008, 103-135).[23] Masks, she argues, "effac[e] time, effac[e] generations, [and] effac[e] mortality" in several forms of cultural performance rituals popular in Mexico (from *lucha libre* contests to *la dia de las muertas* rituals). They figure centrally in efforts to construct identities and political communities in Mexico as well, especially in the nation's indigenous communities (2008, 122). As Levi concludes, "masks in traditional rituals or dramas are…widespread in rural, indigenous Mexico," "function as signifiers of tradition, and are used to assert communal identities and rights (by signifying difference from the national or urban culture, or signifying participation in "deep" culture common to all)" (2008, 106).

For example, masked protagonists (*los tecnicos*) and antagonists (*los rudos)* featured in *lucha libre* ("free fighting" practiced throughout Mexico) demonstrate masked performances that critique national and international politics and that articulate communities of resistance. Demonstrating the political edge of these performances,

recent years have witnessed the emergence of antagonists modeled on the U.S. Border

Patrol as an effort to solidify popular political opinion against US immigration policy

(Allatson 2007, 145). Similarly, death rituals surrounding *dia de los muertos* perform a

related function of affirming collective histories and solidifying collective identities.

Masks and masked performance, such as these, archive efforts to forge identity and

political agency, and mock, violate, and (re)shape community norms and conditions of

belonging (Levi 2008, 108). In this respect, cultural histories of masking in Mexico

underscore that

> Masks work by operating upon the particular ways in which identity…is
> expressed in any culture…*by concealing or modifying those signs of identity
> which conventionally display the actor, and by presenting new values that, again
> conventionally, represent the transformed… identity*. (Pollock 1995, 584)

The EZLN, by donning their characteristic black *pasamontañas*, taps into a

vibrant history of cultural performance to shape oppositional identities in their struggle.

Practically, these *pasamontañas* protect the EZLN from violent reprisals by paramilitary

groups, military troops, and other "law enforcement" officials. Symbolically, masks

activate a strong set of cultural mythologies, social practices, and communal meanings

that amplify the EZLN's message within Mexico and that create shared identifications

with other anti-neoliberal collectivities. Where the masks of *lucha libre* operate by

creating villains and heroes with which an audience can collectively (dis)identify, the

EZLN taps into this performance of collective identification through the use non-descript

black masks that create a smooth surface on which to construct oppositional collectivity.

The *pasamontañas* function as a double-articulation of the consequences of

neoliberal globalization in local communities: first, in the sense that masks capture the

effacement of individual identity enforced by neoliberalism in indigenous (and homeless)

communities; second, in the sense that masks declare shared elements of marginalization under neoliberal globalization's singular manifestations. The black masks suppress individual features or stylized identities present in other traditions of masked performance. As a consequence, the Zapatistas create the basis for radical alterity and expansive inclusiveness between disparate communities marginalized by neoliberalism. In other words, black *pasamontañas* shift the function of masked performance from the reinforcement of national identity and "deep culture common to all Mexicans" (Levi 2008, 102) by abandoning easily recognized cultural and aesthetic codes. The Zapatistas strategically deploy masking as a construction of identity critical to a war-machine based on participation in a 'deep culture common to all' those marginalized by neoliberalism.

The black ski masks enunciate the Zapatistas' disposition toward identity as a deferral of identity. The masks' anonymity challenges efforts by observers nationally and internationally to displace the Zapatistas experience as "not mine" by shifting their resistance from one founded in a particular identity to one grounded in identifications with the experience of anonymity and invisibility the masks represent. In doing so, the EZLN acknowledges the common but differently materialized ways that neoliberalism renders communities it marginalizes anonymous and invisible. Displacing identity defers efforts to dismiss the problems of neoliberalism as an "indigenous problem," and resonates with and offers a visual representation of the invisibility that plagues communities like the homeless activists I examine in previous chapters. The non-descript masks open space for audiences (and other oppositional collectivities) to ask whether the experiences witnessed by the EZLN are "not not mine" (Turner 1979, 84; see also Turner 1982). Critically, then, the Zapatistas deploy masking, either figurative masks of

anonymity or literal black *pasamontañas*, as a tool for constructing new forms of struggle.

Additionally, the Zapatistas reinforce their masked performance as a strategic means to complicate and construct oppositional collectivities. First, masked performance responds to efforts to demonize the Zapatistas intervention as an effort by criminals to avoid detection by the state (Allatson 2007, 145), and it refutes attempts to domesticate the performance as an effort to induce audience participation into a "morality play" (Levi 2008, 102). Second, the EZLN uses masks as a tool for building a subject-group of resistance in place of a subjected-group evoked by politics built around local identities and nation states. Marcos explains how the anonymous black mask is a synecdoche for anti-neoliberal war-machines. He notes that "the same mask of anonymity [created by neoliberalism]" unites "the indigenous, workers, campesinos, housewives, neighbors, unionists, students, teachers, Christians, retired persons, disabled persons, drivers, shopkeepers, activists from political and social organizations, women, youth, children and old persons, all those who discover each other day by day, [all] who resist" (Marcos 2003/2004a, 332-333). Importantly, the EZLN refigures anonymity through a masked performance that invents new bases for identity and identification. (In)visibility under neoliberalism is reappropriated as radical alterity that disparate marginalized communities can transform to create altogether new forms of identity (Pollock 1995, 584).[24] Critically, radical alterity builds the possibility for subject-groups who defer particular identities in favor of an inclusive, plural, but shared identity. Forging identifications from the universal conditions (anonymity/invisibility) of neoliberalism's singular manifestations (indigenous marginalization and homeless subordination) operationalizes critical politics

that exceed national borders or particular experiences with marginalization, and that resonate with the experiences of struggle had by subordinated communities in other locales influenced by neoliberalism.

   Disabling representations and rhetorical reconstructions. Building the basis for new collective identifications only addresses one challenge faced by communities struggling against neoliberalism. Marginalized identities, no matter how inclusive, face 'symbolic hurdles' constructed by dominant frames that prefigure their participation in oppositional struggles. Asen (2002) argues that surmounting these hurdles requires rhetorical interventions aimed at three goals: reshaping circulating identities by asserting new identities, reframing historical narratives, and (re)negotiating the terms of subsequent discursive and practical resistance.

   The EZLN accomplishes the first aim outlined by Asen (2002) by experimenting with alternative bases for oppositional collectivities to forge identifications. The EZLN constructs new (oppositional) becoming-identities, presented in their masked performances, through a system of metaphors that construct a collective subject of resistance. The Zapatistas contest neoliberalism's "individual" subject by integrating a multiplicity of subjects marginalized by neoliberalism into a collectivity that recognizes their singularity. The EZLN's accomplishes this through declarations and communiqués that refuse to endorse or declare a platform, system of party politics, or universal agenda. Likewise, the EZLN avoids advocating universal solutions; rather, they offer the Zapatistas' perspective as a point of articulation for other marginalized peoples. The EZLN communiqués reinforce their collectively-developed ideas by refusing a single voice and relying on plural pronouns (i.e., "we," "us," "our") that recognize a plurality of

oppositional identities/agents. This rhetorical maneuver sustains an open invitation to

heterogeneous communities, cultures, and individuals to join an unfolding anti-neoliberal

war-machine.

Second, the Zapatistas further develop a heterogeneous, plural approach to

collective opposition through the system of metaphors that describe Zapatista identity.

The EZLN declarations address "the people of Mexico and the world," and frame their

resistance as an invitation to join a "family" of resistances. When the indirect "we" that

characterizes the Zapatistas' voice is specified, the collective identity they envision is a

family, or "brothers and sisters," experiencing variable, but interrelated forms of

oppression. Through this metaphor, the Zapatistas deploy a symbolic structure to forge

coalitions of discontent that unite a diverse, but related group of marginalized

communities. A letter addressed "to the people of Mexico" and "to the *peoples* of the

world" on March 12, 1995 illustrates this framing of collective identity. Self-reflexively,

the Zapatistas offer insight into this framing of identity and its ability to broaden

oppositional identifications. They note,

> Being silent, our voice was passing away…So our dead spoke. The oldest ones
> then counseled us to…ask other *brothers and sisters of our race*, our blood and
> hope….We learned to see and to listen to others, to *different brothers and sisters.*
> We listened to their words…and we saw…the same longing that put the fire in
> our hands, that broke up our face until it was nothing but a gaze, that hid our
> name and erased our past. *This voice became strong and great, became the relief
> to our pain. And by waiting we harvested hope. The voice was a seed in the
> collective heart that walks in our step.* (Marcos 1995/2002, 72-74; emphasis
> added)

Critically, deploying this metaphor builds an analogy for the universal

characteristics that unite diverse experiences with globalization. Likewise, the sibling

relations (or 'brothers and sisters' to whom the Zapatistas extend their message)

acknowledge the local, singular differences that exist within globalization as a political structure (or the family as a metaphoric analog for those relations). And, at the same time, the EZLN cleverly refuses privileging an authoritative perspective (i.e., parents). The Zapatista struggle is, instead, one undertaken by comrades (brothers and sisters), not by leaders and followers (parents and children). Finally, this element of the Zapatistas' oppositional efforts resonates with critical discourse analysis by mapping the relation between the macro- and micro-features of rhetorical interventions that shape how resistances can effectively address problems in discourse. As Barton explains, working between these two levels of discourse helps critical analysis identify a rhetorical intervention's "linguistic integrity" and "contextual value." Barton explains, "linguistic integrity means that they [micro-textual practices] are used frequently or noticeably enough to become conventional...and contextual value means that they [micro-textual features] are significant in establishing and maintaining meaning within the context of a text [i.e., its macro-textual features]" (2002, 24).

Next, the Zapatistas challenge sedimented historical narratives and animosities that confront oppositional collectivities (see Asen 2002, 360). The Zapatistas address this challenge in the "First Declaration of the Lacandon Jungle" by identifying and problematizing the historical narrative of Mexico's national progress. Rather than challenge the "truth" of neoliberalism's narrative, the EZLN seeks to (re)cover the perspective of indigenous communities and campesinos excluded from that narrative and to map connections between historical exclusions to contemporary political and economic exclusion. In this respect, the EZLN enacts the project of CDA scholars by asking "what is it about the way social life is structured and organized" by neoliberalism that

marginalizes our community? Likewise, they help locate what "resources" may be drawn on in "tackling and overcoming problems" constructed in and through neoliberal discourse (Fairclough 2001, 125). The "First Declaration" enacts this strategy by proclaiming that:

> We are a product of 500 years of struggle: first against slavery, then during the War of Independence against Spain led by insurgents then, to avoid being absorbed by North American imperialism, then to promulgate our constitution and expel the French empire from our soil, and later the dictatorship of Porfirio Diaz denied us the application of the Reform laws, and the people rebelled and leaders like Villa and Zapata emerged, poor men just like us. We have been denied the most elemental preparation so they [the Mexican government specifically, advocates of globalization and development generally] can use us as cannon fodder and pillage the wealth of our country.…But today, we say ENOUGH IS ENOUGH....[to] the same ones that... today take everything from us, absolutely everything. (EZLN 1994, 1)

In doing so, the Zapatistas reconstruct Mexico's historical narrative as one of economic exploitation that contests neoliberalism's historical narrative of economic progress by illustrating both an alternative experience of this history and by connecting contemporary neoliberal discourses to indigenous counter-histories. Specifically, the Zapatistas' rhetorical interventions in sedimented histories reveal silences in the narratives told by the Mexican government and multinational corporations that construct indigenous identities. Identified as a 'problem in discourse' that sustains indigenous marginalization, the EZLN mobilizes narratives, as rhetorical resources, that resonate in and from indigenous communities as a means to fill these silences.

Finally, the Zapatistas address the last goal outlined by Asen by constructing an inclusive frame for subsequent anti-neoliberal struggles. First, the Zapatistas challenge the cultural model that governs the forms of collective identification made available by neoliberalism.[25] In the First Declaration, the Zapatistas challenge neoliberalism's

constraints on collective action through an invitation to include more voices in anti-

neoliberal struggles. They make this appeal for a more broadly composed group subject

by explaining that "we ask for your participation, your decision to support this plan that

struggles for work, land, housing, food, health care, education, independence, freedom,

democracy, justice and peace" (EZLN 1994, 1-2). Later, after convening a conference of

over 6,000 activists and indigenous people in the Chiapas (many who later organized

protests in Seattle, Genoa, Cancun, Seoul, Mexico City, and Bonn), the Zapatistas

elaborated their vision of an alternative model for subsequent (anti-neoliberal) collective

struggle. Focusing on the inclusion of perspectives made invisible or unsayable by

neoliberalism, they explain:

> We have our own notion of autonomy and we exert it in our spaces. But we know
> that it is not the only one, and it is not necessarily the better one. We are inviting
> you to bring your own experience, your own vision, to this common space, to
> weave there a consensus and to identify divergences, in order to explore what we
> can do together. You are the ones to give us alternative orientations. We are just
> committing ourselves to defend the positions emerging as a consensus as our own.
> (EZLN 1996b, n.p.)

Consequently, by clearing space for a collective and multiplicitous identity and

diffusing historical animosities, the Zapatistas introduce an oppositional model of

collective becoming-identity that challenges the constraints on identity constructed by

neoliberalism's State-form.

Re-constructing Collectivity: Cooperation, Solidarity, and Resisting

'Together, but Separately'

In the previous section, I examined how the Zapatistas mobilized the conditions

of neoliberalism (e.g., anonymity/invisibility) and strategies (e.g., mobilizing indigenous

histories, inventing political relations, and inviting openness to mutual participation in

oppositional struggle) as the basis of collective becoming-identity. In this section, I address how the Zapatistas envision articulations among becoming-identities that form war-machines that "communicat[e], collaborat[e], and perfor[m] in a common political project" (Hardt and Negri 2004, 105).

Neoliberalism's State-form constructs political subjects in ways that subordinate the potential of emergent collectivities "to conduits, pipes, [and] embankments which prevent turbulence, which constrain movement from one point to another, and [which demand that] space itself…be striated and measured" (Deleuze & Guattari 1987, 363). In place of a fluidity of (re)composing and decomposing oppositional collectivities, neoliberalism's State-form constrains these relationships and limits the potential for new ways of organizing anti-neoliberal struggle. War-machines reject the State-form's principle of unity and embrace a principle of constant variation when articulating to other communities engaging in anti-neoliberal struggle. In other words, the war-machine "is not confined to the form in which it is realized" in a particular case, but instead operates as a haecceity of struggle, or a collectivity founded in a "configuration of qualities which serves to make certain distinctions or register certain oppositions, only to disperse upon closer examination into the several determinations which make it up" (Patton 2001, 1293). To support this argument, I examine folktales circulated as part of the Zapatistas' rhetorical war-machine as exemplars of their efforts to model a haecceity of struggle.[26] I focus on two characteristics of these folktales that demonstrate how they produce dynamic and flexible anti-neoliberal war-machines. First, I examine the Zapatistas' use of a folk aesthetic to extend an invitation to cooperative participation. Second, I explore

how the themes and content developed in one of these tales reinforce the possibility of collective identification activated by folk aesthetics.

   Folk aesthetics and cooperative struggle. One of the critical strengths of the Zapatistas' oppositional struggle is their ability to mobilize diverse communities to participate in collective acts of struggle (see Conant 2010). In this section, I examine how folk aesthetics deployed in the EZLN's rhetorical interventions foster collective struggle based on cooperation between communities (i.e., subject-group) instead of subordination to a community of struggle (i.e., subjected-group). Observing the potential for aesthetic forms to fuel political practices, Ranciere argues that aesthetics act as new "configurations of experience that create new modes of sense perception and induce novel forms of political subjectivity" (2004, 9).[27] Accordingly, I also consider the Zapatistas' use of folk tales as an exemplar of the political edge of aesthetic practices.

   The EZLN's use of folktales as the narrative genre for theorizing collective struggle activates a discursive form defined by reading practices that invite the participation of other marginalized communities and that contribute to shaping the bases of cooperation and collective action. Folk culture and the circulation of a folk aesthetic create a space to "establish differential identity, affirm group solidarity, resist dominance, and 'recall home'" (Billingslea-Brown 1999, 2). Even in neoliberal regimes, the consequences of folktales for the construction of identities are pronounced, e.g., modern-day Horatio Alger tales (see Cloud 1996). Folktales allow readers and narrators to *mutually* "quest for cultural identity and...journey back into the historical self" as well as "journey across geopolitical, cultural, and ideological borders." Like *dia de Los muertas* rituals central to EZLN masking, telling and hearing folktales situates contemporary

communities in the context of a shared history. As such, Billingslea-Brown contends that folk culture, and folk narrative in particular, plays a vital role in sustaining marginalized identities and fomenting transformative and revolutionary politics (1999, 15, 23).[28]

Characterized by traditional elements, local, everyday uses, cultural memory functions, and "non-artistic" origins (see Congdon 1987), the tales of the Zapatista uprising evoke a uniformly folk aesthetic. Like "The Story of Questions" which I analyze below, the EZLN's folktales rely on significant cultural practices (e.g., *ejido* (communal) farming), draw on traditional Mayan deities (e.g., Ik'al and Votan), and activate important cultural symbols (e.g., corn) to activate the symbolic relationships embedded in folk aesthetics. "The Story of Questions" theorizes difference as an asset to collective struggle through the foibles of two Mayan deities who come to rely on mutual solidarity and one another's unique capabilities to achieve emancipation. Additionally, the Zapatistas fuse indigenous cosmology, modern revolutionary figures, and indirect parables presented in poetry, prose, and political tracts to construct a rhetorical form that demands cooperative interpretation of its opaque references to, and indirect connections with, conditions of neoliberal marginalization (Sherrard 1999, 151-152). Importantly, these aesthetic commitments resonate with political practices invented in the Zapatista rebellion. The EZLN's choice of a folk aesthetic models their political practice of collective decision-making (discussed above) and echoes the EZLN's invitation to a radically democratic struggle for autonomy.[29] In this sense, the Zapatistas use of folk genres that foster "mutual participation…that leads to liberation and reaffirmation" demonstrates the contention of CDA scholars that "[oppositional] discourses are realized in both genres and texts" (Sherrard 1999, 151-152; Wodak 2001, 66). The Zapatistas

mobilize the "conventionalized, more or less schematically fixed use of language associated with a particular activity" (i.e., folk culture) to activate new forms of collective struggle in neoliberal contexts (Fairclough 1995, 14).

Second, the EZLN's circulation of these texts through loose networks of translators, "cultural workers," and others reinforces the invitation to cooperative participation in collective struggle. In fact, while the Zapatistas have developed direct cooperative relationships with some "cultural workers" to circulate their short stories, one of the primary mediums of circulation has been independent translation and circulation by supporters, sympathizers, and some skeptics. Supporting this effort, the EZLN refuses all rights protections for the stories, instead determining that "any person may use the text of [these] writings for their own uses." In doing so, the EZLN refigures translation and the reproduction of Zapatista folktales as a tool for building solidarity across divergent experiences with neoliberalism, amplifying and circulating the texts is an act of solidarity and a means of increasing visbility.[30] Shedding some light on this use of translation, Marcos contends that the political efforts and success of the Zapatistas have always relied on translation as a necessary tool for inviting others into a collective struggle. As David Romo explains, Marcos' work as the EZLN's spokesperson demonstrates the importance of translation and dissemination to their political efforts. First, as a community organizer in the Chiapas, Marcos "learned not only the words, but also the worldviews, lifeways and stories belonging to...Mayan communities." Then, as a spokesperson to the international media and potential allies, Marcos "learned to translate the indigenous ideas to the world community." In fact, as Romo argues, "part of what has made the guerilla

leader [and the EZLN] so effective in reaching a post-modern, wired-together world is he's one hell of a translator" (aqi. in Ortiz and Poniatowska 2001, 112, fn. 1).

In other words, the EZLN's use of folk aesthetics activates relations with disparate communities and identifies a rhetorical practice that invites a collectivity inclusive of a wide range of experiences with neoliberalism. Marcos describes the importance of the EZLN's commitment to cooperative collectivity evoked by the folk aesthetic, noting that "we don't grieve when we recognize that our ideas and proposals don't have an eternal horizon, and that there are ideas and proposals better suited than ours" to address neoliberalism. Instead the EZLN acknowledges that "to obligate anyone to accept our thinking over another argument wouldn't be the force of reason" (Marcos 2003/2004b, 587). By committing to this critical strategy, the EZLN opens a discursive space where a new political consciousness can be forged cooperatively, a consciousness that invites articulation, not competition, between the diverse experiences of oppression under neoliberalism.

'Together, but separately': Mutual solidarity and 'The Story of Questions.' If the EZLN's folktales utilize an aesthetic form that invites inclusive oppositional collectivities, then the content offers a series of pedagogic parables that elaborate on how these collectivities might be forged. For instance, these tales focus on various themes from the need for introspection as an element of collective politics that insists there are "many...ways of thinking in the world, and how happy the world will be when all...ways of thinking have a place" (Marcos 2002c, 375), to an explanation of the false options and barriers to political collectivity constructed by neoliberalism (Marcos 2002, 318-319; see also Marcos 2002a, 308-309). A close reading of these tales demonstrates how they

elaborate central commitments of oppositional political collectives envisioned by the Zapatistas. In particular, "The Story of Questions" reinforces the commitment to cooperative opposition implicit in the Zapatistas' folk aesthetic.

"The Story of Questions" is dated December 13, 1994, almost a year after the Zapatista Uprising began. It, like many of the other folktales told by Marcos, is the relaying of a tale told to him by "Old Don Antonio." Old Don Antonio was an indigenous man who aided Marcos and other *mestizos* attempting to learn to serve and work alongside the indigenous communities of the Chiapas. The story was told to Marcos ten years before the 1994 rebellion during the earliest years of the EZLN's organizing, and according to Marcos' telling occurred during one of the first meetings between Marcos and Don Antonio. Initiated by Don Antonio's inquiry about what the young Marcos was doing in the Chiapas, the story that Marcos retells purports to tell the "real story" of Emiliano Zapata, an assurance that resonates with folk aesthetics' attention to journeying and building new connections between past and present cultural histories. Marcos emphasizes this element of the tale in his preface. He explains that it emerged from Antonio's insistence that the young Zapatista, after explaining his purposes in the Chiapas, hear "the real story of this so-called Zapata" from whom the EZLN took their name.

The story unfolds as a narrative about two traditional Mayan deities, Ik'al and Votan, that took place "many stories ago." One represented light and the other dark; they were, Don Antonio explained, opposites. The story describes the two gods' evolution from stationary deities unaware of one another to two figures who, by working cooperatively, develop the ability to move "together, but separately and in agreement."

This ability to move, Antonio would explain to Marcos, allowed the gods to arrive in the Chiapas. It was there, realizing that they had become one collective body composed of two individuals, that the gods completed a metamorphosis that produced the "so-called Zapata" that Antonio explained. Constituted by two stages, this metamorphosis that structures the tale discloses the conditions of cooperative collectivity envisioned by the Zapatistas.

In the first stage of the metamorphosis, the gods, Ik'al and Votan, are aware of each other but trapped within their own abstract categories (i.e., "light/day" and "dark/night") and unable to forge a productive relationship (i.e., collective identity) between one another. Each laments, "the day won't go, the night won't go." Aware of their interconnectedness, but unable to act on it, the gods offer an analog to communities marginalized by neoliberalism but prevented by the realities of that marginalization from forging networks of collaboration and communication. As a consequence, "they didn't walk, they were always stationary, these two gods who were one." Dissatisfied, the two gods in the narrative determine to act together: "Let's walk,' said the one who were two. 'how?' said the other. 'where?' said the one." And, "first by asking, 'how?' and then by asking, 'where?' they saw they moved a little bit." After celebrating their ability to act collectively, the gods asked, "how do we move?" and "it brought the answer of 'together, but separately and in agreement'" since the ability and the responsibility to act/walk required equal participation by each god. Viewed in this way, the gods determined that it was unimportant who "moved first" just "as long as we move."

Passing through the first stage of their metamorphosis, the gods enunciate the first condition of collectivity envisioned by the Zapatistas. Interpreted as an analogue for the

different conditions faced by communities marginalized by neoliberalism, the gods'
discovery of the ability to act collectively reinforces the Zapatistas' commitment to
autonomy as integration of differently situated communities into a cooperative, but not
necessarily unified oppositional struggle, or haecceity. What is more, the gods'
conclusion that who moves first is less important than that both move "in agreement"
reinforces the pliant collective struggle described by the war-machine, and resists the
effort to subordinate one element of a collective struggle to a principle of unity or
hierarchy.

In the second stage of the gods' evolution from stationary subjects to active
agents, the gods encounter the question of where they should walk with this new found
ability. Or, more broadly, to what ends a collectivity committed to acting "together but
separately" should commit itself. At first, their solution seems easy: two roads confront
them. The first is short and where it goes/what it achieves is plainly within sight. The
long road is more uncertain and where it leads cannot be known without walking it. "And
because they were so happy they could move," the gods "finally decided that they would
never know where that long road took them unless they moved." However, as the gods
set out on this path, they began to realize that it was no short journey, and wondered,
"How will we walk for such a long time?" when each can only walk by day (Votan) or by
night (Ik'al). Until, after much disappointment, crying, and disagreement, they finally
"agreed and understood that Ik'al could walk by night and Votan by day, and that Ik'al
would walk Votan through the night." Answering the question of how to walk all the
time, the gods concluded that it was necessary to "walk with questions" and since then,
Don Antonio explained, "true men and women...walk by asking." For the gods in Don

Antonio's story, this commitment led the deities to the Chiapas where upon arriving their

metamorphosis culminated in the birth of Emiliano Zapata. As an analog for forging

collectivities among disparate communities subordinated by neoliberalism, the gods'

choice to choose the "long road" resonates with a rejection of a politics of unity that

flattens the diversity of experiences of subordination to fit within a ready-at-hand model

of resistance.

Second, by "walking with questions" that "never stop" and are "never still," the

Zapatistas underline that this commitment is not aimed at developing a product, an

identity that adequately accounts for the range of identities and experiences marginalized

by neoliberalism. Instead, it is aimed at constructing a process, a way of cooperatively

articulating identities and experiences that remains open, a process that acknowledges its

incompleteness, and submits itself to reformulations based on the differing experiences

that new questions (created by new conditions and new identities) raise. In other words,

"walking with questions" envisions and enacts a pliant, active, recomposing, and

decomposing collective responsive to neoliberalism's universally-singular variations and

animated by the desiring-production of disparate identities.

Taken together, the aesthetic form and the thematics developed in "The Story of

Questions" and other Zapatista folktales construct a rhetorical appeal for "mutual

solidarity" as the basis of oppositional collectivity. Traditionally, solidarity has been

conceptualized in terms of ideological solidarity (based in a shared consciousness and

expressed in slogans like "workers of the world, unite!"), rights solidarity (based in the

leveraging of international and national institutions (e.g., the UN or Amnesty

International) to address violations of human rights), or material solidarity (based in a

recognition that costs of social ills are shared and enacted through the delivery of economic support to victims of disasters, wars, and, sometimes, underdevelopment) (Olesen 2005, 100-110).[31] As an alternative to these forms of altruistic solidarity, "mutual solidarity" refers to forms of political cooperation and alliance-making that involve "a more reciprocal or two-way relationship" between potential members. As Olesen describes it, "mutual solidarity may be seen as a form…of solidarity that, while it does not dissolve distance, emphasizes similiarities between physically, socially, and culturally distant actors, while at the same time respecting and acknowledging local and national differences" (2005, 110).

Conceptually, mutual solidarity illuminates the work of the Zapatistas and helps theorize how their construction of collective identifications and solidarities evoke a radically new way of doing oppositional politics. First, the aesthetic genre relied on by the Zapatistas invites a two-way, reciprocal relationship with those who encounter these texts. Second, the themes developed in EZLN folktales theorize the contours of participatory oppositional struggle. Finally, the interpenetration of aesthetic form and political struggle developed in Zapatista folktales demonstrates how "the logic of descriptive and narrative arrangments used in the aesthetic...become fundamentally indistinct from the arrangements used in the description and interpretation of the phenomena of the social and historical world" (Ranciere 2004, 37).

Rethinking Resistance: Minor Politics and Truth

Processes in the Chiapas

Identity and collectivity provide two primary problematics addressed by the Zapatistas' anti-neoliberalism war-machine. The EZLN challenges the narrow range of

discourses that charge the planes of struggle indigenous communities occupy by enunciating counter-histories and constructions of identity that destabilize the neoliberal State-form. Likewise, the Zapatistas loosen the rigid couplings enforced by neoliberalism's linking of indigenous communities and signifiers of backwardness. The EZLN also maps articulations between political collectivities that produce plural, multiplicitous identities capable of resisting the commitments to unity and discipline that constrain traditional social movements. Nonetheless, founding a collective political praxis on an identity that is constantly in flux, and on forms of collectivity that are constantly renegotiating their commitments, also requires rethinking how such a political collectivity can exert political power in ways that can effectively challenge social and political relations of neoliberalism.

Conventional rhetorical scholarship evaluates oppositional discourses and collectivities through measures of their influence on dominant social orders. For example, counterpublic scholars (e.g., Hauser 1999) evaluate positively those discursive operations that gain enough publicity/influence to participate in the public sphere. Similarly, traditional social movements research privileges efforts that effectuate change by governmental, corporate, or social institutions. Both approaches evaluate the relative power of an oppositional collectivity in terms of their ability to exert measurable forms of influence on dominant discourses and institutions. Critically, these approaches falter when one aims to evaluate collectivities that participate in a political effort that is "perpetually prolonging itself [via connective syntheses], breaking off [via disjunctive syntheses,] and starting up again [via conjunctive syntheses]" (Deleuze and Guattari aqi. Goh 2006, 225). To better account for these processes, I analyze the Zapatistas' "minor

politics," a politics "of becoming-minor, of widening the gap between oneself and the norm" (Patton 2001, 1283). First, I identify how the Zapatistas' oppositional practice resonates with 'minor politics' theorized by Deleuzean scholars. Second, I examine the rhetorical techniques that sustain this delicate form of exerting political power. I conclude by discussing how the Zapatistas reconfigurations of identity, collectivity and agency/power contribute to mobilizing and contesting their experience with neoliberalism's State-form in the Chiapas.

     Encuentras, juntas, and assemblies: Minor politics in the Chiapas and beyond. "Minor politics" refer to potential "becomings" that seek not to acquire the position of the majority (i.e., the macropolitics of institutional reform or revolution), but instead struggles to destabilize all fixed majorities and static conditions desired by neoliberalim's State-form (i.e., micropolitics) (Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 291-299). In other words, "the 'minorization' of politics" entails a focus on acts of resistance insofar as they demonstrate "seeds or crystals of *becoming* whose value is to trigger uncontrollable movements within the mean or the majority" (Smith 1997, xlii-xliii). Massumi (1992, 103) contends that "'strategies' is the best word for ways of becoming." They are "less *theories about becoming*" and more properly "*pragmatic guidelines* serving as landmarks *for [productive] future movement*." Massumi emphasizes, "they have no value unless they are immanent…: they must be verified by the collectivity concerned, in other words submitted to experimental evaluation and remapped as needed" (Ibid.). In this section, I examine how the EZLN sustains this focus on contributing pragmatic guidelines that trigger new political formations. My aim is to demonstrate how these efforts construct

alternatives to traditional oppositional efforts and critique oppositional collectivities that discipline the desiring-production of their emergence.

The Zapatistas, in the Chiapas and with international allies, enact political practices that privilege a radically participatory style of decision-making. The EZLN rejects traditional representative politics and deliberative forums that foster uniform political movements, instead embracing rhizomatic nodes of communicative exchange that multiply the number of solutions, identities, narratives, voices, sources of agency, and political sensibilities that any single collectivity can bring to bear in its oppositional struggle (Gilbert 2008, 227-230). More particularly, the Zapatistas pursue political practices that "create spaces of engagement wherein the strategic orientation of a vast range of political and potentially political activists can be sharpened, adjusted, amplified and problematized, in a process [through] which…a community finds new ways to think and be" (Gilbert 2008, 230).

In the Chiapas, the Zapatistas engage in politics that intensify and proliferate local communities' participation in democratic practices of autonomy and self-determination through "Rebel Zapatista Autonomous Municipalities" and "Juntas of Good Government." In these systems, power is held in assemblies founded in local communities. These autonomous municipalities combine to construct the councils of good government that exercise authority over each of the Zapatistas' five autonomous regions. Seats of power in these assemblies are held by every member of the community on a monthly or sometimes weekly rotation. And, in these political schemas, any assembly member may be recalled by failing to enact the mandate of his or her constituents. By devolving power to individual nodes that together construct a collectivity

that starts and stops, reconfigures and reorients itself, based on the changing will of local

communities, the Zapatistas enact local acts of becoming- that multiply the power held in

Zapatista communities.

Two examples demonstrate the effectiveness of this practice of minor politics in

Zapatista communities. First, Marcos explains that after the initial uprising in 1994, the

politico-military structure of the EZLN began ceding authority to local communities in

Zapatista-controlled territory. Through this, the EZLN learned that the radically

democratic process described above, when practiced in local communities, actually sped

up the rate of development of civil society, educational infrastructure, and community

resources. "Because the distance of the military command obligated them…to resolve

their own problems," Marcos argued that these local communities faced choices

"between 'let's go ask the command what to do' and 'we have problems here and we

have to resolve them.'" By privileging self-directed, autonomous, indigenous

communities, the Zapatistas chose the latter "start[e] resolving their own problems"

(Marcos 2007, 44). Second, by decentralizing the Zapatistas' political "program," the

EZLN resists being reterritorialized by neoliberalism's State-form. For example, the

Zapatistas avoid a rearticulation of the normalizing, policing functions of neoliberalism's

conjunctive and disjunctive syntheses by utilizing "assemblies and governing councils" to

ensure that "the division of society into the oppressive dichotomy of rulers and ruled" is

not reproduced (El Kilombo 2007, 14). Marcos explains the importance of these dialogic,

immanent cooperative practices noting, "the opportunity…for history not to repeat itself.

Because if not, it seems to us that it will repeat. You can make a global movement and

take down everything that exists now, and not offer an alternative and come back to make

something equally bad or worse" (Marcos 2007, 53). That, he explains "would be to change history but only to change its protagonist and not its path. And what we want to change is the path" journeyed by anti-neoliberal struggles.

In dialogue with international allies, the Zapatistas enact a similar form of cooperative, rhizomatic political practice that builds connections between differently-situated communities of struggle. Captured in the practice of "encuentras" (encounters), the Zapatistas identify power as a product of earnest interactions between differently marginalized communities. These encounters encourage different oppositional collectivities to listen to and dialogue, to, in effect, learn to encounter others even when the "*deafening noise of weapons and vanguardist ideals would have it otherwise*" (El Kilombo 2007, 12). For example, in July 1996, the Zapatistas hosted the "First Intercontinental Encounter for Humanity and against Neoliberalism" bringing thousands of activists from Europe, South America, North America, Africa, Asia, and Australia to the Chiapas. The encounter was organized around the discussion of four issues: economic aspects of neoliberalism, political aspects of neoliberalism, social aspects of neoliberalism, and cultural aspects of neoliberalism, and facilitated a dialogue in dozens of languages between activists whose struggles were animated by a patchwork of social, political, economic and cultural experiences. Through this international dialogue, interlocutors debated, disagreed, and learned from one another's answers to questions about how one resists and how one struggles and proposes alternatives to each of the facets of neoliberalism focused on by the encounter (EZLN 1996b, n.p.).

Finally, reflecting a commitment to minor politics that proliferated proliferates the power of anti-neoliberal war-machines, the encounter did not issue a program of

resistance to define future struggles. Instead, the Zapatistas framed the "encuentra" as the beginning of an:

> echo that turns itself into many voices, into a network of voices that before the deafness of power, opts to speak to itself, knowing itself to be one and many, acknowledging itself to be equal it its desire to listen and be listened to, recognizing itself as different in the tonalities and levels of voices forming it. (EZLN 1996b, n.p.)

In other words, in place of a program of resistance, the encounter sought the production of new 'pragmatic guidelines' for resistance. That is, by sharing the experiences of marginalization and tactics of resistance adopted by differently situated communities, participants in the encuentra discover new strategies and tactics that multiply the possibilities of becoming-, or lines of flight, that inform their local struggles, and their efforts to forge larger haecceities of struggle with other collectivities. Marcos explains this implication noting that "Each person is going to start to say, 'For me, my world is this way,' and they're going to start constructing it and the other is going to learn. Not just to have ideas…and to understand each other's ideas. Not just this but also to create paths, coming and going, to meet each other" (Marcos 2007, 33).

Democratic spaces enacted through the composition of deliberative social forums evoke the commitments of minor politics. First, the utilization of local practices of self-determination and autonomy avoids enforcing a new State-form that reinscribes new hierarchies reminiscent of neoliberalism. Against the well-worn paths of dependency, the Zapatistas blaze new trails for indigenous independence governed locally, on a human scale, within shared cultural spaces. They cultivate a political practice that multiplies the bases of power by locating them in each singular community of struggle, rather than in the subordination of local communities to one collective program of struggle, or "politics

of the party" (see Badiou 2003). Second, the Zapatistas create new articulations to disparate communities. By creating spaces that draw together the diverse range of subjects neoliberalism marginalizes, the EZLN constructs a space that mobilizes invisible identities to build and share forms of community that depart from neoliberalism's State-form and collective identifications it enforces.

The international of hope: Rhetorical truth processes. Once set in motion, the war-machine's minor politics must include rhetorical strategies that guard against appropriation by neoliberalism's State-form. While Deleuze, Guttari, Negri and others extol the potential of minor politics and warn of the dangers of appropriation by the State-form, it is necessary to turn to Alain Badiou's theory of political truth processes to detect the rhetorical strategies that can help defend a war-machine against these re-appropriations of its political power.

Truth processes, Badiou argues, enact political commitments that "cannot be [reduced to] a State programme" (Badiou 2003, 72).[32] As Badiou notes, a truth process enacts "fidelity, which is the name of the process" and that "amounts to a sustained investigation of the situation" encountered by a marginalized community (Badiou 2001, 67). Rhetorical strategies can foster a "political orientation [that] touches upon truth," Badiou argues, by taking as their axiom "the egalitarian principle of a capacity [among humans] to discern the just or the good" of a singular situation (Badiou 2003, 70-71). However, to accomplish this task is not easy.[33] As Badiou contends, "historically speaking, there have been some political orientations that have had or will have a connection with a truth, a truth of the collective as such….[T]hey alone can act as a condition of philosophy's thinking" about and implications for political practice (or

resistance) (2003, 70). To maintain this connection to a truth, Badiou identifies three

tripping points to be avoided by political/rhetorical truth processes: absolutization,

betrayal, and simulacra.

Absolutization corrupts a political truth process by converting a truth of a

particular situation into an aspiration "to render the whole world good." For instance, by

converting the findings of the Zapatista "encuentra" into a program for *all* communities

marginalized by neoliberalism the "international of hope" described by the Zapatistas as a

"rejection of conformity and defeat" would, through being absolutized, be rendered as a

State-form. As Badiou explains, the sole being of a truth process "lies in the situated

advent" of its singularity. Absolutization, instead of expanding the interval between

singular communities and the normalizing impulses of neoliberalism, domesticates the

minor politics of singular communities by imposing the constraints of a (universal)

political program.

However, the Zapatistas sustain a rhetorical truth process by rejecting unity as the

basis for "minor politics" of struggle against neoliberalism and by articulating the

incompleteness of the solutions that can be found in any singular situation. Revealing this

commitment, the Zapatistas invited participation physically and vicariously by other

oppositional communities. Explaining this position, they argue that:

> Against the International of Terror that neoliberalism represents, we must raise an
> International of Hope. Unity beyond borders, languages, colors, cultures, sexes,
> strategies and thoughts, of all those who prefer a living humanity. The
> International of Hope. Not the bureaucracy of hope, not an image inverse to, and
> thus similar to, what is annihilating us. Not power with a new sign or new clothes.
> (EZLN 1996a, n.p.)

Central to this response as a truth-process are both its commitment to singular situations

in which responses are developed and its refusal to articulate universal strategies for all

communities struggling against neoliberalism. Reflecting on the "Encuentra" and other

rhetorical spaces created by the Zapatistas to "build bridges" between local communities,

Marcos explains that:

> This is what we need to convince the rest of the world: The fact that the only place where you can be yourself, wherever you consider that to be, is in a collective that guarantees you respect and where you guarantee respect in return. In this case, your commitment is not to an organizational structure but to a cause. Now, if I am in a cause and in an organizational structure as well, then I commit myself to respect their decision-making processes, their way of working in collective, and there are people who don't go for that. What they're interested in is that their efforts enter into a cause. *But even so, we think that the world that we are dreaming, in this great society of societies, the great collective of collectives that will be the world, only there can the individual be, without this crisis of identity, of "Who am I?" and "Where am I going?" knowing always that they have all the liberty to decide and create who they are and want to be. And that is what does not exist now.* (2007, 49; italics added)

Consequently, the Zapatistas acknowledge the risk of absolutization that threatens a truth

process and illustrate how a political orientation can be grounded in a truth process that

informs practical, critical interventions in political situations.

The second hurdle faced by rhetorical truth processes identified by Badiou is

characterized as "betrayal" (2001, 78-80). Betrayal of a truth process emerges from the

moments of crisis when a truth-process challenges the efforts of oppositional

collectivities to "keep going" in the face of adversity. However, betrayal for Badiou is not

merely a renunciation, but requires that the collective "become the enemy" of the truth

process to which it once maintained fidelity (2001, 79). Betrayal, Badiou argues, is

avoided through rhetorical processes that encourage political subjects to "keep going,"

and "do all that you can to persevere in that which exceeds your perseverance. Persevere

in the interruption. Seize in your being that which has seized and broken you" (Badiou

2001, 47).

Affirming this imperative, the Zapatistas evoke a similar realization of the crisis presented by neoliberalism. They note, "struggling for a better world" against neoliberalism "all of us are fenced in, threatened with death." Further they explain, that on "every continent, every rural area, every city, and every house" the fence that threatens oppositional collectivities is "reproduced globally." However, they identify how persistence against these realities, a commitment to 'keep going,' sustains a politics that introduces turbulence into neoliberalism's State-form. They explain, "but fences are broken" because:

> The rebels search each other out. They walk towards one another. They find each other and together break other fences. In the rural areas and cities, in the states, in the nations, on the continents, the rebels [through their perseverance] begin to recognize themselves, to know themselves to be equal and different. They continue on their fatiguing walk, walking as it is now necessary to walk, that is to say, struggling. (EZLN 1996b, n.p.)

Finally, the last snare on which a minor politics can be caught, Badiou argues, is through the seduction of a simulacra. A simulacra of a truth process offers all the formal qualities of a truth process, but, whereas a truth process neither excludes nor constrains anyone, a simulacra reinforces a fundamental exclusion as the basis on which to found an oppositional collectivity (Badiou 2001, 72-75). Central to avoiding this risk is discernment that reveals these fundamental exclusions. Rhetorically, the Zapatistas reveal the role of discernment in their oppositional discourse by identifying the differences between the "international of terror" promoted by neoliberalism and the "international of hope" promoted by anti-neoliberal minor politics. On the one hand, the "international of terror" concentrates "power in power and misery in misery," enforces a "distribution of the world" that "destroys humanity" by "creating only one place for money and its servants," and offers a set of political choices governed by neoliberalism's State-form. In

place of "humanity," it offers "stock market value indexes, instead of dignity it

offers...globalization of misery" (EZLN 1996a, n.p.). On the other hand, the

"international of hope," promises "not power with a new sign or new clothing" (i.e., one

that shifts the exclusions of neoliberalism from indigenous Zapatistas to other

marginalized communities), but instead forges what Marcos describes as a politics of

love and mutual respect. Illustrative of Badiou's truth process, Marcos explains that,

> The problem of love is a problem of respect....Love understood as possession, property, is not what we think is love....Fundamentally a relationship, of whatever kind, not just in a couple but between people who relate to each other, has to be based in respect....Whatever political relationship that is not based in respect is a manipulation. Well-intentioned or bad-intentioned, it doesn't matter, because it is a manipulation. (2007, 58)

 The Zapatistas sustain their political truth process by inventing rhetorical practices that

discern between politics that reinscribe neoliberalism's State-form and those that depart

from its normalizing impulses. For the Zapatistas, avoiding the former requires

recognizing that oppositional politics can "construct respect or...can construct a

relationship of domination" and pursuing the latter by acknowledging that oppositional

communities "need a [(rhetorical)] space to listen to each other" (Marcos 2007, 58-59).

<div align="center">Conclusion</div>

In this chapter, my aim has been both to identify how the realities of

neoliberalism reoccur across disparate articulations of its State-form to specific contexts,

and to identify rhetorical strategies that might disclose resonances between singular

instances of anti-neoliberal war-machines. For example, my analysis demonstrates how

the conditions of invisibility/anonymity and political exclusion that challenge homeless

communities (re)articulate themselves with the experiences of indigenous communities

struggling against neoliberalism in the Global South. Similarly, the shifting investments of dominant institutions (i.e., the Mexican government and MNC's) parallel the shifting (polarized) topographies that define urban space. For example, the Chiapas parallels urban refuse space as a site where political subjects are refused recognition, refused services, and refused political power. These resonances between the marginalization experienced by the Zapatistas and that experienced by SafeGround Sacramento highlight the contention made by critical communication scholars (see Shome and Hegde 2002) and critical globalization scholars (see Amster 2008; see also Harvey 2005/2007) that suggests that contemporary flows of neoliberalism disrupt the easy distinctions between Global North and Global South that often inform critical discussion of global capitalism. Likewise, the broad circulation and popularity of the Zapatistas' political praxis (see Conant 2010) offers support for the contention made by scholars from both disciplines that local, vernacular communities can exert power influence on cultures at large.

While I address the resonances between the rhetorical interventions and the strategies that inform them in these two communities in the next chapter, a cursory comparison of the oppositional practice invented by the Zapatistas with those constructed by SafeGround point toward other similarities between the two singularities of struggle. First, the EZLN and "SafeGround" both deploy efforts to reclaim expanded spaces of maneuverability for marginalized identities. On the one hand, "SafeGround" pursues this aim through rhetorical tactics that open new facets of homeless identity (i.e., identifying structural causes of homelessness and critiquing non-homeless communities); on the other hand, the EZLN attempts to expose and fill representational silences with excluded indigenous voices and counter histories. In both instances, the struggle of the two

communities recognizes and situates the rigidly enforced hierarchies that define both communities as 'out-of-place' in a neoliberal world. Second, both communities of struggle enact performative tactics that reinforce their rhetorical efforts through enactments of alternative modes of collectivity and collective opposition. For example, SafeGround activists build conflict networks through camp discussions, practices of comida, and (unauthorized) participation in public space (e.g., protest actions) that expand the affective bonds and forms of solidarity between the housed and the homeless. In the Chiapas, indigenous peasants build this 'mutual solidarity' through encuentras that aim at building shared understandings and 'pragmatic guidelines' around which different communities can coalesce.

Finally, both communities participate in struggles that rely on the cooperative participation as the basis for radically democratic politics. Whether through practices of direct democracy enacted in autonomous Zapatista communities, or through regularly-elected elders who enforce collectively-ratified rules in autonomous homeless camps, both communities highlight autonomy-as-integration of difference and define politics as the deepening of opportunities. Critically, as I discuss in the next chapter, these resonances point toward practical rules of thumb that animate and sustain these individual war-machines, and that begin to map new paths of struggle to be journeyed by emerging anti-neoliberal haecceities.

Notes

[1] For Ranciere (2000/2004), politics is constituted against a "distribution of the sensible" that polices the desiring-productions of local communities by determining what identities, behaviors, and articulations are or are not permissible. Oppositional politics are acts that intervene on, are disruptive of, and challenge the taken-for-granted assumptions of dominant narratives and ideologies.

[2] Their rhetorical interventions have been published in multiple languages, identified as an inspiration by scores of other social movements and struggles, and cited in all manner of popular culture venues from film and music to art and poetry.

[3] For instance, in an article titled "The Subcomandante of Performance," Pena argues, "what made the Zapatistas' insurrection different from any other recent Latin American guerrilla movement was its self-conscious and sophisticated use of media....And since the second day of their conflict, they have placed as much importance on staging press conferences and theatrical photo shoots as on their military strategy. *The war was carried on as if it were a performance"* (1995, 90).

[4] See Greene 1998, 22. The Zapatista struggle, in fact, is aimed specifically at renegotiating both the relationship between indigenous communities and governmental institutions, development practices, and economic discourses, as well as the relationships between local resistances in the Chiapas and other struggles around the globe.

[5] As Butko (2006, n.p.) contends "a counter-hegemonic bloc must employ a strategy that is active, interventionist, and long-term, since the material power and ideological dominance of the hegemon requires a sustained approach to progressively undermine its influence and control over the masses. In terms of his overall conceptualization of a war of position, Gramsci ponders whether 'it [is] possible to plough without first manuring the land?' In other words, Gramsci recognizes that creating the proper conditions necessary for revolutionary activity is essential since 'every revolution has been preceded by an intense labour of criticism, by the diffusion of culture and the spread of ideas,' and that such a process must necessarily involve a wholesale transformation of people's conceptions of the world and norms of conduct.'"

[6] To develop this contextual understanding of the plane of struggle on which the Zapatistas operate is an enormous undertaking, especially when one considers that attention to the political, economic, and cultural histories of the Chiapas is exceptionally illuminating in its own right. For example, George Collier (2005), Evon V. Vogt (1969), Nicholas Higgins (2004), John Halloway (1998), and others have contributed insightful analyses, social histories, and other treaties addressing these concerns that range from broad discussions of political economy and cultural history in the Chiapas, e.g., Halloway, to highly focused considerations of the role played by indigenous identity and/or land and the politics of land distribution in the political realities encountered by the Zapatistas, e.g., Collier and Higgins. However, my present analysis is concerned less with replicating or contesting these important pieces of social, political, and cultural history in the Chiapas and more preoccupied with asking how these situations might be rethought in ways that open room for oppositional collectives to maneuver, and that offer lessons to collectivities struggling in other contexts. And, more particularly, how these possibilities become seized or remain unexploited by the Zapatista war-machine. Accordingly, while I rely heavily on these histories and political analyses to develop a contextual backdrop for my analysis, my specific contribution focuses on the political declarations, folk tales, novels, and other texts

produced by the Zapatistas, and asks what lessons these interventions can teach critical scholars both about the immediate context of their deployment and about anti-globalization politics more broadly.

[7] In doing so, my aim is to map the contours of the "State-form" produced by the articulation of the specific histories, institutions, and identities found in the Chiapas to the abstract machine of global capital. In other words, my aim is to "eventalize" the political field, or pitch, on which the Zapatistas operate. This "eventalization," enables a mapping of these specific configurations, Foucault argues, by making "visible a singularity at places where there is a temptation to invoke a historical constant, an immediate…trait, or an obviousness which imposes itself uniformly on all" (1991, 76-88). Doing so avoids articulating "the" experience of globalization for indigenous peoples, the Global South, or any other broad category, instead focusing on "rediscovering the connections, encounters, supports, blockages, plays of forces, strategies and so on which at a given moment establish what subsequently counts as being self-evident, universal and necessary" in a particular social space and for a particular group of social subjects, e.g., the Zapatistas, operating against the backdrop of the Chiapas local history.

[8] The 1550 Valladolid Controversy that featured debates between Bartolome de Las Casas and Jaun Gines de Sepulveda ended a moratorium on further Spanish conquest by concluding that education, not enslavement, was the proper way of interacting with new indigenous communities. Bouyed by Las Casas' arguments, Spanish explorers, aided by eager missionaries, pursued a vigorous practice of evangelical instruction in "New Spain." Consequently, the Church became a primary participant in "the creation of the ideal colonial subject form…who would be docile, God-fearing, and hard working" (Higgins 2004, 40).

[9] Alongside this, indigenous communities occupied a state of forced labor to fund tributes required by colonial administrators. In this system, indigenous laborers were pressed into a system of indentured servitude that allowed access to a small plot of subsistence farming in exchange for three or more days of labor for a regional agricultural or ranching boss, or *cacique*. As a consequence, for 300 years from the beginning of the Spanish Conquest, through the Bourbon dynasty, and until Independence in 1810, indigenous communities in Mexico confronted a pattern of intensified and streamlined management by colonial authorities that systematically disrupted and dismantled indigenous communities, forbade and punished the practice of indigenous culture, and formalized a two-tier system of political subjects that would sustain centuries of conflict between indigenous communities and their *ladino* and *mestizaje* counterparts.

[10] As a result, until 1988 when these reforms began to be reversed under neoliberal pressures, the Chiapas and other indigenous communities were among some of the strongest supporters of the PRI (for example, in 1988, 89% of the Chiapas arguably voted for the ruling party). However, what began as an apparent effort to restore indigenous communities throughout Mexico quickly became an exploitative form of labor that further marginalized Mexico's indigenous, agrarian communities.

[11] The situation resulted in an economic imbalance as prices continued to increase for the manufactured goods produced in Mexico's urban areas while the wages produced by communal, indigenous agriculture dwindled in real and relative terms. Indigenous communities faced two options: economic catastrophe or a return to more commercialized, wage-based agriculture. Coote (1995, 2-4) contends that this resulted in a reality where the control exerted by wealthy landowners continued to subject indigenous communities to ruthless labor practices.

[12] Throughout the 1980s, Mexico's government, as part of the structural adjustments enforced by the IMF, eliminated an expansive number of subsidies for agriculture rendering indigenous production of corn impossible. With an ability to produce corn and beans (two of Mexico's staple commodities) at two to three times the rate and less than one-third of the costs, the U.S. and other nations eliminated any competition, and in doing so one of the primary cultural experiences of scores of Mexico's indigenous communities (Collier 2005; Coote 1995).

[13] What is more, on the eve of the Zapatista rebellion this claim was confirmed by almost every political or economic measure imaginable. For instance, in a nation where state-funded education, and especially peasant education, is a mandate of the state's revolutionary constitution, illiteracy in the Chiapas far outpaces national averages with only about half of men and a small percentage of women speaking Spanish (as opposed to indigenous languages) (Higgins 2004). Likewise, levels of income and access to basic amenities like electricity and running water lag far behind national averages, while infant mortality, malnutrition, and other public health-related concerns far outpace national benchmarks. Despite periods of massive government investment in the Chiapas, it continues to sustain living conditions resonant with most third world nations (a condition NAFTA promised to eliminate) because "most of the development money that has been funneled into Chiapas has been used to build infrastructure such as roads and dams that will help transport products from the state to the rest of Mexico" (Collier 2005, 16). Confirming this fact is the reality that alongside brutalizing poverty, Chiapas produces enormous amounts of oil and natural gas, 35% of Mexico's coffee, 55% of its hydroelectric power, 3 million head of cattle, and 2.5 million cubic meters of timber that sustains Mexico's internal needs for resources and fuels its efforts to curry trade relationships with other developed nations (Vodovnik 2004, 28-29; see also, Collier 2005, 17).

[14] Two elements of NAFTA's reforms demonstrate how, beyond its political and economic mandates, the agreement and the preparations required for Mexico's participation in the agreement constitutes an assault on indigenous culture in Mexico. First, as part of the reconfigurations of Mexico's economy required for its participation in NAFTA, the central government was required to eliminate the right to communally held property (Coote, 1995). While the *ejido* system of land ownership had been a pivotal issue in the establishment of a national political system inclusive of indigenous identity, under the Salinas administration that laid the groundwork for NAFTA this policy was terminated putting in jeopardy thousands of acres of indigenous land and the cultural identities tied to that land for the people who farmed it for generations. Finally, by opening land to foreign ownership, NAFTA reforms virtually ensured the elimination of autonomous indigenous communities and economies, instead leaving wage labor, often in the same agriculture previously practiced by peasants as the only option (Collier 2005). See also note 12.

[15] Kothari suggests that this construction is accompanied by a number of other discourses that affirm a universal, individualized subject, including discourses of human rights, liberal democracy, and consumer capital (Kothari 2001, 150; see also Badiou 2001; 2003).

[16] Owing to the sensibilities of critical rhetoric that motivate my analysis in this dissertation, my reading of the rhetorical and performative practices of the oppositional collectivities I examine departs from traditional rhetorical criticisms focused on close-readings of a single text. Instead, my aim is to situate a broad range of rhetorical techniques and performative interventions within a rhetorical and historical context out of which, in this case, the EZLN's oppositional efforts emerge. Likewise, rather than focusing on the exemplary status of a particular text, my commitments to productive criticism motivate a concern with particular strategies revealed in the recurring commitments that inform the efforts of the oppositional political collectivities I

examine. Thus, the forms of communicative action on which I focus are often developed incompletely, across numerous texts. Accordingly, I begin this section by complementing the historical contexts provided in the previous section by highlighting some of the key characteristics of the rhetorical contexts from which I draw specific texts and rhetorical fragments for analysis. In the second part of this section, I describe the breadth of the corpus of texts on which I draw and some of their particular characteristics.

[17] As Ono and Sloop (1995) argue, "what must be stressed" in this definition "is that vernacular discourse does not exist only as counter-hegemonic, but also as affirmative, articulating a sense of community that does not function solely as oppositional to dominant ideologies" (22).

[18] This function is characterized by "embodied practice" that may "borrow from, without mimicking, popular culture" in a way that is "everchanging, active, and constantly motivated by a concern for local conditions and social problems" (Ono and Sloop 1995, 23).

[19] In 1996, the Mexican government made an attempt to "out" Marcos as Rafael Guillen. Their effort was motivated by hopes that Marcos could be cast as an intellectual elite out of touch with the experiences of the community in which he worked. After issuing several missives that chastised and teased the Mexican government for their efforts, two notable events occurred. First, members of the EZLN began to proclaim 'we are all Marcos' as a means of signaling an anonymous, but universal identity that had been assumed by the masked rebel. Second, during a public press conference, the actual Marcos offered to unmask himself and expose his identity. However, audience members rejected this notion, again proclaiming 'we are all Marcos.'

[20] The two most recent, and most complete, anthologies of Zapatista texts have been compiled by researchers conducting historical, archival, and cultural research in the Chiapas. The primary texts I analyze are drawn from these anthologies. The first, Vodovnik's (2004) "Ya Basta! Ten Years of the Zapatista Uprising" focuses primarily on political texts, i.e., declarations and letters. The second, Ponce de Leon's (2001) "Our Word is Our Weapon: Selected Writings" includes both political texts and a large selection of Zapatista folktales. Other volumes have been published online, by independent presses, e.g., Cinco Puntos Press, and others.

[21] See "A History about Herons and Eagles in the Lacandon Jungle" and "Support Letter for Leonard Peltier." Both are published in Vodovnik (2004, 133-137, 234, respectively).

[22] See "The Basque Country: Paths," "The Zapatistas Can, and Should, Speak Only About the Indigenous Question?," and "I Shit on all Revolutionary Vanguards of this Planet." All published in Vodovnik (2004, 569-587).

[23] For more on masks' role in the construction of identity, see Tonkin 1992, 225-228.

[24] Strengthening this appropriation is the closely-related trope of death that marks traditional uses of masked performance in Mexico. As with the use of masks themselves, the EZLN reappropriates the related trope of death from its role as a "national totem," or "identity object" (Allatson 2007, 145; Mitchell 2005, 161). Suggesting that the violent material consequences and death toll of globalization in the Chiapas is accomplished in and through the social death wrought by globalization's flattening of, and rendering anonymous, identities in the Global South and elsewhere, the Zapatistas further articulate the common conditions around which a subject-group might be formed by generalizing the experience of "death" under globalization to all those whose identities and ways of life are effaced in the name of development. As Marcos argues, globalization and development "produce a peculiar excess: left-over human beings, not necessary

for the 'new world order,' who do not produce, or consume, who do not use credit, in sum, who are disposable" and thus already subject to a death that precedes the physical (Marcos 2003/2004c, 267). Underscoring the effort to situate death as a common resource around which to forge communities of resistance, Marcos suggests that the social death initiated by globalization is one felt by all individuals marginalized by the demands of development and global capitalism arguing that whether a "peasant without land," "a single woman on the Metro at 10 p.m.," "an Indian in the streets of San Cristobal," "an unhappy student," or "a Zapatista in the Mountains," each singular experience and each person's articulation of the consequences of globalization add to the effort to complete the puzzle that will unsettle its expanding moorings (Marcos aqi. Vodovnik 2004, 42). As Marcos pleads, "to oppose neoliberalism [and globalization], to fight against it, is not just a political or ideological option, it is a question of the survival of humanity" (Marcos 2003/2004a, 325). Thus, whether one is rendered invisible by globalization such that political unintelligibility is tantamount to social death as is the case for the many communities affected by global capitalism in the far reaches of the Global South and the inner cities of the Global North, or whether one experiences death as a "daily fact" as in the Chiapas, Marcos and the Zapatistas contend that the common experience of globalization that initiates these experiences forms the basis from which to found a subject-group capable of constructing a war-machine against globalization.

[25] Explaining that different "social languages" reflect the ability of particular "who's" to speak about particular "whats," Gee's (1996) notion of cultural models provides a framework through which to understand the regulation observed by Escobar in development discourse's strict cloistering of "the rules of the game: who can speak, from what points of view, with what authority, and according to what criteria of expertise" (1996, 87).

[26] These discourses are important for interrogating the Zapatistas' theorization of conditions of collective struggle because of their wide distribution and accessibility to audiences without extensive background knowledge of the EZLN's struggle. In other words, if articulations between communities of struggle are actively forged through communicative practice, then these texts demonstrate one of the most direct efforts made by the Zapatistas to circulate a vernacular "culture" of resistance among wider audiences.

[27] Reinforcing the strong influence that aesthetic practices can exert on political efforts and realities, Thiongo Ngugi explains that the relationship between art and political orders are "problematic and not without potential or actual conflicts" because in "expressing a meaning, a wish, a judgment, a mood, a situation of being...[t]he state and the arts struggle for the voice of the community" becoming "genuine rivals for the allegiance of the community" (1998, 10; 24).

[28] Other critics and theorists have further identified this quality of folk narrative. Focusing on the narratives of historically marginalized communities, Sherrard extends Billingslea-Brown's claims suggesting that one of the characteristics of folk culture generally is its capacity to enable "communal healing" (1999, 151). Similarly, de Certeau suggest that folktales operate in important ways among communities of resistance by providing "repertoires of schemas of action" and a "space" in which "models of good and bad" tactics can be revealed (1984, 22).

[29] For example, the Zapatistas challenge the notion of autonomy as the recognition of separate, discrete, and monolithic individuals, collectivities, or states, inviting participation in autonomy not as separation, but as "integration of the most humble and forgotten minorities of contemporary Mexico" in ways that "recognize the characteristics of their own social, political, and cultural organization" (EZLN 2003/2004, 657). In other words, folktales, as an aesthetic form, evoke participatory relations between narrator/text and audience that promote similar

commitments to cooperation that are manifested both in the Zapatistas "political" efforts, and that informs their efforts to build bonds of solidarity with other marginalized communities.

[30] Within their aesthetic practice, translation activates meanings in a discourse in relation to the specific socio-historical situation of its production and consumption. Rockhill suggests that this use of translation is made possible though efforts that conceive of the process neither in terms of "universal criteria" nor solitary textual meanings, but with "a historical practice" of meaning production "that always takes place within a social framework"(Rockhill 2004, vii-viii). Thus, translation as Rockhill and, arguably, the Zapatistas seek to practice it is "not simply a form of mediation between two distinct languages," but a "relational reconfiguration of meaning...rendered possible by a socio-historical situation" (2004, viii).

[31] However, as Olesen (2005) notes, these forms of solidarity falter on two fronts. First, with the exception of some manifestations of ideological solidarity, these forms of collectivity focus on responding to specific, isolatable forms of injustice that need correction, i.e., a particular genocide in Rwanda or a particular natural disaster in Thailand, but fail to account for on-going forms of oppression that emanate from more structural causes. As a consequence, utilizing these approaches for addressing the challenges facing communities caught up in the flows of neoliberalism's State-form becomes a difficult proposition. Second, these forms of solidarity become subsumed by an altruistic impulse that structures a fixed relationship between empowered and disempowered potential members of a political situation or collectivity. In other words, because rights and material solidarity focus on bringing to bear either institutional pressure (rights solidarity) or material support (material solidarity) to address a particular problem, these forms of solidarity decompose into a one-way relationship where the "provider of solidarity," ostensibly the person not immanently experiencing the disempowering and oppressive realities of neoliberalism, "is supposed to be stronger than the beneficiary, who is weak and in need of help" (Olesen 2005, 108). However, despite these problems, these forms of solidarity are often endorsed by neoliberal institutions and governments because they reinforce the evaluative differences authorized by neoliberalism's State-form, i.e., the establishment of altruistic forms of material support from the Global North to the Global South does little to challenge the structured structures and existing relationships of inequality on which neoliberalism relies and which hastens its increased penetration of "developing" nations.

[32] Badiou (2001) advances an "ethic of truths" grounded in the notion of an "event" or a set of circumstances that convokes the "composing of a subject" who sustains the trace of an event through fidelity to its truth (40). From these four elements, an event which produces a subject who maintains fidelity to the truth of the event Badiou develops his alternative and critique of an ethic of the Other. The circumstances that constitute an event for Badiou function as a supplement, that is, they are in excess of what can be explained by the situation and the usual way of behaving in and accounting for it (Badiou 2001, 41). This excess, or supplement, constitutes the event or that "which compels us to decide a new way of being" thereby producing the process of a truth (truth-process). That is, by thinking the situation according to the event or to be faithful to the way of being constituted by the event produces a truth-process. In the case of the Zapatistas, one could view several events capable of producing fidelities. For instance, the 1994 NAFTA event that evoked the rebellion, the 1996 Encounter that catapulted the Zapatistas into the international anti-globalization spotlight, or the more humble event convoked by the encounters between indigenous communities and non-indigenous community organizers during the pre-history of the Zapatistas. More important than focusing on the particular eventual moment that convokes the Zapatista truth process is understanding how this process is sustained by the rhetorical strategies deployed in the Zapatistas discourse.

[33] As Feltham and Clemens note, Badiou's subject of truth and the political ethics this subject founds "has a dangerous ring" of positing "a new elite of faithful subjects" that "one could be forgiven for comparing at first glance to Mormon doctrine" (2003, 7).

CHAPTER SIX

BECOMING ANTI-NEOLIBERAL: LINKING STRUGGLES,

BUILDING WAR-MACHINES

> The paradox…is that most of the important problems…
> tend to arise on a global scale *and* on a socially microscopic scale.
> -Felix Guattari (2009, 95)

Pierre Bourdieu observed that, under neoliberalism "a Darwinian world emerges –

it is the struggle of all against all at all levels of hierarchy" that is sustained through

"precarious arrangements," arrangements that create a "reserve army of employees [the

unemployed, the homeless, the indigenous, and others that are], rendered docile

by…social processes that make their situations precarious" (1998, para. 9). This study

has attempted to link the "levels of hierarchy" and the simultaneously global and

microscopic, universal and singular, dimensions of neoliberalism to pose critical

questions about how its conditions might be resisted.

By focusing on two communities participating in the struggle against 'the great

neoliberal utopia,' my aim has been to identify how these local communities participate

in identifying the linkages between the scales of neoliberalism, and how those

communities build oppositional war-machines that challenge neoliberalism and its

attempts to restructure the social, economic, and political realities on which they operate.

Additionally, my analysis of these communities aimed at mapping how these local

communities work to build articulations with other struggles against neoliberalism's universally-singular, precarious arrangements. Informed by critical rhetoric, critical discourse analysis, and cultural studies, my effort to contribute to untangling the paradox identified by Guattari has considered a wide range of rhetorical and performative interventions deployed by anti-neoliberal collectivities. Consistent with my commitment to productive criticism, my examination has not been geared toward identifying "the" program of collective resistance to neoliberalism. Instead, my intention has been to identify some of the evocative practices and provocative efforts engaged in by local communities of struggle. From these analyses, my intention has been to point toward new ways of engaging in politics critical of neoliberalism and globalization. In this chapter, I want to consider some of the contributions this study makes to critical communication scholarship broadly. Following this, I want to identify, more specifically, some (provisional) conclusions about the "minor politics" practiced in the communities I examine and what they contribute to a becoming- anti-neoliberal collective politics.

<div align="center">Contributions to Critical Communication Scholarship</div>

If Bourdieu is right that neoliberalism "call[s] into question any and all collective structures that could serve as an obstacle" to neoliberal logics, then the crisis of neoliberalism necessitates inventing new forms of struggles that "elude the dominant means of identification, that produce their own referential axis, and that are interlinked by their own underground and transversal connections" (Bourdieu 1998, para. 5; Guattari 2009, 240). In other words, I am interested in forms of struggle that "undermine traditional production relations, traditional social…systems, [and] traditional attitudes

[about] …the universe" (Guattari 2009, 240). The experiences with neoliberalism and globalization on which I focus (i.e., indigenous populations in the Chiapas and homeless communities in Sacramento) provide two exemplars of such struggles that reveal their broad differences (i.e., their singularity) at the same time that they help uncover the universal assumptions that animate neoliberal realities.

Neoliberalism and globalization reshape the planes of social struggle, the political relationships, and the possibilities for political intervention that form the background for contemporary oppositional practice. First, neoliberalism necessitates that political struggles against it pursue dense and deepening interrogations of the planes on which resistance can be waged. War-machinic struggle cannot be "centered solely upon quantitative aims" of wealth distribution and relations of capital; it must "reconsider the environment, daily life, family life, relations between men and women, adults and children, the perception of time, [and] the meaning of life" Guattari 2009, 241). In Sacramento and in the Chiapas, this study has examined efforts by local dissidents to reclaim ways of daily life (i.e., *comida* and *ejido* farming, respectively) and to remap the meanings of space (e.g., Sacramento's polarized urban topography) as a minor political strategy for eluding dominant identifications that shape local struggles.

Second, neoliberalism's universally-singular conditions suggest good reasons to reject "a vanguard party…from which all 'mass movements'" are defined, to abandon solely national struggles, and to discard methods of struggle that are "centered on a single body of theory." Anti-neoliberal war-machines, like "SafeGround" and the EZLN, avoid strategic centers of resistance, or universal loci of power. They assemble themselves by recognizing that "contradiction…merely indicates that a unique situation, a specific

desire, is at issue." They reject the aim of 'the takeover of the political power of the State" (Guattari 2009, 241-242). They acknowledge that any struggle oriented "in terms of a national framework [or any fixed framework] is foredoomed to failure" and they "develop their own modes of semiotization in order to define themselves and direct their action." Singular constituents of an anti-neoliberal war-machine reject "organized" social movements in the traditional sense and pursue oppositional lines of flight whereby local communities "each at its own level, and following its own pace" participate in anti-neoliberal struggle (Guattari 2009, 241-242). The Zapatistas decentralize their struggle through community dialogues and self-determining municipalities, honor the contradictory desires that emerge within their own struggle and between interlocutors struggling against neoliberalism's disparate manifestations, and enact new ways of defining themselves and their actions by appropriating national, indigenous, and folk narratives and symbols to communicate and implement their oppositional struggle. "SafeGround" activists pursue radically democratic forums whereby homeless individuals reclaim their political voice. "SafeGround" Sacramento activists mobilize alongside students, laborers, veterans and religious leaders broadening the "theories" that animate their struggle and creating new narratives about homelessness. Narratives that challenge dominant modes of homeless misrecognition, and that reframe their "*criminal*" strategies of survival as *political* acts of struggle.

In each chapter, I have theorized the contours of struggle against neoliberalism, developed critical perspectives appropriate to the planes of social experience on which anti-neoliberal struggles unfold, and identified how the oppositional practices of local communities I examine invent practices that resonate with the exigencies described by

Bourdieu, Guattari, and others. In Chapter One, I examined neoliberalism and globalization broadly, identifying how they shape the terrain of struggle traversed by local communities, how they penetrate all levels of social experience (i.e., both overtly political and mundane), and how they challenge efforts to invent alternatives to its hegemonic influence in subnational, national, and supranational communities. Specifically, I focused on how material poverty, differential inclusion, and lack of rhetorical agency are enforced in local communities by neoliberal regimes of power, and specifically how these conditions of neoliberalism impacted collective struggles by indigenous and homeless activists. Critically, Chapter One focused on developing singularity as the concept for thinking through these two experiences with neoliberalism and efforts to resist it. And, it situated this conceptualization of local communities of struggle as a means to challenge extant efforts to theorize anti-neoliberal struggles by scholars in communication and other disciplines.

In Chapter Two, I further theorized neoliberalism and globalization through the lens of Deleuze and Guattari's war-machine and State-form. By shifting focus from the consequences of neoliberalism that I described in Chapter One to the processes (i.e., the three syntheses) through which neoliberalism operates, Chapter Two provides a theoretization of neoliberalism that both links together and helps to map critical distinctions between its macro-, or universal, assumptions and the manifestations of those assumptions in micro-, or singular, experiences. Additionally, interpreting neoliberalism through the critical concepts of "State-form" and "war-machine" helps to focus critical analysis of political struggles against neoliberalism on common topoi in critical communication scholarship. By focusing on how neoliberalism creates strict mechanisms

of oversight, policing identities and constraining what is visible and sayable, Chapter Two focuses on the consequences of neoliberalism for what identities can appear, how those identities can forge collective identifications, and, once composed, how those collectivities may, or may not, exert political influence.

Chapter Two also develops a critical perspective that combines critical rhetoric, critical discourse analysis, and cultural studies as a means to access and interpret the acts of struggle developed in and by local communities ensnared in the flows of neoliberalism and globalization. Drawing together these critical approaches helps support my interest in "productive criticism" by constructing a critical apparatus that accounts for, and shuttles between, the dominant codes that record and enforce neoliberalism in local communities and the minor politics invented in local struggles.

Chapters Three and Four make use of this framing of neoliberalism to analyze the oppositional struggle of a community of homeless activists in Sacramento, California. Chapter Three introduces "SafeGround" Sacramento, maps the dominant codes that shape how homeless communities are apprehended and the boundaries that police their identity and political power, and identifies the 'minor' political strategies invented by this community of activists. In particular, I focus on mapping the 'conjuncture' of institutions, discourses, and ideologies that shape the political context occupied by the homeless activists I study, the range of rhetorical and performative interventions they deploy, and how those strategies contribute to building community by contesting marginalization and subordination.

Chapter Four extends my analysis of "SafeGround" by engaging in critical rhetorical analysis of the rhetorical interventions I introduce in Chapter Three.

Specifically, I focus on acts of witnessing, practices of everyday life, and strategies of challenging dominant codes that shape homeless identity and that limit the political power of homeless communities. Specifically, I focus on how homeless communities traverse the terrains that frame their (mis)recognition and limit their participation in local communities, how they build collective identifications inside and outside homeless encampments, and how they exert political influence through 'conflict networks' constructed by their oppositional interventions. As a consequence, these struggles demonstrate how "SafeGround" addresses the immediate (material) needs of homeless communities, critiques the causes of homelessness, and contributes to efforts to re-member homeless persons as participants in broader political communities. In doing so, "SafeGround" helps contribute to theorizing the conditions of a broad-based anti-neoliberal war-machine described in Chapter Two.

Chapter Five traverses neoliberalism's flows to ask questions about the oppositional struggles of the EZLN. Like Chapters Three and Four, Chapter Five examines the conditions of marginalization constructed through the singular articulation of neoliberalism's State-form to the Chiapas. Following this, I introduce the EZLN in more detail, identifying the range of rhetorical interventions adopted by their collective struggle and considering how their experiences and methods of opposition intersect with the tensions between neoliberal State-forms and anti-neoliberal war-machines. To demonstrate how their oppositional practice contributes to constructing an anti-neoliberal war-machine, I examine, as with "SafeGround," how the EZLN negotiates the symbolic impediments to their recognition as legitimate political subjects. I investigate the means through which the EZLN constructs new collective identifications inclusive of indigenous

and non-indigenous workers, students, queers, teachers, activists, unionists, the unemployed and others, and I focus on how the EZLN develops political 'truth processes' as a means of pursuing an oppositional agenda and exerting political power while honoring the differences between their singular opposition and the struggles of other communities with whom they ally.

By examining nonconventional approaches to political struggle, my dissertation expands what counts as critical communication scholarship, and how that scholarship might be practiced. Specifically, it contributes to thinking about oppositional discourse, social movements, and critical politics by forging a critical perspective drawn from critical rhetoric, critical discourse analysis, and cultural studies. Critical rhetoric challenges scholars to engage criticism as a "thoroughly political activity…linked to…'emancipatory cultural politics'" (Gaonkar 1993, 149). Doing so privileges rhetorical criticism that is "object centered" (i.e., concerned with interrogating and building knowledge through creative explorations of discourse) instead of criticism that is "method centered" (i.e., preoccupied with the 'proper' execution of a particular approach, or perspective, on a rhetorical practice) (150). Motivated by this critical sensibility, my study has mobilized a broad range of critical practices and research methods. To access local communities and ask how they invent collective struggle, I have relied on research practices utilized by communication scholars that identify with ethnographic methods. My intention has not been to produce an "ethnography" of neoliberalism; instead, my aim has been to acknowledge some of the ways political struggle increasingly penetrates all planes of social reality and raises "numerous questions about oppositional lifestyle[s] [and] behavior[s]" often marginalized by traditional rhetorical approaches (Guattari 2009,

95). Borrowing from ethnographic approaches provides a means for my inquiry into local communities to account for these questions and to expand the "ensemble of critical rhetorics" examining oppositional struggle generally and critiquing neoliberalism and globalization specifically (Gaonkar 1993, 154).

Similarly, critical discourse analysis, by emphasizing how rhetorical and performative interventions are embedded in a broader configuration of social practices (i.e., a conjuncture) sharpens claims developed about singular, oppositional struggles. On the one hand, critical discourse analysis identifies the foundations of marginalizing politics (e.g., the fixed, striated, highly regulated political relations described by the State-form machine). On the other hand, it identifies the potential for rhetorical interventions to disrupt, to destabilize, and to intervene in those political conditions; it maps the points of weakness in a regime of political power/control. In other words, CDA embeds the "discursive fragments" privileged by critical rhetoric within a set of macro- and micro- contexts that help refine the efforts of critical rhetoricians to "identify possibilities for future action" (McKerrow 1989, 92).

Finally, cultural studies scholarship helps to focus my analysis on the immanent realities of oppositional struggle by embedding criticism in the processes and places where local communities interpret, rework, produce rhetorical interventions. It situates critical insights in the context of the understandings that local communities make of dominant forms of political power and political representation. In short, cultural studies helps reinforce that oppositional struggle intertwines with and is connected to a "whole way of life" embodied in and by resistant communities (Williams 1958/1983, 237). Beyond recognizing how acts of political struggle (e.g., street protests) reframe the

identities of marginalized communities, invent new metaphors for describing

neoliberalism, or redistribute populations on a field of power, cultural studies emphasizes

the lived dimensions of political struggle and their consequences for building affective

bonds and expressions of solidarity. For instance, cultural studies helps critical research

to include a consideration of how the communal practices of local struggles (e.g.,

SafeGround's *comida*) not only contribute to the basic needs of survival, but also become

sites where new identities are embodied and new meanings are invented.

Linking these three perspectives makes three important contributions to critical

research in the field of rhetorical studies, and communication studies more broadly. First,

this study supplements efforts by critical rhetoricians to engage in participatory modes of

research. Blair (1999), Pezzullo (2003, 2007), and others make compelling arguments for

rhetorical scholars to supplement their textual analyses with the insights yielded by

"being there," participating in "counterpublic performances," and experiencing rhetorical

sites (e.g., museums) whose material dimensions influence their interpretive possibilities.

These contributions are important because they shift attention to the material dimensions

of rhetorical practice. Blair (1999) identifies how the ways that audiences participate *with*

physical environments, as well as the materiality of those rhetorical environments, shape

the meanings of symbolic interactions. Pezzullo (2003) rightly identifies the scope of

rhetorical practice that is absent in purely textual analyses and the critical importance of

cataloging these "texts." Likewise, Hasian (2004) explores, through a "rhetorical

pilgrimage," how a rhetorical site, and the means by which it is structured, shape its

rhetorical influence. This study builds on this previous participatory rhetorical research

by focusing on how oppositional rhetorics are constituted through a "whole way of life"

that underpins (oppositional) culture (Williams 1958/1983, 237). Beyond capturing

fleeting texts, exploring material dimensions of rhetorical sites, or examining

participation in particular rhetorical spaces, this study suggests that the embodied,

everyday, live, minor, vernacular—in a word, mundane-- cultural practices of

oppositional collectivities are crucially important for building affective bonds and shared

cultural imaginations. Assembling these collective bonds sustains oppositional identities,

builds collective identifications, and constructs novel forms of political power.

Second, linking these three perspectives highlights the potential for

transdisciplinary critical research to contribute to theorizing oppositional political

struggle. Fairclough (2001) explains that "transdisciplinary" research means that "the

particular co-engagements" between critical perspectives "may give rise to

developments…which shift the boundaries between different theories and methods," and

it requires perspectives remain "open to 'internalizing'" other approaches as a means to

"transform" what critical insights are available (121-122). For Fairclough (2001),

transdisciplinarity is not simply the cobbling together of multiple methods (an additive

process); it is a synthetic process by which each contributing critical perspective is able to

access new insights into a social problem. In the present study, coupling CDA's interests

in the 'conjunctural' analysis of discursive practice with critical rhetoric's commitment to

the 'critique of freedom' helps point to ways in which CDA can address oppositional

discourses sometimes ignored in favor of CDA's concern with how domination is

sustained (Wodak 2001, see also Meyer 2001). By bringing to bear CDA's concern with

discourse as an element, or moment, embedded within a more complex relationship of

social practices alongside critical rhetoric's concern with how power is challenged and/or

reinforced, the critical perspective that I make use of helps to point toward ways that CDA can contribute to evaluating minor, oppositional discourses in addition to discourses that sustain the domination of homeless, indigenous, and other communities. CDA also configures critical rhetoric in ways that more productively 'identify possibilities for future action.' As I suggest above, by situating the discursive fragments privileged by critical rhetoric within a set of macro- and micro- features of a social practice, CDA helps refine efforts to ask how particular problems with social life (i.e., homelessness and/or indigenous marginalization) can be contested through effectively crafted rhetorical interventions.

Third, this study is not about traditional oppositional politics. It focuses neither on social movements that aim to influence social institutions through large, unorganized collectivities, nor on *new social movements* that seek to participate in constitutive politics that unfold in individual often unrelated actions working in arenas parallel to dominant social institutions. The first of these approaches commits itself to what Grossberg (2010, 257) describes as "oppositional politics," or politics that "depend upon the presence of the other as enemy and presents itself as a direct challenge or threat to the dominant politics confronting it with its own power and its promise of a better configuration of power." In this paradigm, political struggle is evaluated in terms of success replacing or reforming state institutions (i.e., governments) The second approach (i.e., new social movements) commits to what Grossber describes as "alternative politics," or politics whose "very existence…offers itself as an implicit challenge to the hegemonic organization of politics." This register of oppositional politics concerns itself with acting out resistant "consumer lifestyles," engaging in private acts of "resistance," and other

political strategies that critique dominant institutions, but map no means by which dominant relations of power might be overcome.

"Independent politics," on the other hand, describe a politics that are "defined by escaping from the control of dominant politics." Consistent with Deleuze and Guattari's minor politics, "independent politics" measure success by planting seeds of becoming that travel lines of flight that depart from the majority politics enforced by dominant institutions. Both of the collectivities I examine pursue this third mode of politics in their struggles against neoliberalism. Neither the EZLN nor "SafeGround" strives to overtake State power through their oppositional struggles against neoliberalism. Both singularities of struggle recognize the need to critique the relationships of power sustained by dominant politics, to intervene in the mechanisms of oversight that limit what is visible and sayable, and to construct collectivities that evade the efforts by neoliberalism to reduce politics to a practice of mediating the interests of autonomous individuals. As such, these interventions highlight the importance of the critical concepts central to my analysis of both communities: identity, collectivity, and power. In the next section, I conclude by identifying how the EZLN and SafeGround war-machines contribute to theorizing each of these concepts in the context of oppositional struggle, and how both communities contribute to mapping potential lines of flight that can contribute to building a rhetorical war-machine.

Building Rhetorical War-machines, Contesting Neoliberalism

The generative orientation of productive criticism that guides this study is well suited to efforts to identify constituents of a rhetorical war-machine aimed at antagonizing neoliberalism's ordering of social, political, and economic space. Rather

than offering a model, in the form of a set or practices, functions, requirements, or strategies with which to guide resistance to neoliberalism, the war-machine produces paradigmatic guides for struggle that are characterized by being "perpetually in construction or collapsing, and of a process that is perpetually prolonging itself, breaking off and starting up again" (Deleuze and Guattari aqi. Goh 2006, 225). In this section, I am interested in identifying some rhetorical concepts problematized by this perpetual experimentation, and how these challenges contribute to efforts to think about the rhetorical dimensions of oppositional collectivities. Greene (1998) contends that rhetoric is interpreted as the study of governing apparatuses where rhetorical practices contribute to "distributing discourses, institutions and populations onto a field of action," and to facilitating how governing apparatuses make "judgments about what it should govern, how it should govern, as well as offering mechanisms for evaluating the success or failure of governing" (22). My concern is with considering how rhetorical war-machines disrupt, challenge, prevent, or interfere with these governing apparatuses in ways that challenge neoliberalism's State-form.

In the analyses of indigenous and homeless war-machines that comprise this study, I address this concern by asking how the two war-machines I examine contribute productive theoretical insights about questions of identity, agency, and power that animate critical discussions of oppositional discourse and politics.

First, rethinking neoliberal politics specifically and collective struggle generally through the lens of the (rhetorical) war-machine offers an opportunity to contribute to theorizing the nature of those collectivities, as well as how identity operates within them. For instance, in both critical rhetorical studies of counterpublics (e.g., Hauser 1999; Ono

and Sloop 1997) and in efforts to rethink collective struggle utilizing traditional Marxist perspectives (e.g., Cloud 2006), theoretical efforts have difficulty with identity as an element of those collective struggles. On the part of the former, collective struggle (read as: counterpublics) admittedly risks reifying strategic essentialisms that undermine the efforts of emancipatory politics by reinscribing new, but not necessarily progressive, forms of hierarchy. On the part of the latter, collective politics (read as: class solidarity) risk effacing relationally meaningful and strategically valuable identity differences in an effort to effectuate political change.

As an alternative to either of these orientations, Deleuze and Guattari's (1989) war-machine posits a rethinking of identity through the prism of mutations, metamorphoses, and reconfigurations. Their alternative accounts for differences among the constituents composing a subject group by highlighting potential or articulations that traverse these differences, and that deploy supple group identifications to make tactical gains in struggles against dominant hegemonies.[1] This focus on an identity-in-progress, or becoming-identity, reveals "a rhetorical strategy of linkage or identification that recognizes [collective] subjectivity as structured upon a fundamental alterity" (Attias 1998, 105). Eschewing a "stable self-identity" forged either from "strategic essentialisms" or from "*real* class interests," the war-machine posits identity as a constant variation, a haecceity marked by a certain (temporary, momentary, contingent) "configuration of qualities that serves to make distinctions and oppositions, only to disperse into new oppositions based on the local specificities of a particular struggle" (Patton 2001, 1293). Both "SafeGround" and the EZLN build these linkages, these haecceities of struggle by creating identifications with laborers, students, the elderly, the

poor, the unemployed, veterans, queers, immigrants, and other groups immobilized by neoliberalism's State-form. They construct means of "cooperation, communication, and collaboration" that configure singularities, or collectivities that act "in common with deference to their differences and without reduction to a 'unity'" (Ivie 2007, 207). Collectivities that draw their oppositional power from "intersec[ting] with one another in multiple ways to create matrices of cooperation and communication" (Ibid.). In other words, whereas contemporary critical rhetorical scholarship privileges either counterpublics that aim to construct and reinforce *an* oppositional identity, or other means of social change that privilege *an* element of a subjected-group identity (e.g., class) rhetorical war-machines forge oppositional identities from constant variations, experimentations, and mutations that are refigured as a resource in collective struggle. In my analyses of "SafeGround" and the EZLN, I specify how these identities are constructed. I demonstrate to what ends and with what degrees of effectiveness these mobilizations are developed, and I highlight how their efforts at rethinking collective, oppositional identity along these lines avoids both the essentialisms of counterpublics and the effacing of identity required by extant critical perspectives.

Second, the war-machine asks rhetorical theorists to rethink political power as it relates to the rhetorical efforts of oppositional collectivities. Traditionally, social movement scholars have theorized political power in terms of the ability for collectivities to effectuate change at the level of political institutions (Griffin 2001; see also Simons 2001). In recent years, scholars have become concerned with constitutive dimensions of oppositional discourse reflected in a focus on how collective struggles open space for marginalized identities to participate in the public sphere (Charland 1987, see also

McGee 2001). In this sense, power is equated with political voice; the opinions, commitments, values, concerns, and arguments of marginalized communities are injected into discursive spheres from which they were previously excluded. Both perspectives offer an approach to political power that tethers it to the accomplishment of some limited and identifiable goal. As an alternative, the war-machine reconfigures power as access to tactical maneuverability (Deleuze and Guattari 1987). In other words, whereas traditional and more contemporary perspectives conceptualize power in oppositional struggle in terms of the ability to accumulate increases in political influence or representational equity, rhetorical war-machines concern themselves with expanding the ability to continuously evade forms of marginalization prosecuted by neoliberalism and other hegemonies. As Deleuze and Guattari explain, the war-machine's power is a derivative of the timely deployment of tactics: reflected in the ways that nomadology "insinuates itself into the other's place" and "constantly manipulate[s] events to turn them into 'opportunities'" (de Certeau 1984, xix). In other words, if traditional social movements measure power through winning access to political institutions or modes of representation, then war-machines measure power through kairotic interventions that destabilize dominant institutions long enough to create another opportunity-- "another justice, another movement," as Deleuze and Guattari (1987, 353) explain.

My interest is in how theorizing struggles with neoliberalism as a war-machine helps configure these timely interventions, or tactics, within an on-going experimentation with collective resistance. In other words, in place of limiting a consideration of tactics' role in collective struggle to limited, momentary victories, I am interested in asking how examining instances of political efforts oriented against neoliberalism might map a

tactical trajectory where tactics' limited victories can be read as relays between successive lines of flight aimed at redistributing, instead of accumulating, political and rhetorical power. Both the EZLN and "SafeGround" enact a politics built around this concept of power. By constructing an oppositional identity that reappropriates neoliberalism's anonymity, the EZLN creates space to map new collective identifications. Invisibility becomes a means by which a range of marginalized communities (e.g., the homeless, immigrants, and others) can participate in collective struggle. Similarly, "SafeGround," by linking their marginalization to broader failures of neoliberal economic policies, creates the ability to build identifications, and collective struggles with other communities marginalized by neoliberalism in dramatically different ways (e.g., unionists, veterans, and others).

Third, the war-machine rethinks the ways that symbolic action, or rhetorical practice, interacts with social change more generally. Traditional perspectives on social movements view rhetorical criticism as a tool of influence. Rhetorical interventions operate as strategies for influencing institutions and for organizing a collectivity (Griffin 2001; Simons 2001). Contemporary perspectives on social movements interrogate rhetoric's constitutive role in shaping political struggle (Charland 1987; McGee 2001). Rhetorical interventions function as symbolic action that names a particular political reality, constitutes a political identity, or draws boundaries of struggle in ways that change how collectivities may or may not maneuver in relation to these exigencies. The war-machine contributes to this latter aim of rethinking the constitutive dimensions of symbolic action by introducing "militant semiotics" as a tool for conceptualizing interventions into rhetorical situations.[2]

"Militant semiotics" are symbolic interventions that "compose an imaginary and affective field of resistance" potentially "constitutive of progressive political effects beyond those determined by… [a] particular practice" or situation. Thoburn cites the "image function" of the Black Panther Party as an instructive example: "[T]he style and comportment of the Panthers [in word and deed] performed as part of a rich enunciative texture and a complex psychic formation…had special generative power for black communities in politicizing cultural and phenotypical traits, and in developing experimental images and practices of black resistance and cultural expression" (Thoburn 2008, 106). Symbolic interventions by "SafeGround" and the EZLN perform similar functions through the articulation of becoming-identities, the identification of problems with neoliberalism, and the development of alternatives to those problematic practices. Both communities construct an experimental image and practice of anti-neoliberal politics that resonate across a broad range of marginalized communities represented by their allies.

This focus on resonance between these two communities "should not be seen as a way of bypassing or replacing social movement theory so much as a metaphor through which to explore different dynamics and consequences of contemporary social movement activity" (Khasnabish 2008, 20). Resonance, as a critical lens for thinking about the possibility of articulations between oppositional collectivities, aims to highlight how the responses of local communities find ways of identifying the constraints on identity, collectivity, and power that neoliberalism sustains. It ask how "socio-political struggle and its often unanticipated outcomes" can be analyzed in ways that help explain how they "'fit together'" (Ibid.). What assumptions do they share, how do they combat

misrecognition, how do they contest political exclusion, and, most importantly, how

might they provide pragmatic guides for other struggles without sedimenting into

universal theories of how to address the conditions of neoliberalism?

Reflecting on the power that a shift to identifying resonance can offer to

oppositional struggle, Guattari (2009, 100-101) summarizes that

> it is only with respect to their own rhythms, their own levels of conscience, [and] their own languages that a network of exchanges can develop that can release new perspectives on common struggle. It's simply about putting into gear, about making effective what is possible today in this domain, and nothing more than that.

By identifying how "SafeGround" and the EZLN participate in this experimentation, my

goal in this study has been to identify ways that an anti-neoliberal war-machine might be

'put into gear.'

Notes

[1] Guattari succinctly explains when he notes that "The difference between these kinds of molecular revolutions and earlier forms of revolution is that before everything was centered on ideology or The Program, whereas today the mutational models…are immediately transmitted. It is the machinic integration of processes of production, circulation, and information that catalyzes this new 'deal of the cards.' A mutation…that…changes the actual substratum of human existence and, in reality, opens up fabulous possibilities for liberation" (Guattari 1996, 30).

[2] "Militant semiotics," are "not confined to words, but subtends gesture, phoneme, tone, and image;" semiotic tactics whose "seductive aspect…is manifest in wider environments" (Thoburn 2008, 106).

REFERENCES

Agamben, Giorgio. 1993. *The Coming Community*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Allatson, Paul. 2007. *Key Terms in Latino/a Cultural Studies and Literary Studies*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Amster, Randall. 2008. *Lost in Space: The Criminalization, Globalization, and Urban Ecology of Homelessness.* New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Arnold, Kathleen R. 2004. *Homelessness, Citizenship and Identity: The Uncanniness of Late Modernity.* New York: SUNY Press.

Asen, Robert. 2002. Imagining the Public Sphere. *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 35: 345-367.

Attias, Bernardo A. 1998. To Each its Own Sexes? Toward a Rhetorical Understanding of *Molecular Revolution*. In *Deleuze and Guattari: New Mappings in Politics, Philosophy, and Culture,* eds. Eleanor Kaufman and Kevin Jon Heller, 96-111. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ayers, Steven. 2009. Business Owner's View: River District Bears Too Much of Problem. *Sacramento Bee*. October 4.

Badiou, Alain. 2001. *Ethics: An Essay on the Understanding of Evil*. London: Verso.

---. 2003. *Infinite Thought: Truth and the Return of Philosophy*. London: Continuum.

---. 2005. *Metapolitics*. London: Verso.

Barton, Ellen. 2002. Inductive Discourse Analysis: Discovering Rich Features. In *Discourse Studies in Composition,* eds. Ellen Barton and Gail Stygall, 1-18. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Berger, John. 2003. *The Shape of a Pocket*. New York: Vintage.

Billingslea-Brown, Alma Jean. 1999. *Crossing Borders through Folklore: African American Women's Fiction and Art.* Columbia: University of Missouri Press.

Blair, Carole. 1999. Contemporary U.S. Memorial Sites as Exemplars of Rhetoric's Materiality. In *Rhetorical Bodies,* eds. Jack Selzer and Sharon Crowley, 16-57. Madison, WI: Univ. of Wisconsin Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1972/2008. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1998. The Essence of Neoliberalism. *Le Monde Diplomatique*, December 1998. http://mondediplo.com/1998/12/08bourdieu [Last accessed on Nov. 1, 2010].

Brandes, Stanley. 2007. *Skulls to the Living, Bread to the Dead: The Day of the Dead in Mexico and Beyond.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Breton, Marcos. 2009. In Homeless Debate, Reason is Drowned Out. *Sacramento Bee*. October 18.

Buchanan, Ian. 2006. Treatise on Militarism. In *Deleuze and the Contemporary World*, eds. Ian Buchanan and Adrian Parr, 21-41. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP.

Buechler, Steven M. 2000. *Social Movements in Advanced Capitalism: The Political Economy and Cultural Construction of Social Activism.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Butko, Thomas J. 2006. Gramsci and the 'Anti-Globalization' Movement: Think Before You Act. *Socialism and Democracy 20*: 79-102.

Cathcart, Robert S. 2001. *Movements: Confrontation as Rhetorical Form.* In Morris and Browne 2001, 102-112.

Charland, Maurice. 1987. Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the Peuple Quebecois. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73: 133-150.

Chomsky, Noam. Chiapas: Symbol of Resistance. In *Ya Basta!: Ten Years of the Zapatista Uprising,* ed. Ziga Vodovnik, 13-14. Oakland: AK Press.

Chouliaraki, Lilie, and Norman Fairclough. 1999. *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Cloud, Dana L. 2006. The Matrix and Critical Theory's Desertion of the Real. *Communication & Critical/Cultural Studies* 3: 329-354.

Cloud, Dana. 1996. Hegemony or Concordance?: The Rhetoric of Tokenism in 'Oprah' Winfrey's Rags-to-Riches Biography. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication 13*: 115-137.

Cohen-Cruz, Jan. 1998. *Radical Street Performance: An International Anthology*. London: Routledge.

Collier, George A. 2005. *Basta!: Land and the Zapatista Rebellion in Chiapas*. Oakland: Food First.

Conant, Jeff. 2010. *A Poetics of Resistance: The Revolutionary Public Relations of the Zapatista Insurgency.* Oakland: AK Press.

Congdon, Kristin G. 1987. Toward a Theoretical Approach to Teaching Folk Art: A Definition. *Studies in Art Education 28*: 96-104.

Coote, Belinda. 1995. *NAFTA: Poverty and Free Trade in Mexico.* Oxford: Oxfam.

de Certeau, Michel. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: Univ. of CA Press.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix Guattari. 1972. *Anti-Oedipus*. London: Continuum.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix Guattari. 1980/1987. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

DeLuca, Kevin M. 1999a. *Image politics: The New Rhetoric of Environmental Activism*. New York: Guilford.

---. 1999b. Unruly Arguments: The Body Rhetoric of Earth First!, ACT-UP, and Queer Nation. *Argumentation & Advocacy* 36: 9-21.

Dickinson, Greg. 2002. Joe's Rhetoric: Finding Authenticity at Starbucks. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 32: 5-27.

El Kilombo Intergalactico. 2007. Zapatismo: A Brief Manual on How to Change the World Today. In *Beyond Resistance: Everything, An Interview with Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos*, 1-20. Durham, NC: Paper Boat Press.

Endres, Danielle, Leah Sprain, and Tarla Rai Peterson. 2008. The Imperative of Praxis-Based Environmental Communication Research: Suggestions from the Step It Up 2007 National Research Project. *Environmental Communication* 2: 237-245.

Endres, Danielle. 2009a. Science and Public Participation: An Analysis of Public Scientific Argument in the Yucca Mountain Controversy. *Environmental Communication* 3: 49-75.

-----. 2009b. The Rhetoric of Nuclear Colonialism: Rhetorical Exclusion of American Indian Arguments in the Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Siting Decision. *Communication & Critical/Cultural Studies* 6: 39-60.

Escobar, Arturo. 1995. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Esteva, Gustavo, and Madhu Suri Prakash. 1998. *Grassroots Post-modernism: Remaking the Soil of Cultures.* London: Zed.

Esteva, Gustavo. 2001. Basta!: Mexican Indians Say 'Enough!'. In *The Post-Development Reader,* ed. Majid Rahnema, 302-305. London: Zed.

EZLN. 1994. First Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle. In *Ya Basta!: Ten Years of the Zapatista Uprising,* ed. Ziga Vodovnik, 643-644. Oakland: AK Press.

EZLN. 1996a. Opening Remarks at the First Intercontinental *Ecuentro* for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism. In *Our Word is Our Weapon: Selected Writings*, ed. Juana Ponce de Leon, 101-106. New York: Seven Stories Press.

EZLN. 1996b. Tomorrow Begins Today: Closing Remarks at the First Intercontinental *Encuentro* for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism. In *Our Word is Our Weapon: Selected Writings*, ed. Juana Ponce de Leon, 101-106. New York: Seven Stories Press.

EZLN. 2003/2004. Third Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle. In *Ya Basta!: Ten Years of the Zapatista Uprising,* ed. Ziga Vodovnik, 653-659. Oakland: AK Press.

Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language.* London: Longman.

Fairclough, Norman. 2001. Critical Discourse Analysis as a Method in Social Scientific Research. In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, eds. Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 121-138. London: Sage.

Feldman, Leonard C. 2004. *Citizens Without Shelter: Homelessness, Democracy, and Political Exclusion.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Feltham, Oliver, and Justin Clemens. 2003. An Introduction to Alain Badiou's Philosophy. In *Infinite Thought,* 1-37. London: Continuum.

Fenske, Mindy. 2007. Movement and Resistance: (Tattooed) Bodies and Performance. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 4: 51-73.

Fiske, John. 1991. For Cultural Interpretation: A Study of the Culture of Homelessness. *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 8: 455-474.

Foss, Sonja K. 2004. Generative Criticism. *In Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice*, 411-430. Long Grove, Il: Waveland Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1991. Questions of Method. *In The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality,* eds. Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller, 73-86. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1998. *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1: The Will to Knowledge*. London: Penguin.

Fraser, Nancy. 1989. *Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse, and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota P.

Gaonkar, Dilip P. 1993. Performing with Fragments: Reflections on Critical Rhetoric. In *Argument and the Postmodern Challenge,* ed. Raymie McKerrow, 149-155. Washington, D.C.: NCA.

Gee, James Paul. 1996. *Social Linguistics and Literacy*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Gilbert, Jeremy. 2008. *Anti-capitalism and Culture: Radical Theory and Popular Politics*. Oxford: Berg.

Giroux, Henry A. 2006. Reading Hurricane Katrina: Race, Class, and the Biopolitics of Disposability. *College Literature* 33: 171-196.

Goh, Irving. 2006. The Question of Community in Deleuze and Guattari (I): Anti-Community. *Symploke* 14: 216-231.

Gramsci, Antonio. 1973/2007. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Greene, Ronald Walter. 1998. Another Materialist Rhetoric. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 15: 21-40.

Griffin, Leland M. 2001. *The Rhetoric of Historical Movements.* In Morris and Browne 2001, 5-9.

Grossberg, Lawrence. 2010. *Cultural Studies in the Future Tense*. Durham, NC: Duke UP.

Guattari, Felix, and Antonio Negri. 1985. *Communist Like Us*. New York: Semiotext(e).

Guattari, Felix. 2009. *Soft Subversions: Texts and Interviews, 1977-1985*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Gunn, Joshua, and Barry Brummett. 2004. Popular Communication after Globalization. *Journal of Communication* 54: 705-721.

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

---. 2004. *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin.

Harold, Christine. 2004. Pranking Rhetoric: "Culture Jamming" as Media Activism. *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 21: 189-211.

Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hasian, Jr., Marouf. 2001. Rhetorical Studies and the Future of Postocolonial Theories and Practices. *Rhetoric Review* 20: 22-28.

---. 2004. Remembering and Forgetting the 'Final Solution': A Rhetorical Pilgrimage Through the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 21: 64-92.

Hauser, Gerald A. 1999. *Vernacular Voices: The Rhetoric of Publics and Public Spheres.* Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Hayden, Tom. 2010. One Case Against BP, Wall Street, and War. *The Nation*, May 6. http://www.commondreams.org/view/2010/05/06-4

Henley, James E. 1993. Homeless in History: An Inside Look at Sacramento's Depression-era Transient Population. *Golden Notes* 39: 23-47.

Higgins, Nicholas. 2004. *Understanding the Chiapas Rebellion: Modernist Visions and the Invisible Indian.* Austin, University of Texas Press.

Holland, Eugene M. 1999. *Deleuze and Guattari's Anti-Oedipus: Introduction to Schizoanalysis.* London: Routledge.

Holloway, John, and Eloina Pelaez. 1998. *Zapatista!: Reinventing Revolution in Mexico*. London: Pluto Press.

Huckin, Thomas N. 1992. Context-Sensitive Text Analysis. In *Methods and Methodology in Composition Research,* eds. G. Kirsch and P. Sullivan. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP. 84-104.

Huckin, Thomas N. 2002. Textual Silences and the Discourse of Homelessness. *Discourse & Society* 13: 347-372.

Illich, Ivan. 1997. Development as Planned Poverty. In *The Post-development Reader*, eds. Majid Rahnema and Victoria Bawtree, 94-102. London: Zed.

Ivie, Robert L. 2001. Productive Criticism Then and Now. *American Communication Journal* 4: np. Accessed at: http://www.acjournal.org/holdings/vol4/iss3/special/ivie.htm.

-----. 1995. Productive Criticism (editor's note). *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 81: np.

-----. 2007. *Dissent from War*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian.

Johnston, Hank, Enrique Larana, and Jospeh R. Gusfield. 1994. Identities, Grievances, and New Social Movements. In *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*, eds. Enrique Larana, Hank Johnston, and Joseph R. Gusfield, 3-35. Philadelphia: Temple.

Jorgensen, Marianne and Louise Phillips. 2002. *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method.* London: Sage.

Kalb, Loretta. 2009. Freezing Weather Prompts Sacramento Homeless Advocates to Open Temporary Shelter Tonight. *Sacramento Bee*, 6 Dec.: np.

Khasnabish, Alex. 2008. *Zapatismo Beyond Borders: New Imaginations of Political Possibility*. Toronto: University of Toronto P.

Klein, Naomi. 2001/2004. The Unknown Icon. In *Ya Basta!: Ten Years of the Zapatista Uprising,* ed. Ziga Vodovnik, 15-24. Oakland: AK Press.

Kothari, Rajni. 1997. The Agony of the Modern State. In *The Post-Development Reader*, eds. Majid Rahnema and Victoria Bawtree, 143-149. London: Zed.

Lancaster, Roger N. 1992. *Life is Hard: Machismo, Danger, and the Intimacy of Power in Nicaragua*. Berkeley: Univ. of CA Press.

Levi, Heather. 2008. *The World of Lucha Libre: Secrets, Revelations, and Mexican National Identity.* Durham, NC: Duke UP.

Lewis, Robert. 2010. VOA Steps in to Help County Homeless. *Sacramento Bee*. March 23.

Loehwing, Melanie. 2010. Homelessness as the Unforgiving Minute of the Present: The Rhetorical Tenses of Democratic Citizenship. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 96: 380-403.

Marcos, Subcomandante Insurgente. 1995/2002. Come, Bothers and Sisters. In *Our Word is Our Weapon: Selected Writings*, ed. Juana Ponce de Leon, 72-74. New York: Seven Stories Press.

Marcos, Subcomandante Insurgente. 2002a. The Story of the Tiny Mouse and the Tiny Cat. In *Our Word is Our Weapon: Selected Writings*, ed. Juana Ponce de Leon, 308-309. New York: Seven Stories Press.

Marcos, Subcomandante Insurgente. 2002b. Another Cloud, Another Bottle, and Another Letter from Durito. In *Our Word is Our Weapon: Selected Writings*, ed. Juana Ponce de Leon, 318-319. New York: Seven Stories Press.

Marcos, Subcomandante Insurgente. 2002c. The Story of Colors. In *Our Word is Our Weapon: Selected Writings*, ed. Juana Ponce de Leon, 373-375. New York: Seven Stories Press.

Marcos, Subcomandante Insurgente. 2002d. The Story of the False Light, The Stone, and The Corn. In *Our Word is Our Weapon: Selected Writings*, ed. Juana Ponce de Leon, 405-406. New York: Seven Stories Press.

Marcos, Subcomandante Insurgente. 2003/2004a. Above and Below: Masks and Silences. In *Ya Basta!: Ten Years of the Zapatista Uprising,* ed. Ziga Vodovnik, 319-340. Oakland: AK Press.

Marcos, Subcomandante Insurgente. 2003/2004b. I Shit on All the Revolutionary Vanguards of this Planet. In *Ya Basta!: Ten Years of the Zapatista Uprising,* ed. Ziga Vodovnik, 583-587. Oakland: AK Press.

Marcos, Subcomandante Insurgente. 2003/2004c. The Seven Loose Pieces of the Global Jigsaw Puzzle (Neoliberalism as a Puzzle). In *Ya Basta!: Ten Years of the Zapatista Uprising,* ed. Ziga Vodovnik, 257-278. Oakland: AK Press.

Marcos, Subcomandante Insurgente. 2007. An Interview. In *Beyond Resistance Everything,* ed. El Kilombo Intergalactico, 21-60. Durham, NC: Paper Boat Press.

Massumi, Brian. 1992. *A User's Guide to Capitalism and Schizophrenia: Deviations from Deleuze & Guattari.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Massumi, Brian. 2001. Deleuze and Guattari's Theories of the Group Subject: Through a Reading of Corneille's Le Cid. *In Deleuze and Guattari: Critical Assessments of Leading Philosophers*, ed. Gary Genosko, 813-826. London: Routledge.

McGee, Michael Calvin. 1990. Text, Context, and the Fragmentation of Contemporary Culture. *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 54: 274-289.

McGee, Michael Calvin. 2001. Social Movement: Phenomena or Meaning? In Morris and Browne 2001, 125-136.

McKerrow, Raymie E. 1989. Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis. *Communication Monographs* 56: 91-111.

McKerrow, Raymie E. 1998. Corporeality and Cultural Rhetoric: A Site for Rhetoric's Future. *Southern Communication Journal* 63: 315-328.

McKinley, Jesse. 2009. Tent Cities Arise and Spread in Recession's Grip. *The New York Times.* March 26.

Meyer, Michael. 2001. Between Theory, Method, and Politics: Positioning of the Approaches to CDA. In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, eds. Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 14-32. London: Sage.

Mitchell, Don. 2003. *The Right to the City: Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space*. New York: Guilford.

Mitchell, W.J.T. 2005. *What Do Pictures Want?: The Lives and Loves of Images.* Chicago: U. of Chicago Press.

Morris, Charles E., and Stephen H. Browne, eds. 2001. *Readings on the Rhetoric of Social Protest.* State College, PA: Strata Publishing.

Mueller, Carol. 1994. Conflict Networks and the Origins of Women's Liberation. In *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*, eds. Enrique Larana, Hank Johnston, and Joseph R. Gusfield, 234-262. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Murphy, John M. 2007. Globalization and Empire: The U.S. Invasion of Iraq, Free Markets, and the Twilight of Democracy. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 10: 521-523.

Murphy, Patrick D., and Marwan M. Kraidy. 2003. International Communication, Ethnography, and the Challenge of Globalization. *Communication Theory* 13: 304-323.

Nasstrom, Sofia. 2003. What Globalization Overshadows. *Political Theory* 31: 808-834

National Coalition for the Homeless. 2003. *Illegal to be Homeless: The Criminalization of Homelessness in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: National Coalition for the Homeless.

National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty. 2009. *2009 Annual Report*. Washington, D.C.: National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty.

Negri, Antonio. 2008. *The Porcelain Workshop: For a New Grammar of Politics.* Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Ngugi, Thiongo. 1998. *Penpoints, Gunpoints, and Dreams: Toward a Critical Theory of the Arts and the State in Africa*. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Olesen, Thomas. 2005. *International Zapatismo: The Construction of Solidarity in the Age of Globalization.* London: Zed.

Ono, Kent A., and John M. Sloop. 1995. The Critique of Vernacular Discourse. *Communication Monographs* 62: 19-46.

-----. 2002. *Shifting Borders: Rhetoric , Immigration and California's Proposition 187.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Ortiz, Simon, and Elena Poniatowska. 2001. *Questions & Swords: Folktales of the Zapatista Revolution*. El Paso: Cinco Puntos.

Paczynska, Agnieszka. 2008. Turtles, Puppets and Pink Ladies: The Global Justice Movement in a Post-9/11 World. *Working Papers in Global Studies*. Virginia: George Mason UP.

Patton, Paul. 2001. Conceptual Politics and the War-machine in *Mille Plateaux*. In *Deleuze and Guattari: Critical Assessments of Leading Philosophers*, ed. Gary Genosko, 1277-1298. London: Routledge.

Pena, Guillermo Gomez. 1995. The Subcomandante of Performance. In *First World, Ha Ha Ha!: The Zapatista Challenge,* ed. Elaine Katzenberger, 89-99. San Francisco: City Lights.

Peters, John D. 2005. *Courting the Abyss: Free Speech and the Liberal Tradition.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pezzullo, Phaedra C. 2001. Performing Critical Interruptions: Rhetorical Invention and Narratives of the Environmental Justice Movement. *Western Journal of Communication* 64: 1-25.

Pezzullo, Phaedra C. 2003. Resisting "National Breast Cancer Awareness Month": The Rhetoric of Counterpublics and Their Cultural Performances. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 89: 345-365.

Pezzullo, Phaedra C. 2007. *Toxic Tourism: Rhetorics of Pollution, Travel, and Environmental Justice.* Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.

Pollock, Della. 2006. Memory, Remembering and Histories of Change. In *The Sage Handbook of Performance Studies*, eds. Soyini Madison and Judith Hamera, 87-105. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pollock, Donald. 1995. Masks and the Semiotics of Identity. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 1*: 581-597.

Ponce de Leon, Juana. 2002. *Our Word is Our Weapon: Selected Writings.* New York: Seven Stories Press.

Poulakos, John and Steve Whitson. 1995. Rhetoric Denuded and Redressed: Figs and Figures. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 81: 378.

Ranciere, Jacques. 2004. *The Politics of Aesthetics*. New York: Continuum.

Ranciere, Jacques. 2001. Ten Theses on Politics. *Theory & Event* 5: n.p.

Reis, Milton. 1993. Hoovervilles: Depression Settlements of Sacramento, 1931-1935. *Golden Notes* 39, 1-22.

Rockhill, Gabriel. 2004. Jacques Ranciere's Politics of Perception. In *The Politics of Aesthetics*, 1-6. London: Continuum.

Rodriguez, Jaime E. 1993/1997. *The Origins of Mexican National Politics: 1808-1847.* Wilmington, DE: SR Books.

Ronfeldt, David, John Arquilla, Graham Fuller, and Melissa Fuller. 1993/2003. *The Zapatistas "Social Netwar" in Mexico.* Santa Monica: Rand.

Ross, John. 2006. *Zapatistas!: Making Another World Possible, Chronicles of Resistance, 2000-2006*. New York: Nation.

SafeGround Sacramento Website. http://www.safegroundsac.org [accessed January 1, 2010].

Sassen, Saskia. 1998. *Globalization and its Discontents.* New York: New Press.

Scheide, R.V. 2008. Hell's Half-acre. *Sacramento News & Review*. November 6.

Schutten, Julie Kalil. 2006. Invoking Practical Magic: New Social Movements, Hidden Populations, and the Public Screen. *Western Journal of Communication* 70: 331-354.

Sen, Amartya. 1996. *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny.* New York: Norton.

Sherrard, Cherene M. 1999. Review: Conjuring the Folk Aesthetic. *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction 33*: 150-52.

Shome, Raka, and Radha S. Hegde. 2002. Culture, Communication, and the Challenge of Globalization. *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 19: 172-189.

Shome, Raka. 2001. White Femininity and the Discourse of the Nation: Re/membering Princess Diana. *Feminist Media Studies* 1: 323-342.

Sillars, Malcolm O. 2001. *Defining Social Movements Rhetorically: Casting the Widest Net*. In Morris and Browne 2001, 115-124.

Simmen, Edward. 1996. Before and After NAFTA: Changes in Mexican Culture and Customs. In *NAFTA, the First Year: A View from Mexico,* ed. David R. Villers, 129-152. Lanham: University Press of America.

Simons, Herbert W. 2001. Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements. In Morris and Browne 2001, 34-44.

Sloop, John M., and Kent A. Ono. 1997. Out-law Discourse: The Critical Politics of Material Judgment. *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 30: 50-69.

Smith, Daniel W. 1997. 'A Life of Pure Immanence': Deleuze's 'Critique et Clinique' Project. In *Essays Critical and Clinical*, xi-lv. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Stewart, Charles J., Craig A. Smith and Robert E. Denton, Jr. 2007. *Persuasion and Social Movements* (5ᵗʰ ed.). Long Grove, Il.: Waveland.

Strine, Mary. 1998. Articulating Performance/Performativity: Disciplining Tasks and the Contingencies of Practice. In *Communication: Views from the Helm for the 21st Century,* ed. J. S. Trent, 312–317. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Taylor, Diana. 2003/2007. *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*. Durham, NC: Duke UP.

Thoburn, Nicholas. 2008. What is a Militant? In *Deleuze and Politics*, eds. Ian Buchanan and Nicholas Thoburn, 98-120. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Thompson, Jack. 2009. Letter to the Editor. *Sacramento Bee*. October 27.

Tobin, Robert. 2010. Safeground Plan is Not the Answer. *Sacramento Bee*. April 23.

Tonkin, Elizabeth. 1992. Mask. In *Folklore, Cultural Performance, and Popular Entertainments: A Communication-Centered Handbook*, ed. Richard Bauman, 222-232. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Turner, Victor. 1979. Dramatic Ritual/Ritual Drama: Performative and Reflexive Anthropology. *The Kenyon Review1*: 80-93.

Turner, Victor. 1982. *From Ritual to Theatre: The Human Seriousness of Play.* New York: PAJ Publications.

van Dijk, Teun A. 2001. Multidisciplinary CDA: A Plea for Diversity. In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, eds. Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 95-120. London: Sage.

Villers, David R. D. (ed.). 1996. *NAFTA, The First Year: A View from Mexico.*Lanham: University Press of America.

Vodovnik, Ziga. 2004. The Struggle Continues…. In *Ya Basta!: Ten Years of the Zapatista Uprising*, ed. Ziga Vodovnik, 25-51. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Vogt, Evon Z. 1969. Zinacantan: A Maya Community in the Highlands of Chiapas. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.

Waldron, Jeremy. 1991. Homelessness and the Issue of Freedom. *UCLA Law Review* 39: 295-324.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2008. 2008: The Demise of Neoliberal Globalization. *YaleGlobal Online*, February 4. http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/article.print?id=10299 [accessed on June 14, 2008].

Whitson, Steve, and John Poulakos. 1993. Nietzsche and the Aesthetics of Rhetoric. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 79: 13-145.

Williams, Raymond. 1958/1983. *Culture and Society, 1780-1950*. New York: Columbia UP.

Wodak, Ruth. The Discourse-historical Approach. In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, eds. Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 63-94. London: Sage.

Wright, Talmadge. 1997. *Out of Place: Homeless Mobilizations, Subcities, and Contested Landscapes.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Zizek, Slavoj. 2009. *First as Tragedy, Then as Farce.* London: Verso.

Zoulas, Mark, and Mike Cooper. 2009. Officer's View: Proper Support Must be Focus. *Sacramento Bee.* October 4.