

**WHY NOT SHARE A DREAM? ZAPATISMO
AS POLITICAL AND CULTURAL
PRACTICE¹**
**SPECIAL ISSUE: *HUMBOLDT JOURNAL OF
SOCIAL RELATIONS***

Manuel Callahan
Guest Editor
Humboldt State University

Against this monster, people all over the world, and particularly ordinary working people in factories, mines, fields, and offices, are rebelling every day in ways of their own invention. Sometimes their struggles are on a small personal scale. More effectively, they are the actions of groups, formal or informal, but always unofficial, organized around their work and their place of work. Always the aim is to regain control over their own conditions of life and their relations with one another. Their strivings, their struggles, their methods have few chroniclers. They themselves are constantly attempting various forms of organization, uncertain of where the struggle is going to end. Nevertheless, they are imbued with one fundamental certainty, that they have to destroy the continuously mounting bureaucratic mass or be themselves destroyed by it.

C. L. R. James, *Facing Reality*, 1974.

What we have hoped for, and still hope for, is that civil society may achieve something somewhat more complicated and as indefinable as herself – a new world. The difference between now and then is that now we want to participate along with her in the dream that may deliver us from the nightmare. We do not seek to direct her, but neither to follow her. We want to go with her, march by her side. Are we hopelessly naïve? Maybe, but against ‘realist’ cynicism, naïvete may produce, for example, a January 1st, and just look at the heap of dreams brought about by on January 1st. So, we have nothing to lose: Madame civil society and the Zapatistas share the contempt the big politicians have for us, we share an indefinable face and diffuse name; why not share a dream?”

Subcomandante Marcos, 1996.

The 20 and 10 year anniversary of the Zapatista Rebellion has been an important opportunity to reflect on the significance and future struggle of the Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional (EZLN), the Zapatista base communities and the multifaceted “solidarity” network that walks with them. Over the past decade, the Zapatistas have been celebrated as armed communities able to open vital and vibrant political spaces for a collective interrogation of out-dated political practice and renewed efforts towards social justice. The political work of the EZLN is all the more profound given that it has been carried out in the face of daily repression in the form of the low intensity war conducted against the Zapatista communities in rebellion throughout Chiapas. As part of this recognition, many have insisted that the Zapatistas’ most profound success has been their ability to convene and host an increasingly diverse and organized civil society in a series of strategic *encuentros*, or “encounters,” confirming their commitment to “a revolution that makes revolution possible.”² While some agree the role of the EZLN as catalysts for convergence has been critical, Subcomandante Marcos confesses that, “the EZLN has reached a point where it has been overtaken by Zapatismo.”³

In this special issue we take up Zapatismo as a political and cultural practice. We are not so concerned with the emergence of the EZLN and their success as a guerrilla army. Nor does this volume present an analysis of the complex and often contradictory daily struggles of *campesinos* and the more localized indigenous struggle for autonomy, although we do at times allude to it. We accept as a fundamental premise that the Zapatistas are only one of a number of important struggles in Chiapas, southern Mexico more generally, and the nation as a whole. The Zapatistas were not the first to protest the negative impact of neoliberal structural adjustments nor are they unique in their claims or commitment to such political practices as consensus or radical democracy. Indeed, the Zapatistas have never claimed any special role for themselves in the “move-

ment.” Thus, our task in this special issue will be to further a dialogue about the possibilities of Zapatismo outside of Chiapas, especially in sites of privilege. Although Zapatismo may be an “intuition,” as Subcomandante Marcos insists, this volume explores the possibility that the Zapatistas have significantly contributed to theory regarding autonomous political practices and “revolutionary” struggle.⁴ Throughout the pages that follow, the authors grapple with a Zapatismo that is ethical, creative and disciplined, by examining key dimensions of Zapatismo as “an inspiration” that is relevant in both local and global contexts.

Despite the Zapatista’s profound successes they have not escaped the barbs of unsympathetic critics—confident that the EZLN no longer command sufficient moral and political authority or national and international attention to be considered an important political actor. Critics convinced the Zapatistas have overreached their political goals have been especially impatient with Zapatista strategic silences, dismissing their political vision as unrealistic and unobtainable. A recent example of the disenchantment with Subcomandante Marcos and the EZLN surfaced in the impatient and dismissive response to the heated exchange with Spanish Judge Baltasar Garzón and spokespersons for Euskadita Askatasuna (ETA).⁵ Marcos’ attempt to have the last word in the vitriolic exchange, reminding his readers that he “shits on all the vanguards of the world,” no doubt endeared him to some, but for many only confirmed the Zapatistas’ marginalization.

Unfortunately, these incomplete readings fail to register the Zapatistas’ advances as part of a broader movement of autonomy that fundamentally challenges Western models of political practice and cultural representation. Few opponents or detractors have recognized, for example, the political significance of the emergence of an indigenous collective subject emerging from “profound Mexico” and commenting on long standing Western European political strife. Similarly, critics have

failed to register Zapatista silence as a strategy informed by non-Western cultural formations. María Josefina Saldaña-Portillo interprets Zapatista silence as “the clearing that makes speech possible, not because it stands in a dichotomous relation to speech, as contentless space, but precisely because it is in the fullness of silence where differences take shape: ‘In silence, we were speaking.’ Silence is the noise of democracy.”⁶

Although in a technical sense Zapatistas are comprised of the EZLN and their supporters from the base communities, Zapatismo has been available to rebels outside of Chiapas in profound ways.⁷ At critical moments, collectives and individual activists have easily claimed a Zapatista rebel identity for themselves. At mobilizations in support of the Zapatistas, as for example during the series of protests in opposition to Zedillo’s intensification of the low intensity war in 1995 and the March for Indigenous Dignity in 2001, it was not unusual to hear: “We are all Indigenous!” “We are all Zapatistas!” “We are all Marcos!” Not surprisingly, supporters claiming the Zapatista rebel identity have been generously embraced by the Zapatistas. “If,” according to Comandante Zebedeo,

they are suffering exploitation, if they are suffering harassment, if they are suffering intimidation, if they are not receiving a just salary, then they can be considered Zapatistas, because that is our struggle as well. This is what we want, I think many people sympathize with us, because in reality that is perhaps what the great majority of our country and the world are suffering.⁸

As some of the contributors to this issue make clear, supporters beyond Chiapas include those who limit their activity to traditional solidarity strategies as well as those who link their local struggles to an expanding global network with a renewed sense of political urgency and analytical coherence. Ultimately, the contributors to this volume all agree that the Zapatistas have

had a profound impact in what has been referred to variously as the “alter-globalization movement” that gained significant momentum with the serial protests accelerated after Seattle 1999.⁹

Indeed, most of the essays collected here celebrate the variety of rebellions against the Fourth World War in part inspired by the Zapatistas.¹⁰ However, despite notable successes activists and intellectuals have begun to voice doubts regarding the effectiveness of serial protests driven by the meeting schedules of the WTO, World Bank, and IMF. Still others have raised an important alarm regarding the bureaucratization of the movement in the form of a well-funded Non Governmental Organization (NGO) presence opportunistically attempting to proffer a “respectable face of dissent.”¹¹ In light of these challenges, one of the most compelling challenges to the globally networked struggle against neoliberalism will be to continue to facilitate “a space of non-militarized contestation.”¹² Recently, Miguel Pickard asked how we construct that other world collectively evoked at such gatherings as the World Social Forums when we shout, “another world is possible.”¹³ Massimo De Angelis’ essay “‘Zapatismo’ and Globalisation as Social Relations,” specifically takes up this issue in his examination of the World Social Forum and satellite mobilizations.

Those likely to celebrate the Zapatistas, as the authors gathered here confirm, are weary at stating authoritative or definitive claims about Zapatismo. Careful in their choice of language, supporters avoid applying such terms as model when examining the Zapatista political project. Agreeing with Subcomandante Marcos that Zapatismo can be understood as “tendencies,” we might juxtapose these “tendencies” to some of the key statements the Zapatistas have made over a ten year period, including: *Ya Basta!* Enough; *mandar obedeciendo*, lead by obeying; *caminamos preguntando*, we walk asking; *nunca jamas un mundo sin nosotros*, never again a world without us; *todo para todos y nada para nosotros*, everything for everyone nothing for our-

selves; *un mundo donde quepan muchos mundos*, a world where many worlds fit. Not surprisingly, more than a few observers have insisted that the challenge we face will be that these statements operate as more than slogans. As heuristic devices these statements articulate the political impact of the Zapatista rebellion, making it more available to emergent political formations outside of Chiapas. Without a doubt, these statements will continue to take on added meaning as the Zapatista struggle, in particular, and the alter-globalization movement, more generally, advances.

In this special issue we have sought not only to examine Zapatismo more closely but to generate additional discussion about how these “tendencies” can be generated, appropriated, and deployed especially in sites of privilege. We seek to further an already established dialogue about how we might draw upon a force that activates; a process that respects the agency, the voice, the creativity, the experience, the unique histories and the specific manner of engagement of any given community in struggle. “Perhaps,” Subcomandante Marcos explains, “the new political morality is constructed in a new space that is not the taking or retention of power, but serves as the counterweight and opposition that contains it and obliges it to, for example, ‘lead by obeying.’”¹⁴ How do we listen to our *companer@s* in Zapatista rebel territory and stand with them, while at the same moment advance our own particular local struggles? How do we listen to one another in our local contexts in such a way as to recognize the diversity that defines our own spaces? How do we articulate a new mode of social relations that is not mediated by the market while respecting the dignity of those different than ourselves as Massimo De Angelis challenges us to consider? In other words, how do we construct a “politics of asking,” as John Holloway poses in his contribution? As we walk and listen alongside our Zapatista *companer@s*, how do we create new and improve on old rebel territories deep within the “belly of the beast?” Specifically, how do we pursue

a politics of *preguntando caminamos* “walking at the pace of the slowest,” as Gustavo Esteva provokes us to consider. More importantly, how do we represent this process to ourselves and others without reinscribing systems of oppressions that ignore subaltern strategies of knowledge production, as José Rabasa warns.

The Effort at *Encuentro*

Elsewhere I have argued that the Zapatista political imaginary has reintroduced direct action into our grammar of resistance, linked traditional solidarity activism with autonomous alternatives, and provoked a rethinking of previous struggles articulated around identity politics. In many ways, the Zapatista politics of rebellion, combines a politics of refusal, a politics of space and a politics of listening.¹⁵ The contributors to this volume underscore this formulation; adding other critical dimensions of Zapatismo: a politics of asking, politics of dignity, politics of transformation, politics of difference, politics of emancipation, and a politics of hope.¹⁶ As a link between traditional solidarity strategies and more radical alternatives, the Zapatistas invite us to consider the possibilities of an unarmed guerrilla operating in sites of privilege, a resistance that makes direct action a central element of political practice without abandoning a commitment to the political necessity of dialogue and collective decisions.

All the contributors to this volume explore probably the most critical aspect of Zapatismo, namely the Zapatista success at convening an open space of encounter, inviting a diversity of proposals and positions to promote a growing network of rebellion and resistance. The politics of space is that “effort at *encuentro*” and the political possibilities of different political practices slowly taking root.¹⁷ “The audacity of the Zapatistas,” according to the Midnight Notes Collective, “was to open a clearing in the forest heavily patrolled by the Mexican Army and to allow others to come to speak to each other about capi-

talism and revolution.”¹⁸ It is fundamentally a space that allows for the possibility of individual and collective transformation into a community with purpose –the “one no, many yeses!” battle cry that many of the contributors to this volume take up.¹⁹ It provides a new language of political struggle that embodies a certain Mayan “ethical character.”²⁰ Rebels seeking alternative “statements” to the dogmas of the left encountered an art that many had taken for granted: dialogue. Civil society increasingly engaged in an emerging dialogue with itself.

The Zapatista model of *encuentro* does not rely on ideology, organizational affiliation, or even identity. *Encuentro* as a political strategy and space should not be confused with a political rally, radical academic conference, or activist forum. An *encuentro* is not a space to impose an already established political program in order to “conscientize” a community to a specific issue. It is not a chic approach to capture activist market share. Rather, *encuentros* are spaces for a collective analysis and vision to emerge.

It is not an attempt to establish political and programmatic agreements, nor to attempt a new version of the International. Nor does it have to do with unifying theoretical concepts or standardizing conceptions, but with finding, and or building, common points of discussion. Something like constructing theoretical and practical images which are seen and experienced from different places.²¹

The effort at *encuentro* affirms local struggles while being animated by larger networks of opposition against neoliberalism that “circulate struggle.” It connects the “first world” and “third world” without implying either a liberal or even a radical tutelage. Zapatismo challenges “the movement” to collectively nurture the space of encounter as “a commons of wealth not yet lost.”²²

Beyond their own community the Zapatistas have not exactly organized, but rather have convened, hosting a wide array of visitors.²³ More recently, the Zapatistas have dismantled the Aguascalientes and introduced the Caracoles, a dramatic innovation in their political strategy of convening and hosting political spaces.²⁴ Concerned with the growing tensions produced by solidarity work on behalf of the Zapatistas and equally motivated to further support the autonomy of the Zapatista *municipios*, the Zapatistas have inaugurated eight centers in which the EZLN and the base communities can engage civil society. The earlier success of the Aguascalientes and the more recent promise of the Caracoles has meant a persistent flow of visitors, delegations and “Zapatours”—groups who travel to Chiapas to serve as human rights activists, live in the communities as peace observers, work in collective projects, dialogue with the Zapatistas and generally offer support. The combined efforts ensure increased visibility for the EZLN and the base communities. In addition, these “visits” also serve as opportunities to witness Zapatismo on the ground. Over the years, activists and intellectuals have been able to observe first-hand the struggle of rebel autonomous communities resisting a military siege and low intensity war through dialogue, consensus, and direct action. Most travelers return to their own communities profoundly inspired and ready to intensify their solidarity efforts while at the same moment committed to explore “new” strategies for their local struggles—strategies that emphasize a politics of listening.

A space for “encounter,” convened for dialogue, analysis, reflection, and action, transcends a multicultural framework that promotes a liberal pluralist strategy of diversity. The politics of encounter suggested here is polycultural, where each participant is recognized as living in a pluriverse that respects difference, i.e., different political proposals and cultural practices that emerge from a variety of subject positions, histories and political commitments within specific contexts of struggle.²⁵

A situated politics of difference resists the homogenization imposed by, as Subcomandante Marcos suggests, the competing hegemonies of the twentieth century.²⁶ The model of *encuentro*—as space, gathering, and strategy—depends on the mutual recognition of the dignity of the participants in order to imagine new horizons collectively.

But the ‘other’ and ‘different’ are not looking for everyone to be like they are. As if each one is saying that everyone has his own way or his own thing (I don’t know how that’s said now) and, in order for this to be possible, it is not enough to just be, you must also always respect the other. The ‘everyone doing his own thing’ is double: it is affirmation of difference, and it is respect for the other difference. When we say we are fighting for respect for our ‘different’ and ‘other’ selves, that includes fighting for respect for those who are also ‘other’ and ‘different,’ who are not like ourselves. And it is here where this entire resistance movement—called ‘underground’ or ‘subterranean,’ because it takes place among those below and underneath institutional movements—meets Zapatismo.²⁷

The Zapatismo we explore here implies the incompleteness of identity always present in the possibilities of negotiation and transformation.²⁸ Zapatismo exposes the violence of political and cultural homogenization, embracing distinct communities of youth, women, and communities of color, as constituencies who craft complex, often seemingly less obvious strategies of resistance.

As the contributors to this volume remind us, processes of exclusions could also be exerted in revolutionary movements, a history the Zapatistas have struggled not to repeat. Subcomandante Marcos argues that Latin American “revolutionary Left” failed to address two critical elements: “one of

them was the indigenous peoples, from whose ranks we come, and the other was the supposed minorities.”²⁹ The Zapatistas’ commitment to difference rather than identity, dialogue more than command, and autonomy in opposition to state or market domination articulates a praxis that does not subordinate local struggles (issues in particular contexts), a variety of actions (strategies of resistance), or alternative practices (strategies for living outside of state and market forces) to any specific political formation, program, or ideology.

Going Beyond Solidarity

While we should not abandon the responsibilities and challenges of sincere solidarity work, taking our cues from the EZLN, we might suggest that Zapatismo invites people to become part of “the struggle” in their own manner, at their own pace, and without being measured by any specific model of “conscientization” or a political program specified by “the organization.” However, the effort at *encuentro* challenges us to interrogate the limitations and contradictions of more traditional solidarity activism. Zapatismo reveals the political tensions of building a movement based only on single issue campaigns, on behalf of a specific constituency, and relying on short-lived fragile coalitions often over-determined by the most immediate crisis. In many cases those solidarity efforts that fail to escape a liberal mold can unwittingly promote possessive individualism, celebrating a single leader, often considered the best and the brightest of the group, who is expected to state the group’s issues, history, strategies and goals. The result is a single model, plan, or program dominated by an elite. Consequently, a narrowly defined solidarity effort can easily reproduce paternalism and hierarchy within the organization and between the organization and the constituency being “served.”

Echoing Holloway’s warning in this volume, traditional solidarity projects fall into the trap of defining, representing, and speaking for the struggle(s) of others, while at the same

moment insisting on “the progress” of those being aided, making solidarity efforts resistant to modifications and slow to adapt to shifting contexts. Solidarity projects that represent, define and speak for the struggle(s) of others presuppose the progress of those being aided and not the transformation of those providing the aid. Moreover, aid workers operating in a narrow solidarity mode are less likely to acknowledge or celebrate the transformations that have already taken place in “targeted” communities, inadvertently facilitating an insidious imperialism. Professional well-funded NGOs, for example, “can become shadow bureaucracies parallel to Southern nation state administrations.”³⁰ Ultimately, a bureaucratic model of social change will not be able to prioritize and promote the transformation of those providing the aid.

Although there may be valid concerns we must interrogate regarding the challenges of “solidarity,” the political practice examined here does not seek to impose a rigidly defined alternative practice. The Zapatistas have been consistent in keeping with what they have argued is the task of an armed movement: to “present the problem, and then step aside.”³¹ As critical catalysts in posing problems they have deliberately not imposed solutions on other groups or spaces. “But it is already known that our specialty is not in solving problems, but in creating them. ‘Creating them?’ No, that is too presumptuous, rather in proposing. Yes, our specialty is proposing problems.”³²

The Zapatista provocation insists that rights emerge from collective identities and communal needs expressing collectively articulated obligations and not the competing interests of individual need.³³ Rather than emphasize networks as our only organizing objective, we might also imagine the movement in solidarity with the Zapatistas as an imagined community, a collective effort to define obligations that are rooted in a locally placed culture generating knowledge about what works across generations. The very act of provocation undertaken has been a bridge manifest in a new international, not an international

based on rigid party doctrines or dogmas of competing organizations but “an international of hope.” The new international is defined by dignity, “that nation without nationality, that rainbow that is also a bridge, that murmur of the heart no matter what blood lives it, that rebel irreverence that mocks borders, customs and wars.”³⁴ “Instead of a new bureaucratic apparatus, for the world coordination of a political movement expressing universal ideals and proposals,” Esteva explains, “the International of Hope was created: a web constituted by innumerable differentiated autonomies, without a center or hierarchies, within which the most varied coalitions of discontents can express themselves, to dismantle forces and regimes oppressing all of them.”³⁵

The process of creating political space for dialogue between a diverse number of constituencies occupying a particular space suggests that community is neither homogenous nor static. Rather than speak of “the community,” Zapatismo strives for a notion of community embodying a multiplicity of histories, experiences, resources, and obligations. The pursuit of new political relationships underscores the need to re-discover strategies to collectively define obligations of and within a community through dialogue based on respect. Political projects and proposals need to emerge organically—not imposed either by an individual (*caciquismo*) or a cabal (*protagonismo*). As the Frente Zapatista de Liberación Nacional (FZLN) have warned, people organizing themselves must begin “with the situation in which they find themselves, not in the one which we might desire to be found.”³⁶ In new political spaces all voices, all proposals must be responded to with respect. Democracy, as Marcos suggests, is a gesture “to decide upon the dominant social proposal.” Liberty implies the freedom necessary to pursue one action over another, the expression of desire for the fulfillment of hope and dignity. Free from oppression, fear or persecution liberty sustains diversity and the choice, “to subscribe to one or another proposal.”³⁷ “It is,” writes Marcos, “the same desire: de-

mocracy, liberty, and justice. In the heroic delirium of the Mexican southeast, hope implies a name: *Tachicam*, the unity of longing for a better future.”³⁸

In this special issue we have chosen to organize the essays beginning with those that examine the concrete aspects of Zapatismo followed by contributions that explore more theoretical and analytical dimensions of Zapatismo as a critical political and cultural practice. John Ross’ essay, “Celebrating the Caracoles: Step by Step, the Zapatistas Advance on the Horizon,” provides an in depth ethnographic view of some of the practical mechanics of Zapatismo, documenting the most recent if not the most profound advance of Zapatismo. Ross takes advantage of the one year anniversary of the Caracoles to examine the actual workings of the Juntas de Buen Gobierno (JBG) in particular and the Caracoles as a whole.³⁹ As Ross explains these new spaces of encounter are “open to the outside world and through which the outside world can know the Zapatistas.”

The Caracoles, literally snail or conch shell, have long been a powerful symbol “traditionally utilized by Mexico’s indigenous peoples to summon the community together, precisely the function of these political/cultural centers.” The Caracoles house the JBGs as part of “a dramatic restructuring of civil Zapatismo,” establishing both municipal and regional autonomy. According to Ross, the JBGs advance regional autonomy by creating a place to

resolve disputes between autonomous municipalities, and insure an equitable distribution of resources between Zapatista populations such as Oventic, which are adjacent to the road, and those in the outback. Additionally, the JBGs oversee the work of health, educa-

tion, housing, agricultural and justice commissions that serve the region.

The political advances of the Caracoles and JBGs also include the building of schools, teacher training centers, clinics, and bicycle repair shops. The Caracoles as a whole have been so successful that even communities that have been traditionally allied with the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) or the Party of the Democratic Revolution (PRD) have availed themselves of the collective wisdom and strategies of autonomous governance executed by the JBGs. The impact of the Caracoles and the JBGs on a regional level affirms Moises understated insight that “we are learning how to govern ourselves.”

The practical challenges of Zapatismo on the ground and as part of broader political project of indigenous autonomy is further uncovered in the critical examination of the Red de Defensores Comunitarios [Community Human Rights Defender’s Network] provided here by Shannon Speed and Alvaro Reyes in “Rights, Resistance, and Radical Alternatives: The Red de Defensores Comunitarios and Zapatismo in Chiapas.” Speed and Reyes situate the human rights work of the Red de Defensores at the community level explaining how *promotores*, or organizers, are selected and trained to carry out the human rights work of the autonomous Zapatista communities. Speed and Reyes argue that the self-organization of the Red significantly advances Zapatismo by articulating a complex local project that exposes the most violent excesses of neoliberalism while at the same moment disrupts the oppressive discourses of Western human rights and state sovereignty. Thus, the Red embodies a Zapatismo that “demands autonomy and self-determination, expressed not only at the capacity to build another State under a new sovereign, but as the capacity to function unimpeded so as to affect the daily lives and future of its members.”

The Red transcends natural and positivistic legal traditions of human rights and their potentially negative application to indigenous contexts typical of most human rights organization based on standard Western, NGO models. Primarily, the Red defends against and informs about the human rights violations that result from the Mexican government's low-intensity war directed at the Zapatista base communities. It has been the Zapatistas adherence to the San Andrés Accords that has given them the moral high ground to advance their claim for recognition as "human beings with the right to equal treatment" and the right to a "parallel power structure (internal indigenous political and judicial mechanisms) in order to allow the indigenous peoples themselves to decide who they are and who they want to become." Unlike other human rights projects, the work of the Red "is directed by, and is answerable to, the communities themselves, and the authorities of the Zapatista autonomous regions to which they pertain." The Red's self-organization as part of a larger Zapatista strategy makes explicit "their source of strength in a larger social architecture of power and its ultimate political difference with the 'law,' a difference which lies in their self-organization." This deliberate effort at "civil resistance," explains Speed and Alvarez, enables "the *defensores* to make available the political nature of law and the political motivations for the abuses directed against their communities."

Thomas Olesen's essay, "Mixing Scales: Neoliberalism and the Transnational Zapatista Solidarity Network," tackles the transnational dimension of an emergent and complex Zapatista "solidarity" network. Olesen argues that the Zapatista struggle coincides with some general developments currently defining transnational social movements. Specifically, Olesen points to the "imbrication of local, national, and transitional solutions to neoliberalism" and the recent discomfort with the "analytical tendencies" that privilege a "unified global civil society standing up against the global corporate and political establishment." The Zapatistas successful use of the concept of neoliberalism

has allowed them to link their local, and somewhat national struggle, with other activists who are also resisting on both a local and a global scale. The result, according to Olesen, has been a transnational network that articulates all three components of an “injustice frame”: recognition, action, and solution. The emergent transnational network Olesen examines here is comprised of two networks. The first network has been motivated by more traditional solidarity objectives especially active during the increase in the low-intensity war of 1995 and the massacre at Acteal in December 1997. The second network entails the more complex anti-neoliberal “networked” struggle in which key actors, such as the PGA and the White Overalls, emerged.

Olesen rightfully points out, as do the other contributors to this volume, that the Zapatista hosting of the Continental and Intercontinental Encounters were decisive moments in the unfolding of a complex, networked, global opposition to neoliberalism. In the *Encuentros* the Zapatistas become more than “an object of solidarity in the eyes of transnational activists,” transforming themselves into “an important node in a critique of neoliberalism that extends beyond the borders of Mexico.” Unfortunately, highlighting the Continental and Intercontinental Encuentros has often meant glossing over earlier efforts such as the Democratic Convention of August 1994. However, Olesen makes clear that the initial phase of the rebellion, especially the political maneuvering since the cease-fire in early January of 1994, established the recognition and action components of the injustice frame. Beyond January 12, 1994 the Zapatistas’ careful refusal not to offer definitive solutions for confronting neoliberalism has made it possible for other rebels to claim the Zapatistas as an inspiration while articulating their own specific opposition on a variety of levels and sites.

In “Zapatismo Urbano” John Holloway further interrogates the differences between two general responses to the Zapatistas, namely a traditional solidarity strategy and an ap-

proach that challenges supporters to go beyond solidarity. Conceding the importance of efforts to provide material support and keep people informed about the course of the low intensity war and other development projects that threaten Zapatista communities, Holloway complicates attitudes that limit the indigenous of Chiapas to a “them” who need “our” “help.” As an alternative, Holloway examines “urban Zapatismo.”

Holloway’s distinction between traditional solidarity and urban Zapatismo celebrates “the revival of councilism,” as an expressive form of revolt and rebellion. As an alternative to the formal instrumental party strategy, Zapatismo is about finding a path, a “way forward” encourages the horizontal collective consensus driven by council. Zapatista poetics, concludes Holloway, is not about the “centrality of organization” but rather “the call of a world that does not yet exist.” Holloway cautions us that despite the enormous resonance of the Zapatista uprising in the cities there are indeed important differences between the Zapatista reality and that of an urban Zapatismo. We have not organized ourselves into an army, we have little enthusiasm for nationalist symbols and rhetoric, and have not been able to draw on a coherent locally rooted rural community culturally rich in social and political networks. In addition, on a more practical level, the strategic use of violence by the Zapatistas has had a limited draw outside of Chiapas that establishes a space where we come to a closer “understanding that the Zapatistas and we are part of the same struggle.” Holloway argues that Zapatistas impact on an emergent globalized resistance is not as a vanguard who has led the way but as a “resonance and inspiration” that provides us a “particular clarity (not just in the communiqués but in their actions) directions and themes that were already present in the struggles of the cities.” Holloway interprets the Zapatistas from a point of view that insists “we” were already organized in urban areas. The Zapatistas were able to tap into established struggles already resisting the imposition of market logics. The analysis reminds

us that a community possesses the resources for its own transformation and has the collective genius to marshal those resources for political action.

Holloway picks up a theme he has explored elsewhere, namely the political possibilities of the refusal of confronting capital in worn-out predictable ways and exploring an alternative effort towards “the construction of our own world.” “The problem then is not to conceptualize our own action in terms of the challenge to property, but to focus on our own construction of an alternative world and think how to avoid the capitalist appropriation of the products of our own doing.”⁴⁰ In an earlier, now well-known study, Holloway argues the Zapatista rebellion has abandoned the limited language of “class” and “class struggle” for a new language: dignity. Dignity, as a class concept, implies the “struggle against subordination,” referring to the social antagonism that constitutes how “human social practice is organized” in a capitalist context.⁴¹

Against critics quick to write the Zapatistas’ epitaph, Gustavo Esteva’s contribution, “Celebration of Zapatismo,” reviews the myriad of Zapatista successes and theoretical contributions towards “liberating hope.” Zapatismo, for Esteva, is nothing less than “the revolution of the new commons.” The Zapatistas, according to Esteva, successfully “opened themselves to wide coalitions of the disconcerted” in such a way to make possible “a net of plural paths” that “herald a new social order.” Esteva posits a Zapatismo that supersedes the conceits of representative democracy, including investing authority in elected officials (as well as the corporate interests they serve), relying on the beneficence of the State, or subverting political demands to those of the market place. Esteva argues persuasively that the political space opened by the Zapatistas activates a political project of “peoples’ power” or radical democracy as an alternative to representative democracy.⁴² “The Zapatistas,” explains Esteva, “gave legitimacy to a struggle for democracy that neither surrenders itself to its illusions nor aspired to a transitory

or permanent despotic substitute; a struggle that does not aim to conquer 'democratic power' but to widen, strengthen and deepen the space where people can exert their own power."⁴³ The radical democracy pursued by the Zapatistas embodies "a commitment to the common good, as expressed in common sense, the sense held in the community." Esteva's assessment of the Zapatistas' political project anticipates some of the challenges of implementing a radical democratic vision, including the challenges of working through consensus.

Throughout, Esteva points to the critical element of transformation. The Zapatistas have themselves undergone a series of transformations – a narrative that is by now well known. The small *foco* of urban revolutionaries who traveled to Chiapas as a revolutionary vanguard abandoned "Revolution" once they were "contaminated by and subordinated to the communities."⁴⁴ In another move of transformation, the emergent Zapatista community armed itself.⁴⁵ Throughout the EZLN's transformation, from a guerrilla *foco* to a community in arms, the Zapatistas negotiate a number of identities and political positions. The Zapatistas' successful management of the politics of transformation reflects, as Esteva informs us, "one of the best traditions of these indigenous communities and peoples... the tradition to change the tradition in a traditional way."

One of the most notable symbols of transformation has been Subcomandante Marcos, who, Esteva insists, is not the core of Zapatismo. For Esteva, Marcos is "a cultural bridge" that facilitates the dialogue with civil society. Marcos, Esteva argues, was born on January 1, 1994, and "will soon vanish" once his service is no longer needed – in this way he is not ideologically essential to Zapatismo.⁴⁶ Marcos' identity, cultural and intellectual resources, and organizational commitment are entirely in service of the communities that collectively command, underscoring the "lead by obeying" all of the authors gathered here agree is a fundamental dimension of Zapatismo. Some critics have chosen to define Marcos' relationship to the indig-

enous communities as that of translator. However, the gesture to define, and ultimately contain, Marcos as translator limits Zapatismo to a rigid program and set of prescriptions denying its open, fluid and provocative character as “an intuition.” In a number of communiqués Marcos makes extensive use of the metaphor of the *corrida* while conducting a very powerful and imaginative critique of key dogmas. In one sense, Marcos has been able to *torrear* with a number of notable public intellectuals and leaders and the dominant ideologies they espouse, exposing the competing hegemonies of previous eras.⁴⁷

In “‘Zapatismo’ and Globalisation as Social Relations,” Massimo De Angelis provides a detailed study of how Zapatismo supersedes the “traditional discourses grounding politics on ‘ideologies’ and ‘lines.’” De Angelis critiques the deficiencies of earlier “managerial” approaches typical of the left that refuse to abandon “event focused, culturally closed to democratic participation” strategies. Ultimately, De Angelis confirms that the Zapatistas offer “fresh and insightful coordinates” that make available “a general framework” that empowers communities. De Angelis’ Zapatismo directly confronts the intensely oppressive social norms of doing articulated by an abstract disciplinary market that produces isolation, alienation, competition and scarcity, a process made worse by the more recent consolidation of interdependence characteristic of globalization. “It is the abstract process of disciplinary markets,” explains De Angelis, “that articulates the social body in such a way as to constitute social norms of production rather than individual social actors negotiating among themselves the norms of their free cooperation.” Zapatismo, according to De Angelis, challenges capitalist strategies of enclosure and disciplinary integration through a

horizontal building of bridges, of establishing links, learning from mistakes, de-fetishising our relations to the others, reaching out and being reached, sharing re-

sources and creating commons, reinventing local and translocal communities, articulating flows from movement to society and vice-versa. In other words, within this framework politics is redefined in terms of the constitution of a social force that learns to articulate many yeses, that takes responsibility for the production of new social relations.

De Angelis' critical effort brings to the forefront the Zapatistas' political intervention in capitalist social relations, creating the political space necessary for communities "to invent their own politics and construct alternative social relations." Significantly, De Angelis's investigation of Zapatismo poses the question: "how do we *live* a new set of social relations?" The proposition here underscores Zapatismo as "a question rather than an answer," echoing some of the other contributors to this volume. The Zapatistas successfully opened up a space so "we can coordinate social action in a different way." De Angelis concludes that "when we ground politics of emancipation on this field of social relations, 'lines,' 'norms,' and 'programmes,' (i.e. simply stated all those strategic devices to inform us what to do next) become *emergent properties* of communicational processes rather than the way around." Here, much like the other contributors to this volume, De Angelis redirects our attention to the "effort at *encuentro*."

José Rabasa's essay, "On the History of the History of Peoples *Without* History," draws our attention to the critical intersection of the political and cultural dimensions of Zapatismo. Exploring the tensions regarding representation, Rabasa cautions against ideological constraints that force the Zapatistas into familiar and dominant Western narratives of social change. Rabasa's warning against how the Zapatistas might be represented underscores the challenges of acknowledging how complex and multilayered "movements" represent themselves. Most importantly, Rabasa notes that analysts can misrepresent or gloss

over the complexity of subaltern rebellion as part of an effort to legitimize the struggle as having history. “The world of subaltern insurrections,” counters Rabasa, “is a world ruled by the imagination, marvel, civil society, and poetics, which the prose of counter-insurgency, i.e., history, has sought to neutralize in its pursuit of the causes and effects of rebellions.”⁴⁸ Rabasa’s quarrel with state or elite uses of history directly points to the critical role of the politics of knowledge production—as an essential dimension of subaltern insurgency, generally, and Zapatismo, in particular. Rabasa insistence that “this guerrilla will create space for knowledge production that invent practices for confronting the State and furthering the *without* history” affirms the important intersection of the political and cultural practice of Zapatismo.

Rabasa is vigilant of any gesture that exercises “epistemic violence” that subsumes subaltern insurrection, in this case Zapatismo, into western discourses—even discourses of resistance that seek to challenge post-fordist or neoliberal hegemony. “Our writings as intellectuals,” Rabasa warns, “should remain vigilant of the epistemic violence we inflict with our slogans, generalizations, and desires to constitute a master model for interpreting the globalization that haunts us all but with different degrees of virulence.” Rabasa’s engagement with the recent work of Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri illuminates the analytical dilemmas of celebrating and representing the revolutionary subject without accounting for the uniquely situated collective subject of the Zapatistas articulated through the San Andrés Accords. “In the context of indigenous struggles,” explains Rabasa, “the primacy of post-Fordism hardly qualifies as a form of consent, as hegemonic, rather as a violent coercion into submission when not a war for the extermination of all those other, that are considered an error of humanity.”

Ultimately, Rabasa takes up a concern shared by many of the contributors of this volume, namely the danger of constructing Zapatismo as a model of revolution. In an early ex-

amination of Zapatista political practice, Rabasa points out that the task of a subaltern studies political approach would be to acknowledge oppositional epistemologies that re-write the documenting of resistance or the counter-insurgency made possible in the representation of resistance as deviance.⁴⁹ Regarding the political dilemmas of self-representation, Rabasa points to the necessity of confronting a well established “representational machine” that wants to force the Zapatistas into either a “peasant” rebellion or intransigent Indian framework.⁵⁰

The Zapatistas shared their collective analysis of the conjuncture, and, at times, made their multifaceted strategy available through the communiqué and the figure of Subcomandante Marcos. As a cultural practice Zapatismo has been made available through a complex autoethnographic project for which it has become increasingly well known.

But what is surprising is not this gigantic war machine destroying, assassinating and persecuting more than a million indigenous. No, what is really extraordinary and marvelous is that it is, and it will be, in vain. Despite of it, the Zapatistas not do not surrender nor are defeated, they even grow and become stronger. As they say in these mountains, the Zapatistas have a very powerful and indestructible weapon: the word.⁵¹

The Zapatista autoethnographic project has, as autoethnography implies, combined Western and non-Western tools, idioms and strategies for self representation that have come to define Zapatista political and cultural practices manifest in the sharing of their word.⁵² Their word, has been offered in solidarity, and as an invitation to struggle on a variety of fronts. The Zapatista word, the word spoken in resistance, is fundamentally a provocation to participate in a new political space (*encuentro*), develop new political relationships or strategies of doing politics (dialogue), and collectively articulate a new political project

(autonomy). “Our blood and our word,” the Zapatistas declared, “have lit a small fire in the mountain and we walk a path against the house of money and the powerful. Brothers and sisters of other races and languages, of other colors, but with the same heart now protect our light and in it they drink of the same fire.”⁵³

The autoethnographic requires that the Zapatista historiography and political treatise be conveyed through a process entirely of their own making and completely on their own terms despite the opprobrium they might receive not conducting themselves in a predictable or acceptable “leftist” manner. This extraordinary dimension of Zapatista political and cultural practice has taken shape through a strategic engagement with the media, political leaders and the parties, and an increasingly organized civil society. Without a doubt they have been exceptional in the management of their own image, especially given that they did not anticipate, nor could they have imagined, how they would eventually be embraced by civil society. Most importantly, the Zapatistas sharing of their word requires a response from the international Zapatista solidarity community to maintain support for the Zapatistas/EZLN and to struggle locally without necessarily waiting for initiatives by the EZLN.

The history of conquest and colonization has only allowed subjugated peoples the options of “good” or “bad” subjects, ignoring the option of the non-subject.⁵⁴ In keeping with the imperatives of a critical cultural practice, the Zapatistas have claimed the position of “non-subject.” The Zapatistas have consistently insisted that the marginalized, the forgotten and faceless, are also agents of history, and that they cannot be included simply by adding them to a liberal framework of individual rights. The Zapatistas have reclaimed their particular history, proclaimed their cultural singularity, and argued for their autonomy as essential elements to their political participation, cultural survival and well-being, demonstrating the necessity of

reclaiming our histories and cultures as we reclaim our commons. Not only does the Zapatistas' political project of "not forgetting" re-insert them in Mexican national and "revolutionary" narratives, it also sustains a the political project of pursuing a radically different political imaginary.

No we Indian peoples have come in order to wind the clock and to thus ensure that the inclusive, tolerant, and plural tomorrow which is, incidentally, the only tomorrow possible will arrive. In order to do that, in order for our march to make the clock of humanity march, we Indian peoples have resorted to the art of reading what has not yet been written. Because that is the dream which animates us as indigenous, as Mexicans and, above all, as human beings. With our struggle, we are reading the future which has already been sown yesterday, which is being cultivated today, and which can only be reaped if one fights, if, that is, one dreams.⁵⁵

The Zapatistas have been astute and adept at nurturing "situated knowledges" that narrate their own struggle and make available their political project on their own terms.

The Zapatistas' effort at *encuentro* and effort to go beyond solidarity may appear as though they have only pursued a "model of peace," however they have not abandoned the "model of war" altogether.⁵⁶ They have held it in abeyance, the two possibilities working in conjunction to expand their political project for Mexico and beyond. Although they have refused to give up their arms, they have embraced a strategy that has creatively engaged the political process on their own terms. As Esteva explains in his essay for this volume, the Zapatistas have embraced violence strategically. They have been careful not to use violence as a means to dominate, or even convince others of the virtues of a Zapatista vision or program. "Zapatismo," explains Sergio Rodríguez Lascano, "reminds us that power is a

social relation, not a thing or a palace that can be taken, won electorally or assaulted.”⁵⁷ Concludes Marcos, “We define our goal by the way we choose the means of struggling for it. In that sense, the value we give to our word, to honesty and sincerity, is great, although we occasionally sin of naïveté.”⁵⁸

Endnotes

¹ The author would like to thank Sam Oliner, Jordan Camp, and Squiggy Elvira Rubio-Hale for making this issue possible. In addition, special thanks go to Jordan Camp, Vik Bahl, and Toyin Falola for reading earlier versions of this essay. I would also like to acknowledge Acción Zapatista de Humboldt and Acción Zapatista Austin for helping me to remain inspired by Zapatismo.

² Subcomandante Marcos, “Durito IV Neoliberalism and the Party State,” in Acción Zapatista Editorial Collective, *Conversations With Durito: The Story of the Defeat of Neo-Liberalism* (New York: Autonomedia, forthcoming).

³ Subcomandante Marcos, “The Punch Card and the Hour Glass,” *New Left Review* 9 (May-June 2001): 70.

⁴ Paraphrasing Harry Cleaver and evoking the uses he suggested for Marx’s *Capital* as a political document, we might suggest Zapatismo operates as a weapon in the hands of rebels. See Harry Cleaver, *Reading Capital Politically* (New York: AK Press, 2000): 23.

⁵ This text appeared in *La Jornada*, November 25, 2002. Originally translated by Leslie López for *CounterPunch* (January 11, 2003), <http://counterpunch.org/zaps01112003.html>.

⁶ María Josefina Saldaña-Portillo, “The Politics of Silence: Development and Difference in Zapatismo,” in *The Revolutionary Imagination in the Americas and the Age of Development* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003): 235.

⁷ For an excellent early description of the relation between the EZLN and the many dimensions of the “new Zapatista movement,” see Xochitil Leyva Solano, “The New Zapatista Movement: Political Levels, Actors and Political Discourse in Contemporary Mexico,” in Valentina Napolitano and Xochitil Leyva Solano, eds., *Encuentros Antropológicos: Power, Identity, and Mobility in Mexican Society* (London: Institute for Latin American Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, 1998): 35-55.

⁸ Big Noise, *Zapatista*, 1998.

⁹ There are a number of terms used to describe the increasingly globalized networked resistance to neoliberalism, including alter-globalization, antiglobalization movement, movement of movements, and the global anti-capitalist movement, to name just a few.

¹⁰ Subcomandante Marcos has argued that this phase of savage capitalism is best understood as the Fourth World War, making the Cold War the third in a series of global conflicts. See Subcomandante Marcos, "Chiapas the War," *La Jornada*, November 20, 1999. Originally translated by irlandesa.

¹¹ Jim Davis, "This Is What Bureaucracy Looks Like" in Eddie Yuen, Daniel Burton-Rose, George Katsiaficas, eds., *The Battle of Seattle: The New Challenge to Capitalist Globalization* (New York: Soft Skull Press, 2001): 176.

¹² Eddie Yuen, "Introduction" in Eddie Yuen, Daniel Burton-Rose, George Katsiaficas, eds., *The Battle of Seattle: The New Challenge to Capitalist Globalization* (New York: Soft Skull Press, 2001): 7.

¹³ Miguel Pickard, February 11, 2005, Humboldt State University, Arcata, CA.

¹⁴ Subcomandante Marcos, "De árboles, transgresores, y odontogía," in EZLN, *Documentos y comunicados 3* (México, D.F.: Ediciones Era, 1997): 121.

¹⁵ Manuel Callahan, "Zapatismo Beyond Chiapas," in David Solnit, *Globalize Liberation: How to Uproot the System and Change the World* (San Francisco: City Lights Books, 2004): 217-228.

¹⁶ Indeed, over the decade I have benefited from the work of all the authors gathered in this special issue.

¹⁷ Subcomandante Marcos, "El Mundo: Siete Pensamientos en Mayo de 2003." Originally published in Spanish by *Rebeldía*, May 2003. <http://www.revistarebeldia.org>.

¹⁸ Midnight Notes Collective, "The Hammer and... or the Sickle? From the Zapatista Uprising to the Battle of Seattle," in *Auroras of the Zapatistas: Local and Global Struggles of the Fourth World War* (New York: Autonomedia, 2001): 10.

¹⁹ For an insightful analysis of global resistance making use of the phrase, see "One No, Many Yeses," *Midnight Notes* 12 (December 1997).

²⁰ According to Enrique Dussel the EZLN's strategic use of a distinctly Mayan idiom reclaims "the *dignity of the negated historical subject*." It presents an example of community that is "institutionalized through social means conducive to consensus, agreement, and decision making." The Maya democracy of the EZLN's political project disrupts the very legitimacy of the nation state, exposing it as a historical development brutally imposed on indigenous peoples. See Dussel, "Ethical Sense of the 1994 Maya Rebellion in Chiapas," *Journal of Hispanic/Latino Theology* 2:3 (February 1995): 42, 47.

²¹ Subcomandante Marcos, "El Mundo: Siete Pensamientos en Mayo."

²² "The Hammer and... or the Sickle?," p. 9.

²³ This overview by no means represents fully the framework, contradictions and successes of the spaces they have convened, omitting, for example, the number of organizational and institutional links that sustain the

encounter. Here we would note, for example, the EZLN's strategic use of advisors as well as the development of such political formations as the Frente Zapatista Liberación Nacional and Enlace Civil.

²⁴ I am indebted to Gustavo Esteva for informing my thinking regarding the politics of hosting.

²⁵ Vijay Prashad has recently argued for a polycultural approach to political work in general and anti-racist work in particular. Polyculturalism introduces “a broad antiracist platform that would not (like liberal multiculturalism) invest itself in the management of difference, but it would (like a socialist polyculturalism) struggle to dismantle and redistribute unequal resources and racist structures.” Prashad elaborates that “polyculturalism, as a political philosophy, does not see difference ‘as evidence of some cognitive confusion or as a moral anomaly’ (as liberal multiculturalism is wont to do), but it sees those features of difference with which it disagrees as ‘the expression of a morality you despise, that is, as what your enemy (not the universal enemy) says.’” Significantly, Prashad notes that this type of analytical approach stresses “an ethico-political agenda forged in struggle (not as some universal, ahistorical verities).” Vijay Prashad, *Everybody Was Kung Fu Fighting: Afro-Asian Connections and the Myth of Cultural Purity* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2001): 69.

²⁶ Subcomandante Marcos, “La entrevista insólita,” interview by Julio Scherer García, *Proceso* 1271 (11 Marzo 2001): 12-13.

²⁷ Subcomandante Marcos, “De la cultura subterránea a la cultura de la resistencia,” *La Jornada* (October 27, 1999).

²⁸ Stuart Hall has argued that identity is much like a bus, “not because it takes you to a fixed destination, but because you can only get somewhere – anywhere- by climbing aboard. The whole of you can never be represented by the ticket you carry, but you still have to buy a ticket to get from here to there.” For Hall identities are “points of suture,” temporary sites where one negotiates who one is and who one is to become. Moreover, Hall suggests that identity is always a narrative, a fiction - “the story we tell ourselves about ourselves.” Hall addresses the issue of politics within this framework of identity by concluding that political collectivities necessarily are imagined communities. “It is because they are imagined,” emphasizes Hall, “because they are constructed between the real and desire—that such communities can act as mobilising political force.” Stuart Hall, “Fantasy, Identity, Politics” in Erica Carter, ed., *Cultural Remix: Theories of Politics and the Popular* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1995): 65-66.

²⁹ Marcos, “The Punch Card and the Hour Glass,” p. 71.

³⁰ Davis, “This Is What Bureaucracy Looks Like.”

³¹ Subcomandante Marcos, “La entrevista insólita,” p. 15.

³² Subcomandante Marcos, "Oxymoron" *La Jornada*, "Ojarasca" 37, (May 9, 2000).

³³ Gustavo Esteva and Madhu Suri Prakash, *Grassroots Post-modernism: Remaking the Soil of Cultures* (New York: Zed Books, 1998); Wendell Barry, *Sex, Economy, and Community* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1992).

³⁴ "Primera declaración de la Realidad contra el neoliberalismo y por la humanidad," in EZLN, *Documentos y comunicados 3* (México, D.F.: Ediciones Era, 1997): 126.

³⁵ Gustavo Esteva, "The Zapatistas and People's Power," *Capital and Class* 68 (Summer 1999): 154.

³⁶ *FZLN Basic Documents* (approved during the founding congress held in Mexico City, September 1997).

³⁷ Subcomandante Marcos, "Durito IV Neoliberalism and the Party State."

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ross' contribution should be read along side "Chiapas: The Thirteenth Steele" the series of communiqués penned by Subcomandante Marcos in which he announces the transformation of the Aguascalientes into the Carcoles. See Subcomandante Marcos, "Chiapas: The Thirteenth Steele," originally published in *La Jornada*, (July 1997). English version available in Chiapas 95, <http://www.eco.utexas.edu/Homepages/Faculty/Cleaver/chiapas95.html>.

⁴⁰ John Holloway, *Change the World Without Taking Power: The Meaning of Revolution Today* (London: Pluto Press, 2002).

⁴¹ John Holloway, "Dignity's Revolt," in John Holloway and Eloína Peláez, eds. *Zapatista! Reinventing Revolution in Mexico* (London: Pluto Press, 1998): 159-198.

⁴² Esteva, "People's Power," p. 154.

⁴³ Esteva, "People's Power," p. 154.

⁴⁴ Yvon Le Bot, *Subcomandante Marcos, El Sueño Zapatista* (Barcelona: Plaza & Janés, 1997): 148-9.

⁴⁵ A compelling analysis of this transformation can be found in Luis Lorenzano, "Zapatismo: Recomposition of Labour, Radical Democracy and Revolutionary Project," in Holloway and Peláez, *Zapatista! Reinventing Revolution in Mexico*. 126-158.

⁴⁶ Esteva and Madhu Prakash's concept of the "incarnate intellectual" might be useful here. The conceptual framework of the incarnate intellectual abandons previous approaches towards intellectuals, such as Gramsci's organic intellectual, that celebrate the intellectual as one who directs and conscientizes through cultural leadership. According to Esteva and Prakash Marcos embodies the very characteristics of the incarnate intellectual: 1) celebrates personal autonomy and social capacities that thrive on the margins; 2) shares professional knowledge with "clients," "consumers," sup-

posedly being served in such a way that is not “shadow work;” 3) distances oneself from the language and categories which define the profession; 4) specific competences that articulate new ways for a shared communal wisdom. The incarnate intellectual reflects a movement that is “outside the political economy of education and development” in pursuit of “placed knowledge” that claims solidarity with the people rather than “educating” or “developing” them to processes of “underdevelopment.” Madhu Suri Prakash and Gustavo Esteva, *Escaping Education: Living as Learning within Grassroots Cultures* (New York: Peter Lang, 1998): 117-121.

⁴⁷ For English dominant audiences prone to translate the *corrida de toros* as simply a “bullfight” the fullness of the metaphor may be lost. A *matador* in a *corrida de toros* does not simply fight and ultimately kill a bull. Rather, as Garry Marvin aptly points out, the *corrida* consists of an intermingled processes of *lidiar* and *torerar* as part of a craftsmanship to bring out the best in the bull. Garry Marvin, *Bullfight* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994): 205-206.

⁴⁸ Rabasa’s reference to the prose of counter insurgency is especially poignant given some of the key theoretical insights Ranajit Guha provides regarding the peasant as “the subject of his own history.” “For once a peasant rebellion has been assimilated to the career of the Raj, the Nation, or the People,” argues Guha, “it becomes easy for the historian to abdicate the responsibility he has of exploring and describing the consciousness specific to that rebellion and be content to ascribe it to a transcendental consciousness. In operative terms, this means denying a will to the mass of the rebels themselves and representing them merely as instruments of some other will.” Ranajit Guha, “The Prose of Counter-Insurgency,” in Nicholas Dirks, et. al., *Culture/Power/History: A Reader in Contemporary Social Theory* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994): 364.

⁴⁹ See José Rabasa, “Of Zapatismo: Folkloric and the Impossible in a Subaltern Insurrection,” in *The Politics of Culture in the Shadow of Capital* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997): 399-341.

⁵¹ Subcomandante Marcos, “La máquina del etnocidio,” *La Jornada*, (November 27, 1999).

⁵² See Mary Louise Pratt, “The Art of the Contact Zone,” in David Bartholomae and Anthony Petrosky, eds., *Ways of Reading: An Anthology for Writers* (Boston: Bedford Books, 1993): 445-446.

⁵³ “Cuarta declaración de la Selva Lacandona,” in EZLN, *Documentos y comunicados 3* (México, D.F.: Ediciones Era, 1997): 80-1.

⁵⁴ Through various technologies and strategies of circulation representational machines “translate an undifferentiated succession of local, individual, concrete events of encounter into larger, more meaningful narratives –

narratives that convey meaning to formulations of nation, empire, race, or masculinity—each culture must work with and through certain representational technologies.” Ricardo Salvatore, “Representational Machines of Empire,” in Gilbert M. Joseph, Catherine C. Legrand, and Ricardo D. Salvatore, eds., *Close Encounters of Empire: Writing the Cultural History of US-Latin American Relations* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998): 71-73

⁵⁵ G. Esteva and M.S. Prakash, *Grassroots Postmodernism*, p. 45.

⁵³ Subcomandante Marcos, speech given at the “Paths of Dignity: Indigenous Rights, Memory and Cultural Heritage” intercultural meeting, Mexico City, March 12 2001.

⁵⁶ The “model of war,” Foucault suggests, “is not only ridiculous but, more importantly, dangerous as well.” “Because,” Foucault explains, “by virtue of saying or thinking ‘I’m fighting against the enemy,’ if one day you found yourself in a position of strength, and in a situation of real war, in front of this blasted ‘enemy,’ wouldn’t you actually treat him as one? Taking that route leads to oppression, no matter who takes it: that’s the real danger.” In this case, Foucault specifically chastises intellectuals who elevate ideological disputes to “a grand theme of ideological struggle,” constructing enemies and insisting the stakes have “greater political weight” than they actually might have. “Wouldn’t it be much better instead,” Foucault concludes, “to think that those with whom you disagree are perhaps mistaken; or perhaps that you haven’t understood what they intended to say.” Michel Foucault, *Remarks on Marx* (New York: Semiotext(e), 1991): 180-81

⁵⁷ Sergio Rodríguez Lascano, “Zapatismo: A Bridge to Hope,” *Rebeldía* 1 (November 2002).

⁵⁸ Subcomandante Marcos, “The Punch Card and the Hourglass,” p. 76.