The Neo-Zapatista Movement of Chiapas: Identities and Strategies

Carlos A. Gadea[a]

Abstract

One of the collective phenomena that has allowed a theoretical debate on the social movements in the current context is the neo-Zapatista of Chiapas. From a discussion on some significant events and possible interpretations about their identities, strategies, demands and speeches, the aim is to place the movement in a structural dynamics that will acquire different views. In apparent confirmation of an "identitarian community of resistance", the neo-Zapatismo seems to move toward a new scenario, in which "your chance" is configured from its structural flexibility and fluidity. In this way, the neo-Zapatista movement seems to confirm that the theoretical antinomies on the social movements relating to the American school, its emphasis on "strategy" of collective actions, and the ones referring to the European version, emphasizing the dimension of "identity", cannot be considered completely contradictory. The neo-Zapatismo has shown that a particular strategy developed a specific corresponding identitarian construction, and vice versa.

Keywords

Social movements, neo-Zapatismo, Chiapas, modernity, globalization

The objective of this text is to analyze the emergence, the demands and strategies of the neo-Zapatista movement from Chiapas, with a clear intention to dialogue with some theoretical approaches on social movements and collective actions. This is a sort of a compendium and updating of the main ideas and discussions undertaken in the book[1] published in Mexico by the Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Mexico's publisher. On that occasion, it has been emphasized the importance of considering this mass phenomenon in the scenario of economic and political processes of globalization, carrying also an analysis that put the neo-Zapatismo as a collective actor that showed the need to deal with a new level of socio-historical complexity. This meant and means to understand, first of all, there are the different actors who define for themselves the "reality" they find, since depending on their positions as collective actors

of certain motivations and intentions, beliefs and desires, they perceive the world differently, and act accordingly, from a different point of view[2].

The "particular identity" that a collective actor would draw arises from his "interpretation of the world", and it could be understood that the collective actions tend to be defined primarily as "models of sociability". Returning "relational" concepts to express the "state of constant flow" of the present, one can say that the own purposes of collective actions tend to arise "a posteriori" from the "types of sociability" experienced, and from the dynamics of the

[a]Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos, Brazil

Correspondent Author:
Carlos A. Gadea, Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos, Av. Unisinos 950, São Leopoldo, RS, Brazil. CEP: 93022-000
E-mail: cgadea@unisinos.br

action undertaken and from the interaction with their surroundings.

This is the starting point for analyzing the current collective phenomena which must be taken into detail, where it encounters a strong social movement with flexibility and structural fluidity, as is the case of the neo-Zapatista movement from Chiapas. Since it has publically appeared in the Mexican Southeast on January 1, 1994 (on the same day as the entry of the free trade agreement between Mexico, Canada, and United States), under a political-military formation called the Zapatista National Liberation Army (EZLN), the neo-Zapatismo brings to the scene several debates about identity and strategy of social movements today.

Based on silence and poor weapons, the indigenous members of the ELZN took the localities of San Cristóbal de las Casas, Las Margaritas, Altamirano and Ocosingo, surprising tourists and the State Government itself. They declared war against the "bad government" of president Carlos Salinas de Gortari; claimed by "land", as an echo of Emiliano Zapata revolutionaries, and by "liberty", based on the history of over 500 years of marginalisation of their indigenous condition. After the surprise and, later, confusion, it began to establish a political and cultural debate of great proportions, not only in Mexico, but also in other regions of the planet. Basically, Mexico would never be the same after that dawn.

INTERPRETATIONS

During this social effervescence, several interpretations considered these rebel indigenes as protagonists of a typical rebellion of an armed Latin American left-wing politics, in a visible strategic defeat and somewhat ideologically obsolete. The EZLN entered on the list of the renowned guerrilla organisations of a continent that breathed violence. The idea was thus to find similarities and different hues with the FMLN (*Frente Martí de Liberación Nacional*—Martí National Liberation Front) in El Salvador, with the FSLN (*Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional*—Sandinista National Liberation Front) from Nicaragua, or with guerrilla groups from Guatemala, as the Guerrilla Army of the Poor.

As soon as it was realized that they were able to articulate the secular consciousness of oppression and injustice with a firm conviction to reaffirm their indigenous identity, radical questionings to conceptions and discriminatory politic practices of the Mexican State began to accentuate aspects which could not reduce their actions and demands within the ideological boundaries that used to characterize the political movements from years ago.

There was no doubt about the indigenous base of this movement, something that Octavio Paz (1994), with a highly critical interpretation of its emergence, recognized as inherent in the conflict unleashed. Neither there were doubts of the miserable situation that had generated the armed discontent with many indigenous communities, which led several analysts to do a reductive interpretative combination: the indigenous identity is reduced exclusively to claim for economic and political modernization, therefore, a collective actor is a product, exclusively, of the precarious conditions of material life, and intended to join the modernizing logic.

Simultaneously, deriving from ethno-political studies, other visions understood that in the emancipatory logic of these indigenes existed a will manifested by defending their culture and identity traits from a new offensive modernizing and exclusionary, joining thus, to protest dynamics of an "indigenist" character. But just as these considerations were known, it is possible to understand—by observing the own interaction of the movement—that neo-Zapatismo designs its demands and acquires its identity from a certain "ambiguity". The claims for "modernisation" embodied in its fight for an effective political, economical and cultural "integration", with the Mexican nation, cannot be dissociated from the constant "reaffirmation of identity" and from the

requirements of political and cultural "recognition" of the indigenous peculiarity. This supposed "tension" is insoluble when designing the dimensions for equal rights and the political discourse "is done outside" of the movement itself.

Having regard to the false dichotomy between "modernization-integration" and "self-assertion of indigenous identity", supported by some analysis, it is possible to reach a second statement: the neo-Zapatista movement cannot just be considered as an expression of a "new social movement", since there is certain "deficit" in the understanding of collective actions that combine, interdependently, (re)valuation of communitarian, the fight against exclusion (in all aspects) and the forms of organization through "identitarian communities of resistance"; it means, "multi-sector networks" that congregate a variety of social actors, vindicate interests and "living worlds"[3].

The neo-Zapatismo seems to have provided a "multiplicity" of speeches, demands, desires and concerns that have arisen from various contexts and local scenes, contingently translating itself in the cultural space of the indigenous community.

THE IDENTITY AMBIGUITY AND THE STRATEGIC FLEXIBILITY

Emerged as a political-military organization in November 1983, until 1995, the neo-Zapatista movement focused on increasing the political action on the basis of an effective democratization of Mexico, seeking to create social and civil spaces of debate and political organization, by redirecting its actions to "non-military" spaces and officiating itself, visibly, as a "bridge" between the civil society and the political power. The neo-Zapatismo began to define itself as a promoter of a "civil citizen movement"[4], realizing a process of transformation of its structure and identity that makes possible to understand that the EZLN is not, strictly speaking, the neo-Zapatista movement, but an element of it.

The movement that has been structured in early 1995 came from a guerrilla organization that was turned into an "armed communitarian" movement. This transformation, undoubtedly, relates to an accelerated process of "massification" of the EZLN (with the indigenous youth in the region) and to a growing contact with the community of Lacandon Jungle and hundreds of members of the EZLN in the early 1990s, when the repression of paramilitary "groups" over those communities had increased. Thus, the EZLN, an initially guerrillero phenomenon that aspired to "take the power" and establish socialism, translates into an "army of indigenous communities", in their defense against the continuous harassment of paramilitary groups. Increasingly, what was known as the EZLN resulted in the confluence of indigenous and guerrillas' components[5] and organizational and military aspects, so there was a very close linkage between these (divided into "militia" and "insurgents") with indigenous communities that were linked geographically and socially to the so-called "support bases". So, when the January 1 arrived with a few hundred armed indigenes in a forgotten Mexican Southeast, it was like looking at an EZLN which was not the same as had been envisioned in the 1980s.

The movement began to see itself in the position of an "army of communities" in the Selva Lacandona and the region of Los Altos, in a Mexican society with global expression, which inadvertently attributed this role to the EZLN. In 1994, the neo-Zapatismo was touched with those "politicized" groups, organisations and citizens and also gathered around a sort of "emerging nationalism" in the left-wing politics. From a typical performance of a "radical left", the neo-Zapatismo pointed to the civil society organization, complying with the traditional rites of a militant left: the Democratic National Convention[6] may have been its greatest expression.

Until the beginning of 1995, the movement has gone primarily through two transformations. It can be affirmed that a first neo-Zapatismo was what came up

from the origin of the EZLN until the time that the indigen becomes majority, not only by modifying quantitatively the movement, but also by modifying its essence, in what regards to the politico-military decisions and their own demands, as well as to their ideology and culture. In an intensified way, indigenous communities had demanded that the EZLN submitted itself to a collective decision-making, converting "the community" to the basic core of the politic. In the 1990-1991 years, it is seen a second neo-Zapatismo, which was constituted since the "cultural shock" between the EZLN and the indigenous communities. On January 1, 1994, the movement also consolidated itself with the effervescent participation of the Mexican society beneath the slogan "peace in Chiapas" or "we are all Marcos".

The second neo-Zapatismo, however, can be defined as a modernization movement, and not so much as a reconstructor of the indigenous identity. At the same time, and in correspondence with such dimension, it can be said that its actions were clearly oriented to the definition of strategic instances, to the rearticulation of political and social spaces of action, to the elaboration of possible connections with the society, as well as responding to the military and symbolic attacks of his nearest opponent: the Mexican Government. So, as the federal army advanced over the conquered geographic spaces in February 1995, the neo-Zapatismo joined a structural dynamics defined in quite different terms from those the world's society witnessed since its creation in 1994. On the trail, traveling a few miles, the indigenous rebels entrenched themselves in La Realidad, transformed into a stronghold from where the movement would rebuild its forces. Thus, the retreat was turned into strategic reformulation. The movement of uncertainty or complexity, as was often represented, started to present not easily predictable characteristics to its protagonists, to the observers, and to the Mexican Government itself. Despite their geographical confinement, their apparent isolation, the military siege and the constant pressure from the Government, the neo-Zapatismo gets in touch with Mexican and foreign non-governmental organizations (NGOs), triggers a worldwide movement against the militarist policy of the Government, promotes social events at the international level and, above all, acquires a more defined indigenous profile, deploying, now with more clarity, a reconstruction of its identity.

THE RETURN TO THE COMMUNITY: THE INDIGENOUS QUESTION

As a result of the decline because of the advance of the Mexican federal army, the neo-Zapatismo begins to suffer some extenuation in the political and social space played at the national level. While the rebels seemed to recognize themselves in the indigenous profile, a hard-hitting debate begins to deal with the concept of "indigene" to the Mexican nation and the movement itself. In relation to the reflections on the neo-Zapatismo and the indigene, a type of reflection has developed from these explanatory spaces, as they see, in "frustration" and resistance to the results of modernization processes, the deciding factor for their formation. This perspective would be accompanied by a spirit that wished to reduce to simple "premodernity" the "mobilizing" neo-Zapatista content, as the product of a "primitivist resistance" (and even folk) of the indigenous communities of Chiapas. The modernization, therefore, presented itself as a foreign category to the identities placed by the movement.

At the same time, another kind of explanation would rather characterize the movement as a result of the current modernisation processes that, somehow, was intended to achieve, critically revising modern values and extolling the immediate demand for citizenship. In this case, the modernization continues to be the development paradigm by which social movements of indigenous nature also seek to transit.

Analyzing this explanatory duality, the subjectivity of neo-Zapatismo is crossed by a reflective critique of rationalism and exclusionary modernity and by a recreation of the so-called modernizing elements in terms of political, social, cultural and economic processes of current Mexico. But that should not get it away from an expressive and identitarian mechanism that the movement takes to develop and express this "duality", since the construction of its guidelines, as a collective action, is more focused on creating relationships of cultural affirmation than effective formulation of historical and political meta-projects.

This is how the neo-Zapatista movement claims for the urgency of a "new type of modernization", a balance between subjectivation and modernization (remembering Alain Touraine), platform of "multicultural Mexico". This new identity would be based on significant achievements as the advancement of February 1995, the National Indigenous Forum of August 1996, the "San Andrés Agreements[7]", the "First Intercontinental Encounter for Humanity and Against Neo-liberalism" of late July and early August 1996, and the National Indigenous Congress of October 1996, in which the movement defines what here is called the third neo-Zapatismo, a kind of a way back when to the indigenous identity.

The third neo-Zapatismo is the strategic dimension in which it consolidates the reconstruction of the indigenous identity, from the moment that speaks to the society and presents its "new type of modernization", a gesture that seems to establish the question made by Calderón (1995: 11), when once faced with the dual modernization-subjetivation: "How it is possible the social integration and the construction of otherness among actors and individuals so distinct, given the characteristics of a socially excluding modernization process, especially in peripheral societies?".

While this question focuses on the "modernization process", the type of construction of identity develops, first, from an expansion and channeling indigenous demands of national character and the need for "a new pact between the State and the indigenous world" and, at the same time, from a reindianitation and reorganization of communal indigenous culture, producing the emergence and proliferation of ressignification of the idea of indigenous cultural tradition. Maybe this has been possible because the neo-Zapatistas rebels, before January 1, 1994, had formed a "regional autonomy" based on community support. The neo-Zapatismo, therefore, makes a sort of "return to the community", as a trip to their daily lives, as a struggle for the recognition of "cultural difference". Wanting to overcome the isolation of communities, the indigenous rebels establish a sort of "intercommunity network", whose main agglutinating factor is the historic call for "autonomy", in the context of a cross-community space that flows into the space of the Mexican nation: the first "community ideal" outlined by the neo-Zapatismo, which projects to a struggle for the recognition of indigenous rights.

RESISTENCE COMMUNITY AND THE (POST)NEO-ZAPATISMO

With the third neo-Zapatismo, defined after a central demand by political, economic and cultural autonomy and by "indigenous rights", the movement introduces a cultural debate that will keep it in "connection" with other collective actors on the basis of an identity that transcends the strictly indigenous, but that unquestionably comes from itself. This debate and this political strategy developed refer, on the one hand, to the fact that Mexican society should assume an effective respect for the rights of indigenous peoples as a prior exercise to understand the integration crisis that currently afflict the modern Mexican State, evidenced in political, administrative and legal limitations to legitimize a "multicultural State." To admit any "conversation" between identities and the State arises from an interest and belief in a multiculturalism that comes from a pluralism as a new

form of universalism, a kind of universalism without uniformity, rooted, as can be seen, in the same liberal tradition, since that in the instance, the universalism cannot be indifferent to the diversidad[8].

There is no doubt that this approach prefers to continue to recall the old rationalist principles—the ones of the revolutionaries from the eighteenth century—that claim that the political and juridical structures include abstract citizens. But what happens when they do not see themselves in this "condition" any more and prefer to self-affirm themselves in a denial of this abstraction? Such a process, in addition to "match", has got a cultural homogenization that has not actually prevented itself from manifesting in the form of an economic and social inequality, as seen in the indigenous peoples. So that is how the cultural homogeneity and abstraction are intertwined in a particular way, in which its constitution appears undifferentiated: the abstraction is the "denial of difference", its symbolic annihilation. The abstraction is a characteristic trait of the languages of power (Wolin 1996: 161).

The neo-Zapatismo brings the idea that a principle of universal justice is powerless to obstruct the exclusion, especially when the factors of marginalization are cultural. The marginalization is the clear result of an exclusion of the indigenous identity, because this category is the main responsible for the condition of "inequality" experienced. Given this, the neo-Zapatista movement has proposed that the recognition of the collective rights were materialized in cultural self-determination and autonomy, political and legal figures that can only establish an ideal of democratic integration. As the integration or inclusion is a necessary condition of democracy, it is certain that this is a formal principle more than constitutive, and then, a pre-condition of equality. In this way, the rebels stand by a policy conception in which the integration does not warrant recognition, since even the recognition not always represented integration. So, it should not be surprising

that the search for recognition of differences tend to look for rethinking integration from another "epistemic place", a true shock to the "Mexicanidad" and their foundations.

The discussions about multiculturalism make reference to the problems related to the ethnic and cultural composition of the so-called modern societies, and discussions seriously raise questions about the idea of cultural and social homogeneity. Regarding the irruption of the neo-Zapatista movement, it consists of a break introduced in the normativity of modernity through the claim by "right to have rights" on par with the rest of society, but without neglecting the right to ethnic and cultural differences.

This type of claims, centered, mostly, from moral damages to heterogeneous identities of subjects, have been represented, in general, as "particularistic" claims or demands which endanger the modern rules, since they stablish conflict in "pre-racionals" instances. This qualification is based on the fact that these identities do not explain themselves based on a contrast of interests or worldviews that contain "universal" components, but specific ethnic, cultural, religious, sexual differences, and so on. According to this perspective, the conflicts generated by this kind of "particularistic" claim are characterized by not developing a "positive" function of social integration.

For its part, Wolin (1996: 155) aptly put us in front of a "new pluralism" that, contrary to that intended by Locke[9], supposed involuntary associations (of color, gender, sexual preference) around particular traits of its protagonists. This means that the virtual "recognition of differences" is simply inexpressible by rational means, since, it seems, they are not visible to the underlying criteria that can locate that or on which wake up (Rustin 1996: 46).

Trying to argue "positively" on how to "embed" these differences of identity in institutional rules, Kymlicka (1996) did not hesitate to place them as the language of "citizenship". It results that, to him, "the fear is that the differentiated rights, according to the

group, weaken the sense of shared civic identity that holds together a liberal society. These rights will be a source of disunity which may lead to the dissolution of the country…" (Kymlicka 1996: 239). Apparently, these types of concerns do not emphasize the social differences, leaving the egalitarian actors in their rationality. Could it be said that in the case of the indigenous Mexican rebels there is not the "sense of civic identity"? Would not be the marginalization problem which had caused certain dissolution of the country? Without a doubt, the challenge seems much more complex.

Of course, all these discussions do not seem to lose sight of the fact that multiculturalism, while it is inherent in the context represented by the global modernity, also means a resizing of different identities and their consequent group formations. This is due, first of all, to the fact that the normal expectation of an effective homogenization of the world, according to the image derived from the historical project of modernity, found itself frustrated. It is in the market rationality and in the widespread consumerism (even though in relative terms, in the case of the last one) where it can be seen some evidence of this, but the accent placed on a "reaffirmed" plurality of identities designates a current reality that is also the present.

It is in this manner that the collective subjectivities transcend symbolically the rational dynamics of social relations, delineated from an irreducible back-and-forth between "aesthetics" and "ethics"[10]. Thus, for example, the ethical factor is what allows the formation of a resistance community around the neo-Zapatismo. This resistance community takes shape and structure from a wide network of actors in solidarity that show initiative, materialized in events like the "Intercontinental Encounter for Humanity and Against Neo-liberalism" (July-August 1996)[11], with a wide repercussion, which starts a dynamic of contacts with a variety of sectors of global society. In this sense, there is an interesting feature that begins to set up the neo-Zapatismo: the formation of a network of

diverse identity communities, in apparent contradiction with the until now "events" or "meetings" experienced by different sectors or social actors on the planet, as events in which feminists gather together, the natives get together with each other, environmentalists are meeting each other, and so on.

This is what gave the "multicultural" character to the event, the plurality of experiences that share the same "existential" anxiety and the possibility of identity claims. In this sense, this event, organized by the neo-Zapatismo, allowed it to emphasize the indigenous identity of the movement within the diversity of identities that self-defined themselves as excluded; and, at the same time, allowed it to incorporate a variety of practical experiences and "living worlds" brought by foreign guests in its own strategy and identity, enriching considerably the "pluralist vision" that the movement already had.

At the same time, and in a decisive way, this "multicultural community", arising from the contact with diverse individuals and groups from around the world, adds a real production in the virtual space of (and in) the Internet of a "virtual community of resistance". The horizontality of the communication, provided by the cyberspace, has turned the neo-Zapatista movement as an "extra identitarian community" in circulation. It may continue to represent an important referential, but it has already ceased to be the emancipatory "referent" of virtual connections in resistance communities. This is how the neo-Zapatismo widens, it means, dissolves, falls into the fatal trap of their own strategy: what here is called (post)neo-Zapatismo.

This apparent type of conformation of resistance communities seems, currently, to contemplate a strategic and identitary dynamic of the neo-Zapatista movement. But it contemplates one dimension that derives from its trans-identity, defining, essential and more generally, what is called (post)neo-Zapatismo, the dimension of the movement in which, for example,

the geographic and symbolic spaces of its action becomes a "nebula". The (post)neo-Zapatismo means:

(1) The definitive consolidation of the neo-Zapatismo not as a current transformation of the left-wing politics, but rather a new product built from the ideals of a left-wing in crisis and politically disoriented. Also it results in being a sort of "refuge" for a kind of political activism derived from the speech and political left-wing authoritarian practices;

(2) The term of current expression between the first, the second and the third neo-Zapatismo. These dimensions are contingently present during the action and the expressiveness of the movement, since from a certain "situational logic" that the typically "guerilla man" can reappear, as well as the moderizing, "nationalistic" and pro-mobilizationing speech of the Mexican civil society, as well as the identity and ethnic-cultural character demands. The interlacing is a synonym of an identitary and strategic neo-Zapatismo cocktail;

(3) The historical moment of the neo-Zapatista movement in which it settles into a trans-national context, in the dynamics of several and global collective actions;

(4) The product of the central role of different NGOs in the geographical context of the indigenous pro-Zapatistas communities (the so-called "support bases"). This contact between NGOs and the movement changed drastically its action;

(5) The expression of a resistance community from cultural identities in the contemporaneity. From that moment, it is consolidated the second "community ideal" of the neo-Zapatismo, which projects itself to a fight against the economic, political, social, and cultural exclusion along with other "identitarian communities", building it in a "global identitarian community". According to what is stated above, it is also evident that the identity of the neo-Zapatista movement cannot be reduced only to their ethnic and cultural community foundations and their struggle for autonomy, since the formation of a broader resistance community, from the connections of different excluded identities, is also an inexhaustible source of meaning for the movement;

(6) The structuring of a conflict starring excluded identities and not so much (or maybe in a lesser extent way) "abstract" national and international civil society. That is the reason why today it is possible to show the existence of "several neo-Zapatismos" as any "anarcho-punk community", "the feminisms", some young Christians of Brazil, those people who see in the struggle for the autonomy of their own struggle (Basques, Catalans, Irish, other indigenous peoples from other countries), ecologists, environmentalists, and so on;

(7) The (post)neo-Zapatismo also highlights the peculiar dynamic that this community of global resistance has assumed. The different "dialogues" between the resistance communities arise from specific concerns to each of them, in addition to the themes and details that revolve around neo-Zapatismo and Chiapas. In short, the (post)neo-Zapatismo is the size of the movement in which, to have literally expanded and extended exponential manner through the virtual space of the Internet, widespread circulation of "identitarian communities" that survive and communicate in cyberspace are joined. This is how the neo-Zapatismo dissolved in the "virtual network", allowing the understanding that, whether via the Internet or by more conventional means, the neo-zapatismo is already everywhere, it is part (one way or another) of the radical emancipatory aesthetics and political ahead of what can be "understood" by global modernity.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

There are those who have observed that the alleged vagueness of the neo-Zapatista movement is the biggest sign of the inconsistency and inability to deal with the struggle and its surroundings. In this article, it has been sought to demonstrate that there is no lack of

definitions. In any case, is its flexibility, or rather its "production process" of strategies (terminating symbols, ideals, attitudes, and political positions), through a continuous interest in knowledge and information, that has led the neo-Zapatismo to innovate, to engage in an ongoing reflexivity of its action. Perhaps it is this feature that confuses those who understand collective actions as "methodologically predetermined units". In any case, without wishing to make a game of words, one can understand that the alleged vagueness leads to the definition of "multiple neo-Zapatismos": each one could recognize itself in the fluid strategy of looking itself into the mirror and see the face that exists under this "virtual cap".

It was in this manner, with the interaction with "other collective subjects" that the neo-Zapatismo made itself into a dynamic collective action, able to articulate, in its own strategy and speech, a plurality of demands in various contexts, "situational logics" and "identity communities". Thus, the movement not only achieves to break the isolation to which it is subjected, as essentially, "builds itself up" around a circle of international protests against the excluding "new world(s) order(ers)". This assumes the structuring of a "collective subject" from an "ethics of social commitment" not for itself, but for a broader resistance community. The neo-Zapatista movement went into sync with other actors for being a product of this tune. Frequent exchanges of knowledge, information and mediators "design" its chance as social movement.

On the other hand, the neo-Zapatista movement made possible the formation of new collective spaces of protest at national and international level. In its ambiguity of identity (and demands) and communicational logic, it breaks into a multitude of symbolic spaces of protest, allowing the emergence of certain "redefinitions of identity" in a "global" approach and continuous cultural distances. This characterization of the neo-Zapatismo seems to

acquire materiality in the social emergence of a new collective actor, as the People's Global Action, internationally known from the mobilizations against the World Trade Organization (WTO) in Europe in May 1998; the mobilizations against the Group of Seven (G7) in Germany in June 1999, and, more recently, in the demonstrations in Seattle against the WTO in December 1999. With an interesting expression and organization, this new social actor had, in its origins, different "encounters" organized in Chiapas and outside of Mexico.

In short, what, in this article, is called (post)neo-Zapatismo is the dimension of the movement that reaffirms its fluid and flexible character, and takes on, decidedly, a pragmatic character in its collective action logic, even without meaning the lost or absence of the emancipatory horizons that give life to it. The (post)neo-Zapatismo exists in the "possibility" that the neo-Zapatismo continues to circulate through the virtual and real spaces of "communities of resistance" in the current global modernity(ies).

Notes

1. Mention to the book *Acciones Colectivas y Modernidad Global. El Movimiento Neo-Zapatista (Collective Actions and Global Modernity. The Neo-Zapatista Movement)*, published in 2004.
2. For example, under this perspective exists a clear analytic-theoretical heritage from Schütz (1932) and from Schütz and Luckmann (1973).
3. As the original: "*El mundo de la vida, entendido en su totalidad, como mundo natural y social, es el escenario y lo que pone límites a mi acción y a nuestra acción recíproca. Para dar realidad a nuestros objetos, debemos dominar lo que está presente en ellos y transformarlos. De acuerdo con esto, no solo actuamos y operamos dentro del mundo de la vida sino también sobre él*" (in Spanish) (Schütz and Luckmann 1973: 27).
4. So many studies show, putting the neo-Zapatista as a social actor that appeals to old values such as homeland defense, national identity, the right to be considered citizens and then to eat, dress, educate themselves and live in decent shape. See Ceceña (1996a).

5. Here it refers to the ones that already included the EZLN before this process of "massification", those which were ideologically seduced by the same values "revolutionaries" of Latin American movements from some years ago.

6. Multitudinous political event organized by the "Zapatistas" in Aguascalientes, near the town of Guadalupe Tepeyac, in August 1994.

7. Signed on February 16, 1996 between the Government and the neo-Zapatistas rebels. These "deals" established the criteria for a new relationship between indigenous peoples and the Mexican State, confirming that "indigenous peoples have been suffered from forms of subordination, inequality and discrimination that have led them to a structural situation of poverty, political exclusion and exploitation. (History) confirms that it have persisted against a legal system whose ideal has been the homogenization and cultural assimilation. Also states that to overcome this reality requires new actions, participative and convergent for the Government and society, including, above all, the indigenous peoples themselves". See Ceceña (1996b: 136), and Hernández Navarro and Vera Herrera (1998: 56).

8. Nuclear inquietation of Kymlicka (1996).

9. That "… supposes a plurality of voluntary associations, i.e., the identities whose we are not welded" (Wolin 1996: 155).

10. By "aesthetic", it means an "experience in common", a "special sensitivity" experienced that "ethics" here refers to allowing "the collective tie", which generates this "shared experience". See Maffesoli (1987).

11. As the "Second Intergalactic Meeting", realized in Spain in August 1997.

References

Baudrillard, J. 1993. *Cultura y Simulacro (Culture and Drill)*. Barcelona: Ed. Kairós.

Barabas, A. M. 1996. "La Rebelión Zapatista y el Movimiento Indio en México" (The Zapatista Rebellion and the Indian Movement in Mexico). In *Série Antropología 208*. Brasilia: Universidade de Brasilia.

Barreda, A. 1998. "La Sublevación de Chiapas en la Lucha Mundial por Valores de uso Anticapitalistas" (The Chiapas Uprising in the Global Struggle for Anti-Capitalist Values). In *Cahiers Marxistes No. 209*. Paris.

Bonfil Batalla, G. 1987. *México Profundo. Una Civilización Negada (Deep Mexico. A Denied Civilization)*. México: Ed. Grijalbo.

Calderón, F. 1995. "Modernización y Ética de la Otredad. Comportamientos Colectivos y Modernización en América Latina" (Modernization and Ethics of Otherness. Collective Behaviour and Modernization in Latin America). *Revista Mexicana de Sociología* 3:3-16.

Castells, M. 1998a. *La era de la Información. Economía, Sociedad y Cultura (Vol. 1: La Sociedad red) (The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture. The Network Society)*. Madrid: Ed. Alianza.

——. 1998b. *La era de la Información. Economía, Sociedad y Cultura (Vol 2: El Poder de la Identidad) (The Information Age. Economy, Society and Culture. The Power of Identity)*. Madrid: Ed. Alianza.

Ceceña, A. E. 1996a. "Universalidad de la Lucha Zapatista. Algunas Hipótesis" (The Universally of the Zapatista Fight. Some Hypotheses). In *Chiapas 2*. México: ERA-IIEc.

——. 1996b. "Contexto de la Nueva Relación" (Context of the New Relationship). In *Chiapas 2*. México: ERA-IIEc.

Chiapas 2. 1996. México: Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas (Economic Investigation Institute).

Chiapas 3. 1996. México: Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas (Economic Investigation Institute).

Chiapas 6. 1998. México: Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas (Economic Investigation Institute).

Diaz Polanco, H. 1997. *La Rebelión Zapatista y la Autonomía (The Zapatista Rebellion and the Autonomy)*. México: Ed. Siglo XXI.

EZLN. 1996a. *Primer Encuentro Intercontinental por la Humanidad y Contra el Neoliberalismo (First Intercontinental Encounter for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism)*.

——. 1996b. *Documentos y Comunicados 1 y 2 (Prologo de Antonio García de León) (Documents and Communications 1 and 2 [Prologue Antonio García de León])*.

Featherstone, M. 1997. *O Desmanche da Cultura. Globalização, Pós-modernismo e Identidade (Dismantling of Culture. Globalization, Postmodernism and Identity)*. São Paulo: Ed. Studio Nobel.

Foucault, M. 1992. *Microfísica del Poder (Microphysics of Power)*. Madrid: Ed. La Piqueta.

Gadea, C. A. 2004. *Acciones Colectivas y Modernidad Global. El Movimiento Neozapatista (Collective Action and Global Modernity. The Neo-Zapatista Movement)*. Toluca: UAEM.

Garcia Canclini, N. 1995. *Culturas Híbridas. Estrategias Para Entrar y Salir de la Modernidad (Hybrid Cultures. Strategies for Entering and Exiting the Modernity)*. Buenos Aires: Ed. Sudamericana.

Giddens, A. 1993. *Consecuencias de la Modernidad (Consequences of Modernity)*. Madrid: Ed. Alianza.

Hall, S. 1997. *A Identidade Cultural na Pós-modernidade (The Cultural Identity in the Pos-modernity)*. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. DP&A.

Hernández Navarro, L. and R. Vera Herrera. 1998. *Acuerdos de San Andrés (Agreements of San Andrés)*. México: Ed. Era.

Honneth, A. 1997. *La Lucha por el Reconocimiento (The Struggle for Recognition)*. Barcelona: Ed. Crítica.

Kymlicka, W. 1996. *Ciudadanía Multicultural (Multicultural Citizenship)*. Barcelona: Ed. Paidós.

Le Bot, I. 1997. *Subcomandante Marcos. El Sueño Zapatista (Subcomandante Marcos. The Zapatista Dream)*. Barcelona: Ed. Palza & Janés.

Luckmann, T. 1996. *Teoría de la Acción Social (Theory of Social Action)*. Barcelona: Ed. Paidós.

Lyotard, J. F. 1989. *La Condición Postmoderna (The Postmodern Condition)*. Madrid: Ed. Crítica.

Maffesoli, M. 1987. *O Tempo das Tribos. O Declínio do Individualismo nas Sociedades de Massa (The Time of Tribes. The Decline of Individualism in Mass Society)*. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Forense-Universitária.

——. 1995. *A Contemplação do Mundo (The Contemplation of the World)*. Porto Alegre: Ed. Arte e Ofícios.

——. 1997. *A Transfiguração do Político (The Transfiguration of the Politician)*. Porto Alegre: Ed. Sulina.

Melucci, A. 1998. "Acción Colectiva y Transformación Personal en la era de la Información" (Collective Action and Personal Transformation in the Information Age). *Ciudades (México)* 37:3-11.

Montemayor, C. 1997. *La Rebelión Indígena de México (The Indigenous Rebellion in Mexico)*. México: Ed. Joaquín Mortíz.

Newcomb, T. M. 1964. *Manual de Psicologia Social (Manual of Social Psychology)*. Buenos Aires: Ed. Eudeba.

Paz, O. 1994. "El nudo de Chiapas" (The Knot of Chiapas). *La Jornada*, January 5, 1994, pp. 1 and 14.

Rustin, M. 1996. "La Igualdad en los Tiempos Posmodernos" (Equality in Postmodern Times). In *Pluralismo, Justicia e Igualdad*, edited by D. Miller and M. Walzer. Buenos Aires: Ed. FCE.

Scherer-Warren, I. 1999. *Cidadania sem Fronteiras. Ações Coletivas na era da Globalização (Citizenship Without Borders. Collective Actions in the Era of Globalization)*. São Paulo: Ed. Hucitec.

Scherer-Warren, I. and P. Krischke. 1987. *Uma Revolução no Cotidiano (A Revolution in Daily Life)*. São Paulo: Ed. Brasiliense.

Schütz, A. 1932. *Fenomenología del Mundo Social (Phenomenology of the Social World)*. Buenos Aires: Ed. Paidós.

Schütz, A. and T. Luckmann. 1973. *Las Estructuras del Mundo de la Vida (The Structures of the World of Life)*. Buenos Aires: Ed. Amorrortu.

Taylor, C. 1994. *El Multiculturalismo y la "Política del Reconocimiento" (Multiculturalism and the "Recognition Policy")*. México: Ed. FCE.

Tönnies, F. 1979. *Comunidad y Sociedad (Community and Society)*. Barcelona: Ed. Península.

Touraine, A. 1994. *Crítica de la Modernidad (Criticism of Modernity)*. México: Ed. FCE.

——. 1997. *Podremos Vivir Juntos (Can We Live Together)?* Buenos Aires: Ed. FCE.

Wolin, S. S. 1996. "Democracia, Diferencia y Re-conocimiento" (Democracy and Difference Reacquaintance). *La Política. Revista de Estudios Sobre el Estado y la Sociedad (Madrid)* 1:151-170.

Zermeño, S. 1996. *La Sociedad Derrotada. El Desorden Mexicano de fin de Siglo (The Defeated Society. The Mexican Disorder of End of the Century)*. México: Ed. Siglo XXI.

Bio

Carlos A. Gadea, professor and researcher in the Social Science Post-graduate Program, Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos; editor of the periodic journal Ciências Sociais Unisinos; researcher of National Counsel of Technological and Scientific Development (CNPq); Post-doctorate at the Center for Latin American Studies, University of Miami; research fields: Latin American studies, social theory, collective mobilization, urban violence.