

THE LACANDON FOREST AND THE POLITICAL:
A RANCIERÉAN ACCOUNT
OF
THE ZAPATISTA MOVEMENT

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY
AYKUT ÖRKÜP

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

FEBRUARY 2014

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Raşit Kaya
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aslı Çırakman

Deveci

Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aslı Çırakman Deveci (METU, PADM)

Assist. Prof. Dr. Aylin Topal (METU, PADM)

Instr. Dr. Nalan Soyarık Şentürk (Başkent Uni., PSIR)

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Aykut Örküp

Signature:

ABSTRACT

THE LACANDON FOREST AND THE POLITICAL: A RANCIÈREAN ACCOUNT OF THE ZAPATISTA MOVEMENT

Örküp, Aykut

M.S., Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Aslı Çırakman Deveci

February 2014, 134 pages

This thesis aims to show that the Zapatista movement has a political character in line with the thought of Jacques Rancière. The main themes of Rancière's understanding of politics, such as *police*/politics distinction, presupposition of equality and subjectivization are presented. It is argued that the Zapatista movement has created a rupture in the *police* order since the initial uprising of January 1, 1994 showed that there was another world which had been invisible. It is also asserted that the movement has acted out of the presupposition of equality, not only in the declarations, communiques and statements of the members of the EZLN, but also in the practices and principles followed within the Zapatista communities. Finally it is argued that the characteristics of subjectivization, which are argumentative demonstration, theatrical dramatization and impossible identification, are observed in the movement. It is thought that the examination of the Zapatista movement with reference to Rancière's understanding of the 'political' will be helpful to understand the Zapatista movement and the hope that it implies for the all movements around the world.

Keywords: Zapatista Movement, Jacques Rancière, EZLN, political, politics

ÖZ

LACANDON ORMANI VE SİYASAL: ZAPATİSTA HAREKETİNİN RANCIÈRECİ BİR DEĞERLENDİRMESİ

Örküp, Aykut

Yüksek Lisans, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Aslı Çırakman Deveci

Şubat 2014, 134 sayfa

Bu tez, Zapatista hareketinin, Jacques Rancière'nin düşüncesiyle bağdaşan bir şekilde siyasal bir yanı olduğunu göstermeyi amaçlamaktadır. Rancière'nin siyaset anlayışındaki, *polis*/siyaset ayrımı, eşitliğin varsayımı ve öznelleşme gibi ana temalar sunulmaktadır. 1 Ocak 1994 günü gerçekleşen ilk ayaklanma, daha önceden görülmez olan diğer bir dünyayı gösterdiği için Zapatista hareketinin *polis* düzeninde bir çatlak yarattığı iddia edilmektedir. Ayrıca hareketin, yalnızca EZLN üyelerinin deklarasyonlarında, duyurularında ve açıklamalarında değil, yanı zamanda Zapatista topluluklarında görülen uygulamalarında ve izledikleri ilkelerde de eşitliğin varsayımı ilkesi üzerinden hareket ettiği öne sürülmektedir. Son olarak, öznelleşmenin özellikleri yani tartışmacı gösteri, teatral dramatizasyon ve imkansız kimlik hareket içinde gözlemlenmektedir. Zapatista hareketinin, Rancière'in 'siyasal' anlayışına referansla incelenmesi, Zapatista hareketini ve hareketin dünya çapındaki tüm hareketler için ortaya koyduğu umudu anlama konusunda faydalı olacağı düşünülmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Zapatista Hareketi, Jacques Rancière, EZLN, siyasal, siyaset.

To Zapatistas

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my greatest attitude to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aslı ırakman Deveci who provided me with invaluable guidance, help and support. I am also indebted to my thesis committee members, Instr. Dr. Nalan Soyarik Őentürk and Assist. Prof. Dr. Aylin Topal, for their insightful comments.

I must express my profound gratitude to my friends Sanem, Pelin, Aya Berna, Senem and Gray for their help and encouragement in the course of writing this thesis. I am also thankful to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Őebnem Oğuz for her valuable comments and support.

I am also grateful to my family for their support. Without the support and encouragement of these people, this thesis might not have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. RANCIÈRE AND THE POLITICAL	8
2.1 The Distinction between the <i>Police</i> and Politics	9
2.2 Equality.....	11
2.3 The Wrong or the Miscount.....	19
2.4 Subjectivization.....	23
3. A BRIEF HISTORY OF MEXICO.....	27
3.1 The Conquest and the Colonial Era (1521-1810)	27
3.2 Independence (1810-1821)	32
3.3 The <i>Porfiriato</i> (1876-1911)	41
3.4 Revolution and the Single Party Rule (1911-1982)	45
3.5 Transition to Neoliberalism (1982-1994)	57
4. HISTORY OF THE ZAPATISTA MOVEMENT	61
4.1 The Roots and Ten Years of Preparation.....	62
4.2 Declaration of War and the First Years	65
4.3 The Fourth Declaration.....	71
4.4 The New Millennium	74
5. A RANCIÈREAN ACCOUNT OF THE ZAPATISTA MOVEMENT.....	86
5.1 The Distinction between the <i>Police</i> and Politics and the Zapatistas.....	87
5.2 Equality and the Zapatistas	98
5.3 Subjectivization and the Zapatistas	105
6. CONCLUSION.....	115

BIBLIOGRAPHY	119
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A: TURKISH SUMMARY	124
APPENDIX B: TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU	134

CHAPTER I

Introduction

This study examines the Zapatista Movement, which emerged after the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (*Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional* - EZLN) went public and took control of several towns in Chiapas on January 1, 1994. Although the occupation of towns by the EZLN did not last long, the emergence of the Zapatista movement had profound effects. Apart from being an inspiration to antisystemic movements all over the world such as the Seattle World Trade Organization protests and the creation of World Social Forum; the Zapatistas abandoned the traditional method of seizing state power through armed struggle used by the previous guerilla groups while renouncing hierarchical organization and organizing on the basis of equality, and made listening a central value in the movement. In addition, the Zapatistas introduced an alternative to the politics in Mexico by opening up political spaces. While seizing political power is not on the agenda of the movement, participation in the elections or supporting candidates in elections are not their ways of engaging in politics, either. Their objective is the creation of autonomous democracy, which is not regulated by the political elite and which is based on equality. In this regard, the Zapatista movement's significance is not only caused by their unmasking the inequalities and exclusion faced by the indigenous but also by their presenting an alternative politics. The analysis of the principles and practices of the Zapatista movement from a Rancièrian perspective is particularly important for this reason since Rancière reformulates what is called politics as *police* order and suggests an alternative to this *police* order, and alternative which he bases on equality and argues to be politics. Therefore, the main objective of this study is to analyze the Zapatista movement from a Rancièrian perspective and present the affinities between Rancière's understanding of the political, politics and democracy and the principles and practices of the Zapatista movement.

There are many studies that focus on different aspects of the Zapatista movement. Some authors argue that the Zapatista movement is a postmodern rebellion not only because the Zapatistas' use of technology and the internet instead of weapons, but also because of their emergence during the collapse of the modern bipolar world and their break away with the traditional national liberation movements: "Their demands for change have become postmodern in that they want a new social and economic order that goes beyond capitalism while also rejecting the twentieth-century socialist project."¹ On the other hand, there are studies that argue although there are postmodern elements in the movement, there are also modern aspects such as nation and capitalism.²: "It is difficult to see how a rebel army of peasants, aware of itself as the product of five hundred years of struggle, that quotes from the Mexican constitution to legitimate its demand that the president of Mexico immediately leave office, that additionally demands work, land, housing, food, health, education, independence, liberty, democracy, justice, and peace for the people of Mexico, can be called a 'postmodern political movement.'"³ Josée Johnston, in turn, leaves aside the debates about modernity and postmodernity and focuses on the Zapatistas' demand for democracy and investigates what he calls the paradoxes of the democratic demands made by an army, the EZLN.⁴

There are also authors who take a Gramscian approach to the Zapatistas and focuses on hegemony, counter hegemony, civil society while arguing that Subcomandante Marcos is the organic intellectual. In this view, the new identity constructed by the Zapatistas is constructed within the struggle and is part of the struggle for hegemony.⁵ Moreover it is argued that the Zapatistas fight a war of position that aims to gather influence in the society instead of fighting a war of maneuver. Kathleen Bruhn compares the EZLN and EPR (*Ejército Popular*

¹ Roger Burbach, *Globalization and Postmodern Politics: From Zapatistas to High-Tech Robber Barons* (London: Pluto Press, 2001), 117.

² Daniel Egan, "Rethinking the Zapatistas: Frantz Fanon and Resistance to Neoliberalism," *Humanity & Society* 30, no. 1 (2006).

³ Daniel Nugent, "Northern intellectuals and the EZLN," *Monthly Review* 47, no. 3 (1995).

⁴ Josée Johnston, "Pedagogical guerrillas, armed democrats, and revolutionary counterpublics: Examining paradox in the Zapatista uprising in Chiapas Mexico," *Theory and Society* 29, no. 4 (2000).

⁵ D. Kanoussi, "El Zapatismo y la politica de la identidad" in *El Zapatismo y la politica*, ed. D. Kanoussi (Mexico D. F.: Plaza y Valdes, 1998) in Mihalis Mentinis, *Zapatistas: The Chiapas Revolt and What It Means for Radical Politics* (London: Pluto Press, 2006), 34.

Revolucionario, Popular Revolutionary Army) in terms of the documents issued by and the discourses of the two groups.⁶

Other authors approach the Zapatista movement as the continuation of the previous struggles in Chiapas while not ignoring the discerning characteristics of the Zapatista movement. Adolfo Gilly, for example, presents the connections between the past and present in terms of the conditions in Chiapas and focuses on the rebellions of the agrarian sector. As "after the revolution, exploitation and its corresponding forms of domination changed much less in Chiapas than the political and economic forms in which they were enveloped"⁷, Gilly places the Zapatistas within the struggles that have taken place in Chiapas. Neil Harvey investigates the development of peasant movements in Chiapas in 1970s and 1980s, the effects of Salinas' neoliberal reforms in Chiapas and touches upon Zapatistas' struggles for indigenous rights, land reform in Chiapas, democratization and women's rights.⁸

Others focus on autonomy in Chiapas, for example Richard Stahler-Sholk emphasizes the dilemmas of autonomy such as the limits of territorial autonomy, the limitation of resources and multiculturalism trap.⁹ Chris Gilbreth and Gerardo Otero discuss the contributions of the Zapatistas to democratization of Mexico and assert that "uprising contributed to an expansion of democracy in the domain of political society but also beyond it—into civil society and the cultural sphere. In addition, it has sought to expand democratization to the economic realm in order to address the social costs of neoliberal market reforms."¹⁰

On the other hand, John Holloway brings in a new concept, dignity, and emphasizes the undefined, anti-definitional, anti-power characteristics of the Zapatista movement. He argues that the Zapatista struggle is not a "Revolution" but a "revolution". It is a revolution as the radical transformation of the society is aimed

⁶ Kathleen Bruhn, "Antonio Gramsci and the Palabra Verdadera: The Political Discourse of Mexico's Guerrilla Forces," *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 41, no. 2 (1999).

⁷ Adolfo Gilly, "Chiapas and the Rebellion of the Enchanted World," in *Rural Revolt in Mexico: US Intervention and the Domain of Subaltern Politics*, ed. Daniel Nugent (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 1998), 279.

⁸ Neil Harvey, *The Chiapas Rebellion: The Struggle for Land and Democracy* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1999).

⁹ Richard Stahler-Sholk, "Resisting Neoliberal Homogenization: The Zapatista Autonomy Movement," *Latin American Perspectives* 34, no 2 (2007).

¹⁰ Chris Gilbreth and Gerardo Otero, "Democratization in Mexico The Zapatista Uprising and Civil Society," *Latin American Perspectives* 28, no.4 (2001).

but it is not a Revolution since there is no grand plan. In this regard, while the aim of the Zapatista movement is clear, to build a society based on dignity, the means to achieve that aim are not defined.¹¹

However, as Mentinis argues, most studies on the Zapatistas tend "to apply ready-made theories to the Zapatista rebellion, and approach it as a materialisation [*sic*], an expression of certain theoretical frameworks" and these studies "fail to see that the Chiapas rebellion is something more than a case study that proves certain theory, that there are elements in the rebellion that force us to go beyond existing theories and invent new categories for understanding it."¹² Therefore, Jacques Rancière's understanding of politics, political and democracy could be useful for an analysis of the Zapatista movement. Jacques Rancière argues that politics can emerge anywhere, anyone can engage in politics as there is no proper subject of politics and politics is actually the presupposition and enactment of equality. Apart from stating that equality of anyone to anyone is the only universal and politics is based on the presupposition of this equality, he does not instruct a method for politics or struggle. As Todd May argues, democratic politics in a Rancièrian sense is not granted from above but emerges from below, is horizontally egalitarian in the sense that those participating are equal, is vertically egalitarian in the sense that those outside of the movement are treated as equals, it is oriented towards non-violent action and may happen anywhere.¹³ In addition, the Zapatistas clearly make clear on many occasions that their intention is not to assume a vanguard position, not to present their method of struggle as the only way and not to tell people what to do: "Zapatismo poses the question: 'What is that excluded me?', 'What is that has isolated me?'...In each place the response is different."¹⁴ In this sense, anyone who is excluded, who is treated unequally can take part in the struggle against exclusion and inequality, while there is not only one way for this struggle. In this regard, analyzing the Zapatista movement from the perspective of Rancière might not be approaching the Zapatista

¹¹ John Holloway, "Dignity's Revolt," in *Zapatista! : Reinventing Revolution in Mexico*, ed. John Holloway (London: Pluto Press, 1998).

¹² Mentinis, 2006, 54.

¹³ Todd May, *Contemporary Political Movements and the Thought of Jacques Rancière* (Cheshire: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), 22.

¹⁴ Simon Tormey, "'Not in my Name': Deleuze, Zapatismo and the Critique of Representation" *Parliamentary Affairs* 59, no: 1 (2006), 150.

movement as a case study that proves Rancière's theory, rather it could be useful for understanding the movement and developing new categories for the study of the Zapatista movement in further research. Moreover, the resemblance between Rancière's thought and the Zapatistas that while there is something against which struggle must take place, there is not one way to carry this struggle is intriguing.

Within this context, this study comprises of four main chapters. The second chapter introduces Rancière's understanding of the political, politics and democracy around the themes of *police*/politics distinction, equality, miscount/wrong and subjectivization. Rancière renames what is usually called politics as the *police*, which is "the set of procedures whereby the aggregation and consent of collectivities is achieved, the organization of powers, the distribution of places and roles, and the systems for legitimizing this distribution."¹⁵ The fundamental characteristic of the *police* is that it partitions the sensible while it also determines the rule on which this partition is based. The parties, which belong to these parts, and what share these parts receive are all decided by the *police*. Whatever or whoever is left outside this partition does not exist according to the *police*. Politics, on the other hand, creates a rupture in this logic and shows that the parts outside this partition, the parts that are not counted exist.

This rupture becomes possible by the presentation of equality. However, equality here is neither something that is distributed nor something that exists or that can be actualized as the result of politics. It is a mere assumption, a claim to be existing political subjects. The presupposition of equality always comes with the claim to be counted as existing political subjects since politics does not have a proper subject of itself. "It occurs when those who have no recognized part in the social order, the sans-part who do not 'count', who are invisible or inaudible politically speaking, assert their egalitarian claim, which is always also a collective claim to existence as political subjects."¹⁶

This claim requires a process of subjectivization, which consists of three moments: argumentative demonstration, theatrical dramatization and impossible

¹⁵Jacques Rancière, *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy*, trans. Julie Rose (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), 28.

¹⁶ Oliver Davis, *Jacques Rancière* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2010), 84.

identification. The argumentative demonstration bases the claim to existence as political subjects on logical grounds using the syllogism of emancipation as Rancière calls while theatrical dramatization is the emergence of the subject in the perceptible realm. The impossible identification, on the other hand, is the relation of the self to an other.

The third chapter gives a brief account of the history of Mexico, starting from the Spanish conquest, as the Zapatistas state in their first declaration that they are the product of 500 years of struggle. This chapter will give the background in which the Zapatista movement emerged and it will consist of five sections: the Conquest and the Colonial Era, the Independence, the *Porfiriato*, the Revolution and the Single Party rule, and Transition to Neoliberalism. In each section, the developments in Mexico will be explained and assessed from the perspective of the indigenous people. The first section will explain the effects of colonization, imposition of Spanish language and culture and the racial hierarchy that was established. Later, the independence struggles between 1810 and 1821 and the post-independence period which was marked with chaos due to the conflicts between liberals and conservatives will be touched upon. Then the *Porfiriato* period and the prominent ideology of this period, positivism, will be explained. The Mexican Revolution following the *Porfiriato* period and the consolidation of the revolution, which culminated in the establishment of the Institutional Revolutionary Party (*Partido Revolucionario Institucional* - PRI) will be analyzed. Finally, Mexico's transition to neoliberalism which took place in the early 80s will be briefly touched upon.

The fourth chapter introduces the Zapatista movement, its emergence and development in the 1980s, and touches upon the events after January 1, 1994. In this chapter, the development of the EZLN prior to 1994, which began in 1983 and lasted 10 years will be explained. The seven stages as told by Subcomandante Marcos will be presented and the organization of the Zapatistas in villages will be stated. Later, the culmination point of this development, the decision to declare war, and the following ceasefire which was taken collectively will be presented. Lastly, the principles of Zapatista movement and its non-hierarchic organization based on equality will be shown by the examples of the practices within the movement and

Zapatista communities, such as the governing principles: “to lead by obeying; to represent, not replace, to work from below and not to seek to rise; to serve, not self-serve; to convince, not conquer; to construct, not destroy; to propose, not impose”¹⁷; the establishment of autonomy and the crucial place of listening within the movement.

The fifth chapter analyzes the Zapatista movement on the basis of three themes in Rancière's thought: the distinction between *police* and politics, equality and subjectivization, which will be formulated as three problems: whether the conditions in which the indigenous people of Chiapas live could be described as the *police* and the Zapatista movement could be seen as a rupture in this *police*; whether equality of anyone to anyone is distributed or presupposed within the movement and whether subjectivization can be observed in the Zapatista movement. Firstly, the post-revolutionary Mexico, nation-building process and later, in 1990s, the efforts to incorporate Mexico into global market will be evaluated with respect to the *police* order. The Zapatistas' emergence as an armed group, as an army will be analyzed and it will be tried to show that the declaration of war was a last resort appealed to be heard by the indigenous. Moreover, it will be argued that this declaration of war was a rupture in the *police* order. Then, the principles of the Zapatistas which are based on equality will be investigated, it will be suggested that these principles were not just words but they were put in use in regular basis. The main argument will be that the Zapatistas have an understanding of equality which is similar to Rancière's. Lastly, it will be asserted that the Zapatista movement is not only an indigenous movement but a movement of all those excluded and visible. In this line, it will be argued that subjectivization process that is central in Rancière's understanding of politics can be observed in the Zapatista movement.

¹⁷“Seven Principles of “Rule by Obeying/Mandar Obedeciendo” of the Zapatista ‘Good Government’ and the National Congress of Indigenous Peoples,” [zapatismo.florycanto.net](http://www.zapatismo.florycanto.net), accessed October 24, 2013.
<http://www.zapatismo.florycanto.net/docs/zapatistasevenprinciplesgoodgovernment.pdf>.

CHAPTER II

Rancière and the Political

Jacques Rancière asserts a ground-clearing claim by taking what is and has been called politics since the antiquity, the system that operates in order to distribute and legitimize, that is, “the set of procedures whereby the aggregation and consent of collectivities is achieved, the organization of powers, the distribution of places and roles, and the systems for legitimizing this distribution”¹⁸ and renaming it as the *police*. However, what is meant here by the term *police* is not the coercive apparatus of the state. Rather, Rancière refers to Foucault here and to the meaning given to the *police* by the 17th and 18th century writers: anything about the man and man’s happiness. Briefly in Foucault, policing or police is not necessarily related to the military aspect, it is actually related to the state’s health. “The police as Foucault discovers it concerns the regulation of and concern for the health and productivity of the lives of a state’s citizens”¹⁹. The term *police* in Foucault is associated with “governmentality” and tries to provide a fully functioning population for the state. However, Rancière does not argue for a necessary connection between governmentality and police and does not limit the use of police only to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. He refers to it as a way of generating the proper social order and maintaining it. In this regard, the term *police* is taken by Rancière as neutral and not pejorative.

Now, in order to present Rancière’s understanding of the political and politics, his political thought will be analyzed under four main headings: the distinction between the *police* and politics, equality, the wrong or the miscount and subjectivization.

¹⁸Rancière, 1998, 28.

¹⁹ Todd May, *The Political Thought of Jacques Rancière* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008), 41.

2.1. The Distinction between the *Police* and Politics

The *police* is strictly related to distribution and the perceptible, and to determining both the parties and who belongs to these parties and the share that will be received by these parties. It “defines the allocation of ways of doing, ways of being, and ways of saying”²⁰ as well as it determines what is visible and sayable and specifies what is speech and what is noise, a specification strictly related to equality. As *the police* here is not the coercive apparatus of the state, it does not necessarily aim to repress, it actually aims to ‘partition the sensible’. ‘Partitioning the sensible’ is “a general law that defines the forms of part-taking by first defining the modes of perception in which they are inscribed”²¹. Rancière uses the word “partition” in a double sense, one of which is separating and excluding while the other is allowing participation. “Partitioning the sensible” are big words, in the sense that it indicates that the sensible, all that exists are determined, the parts that exist are defined, and beyond these existing parts, there are no parts. *The police*, therefore, implies that a void lacks as well. “From Athens in the fifth century B.C. up until our own governments, the party of the rich has only ever said one thing, which is most precisely the negation of politics: there is no part of those who have no part”²². The rich here clearly signifies those who have part in a police order.

Politics, on the other hand, which is sharply different from what we call politics today, which Rancière calls *the police* as stated, is something whose essence “is to disturb this arrangement by supplementing it with a part of the no-part identified with the community as a whole”²³. Therefore, politics shows that there is a void and there is a part that is not counted and that supplements the existing parts, or in other words, the parts that are counted and considered as visible by *the police*. Thus, against the denial of a void or a supplement by *the police*, politics brings into play the void and the supplement by showing their possibility.

In this regard, politics or political activity is antagonistic to *the police*. As seen, *the police* configures the visible, sayable and audible. As stated by Rancière, the aim of the police (as the coercive apparatus of the state), in the case of a

²⁰Rancière, 1998, 29.

²¹ Jacques Rancière, “Ten Theses on Politics” *Theory & Event* 5, no: 3 (2001): 9.

²²Rancière, 1998, 14.

²³Rancière, 2001, 10.

demonstration, is not primarily to arrest the demonstrators but rather to break up the demonstration. The main objective of the police, then, is to assert that there is nothing to see, nothing to say and nothing to hear there, to partition the sensible: “Move along! There is nothing to see here!”²⁴ Now this partition presents us with a conception of one world, in which there is nothing to see. The possibility of the existence of another world, in which there is something to see, within or beyond this former world is denied just as the void and supplementary part(s) are denied. When it comes to politics, dissensus is what is essential to politics in the sense of presenting two worlds in this one world. Politics transforms what is once considered invisible and noise into visible and discourse. It shows that the perceptible as stated by the *police* is not the only perceptible and transforms this perceptible by introducing another perceptible, which was once not perceptible and not accepted as existing. Politics implements “a basically heterogeneous assumption, that of a part of those who have no part, an assumption that, at the end of the day, itself demonstrates the sheer contingency of the order, the equality of any speaking being with any other speaking being”²⁵. Therefore, these two worlds, the world of the *police* and the world of that heterogeneous assumption, two processes, one of which is the *police* process and the other is the process of equality come together. Politics occurs when this two meet, in Rancière’s words: “the political is the encounter between two heterogeneous processes”²⁶.

The *police*, in other words, indicates a hierarchy in the society, a hierarchy which is based on the assumption that people have different capacities, therefore must have different positions. This hierarchical society represents a whole consisting of known and counted parts. However, the disagreement over the counting of these parts is always possible, which is the essence of politics according to Rancière and this possibility is excluded in the *police*.²⁷ There is no doubt that the hierarchical order of the police is inegalitarian. Politics, whose essence is the disagreement over the counting of the parts, opposes this inegalitarian order of the *police* through presupposing the equality and by doing so, politics shows the arbitrariness of the

²⁴Ibid., 10.

²⁵Rancière, 1998, 30.

²⁶Jacques Rancière, “Politics, Identification, and Subjectivization” *October* 61 (1992): 58.

²⁷Davis, 2010, 79.

police order. The reason is that the counting of the parts includes a major wrong, and the revelation of this wrong as well as the declaration of the people who seem unequal to be equal, is actually “the sudden revelation of the ultimate *anarchy* on which any hierarchy rests”.²⁸ This ultimate anarchy is related to Rancière’s idea that inequality is only possible due to equality, and this will be analyzed in the next section on equality.

Before that, it should be noted that not all police orders are the same. There may be a better police order and a worse police order. A good police order may provide lots of good things and there may be a preferable police order to another police order. However, what interests Rancière is the very nature of the police order. Of course, the police order in which we live is better than the police order in which, for example, slaves lived in. Nonetheless, “the regime of public opinion as gauged by the poll and of the unending exhibition of the real is today the normal form the police in Western society takes. Whether the police is sweet and kind does not make it any less the opposite of politics.”²⁹

2.2. Equality

Another point which needs to be noted about politics is that it has no specific objects, which means that everything can be political. This, however, does not suggest the same suggested by the slogan “everything is political”. Rancière sees politics as a possibility that actualizes rarely. “...politics can be anywhere: it can potentially manifest itself at any time, for example in the context of a dispute over immigration and nationality, a strike by workers or an educational dispute”.³⁰ The political comes not with the object or the place of an action. What makes an action political is the form of that action. This form is shaped by asserting equality through a dispute, by claiming that a part that has no part in a police order is equal to the parts that have parts. “So nothing is political in itself”.³¹ However, everything can be political if it allows for the meeting of the police logic and egalitarian logic. “A strike is not political when it calls for reforms rather than a better deal or when it attacks

²⁸Rancière, 1998, 16

²⁹Ibid., 31.

³⁰Davis, 2010, 79.

³¹Rancière, 1998, 32.

the relationships of authority rather than the inadequacy of wages. It is political when it reconfigures the relationships that determine the workplace in its relation to the community”.³² The reason is that the general law of the police “defines the forms of part-taking by first defining the modes of perception in which they are inscribed”³³ and politics or the political should interfere and transform these modes of perception in order to transform the forms of part-taking.

Rancière’s idea that nothing is political in itself comes from the fact that political is only possible with the principle of equality, a principle which does not belong to the political. Equality is not something that is implemented by politics, something that is written in the law or an aim, a target that will be actualized by politics. Nor it is the liberal conception of distributive equality. As May argues, by characterizing equality with distribution, a distributor is presupposed, which implies a hierarchy between the distributors and the ones who receive this distribution. Furthermore, since the distributor assumes an active role and decides on what will be distributed to whom and to what extent, the liberal conception of distributive equality gives a passive role to the ones who receive the distribution. This passivity, along with the hierarchy implied, indicates that at the heart of the distributive equality, there is actually no equality.³⁴ In Rancière’s account, however, equality is not something that is to be distributed; rather it is something to be presupposed. “It is a mere assumption that needs to be discerned within the practices implementing it”.³⁵ In this regard, in Rancière’s thought there is no place for hierarchical organizations aiming at creating or asserting equality. What these hierarchical organizations in fact do is to distribute equality, which cannot be distributed but presupposed. Also, the distributive equality or the passive equality is nothing but policing in Rancière’s understanding since the distributors determine the part-taking. Determining the parts, specifying the ones who take part and who do not take part and deciding on which part will get what is possible in a police order. Therefore, distributive or passive equality has nothing to do with politics.

³²Ibid., 32.

³³Rancière, 2001, 9.

³⁴May, 1998, 4.

³⁵Rancière, 1998, 33.

Politics and equality might be taken into consideration along with the distinction between speech and voice and the ones who have speech and the ones who have voice. “The voice, according to Aristotle, is an organ designed for a limited purpose. It serves animals in general to indicate or show sensations of pain or pleasure”.³⁶ Thus, there are two categories: the category of those who have the logos and of those who do not. Those who have logos can use the capacity of speech while those who do not can only express pain or pleasure. The distinction between these two indicates an inequality. Politics, however, is not based on this distinction. To base politics on this distinction would mean that there are ones who are proper for politics and there are those who are not proper; there are the ones who should be counted and those who should not be counted. This distinction “is, on the contrary, one of the stakes of the very dispute that institutes politics”.³⁷ The idea here is that this distinction between speech and voice is made within the police order and it defines what is understood as speech and what is considered to be voice, therefore, this distinction cannot be the basis of politics. Politics comes into play when this distinction that is produced and reproduced by the police order is challenged and when it is asserted and shown that what is once considered to be voice, to be the meaningless noise which expresses pleasure or pain, can be understood as speech.

Here, the tale of the Roman plebeians on Aventine Hill, a tale told by Livy, rewritten by Ballanche in 1829 and referred by Rancière proves to be an important example. In this tale, the Roman plebeians retreat to Aventine Hill and an ambassador, Menenius Agrippa is sent to them in order to bring back them to order. Menenius Agrippa tells a fable to the plebeians, which briefly associates the human body with the society and refers to the patricians as the stomach while referring to the plebeians as the rest of the body. Rancière points out that the patricians did not recognize that the plebeians had the capacity of speech at that time. “They do not speak because they are beings without a name, deprived of logos...” and “whoever is nameless cannot speak”.³⁸

³⁶Ibid., 21.

³⁷Ibid., 22.

³⁸Ibid., 23.

What Menenius Agrippa does in this tale has a crucial place in Rancière's understanding of equality. To tell a fable to the plebeians is to accept that plebeians had the ability to understand the speech and the ability of speech. Rancière quotes Ballanche:

They have speech like us, they dared tell Menenius! Was it a god that shut Menenius's mouth, that dazzled his eyes, that made his ears ring? Did some holy daze take hold of him?...He was somehow unable to respond that they had only transitory speech, a speech that is a fugitive sound, a sort of howling, a sign of want and not an expression of intelligence. They were deprived of the eternal word which was in the past and would be in the future.³⁹

This quotation clearly depicts the police order in which the patricians and plebeians lived. That police order determines what is considered to be speech and what is considered to be noise. Also, since speech is closely related to logos, the police order also defines those who have logos and those who do not. However, the plebeians' retreat to Aventine Hill, proves to be a political act, an act of politics that interrupts that police order. The fable told by Menenius is a reflection of police order in itself but the political significance of this fable can be clearly seen in the fact that the withdrawal of the plebs and Agrippa's visiting them at the hill in order to tell a fable, in a way, presupposed their political existence, which was not recognized before.⁴⁰

This idea is also inherent Rancière's claim that "in the final analysis, inequality is only possible through equality".⁴¹ The train of thought here is as follows: the order of society can exist because while some command, others obey. However, to ensure that order and obedience, one should firstly understand the order and understand that one should obey. And this understanding presupposes the equality between the ones who command and ones who obey. As in the case of Menenius, the ones who command have to encounter the ones who obey and explain

³⁹Ibid., 24.

⁴⁰Davis, 2010, 83.

⁴¹Rancière, 1998, 17.

them why they should obey just in line with the fable told. This action, in turn, indicates that both the ones who obey and the ones who command are already equal.

Another point that should be made about politics is that it has nothing to do with interests or shares. The primary concern in politics is the existence of parties and acknowledgement of them as parties. “The double sense of logos, as speech and as account, is the space where this conflict is played out”.⁴² Logos as speech itself determines the gap between speech and its account in the police order. “And the *aisthēsis* that shows itself in this speech is the very quarrel over the constitution of the *aisthēsis*, over this partition of the perceptible through which bodies find themselves in community”.⁴³ That is, the perceptible itself partitions the perceptible and in the case of a police order constitutes itself as the only perceptible. The perceptible in the patrician and plebeian conflict referred above is that there are no parties constituted against the patricians and this perceptible denies the existence of another perceptible which is the existence of another party, the party of the plebeians. Since there are no parties against the patricians, there is no political stage. As quoted by Rancière: “‘Your misfortune is not to be,’ a patrician tells the plebs, ‘and this misfortune is inescapable.’”⁴⁴ As seen in this example, in police order, there exists no common stage. Politics, at this point, is the very conflict regarding the existence of this common stage and the existence of the parties as parties. Parties, in this sense, are not pre-determined and do not exist before the conflict, a conflict that is presented by the parties and through which the parties are accepted as parties. Politics, therefore, does not exist through asserting interests. Rather;

Politics exists because those who have no right to be counted as speaking beings make themselves of some account, setting up a community by the fact of placing in common a wrong that is nothing more than this very confrontation, the contradiction of two worlds in a single world: the world where they are and the world where they are not, the world where there is something “between” them and those who do not acknowledge

⁴²Ibid., 26.

⁴³Ibid., 26.

⁴⁴Ibid., 26.

them as speaking beings who count and the world where there is nothing.⁴⁵

In addition, associating politics with interests and in this way, reducing it to pursue of interests might be seen as a trick of the police order. It might be argued that claiming that the other party only pursues of its own interests is to associate them with the Aristotelian conception of voice which only indicates sensations of pleasure or pain. Therefore, this association of the other party with interests is a way of reducing them to a part having no logos, even to a part that actually has no part.

Therefore, it would not be misleading to state that instead of interests, equality is the central theme in Rancière's understanding of politics. This equality emerges as challenging the police's partition of the perceptible and showing the possibility of another world in which those who do not count are counted.

For example, Rancière refers to the strike of French tailoring trade workers in Paris in 1833. He argues that the publications made by the workers after the 1830 Revolution started to ask the same question, which was whether French people were equal or not. These publications, according to him, "tend to take the approximate form of a syllogism."⁴⁶ The major premise of the syllogism was the fact that in the 1830 Charter it was stated that all French people were equal before the law. The minor premises in the case of 1833 strike were that the workers' demands regarding the rates of pay, working hours and conditions were not responded by the master tailors; a bosses' federation was established and despite the law stating that bosses' federation were to be treated as the workers' federation were treated, only the workers' federation was prosecuted; and the Public Prosecutor to the King, Monsieur Persil declared that workers were not equal to the other men.

Therefore, it is obvious that there is a contradiction between the major premise and the minor premise, the law says something and the deeds contradict this say. Rancière, at this point, argues that there are two distinct ways of looking at this contradiction. One is the way which has become the normal and in which it is stated that the law gives the illusion of equality and hides inequality. The way in which the

⁴⁵Ibid., 27.

⁴⁶Jacques Rancière, *On the Shores of Politics*, trans. Liz Heron (London: Verso, 1995), 45.

workers of that strike responded, however, quite differs from this normal way. They decided that either the major premise or the minor premise had to be changed. This way of responding is unique in the sense that “taking what is usually thought of as something to be dismissed, as a groundless claim, it transforms it into its opposite – into the grounds for a claim, into a space open to dispute”.⁴⁷ Therefore, the workers, instead of dismissing the Charter article that read all French people are equal before the law, took that article and based their equality demands on that article. Either that article had to be changed and state that all French people were not equal before the law; or their bosses and Monsieur Persil had to change their acts and speeches. Thus, the written claim of equality was not nothing, it was actually powerful, a power in the sense of creating “a space where equality can state its own claim”.⁴⁸ In this way, the Charter article was used as a proof and reason for the assertion of equality. Through their actions, the workers verified the article on equality. Therefore, the strike had a form of logical proof.

This mentality of strike was quite different from the previous strikes’ mentality. In previous strikes, workers refused to work, as a power play, they engaged in a logic of power struggle. Here, an example given by Rancière should be noted: The revolt of the Scythian slaves. According to the tale told by Herodotus, the Scythians put out the eyes of slaves, at least until the Scythian warriors left their homeland for war. These warriors stayed away from their homeland for a generation, during which a generation of slaves whose eyes were not put out was raised. This generation of slaves realized they were equals to their masters and prepared for war until the warriors returned their homeland. The warriors’ attack was defeated and a warrior suggested to his friends to leave aside the weapons and grab their whips in order to remind the slaves that they were slaves. This tactic was successful as the slaves gave up without fighting when they saw the whips.⁴⁹

At this point, it should be remembered that politics has nothing to do with the power relationships or the exercise of power according to Rancière: “To identify politics with the exercise of, and struggle to possess, power is to away with politics”.

⁴⁷Ibid., 47.

⁴⁸Ibid., 47.

⁴⁹Rancière, 1998, 12.

The example presented above signifies that a power relationship was tried to be established by the slaves, therefore, there exists no sign of politics in addition to that their endeavor to establish a power play was in vain as they were defeated.⁵⁰ The slaves tried to engage in a logic of power struggle and since this logic, this game is of the masters, the slaves were not able to overcome their masters. On the contrary, the example of the plebeians at Aventine Hill is not an example of power play. Their retreat to Aventine Hill was not an indicator of a power play rather it was that “they established another order, another partition of the perceptible, by constituting themselves not as warriors equal to other warriors but as speaking beings sharing the same properties as those who deny them these”.⁵¹

Therefore, the distinction between the strike of French tailoring trade workers in Paris in 1833 and the previous strikes is as follows: the strikes before 1833, as the Scythian slaves’ revolt, engage in a power play and try to establish a power relation while the 1833 strike, just as the plebeians’ retreat to Aventine Hill, tries to constitute a different order a different partition of the perceptible. While constituting this unrecognized world within the recognized world, they do not constitute themselves as equals in terms of power, rather they assert themselves as equals in terms of being speaking beings. Therefore whereas the strikes before 1833 as well as the Scythian slaves’ revolt cannot be considered to be politics or political according to Rancière; the 1833 strike and the retreat to Aventine Hill are political.

Politics is a specific rupture in the logic of *arche*. It does not simply presuppose the rupture of the ‘normal’ distribution of positions between the one who exercises power and the one subject to it. It also requires a rupture in the idea that there are dispositions ‘proper’ to such classifications.⁵²

In this regard, the strikes before 1833 and the revolt of the Scythian slaves were not political in the sense that they tried to introduce a rupture in terms of changing the placements of the actors in a power game instead of changing the game

⁵⁰Rancière, 2001, 1.

⁵¹Rancière, 1998, 24.

⁵²Rancière, 2001, 4.

itself. They tried to be exercisers of the power instead of being the subjects on whom the power is exercised. On the other hand, the 1833 strike and the plebeians of the Aventine Hill tried to change the structure in which the power is exercised. Their aim was to create a rupture in the logic of *arche* by indicating that the ones who exercise power over them actually do not have the right to exercise power.

2.3. The Wrong or the Miscount

In order to be able to present the notion of the wrong or the miscount, we must turn back and refer to Aristotle again. Aristotle's definition of the political nature of the human is noteworthy; this definition signifies the distinction between the human and the animal. The distinction at question here is between the power of speech and voice. Speech is different from voice in the sense that while voice indicates only pain and pleasure and is a common capacity for all animals, speech expresses what is useful and what is harmful and also what is just and what is unjust. The high and political nature of the human lies in distinction, the distinction between the animal that can indicate its pleasure or pain and the human that can, in addition, express a perception of the useful/harmful and just/unjust.

However, we see in Aristotle that the expression of useful and harmful leads to having the perception of just and unjust. Aside from the fact that while the good is objective and pleasurable and painful are subjective, it is quite a difficult job to discern the unpleasant feeling of a blow from feeling injured from this blow; it is quite another difficult job to establish a connection between the useful and harmful and the just and unjust.

First of all, useful and harmful are falsely opposed terms in Aristotle's usage: *sumpheron* and *blaberon*. *Blaberon*, to start with, has two meanings: "in one sense it is the lot of unpleasantness that falls to an individual for whatever reason, whether it be through a natural catastrophe or human action, and in the other, it is the negative consequence that an individual suffers as a result of their action or, more often, the action of another".⁵³ It is clear now that *blaberon* points to a relationship between two parties. On the other hand, *sumpheron* does not signify a relationship

⁵³Rancière, 1998, 3.

between two parties but a relationship to oneself: “it is the advantage that an individual or a group gains or hopes to gain from an action”.⁵⁴ Therefore, *sumpheron* does not imply a reciprocal relationship as *blaberon* does and those two are not opposites of each other.

Now, according to Plato and Aristotle, in the just city, *sumpheron* does not have a *blaberon* which corresponds to it. The justice referred to here has nothing to do with the calculation of the interests of the individuals or reparation of the damage done by others. Justice here is selecting the right measure to determine each part’s share from the common. Justice, according to Book V of *The Nichomachean Ethics*, “consists in not taking more than one’s share of advantageous things or less than one’s share of disadvantageous things”.⁵⁵ In this way, by identifying the harmful, the disadvantageous with *blaberon* and the advantageous with *sumpheron*, it is now possible to establish the connection between the useful and the just: justice acts on the matter of advantageous and disadvantageous, *blaberon* and *sumpheron*, and dictates to take the appropriate share to everyone.

However, this definition of justice is not a political order. In order for the political to begin, it must be stopped calculating the profit and loss, and what must be interested is the common lots, the distribution of them. The calculation of profits and losses signifies a political community resembling a contract made between economic actors. For the political, on the other hand, we need something different. This is the root of the problem according to Rancière: the logic of exchange, of calculating the interests is submitted to the logic of common good. In other words, arithmetical equality is submitted to geometric equality. The common good, therefore, requires that the shares in the community should be determined proportionally to the *axia* of the parts in the community, which is the value brought by the part to the community and the right that this value gives to the part in sharing the common power. The problem here is that this kind of geometric equality implies a construction and a counting of the parts, which in turn may mask a wrong, a miscount, maybe the *blaberon* itself: “Politics arises from a count of community ‘parts’, which is always a

⁵⁴Ibid., 3.

⁵⁵Ibid., 5.

false count, a double count, or a miscount”.⁵⁶ In other words, the counting of the parts in a community always excludes a part, or, states that a certain part is taken into account while actually that is not taken into account. This is the actual *blaberon*, and politics emerges due to this *blaberon*.

When looked to the *aixai* (plural of the *aixa*) referred by Aristotle, there are three: *oligoi* (the wealth), *arête* (the excellence or virtue) and *eleutheria* (freedom). In Aristotle’s political philosophy, these three reflects three distinct political regimes which are, on their own, not good regimes. However, if these three regimes can be combined together, then the city might have a good regime directed at the common good. The problem is that against the oligarchs having the *aixa* of wealth and the aristocrats having the *aixa* of excellence or virtue, what power can the demos or the people hold with their *aixa* of freedom? Among the *aixai*, the wealth of the oligarchs stands out although this particular quality of wealth is one which belongs to the realm of arithmetical equality. But the question is what is brought by the freedom of the demos to the community. According to Rancière, this is the point at which the miscount emerges. The freedom of the people is not a property that is determinable, it is an invention. The ground of the fact that anyone can be counted within the party of people, of demos is being born in a particular city: “The simple impossibility of the *oligoi*’s reducing their debtors to slavery was transformed into the appearance of a freedom that was to be the positive property of the people as a part of the community”.⁵⁷

At this point, Rancière, in order to give an account of democracy, refers to the ancient Greeks, especially to Athens after the abolishment of enslavement for debt. Miscount, one of the essential themes of Rancière’s philosophy is notable at this point. Anyone born in Athens, each citizen of Athens became a part within the society after the abolishment of slavery for debt. This freedom was an empty freedom since it only meant not being a slave. However, this freedom also prevented the identification of domination with wealth. Freedom became a common property regardless of the fact that the people, demos, did not have any qualification such as wealth or virtue. Through freedom, “the demos attributes to itself as its proper lot the

⁵⁶Ibid., 6.

⁵⁷Ibid., 7.

equality that belongs to all citizens”⁵⁸ and the demos identifies itself with the community at whole. Freedom, in this sense, emerges and causes a rupture in the logic of oligarchy by preventing the government of the oligarchy according to the arithmetical rules of calculating interests, profits and debts.

However, the miscount is not limited to this; in fact freedom is not a qualification proper to the demos at all. The demos’, the people’s only qualification is having no positive qualification while aristocrats have virtue, or oligarchs have wealth although they share the same freedom: the individuals of the demos are free like the aristocrats or oligarchs. It is this freedom shared with the ones superior to the demos which gives the specific qualification of the demos. The people, through this shared freedom, can claim the equality belonging to all citizens. Through this claim, the party of demos, of people also identifies itself with the whole community, and does so in the name of the wrong done to them.

The fact that the demos attributes itself the equality and identifies itself with the whole community indicates that there has been a miscount in the society, a miscount of the parts in the sense that the status quo, the police order, has determined the parts who had part in the society and concluded that those who had no part had no part. Rancière sees a good knowledge of democracy in Plato’s hatred of democracy and states that Plato is aware of the “democracy’s miscount, which is, after all, merely the fundamental miscount of politics”.⁵⁹ Politics is possible due to the fact that the parts of the whole community are counted wrong. But before that, the only qualification of the demos, which is having no qualification at all, brings virtue, the property of the aristocrats, into question, which is the possibility that virtue actually does not exist and the *aristoi* is another name for *oligoi*. In fact Aristotle also acknowledges this to some extent and admits that there are only two parties in the city, the rich and the poor: “almost everywhere the wellborn and the welloff are coextensive.”⁶⁰

It is clear that the irreducibility of these two distinct classes, of the rich and the poor manifests a struggle between them. However, this does not mean that this

⁵⁸Ibid., 8.

⁵⁹Ibid., 10.

⁶⁰ Aristotle, *Politics*, IV, 1294, a 19-20, trans. T. A. Sinclair, revised by Trevor J. Saunders (London: Penguin Classics, 1992) in Ibid., 11.

struggle is a social reality with which politics deals with. It is what institutes politics actually. The part that has no part, the part of the poor does not exist prior to politics; it exists together with the politics. “Politics exists when the natural order of domination is interrupted by the institution of a part of those who have no part”.⁶¹ This is the manifestation of the distinction between the police and politics. The natural order of domination, in other words, the police determines the parts in the society, those who have no part according to this counting of the parts, then, claims that they have a part actually and institute that part, which in turn interrupts the police. This is when the politics exists. This is where equality comes into play.

2.4. Subjectivization

Another crucial aspect of politics according to Rancière is subjectivization. The main reason for the importance of subjectivization is that the party having no part does not exist prior to politics. Since politics does not have a proper subject of itself, politics is a process of becoming subject. We have mentioned that equality and its presupposition play a crucial role in Rancière’s philosophy. The presupposition of equality always comes with the claim to be counted as existing political subjects, that is with subjectivization. The process of subjectivization has three moments: argumentative demonstration, theatrical dramatization and ‘heterologic disidentification’.⁶²

For the argumentative demonstration, we may refer back to the French tailors’ strike in 1833. The syllogism in the case of this strike consisted of one major premise and third minor premises, and the direction chosen by the workers was not to declare that the major premise, the statement that “all the French are equal before the law” in the Charter of 1830, was just a trickery, but it was to assert that according to logic either the major premise or minor premises had to be changed. We see in Rancière that he does not disregard the written equality declarations, “but only if they are taken up confidently with a view to verifying them rather than regarded as overly optimistic aspirations or illusory misdescriptions of reality”.⁶³ Thus, Rancière

⁶¹Ibid., 11.

⁶²Davis, 2010, 84.

⁶³Davis, 2010, 85.

is not naïve to claim that these declarations, documents will create equality, rather he sees these declarations and documents as a way of verifying the equality. Rancière, also accepts that there is universality in politics, there is only one universality which is equality. However, it's not a value sharing the essence of Humanity or Reason. "Equality is not a value to which one appeals; it is a universal that must be supposed, verified, and demonstrated in each case".⁶⁴ In this regard, the excluded groups can appeal to Man, Human Being and the Rights of Man just as in the case of French tailors. These concepts to which they appeal are not universal, however, the consequences following the demonstration and the way of this demonstration are universal. Rancière summarizes the logical schema of a social protest in this way: "Do we or do we not belong to the category of men or citizens or human beings, and what follows from this?"⁶⁵ This is the argumentative and logical demonstration in Rancière.

Now, the second moment of subjectivization is theatrical dramatization. The reason it's called theatrical dramatization can be firstly found in Ten Theses on Politics in which Rancière states that what a police officer does in the case of a demonstration is, instead of interpellating the demonstrators, to break up the crowd: "It is, first of all, a reminder of the obviousness of what there is, or rather, of what there isn't: 'Move along! There is nothing to see here!'"⁶⁶ This is the partition of the sensible by the police order. Politics, on the contrary, has to reconfigure this partition and this space partitioned by the police order. The space belongs to moving along according to the police order, however, politics transforms this space into one in which a subject can appear. Another reason for subjectivization to be theatrical is that the appearance of a subject in the space transformed by politics is also an appearance in terms of perception, visibility and audibility. Through subjectivization a subject that cannot be perceived, seen and heard once emerges and becomes perceived, seen and heard after the emergence. In addition, the subject acts and pretends that he or she is something that he or she is not to become that something.

⁶⁴Rancière, 1992, 60.

⁶⁵Ibid., 60.

⁶⁶Rancière, 2001, 10.

In other words, the subject that emerges pretends he or she is equal to anyone, he or she can be heard, seen and perceived in order to be equal, heard, seen and perceived.

The third moment of subjectivization is called heterologic disidentification by Davis. Rancière defines the process of subjectivization as “the formation of a one that is not a self but is the relation of a self to an other”.⁶⁷ Here, he gives the example of Auguste Blanqui, who was one of the revolutionary leaders in France in the nineteenth century. During his prosecution for rebellion, the prosecutor asked him his profession and his answer was proletarian. When the prosecutor told him that it was not a profession, he answered “it is the profession of the majority of our people who are deprived of political rights”.⁶⁸ The thing is that Blanqui was not a worker, however, according to Rancière he was right since proletarian was the name for an outcast, meaning the name for the people who are excluded and denied to have an identity in a police order, not the name of a social group that could be identified in sociological terms. In this regard, subjectivization becomes disidentification as well.

The logic of subjectivization is a logic related to the other, according to Rancière, firstly for it is simply not the assertion of an identity, it is also the refusal of an identity imposed by the police order. “Policy is about ‘right’ names, names that pin people down to their place and work. Politics is about ‘wrong’ names – misnomers that articulate a gap and connect with a wrong”.⁶⁹ Secondly, subjectivization is a demonstration which supposes an other. And thirdly, the logic inherent in subjectivization requires an impossible identification, for which Rancière gives the example of one of the 1968 slogans that “We are all German Jews”. It is clear that the French youth who shouted this slogan were not really German Jews, however, they tried to identify themselves with German Jews in an impossible way. Another example given by Rancière is the identification with the Algerians who were abused, beaten and killed by the French police in 1961. As Rancière states “we could not identify with those Algerians, but we *could* question our identification with the ‘French people’ in whose name they had been murdered”.⁷⁰ Therefore, they could become political subjects between two identities, the French and the Algerians. They

⁶⁷Rancière, 1992, 60.

⁶⁸Ibid., 61.

⁶⁹Ibid., 62.

⁷⁰Ibid., 62.

could not assume the French identity since the Algerians were killed for that identity, and they could not assume the Algerian identity since they were not really Algerians.

CHAPTER III

A Brief History of Mexico

The First Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle, which is EZLN's declaration of war, starts by stating that:

TO THE PEOPLE OF MEXICO:

MEXICAN BROTHERS AND SISTERS:

We are a product of 500 years of struggle: first against slavery, then during the War of Independence against Spain led by insurgents, then to avoid being absorbed by North American imperialism, then to promulgate our constitution and expel the French empire from our soil, and later the dictatorship of Porfirio Diaz denied us the just application of the Reform laws and the people rebelled and leaders like Villa and Zapata emerged, poor men just like us.⁷¹

This is why it is needed to include a brief history of Mexico. Since EZLN positions itself with reference to a 500 years of struggle, it is quite crucial to understand this continuous struggle, its reasons and against whom and how this struggle is carried out. Therefore, this chapter will give the outlines of Mexican history on which the 500-year oppression and resistance is shaped.

3.1. The Conquest and the Colonial Era (1521 – 1810)

The first encounter between the indigenous and the Spanish took place in 1517 when an expedition led by Fransisco Hernàndez de Còrdoba sailed from Cuba, which was then a Spanish colony, and landed in Yucatàn.⁷² However, this was not the last. After a second expedition sent in order to gather information, a third one led by Hernàn Cortés was sent from Cuba. "In the year 1519, the Aztec year of One Reed, Cortés landed on the Maya island of Cozumel. Accompanying him were 550

⁷¹"First Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle," struggle.ws, accessed February 20, 2013. <http://struggle.ws/mexico/ezln/ezlnwa.html>.

⁷² Philip L. Russell, *The History of Mexico* (New York and London: Routledge, 2010), 15.

Europeans, 16 horses, attack dogs, and some small cannon.”⁷³ And the Cortés expedition sealed the faith for the Aztec Empire. The Spanish defeated the Aztecs through their advanced warfare technology, the alliance they made with the Tlaxcalans and they entered into the great Aztec city Tenochtitlan on the eightieth day of the siege they laid, on August 13, 1521.⁷⁴ Thus the end of Aztec Empire came. The Spanish, through continuing expeditions, “laid the basis for Spanish colonization, which was more pervasive than that of the Aztecs.”⁷⁵ This colonization meant the imposition of the Spanish language and culture, which also meant the natives’ deprivation of their direct control on their land. As Russell quotes Enrique Florescano, a Mexican historian:

Pre-Hispanic man was totally integrated with the earth, his land, his community, nature, and the cosmos. This deep, inextricable integration began to disappear with increasing rapidity when the Spanish arrived and took the land. Upon losing their land, and as the nature of its use changed radically, the Indians lost their place in the world and their relationship with other men, nature, and the cosmos.⁷⁶

This is the reason why the Land Reform has been highly emphasized during and after the Mexican Revolution and has been a question on the agenda of indigenous right demands.

The indigenous who allied with the Spanish saw the Spanish as an opportunity to bring down the Aztec empire and dominance, however, soon it became clear that the destruction of the Aztec empire would not benefit the indigenous, but benefit the Spanish. “The Spaniards intended to put themselves into the position held by the Aztec elite and rule their conquered territory in a substantially similar manner, though on a different religious basis.”⁷⁷

⁷³ Lynn V. Foster, *A Brief History of Mexico* (New York: Checkmark Books, 2007), 50.

⁷⁴ Burton Kirkwood, *History of Mexico* (Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2000), 45.

⁷⁵ Russell, 2010, 28.

⁷⁶ Enrique Florescano, *Origen y desarrollo de los problemas agrarios de México, 1500–1821* (Mexico City: Era), 21–22 in Russell, 2010, 28.

⁷⁷ Brian Hamnett, *A Concise History of Mexico* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 58.

When it comes to the effects of the conquest, the immediate one was the epidemics caused by the European diseases. “The epidemics following the Conquest caused population loss exceeding that caused by the Black Death in fifteenth-century Europe. An eyewitness account estimated 60 to 90 percent mortality from the 1545–1548 epidemic alone.”⁷⁸ The most lethal diseases for the indigenous, according to modern scholars, were smallpox, typhus and influenza. The other reasons of the declining population were villagers’ becoming unable to provide for themselves and their community due to the increase in the Spanish’s labor demands, “Spanish atrocities, especially during the first wave of the conquest” and “the incorporation of Indian women into the reproductive system of the whites.”⁷⁹

In the face of this declining population, the Spanish increasingly needed labor. In order to meet his need, the *repartimiento*, which obligated the indigenous to work for the Spanish for a certain number of days a year, was established in 1549. The indigenous who tried to escape this service and the indigenous leaders who could not provide the worker number demanded were subjected to prison, fine or corporal punishment. As a result of this institution, products such as wheat were provided, the laborers were used for mining and construction. The wages paid to the *repartimiento* laborers were extremely low and these forced laborers were prohibited to demand higher wages by the Spanish Crown.

In the seventeenth century, the decline of the indigenous population continued due to the continuing Spanish acquisition of the indigenous lands, and the indigenous’ fulfilling *repartimiento* duties instead of providing for themselves and their communities. However, in 1620s, the indigenous population began to increase as the indigenous developed immunity against the European diseases to some extent and as the productivity of indigenous increased due to the fact that they learnt and incorporated some Spanish elements that increased productivity.⁸⁰ Nevertheless, this increase in population emerged late and could not obstruct the community from being predominantly European and *mestizo*.⁸¹

⁷⁸Russell, 2010, 32.

⁷⁹Ibid., 33.

⁸⁰Russell, 2010, 34.

⁸¹ Mestizo: (in Latin America) a person of mixed race, especially one having Spanish and American Indian parentage. ("Mestizo,"

The *repartimiento* institution was abolished in 1632, except some mining operations. As many indigenous left their community to work in *haciendas*⁸², mines and cities not to be forced to do *repartimiento* services, the importance of this institution in the economy decreased. In this sense, the concept of wage labor emerged as the control of indigenous labor passed to the employers from the administrators of the *repartimiento*, namely officers of the Crown. This indicated that the Crown's power over the production in Mexico declined. "Initially a temporary arrangement, wage payment soon became a permanent system. As Indians lost their lands or failed to meet the financial responsibilities of the tribute payments or wished to obtain some income, they hired out to the *hacendados*⁸³, owners of *obrajes*⁸⁴, or mine owners."⁸⁵

Carlos II, the Spanish King died in 1700 without any heirs to the throne, which resulted in the emergence of a new dynasty, the Bourbon dynasty. After coming to power, the dynasty implemented a series of reforms known as the Bourbon reforms. The reforms resulted in great increases in taxes as well as that the regime became increasingly absolutist. During the reign of Carlos III (1759 – 1788), the king and his ministers saw that absolutism was the only way to solve the problems of the country. The administrative aspect of the Bourbon Reforms included the replacement of 200 regional administrative units called provincial *corregidores* with 12 regional *intendentes*. In addition, while the former dynasty, the Habsburgs regarded Mexico and the New Spain with the same status with other regions of Spain, "...the Bourbons viewed Mexico more as a modern colony, serving to provide revenue to the Crown."⁸⁶

<http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/mestizo?q=mestizo>, Accessed February 10, 2014.)

⁸² Hacienda: (in Spanish-speaking countries or regions) a large estate or plantation with a dwelling house. ("Hacienda," <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/hacienda?q=hacienda>, Accessed February 10 2014.)

⁸³ Hacendado: the owner of a hacienda. ("Hacendado," <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/hacendado?q=hacendado>, Accessed February 10 2014.)

⁸⁴ Obraje: logging camp. ("Obraje," <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/translate/spanish-english/obraje>, Accessed February 10 2014.)

⁸⁵ Kirkwood, 2000, 57.

⁸⁶ Russell, 2010, 35.

As the result of these reforms, Mexico became a major source of income to Spain. Between 1712 and 1798, revenue supplied by New Spain to the mother country increased from 3 million pesos to more than 20 million. The tribute Indians paid rose from 200,000 pesos in the 1660s to 1 million pesos in 1779. In 1790, New Spain contributed 44 percent more per capita to imperial coffers than did Spaniards. As historian John Lynch noted, by increasing the monetary demands on New Spain, the Bourbons “gained a revenue and lost an empire.”⁸⁷

However, the racial hierarchy continued to exist after the reforms were implemented, even in the age of Enlightenment. Despite the fact that the economy flourished, the wealth continued to accumulate in the whites’ hands. During this time there emerged four central racial categories in Mexico: Europeans (Spaniards), *Mestizos*, the indigenous and the slaves. During the first years of the conquest, the position of individuals in the society was determined according to the participation in the conquest. However, later, after the arrival of more Spanish in Mexico, other factors became important in determining one’s position. For example, being born in Spain gave a higher social status than being born in the New World.

Spaniards were the elites of the Mexican society but as mentioned there was stratification among them as well. The ones who were born in Spain were called *Peninsulares*, and the ones who were born in New Spain were called *Creoles*. *Creoles* were subordinate to the *Peninsulares* and their access to top offices, which were dominated by the *Peninsulares*, was limited.

Many in Spain believed in the inferiority of the colonial environment, arguing that the atmosphere produced an individual who was physically, mentally, and morally inferior. *Peninsulares* thus viewed the *Creoles* as lazy, irresponsible, and lacking in physical and intellectual vigor. Pregnant women even returned to Spain so their children would escape the stigma of being born in New Spain.⁸⁸

⁸⁷Ibid., 37.

⁸⁸Kirkwood, 2000, 59.

Due to this relationship based on inferiority-superiority, *Peninsulares* identified themselves with the Spanish Kingdom, while *Creoles* did with the colony.

Mestizo, on the other hand, was a combination of three races: European, indigenous and African. This group came in third in the racial hierarchy and the word *Mestizo* was generally used to describe ones whose parents are Spanish and indigenous. The indigenous belonged to the fourth level of the society, were regarded as an inferior race. At the bottom of the society were the African slaves.

In addition to the racial hierarchy, there was a hierarchy based on wealth as well. During the first years of the Conquest, the indigenous nobles also belonged to the elite but as the Indian nobility declined, the hierarchy among the Indians, too, declined. Eventually, “wealth remained overwhelmingly in the hands of those of European descent. In 1792, there were only four non-whites in the 327-member elite of Antequera (today Oaxaca City).”⁸⁹

In the light of these, the impact of the conquest on the indigenous people was harsh. Not only the indigenous population dramatically decreased due to the conquest war and diseases carried by the European but also they were oppressed in terms of culture and religion and they were also treated as an inferior race. Furthermore, the *repartimiento* system and the following wage labor system were essentially forced labor. Although the wage labor system was introduced as a solution to the abuses that have taken place under the *repartimiento* system, it brought the debt peonage, in which the indigenous people working in haciendas had to work for all their lives in order to pay their debts to the hacendados while their unpaid debts were inherited to their children, who, in turn, had to work in the haciendas to pay these debts. As can be seen, the Zapatistas' reference to slavery in the First Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle is a historical reality.

3.2. Independence (1810 – 1821)

Although the Bourbon Reforms led to great income increases for Spain, as noted they also led to the decline of the empire. As the result of these reforms the political, social and economic conditions in Mexico were worsened. Actually, those

⁸⁹Russell, 2010, 38.

who lived in Mexico were loyal to the king and supported monarchy all along. However, the expulsion of the Jesuits, of which 450 out of 680 were Mexican, as in not of European descent, from Mexico in 1767, the introduction of the intendancy system, which targeted *Creoles*' flexible, autonomous and illegal commercial actions, in 1786, the increase in taxes which led a contemporary observer, Humboldt to report "that New Spain contributed ten times as much revenue to Spain, on a per capita basis, as India did to Britain"⁹⁰, economic restrictions that protected Spanish producers, low trade barriers which could not protect producers and manufacturers in Mexico, compulsory military service, in addition to the inequalities between *Peninsulares* and *Creoles*, as *Peninsulares* held the top bureaucratic, military and church offices, created a sense of resentment toward Spain.

The wars that Spain took part, namely the French-Spanish war between 1793 and 1795 and the English-Spanish war between 1796 and 1807 resulted in high costs for Spain. Spain, in turn, took drastic measures to overcome these costs and ordered that the Mexican Church would immediately collect all the debts that are owed and would send this money to Spain. Since the Church was the biggest and most important money lender in Mexico, the impact of this decree called the Royal Law of Consolidation "reached all sectors of Mexico even though it remained in effect for only four years."⁹¹ When the Church demanded repayment, most of the indebted could not repay and had to sell their property. The most affected were the small business owners, miners, artisans and merchants. Since the buildings belonging to the people who could not repay their debts were sold, there were many businesses that were closed. In addition, since many people were selling their property, the market prices were frankly against the interests of the sellers. The decree also had negative consequences for schools, hospitals, orphanages that were funded by the Church and the clergy's lower rank.⁹²

In 1808, the French invaded Spain and the king Fernando VII was removed from throne. Napoleon I replaced Fernando with his brother Joseph Bonaparte. This development led to the emergence of *juntas*, which were "temporary provisional

⁹⁰Ibid., 112.

⁹¹Kirkwood, 2000, 77.

⁹²Russell, 2010, 114.

governing bodies”⁹³ that represented the nation in the lack of a king. While these juntas were being established in Spain, *Creoles* in Mexico also wanted a junta in Mexico. *Peninsulares*, fearing that this could result in a junta that would favor *Creoles* instead of themselves, replaced the viceroy through a coup. The new viceroy and the one that would be his successor in office later remained weak in power. In this power vacuum, several secret societies aiming for the independence and operating under the guise of literary societies emerged.

However, the authorities, of course, were aware of this independence attempts and several conspirators were arrested before they could realize their plan to declare independence on December 8, 1810. Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, who was a priest and one of the conspirators managed to escape from arrest. “Upon learning that the Spanish were coming, Hidalgo decided to launch the rebellion immediately. Evidently he had not been a driving force behind the plot up to this point. Early on the morning of September 16, 1810, he issued his famous *Grito de Dolores* (Cry of Sorrow), which set Mexico into rebellion.”⁹⁴ Although Hidalgo and his rebel army could be victorious for some time, eventually he was defeated and he was captured on March 21, 1811 and then was executed. Hidalgo had failed in attracting the support of the *Creoles*.

After the death of Hidalgo, the struggle for independence continued under the leadership of José María Morelos, another priest and follower of Hidalgo. Morelos’ program, however, was quite different from Hidalgo’s. He was against racially inequality and declared that “Slavery will be forbidden forever, as well as caste distinctions, leaving everyone equal, and the only thing that will distinguish one American from another is vice and virtue.”⁹⁵ Despite Hidalgo, Morelos was also a better military leader who could apply guerilla tactics well enough to overcome the disciplined soldiers in many instances. Through the successful application of guerilla warfare, they could encircle the capital city. On September 14, 1813 Morelos and his supporters came together in Chilpancingo and convened a Congress. Morelos, in his opening speech, referred to Montezuma, one of the indigenous leaders who resisted

⁹³Kirkwood, 2000, 78.

⁹⁴Russell, 2010, 117.

⁹⁵In Russell, 122.

against Cortés as a national hero.⁹⁶ An independent Mexico and a broad participatory government were called during the same Congress.⁹⁷ The Congress declared independence on November 6, 1813 and on October 22, 1814 a constitution that acknowledged the equality of all Mexicans and separation of powers was promulgated.

However, the rebels began to be defeated by the royalist armies and suffered the lack of union among the rebel bands. In addition, although Morelos prohibited land-takeovers by peasants, respected property and promised *Creoles* top offices and therefore tried to gain support from them and not to repeat Hidalgo's error, he could not attract this support due to the fact that rebels' social program which included the equality of all Mexicans regardless of race and participatory government were against the *Creole* interests. Eventually, in 1815 Morelos was captured and executed. Yet, the rebel forces continued to operate and so the uncertainty, for six years. The Spanish troops sent to Mexico in order to bring an end to the rebellion were unable to be successful, which awakened resentment even among the citizens who formerly supported the King and who started to blame the viceroyalty for failure. "The actions of the Spanish government in Mexico, coupled with (1) the political instability since the days of the Bourbon reforms, (2) the French occupation, and (3) the insurgent movement reawakened the attitude that the colony was poorly governed."⁹⁸

Furthermore, liberals started to become prominent in Spain, a development that made conservatives, who thought that similar liberal policies would be applied in Mexico, nervous. Royalist troops were still after the remaining rebel leaders, one of whom was Vicente Guerrero at that time. Augustin de Iturbide, a former commander in the royalist army was given the duty to capture Guerrero. However, instead of capturing him, Iturbide joined forces with Guerrero for independence. The Plan of Iguala, which declared independence for all Mexicans regardless of race, established a constitutional monarchy, established Catholicism as the state religion and guaranteed the Church's properties was signed on February 24, 1821. The head of

⁹⁶Ibid., 123.

⁹⁷Kirkwood, 2000, 83.

⁹⁸Ibid., 85.

the monarchy would be the Spanish king or another prince of European decent. Later, Iturbide could make a modification which allowed that a Mexican could be the head of monarchy in the lack of a European prince. Iturbide and the other rebel leaders marched to the capital on September 27, 1821 and thus Mexico gained its independence.⁹⁹

It might be said that Mexico's independence led to a period of chaos. Mexico saw more than 50 governments during the 40 years after its independence. Initially, a Congress was elected that first met in February 1822. The same Congress elected Iturbide as emperor "with the title 'Agustín, by Divine Providence and by the Congress of the Nation, the First Constitutional Emperor of Mexico.'"¹⁰⁰ It might also be said that with Iturbide, the period of caudillo rule, the rule of charismatic leaders, began in Mexico.¹⁰¹

Nevertheless, the empire did not last long. Due to the devastating wars of independence the Mexican economy was nearly destroyed and no investment has been made during Iturbide's rule. In addition to the worsening economic conditions, emperor oppressed any opposition and censored the press, which was objected by the Congress. Thus, Congress was dissolved with an order from emperor. These developments led to a decline in the support for emperor and republican views were propagated.¹⁰² In December 1822, the commander of Veracruz port, Antonio López de Santa Anna declared that he opposed the emperor and issued a rather ineffective plan, Plan of Veracruz. Later, another commander, General José Antonio Echávarri, who was charged with capturing Santa Anna, declared Plan of Casa Mata, which called an end to Iturbide rule and empire and the establishment of a republic, a written constitution and the election of a new Congress based on more participatory principles. Eventually, Iturbide fled the country in 1823 on the condition that he would be executed if he ever returned. In 1824 he returned and was executed. In the same year, the Congress issued a new constitution that abolished monarchy. Guadalupe Victoria was elected as Mexico's first president in 1824. Until his term ended in 1828, a relative stability was prominent in Mexican politics. However, from

⁹⁹Foster, 2007, 115.

¹⁰⁰Russell, 2010, 142.

¹⁰¹Kirkwood, 2000, 86.

¹⁰²Foster, 2007, 119.

1828 to 1855, the year *Reforma* (Liberal Reform) was carried out, instability was the basic element in politics.

During this instable period, General Antonio López de Santa Anna has been a prominent and central figure. "Repeatedly president of Mexico, yet disgraced almost as often, exiled, and, in the end, executed for treason, Santa Anna's political life spanned the first critical decades of Mexican Independence."¹⁰³ He was first elected president in 1833 and Valentín Gómez Farías, who was relatively more liberal, became his vice-president. Santa Anna practically left governing to Farías, however, when Farías tried to establish civilian control over the army and to reduce the army size, he marched against his own vice president, dissolved the congress, suspended the federalist constitution, and assumed dictatorial powers in 1834."¹⁰⁴

However, he did more than corrupt practices. When faced with the threat of Texas' independence he marched against the Texas army, was defeated with the help of the US, was captured and negotiated an agreement that would give Texas independence and grant himself freedom. Texas remained independent between 1836 and 1845. When Texas claimed more land, a claim backed by the US, Mexico and the US engaged in war. In addition to the great land losses, Mexico City was invaded by the US army in 1847. The treaty that ended the war and that resulted in Mexico's loss of New Mexico, Texas, Arizona and California with the compensation of 18 million dollars was signed on February 2, 1848.¹⁰⁵ Santa Anna left the country in March 1848 and lived in exile for five years until he returned in 1853 in order to end the instability in Mexico. "Pronouncements, civil wars, corruption, and failure to respond to the financial crises facing Mexico (the \$15 million paid to Mexico as part of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo was quickly consumed) had caused conservatives to reconsider his authoritarianism and grant him even more extensive authority."¹⁰⁶

In 1855, however, Santa Anna was overthrown by liberals. It might be a mistake to include all of them under the name liberals, though. There were two factions in the liberal movement, one of which was the *puros* (pure ones) and the

¹⁰³Ibid., 120.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., 121.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., 125.

¹⁰⁶Kirkwood, 2000, 100.

other was the *moderados* (moderates). While the *puros* were more radical and demanded the political participation of the poor, *moderados* were relatively more conservative and did not want to trust the poor with political participation and power.¹⁰⁷ These two liberal factions united when Benito Juárez and Melchor Ocampo met in 1854, supported Juan Alvarez's guerilla activities and declared the Plan de Ayutla.¹⁰⁸ Alvarez elected president after Santa Anna was overthrown and the new liberal government started to issue the liberal reforms.

The first liberal law was the *Ley Juárez* which targeted the privileges of the church and military. The harsh reactions against this law led to the resignation of Alvarez, however, the new president Ignacio Comonfort furthered the reforms. The *Ley Lerdo* introduced by Comonfort presidency required the sale of the properties of all institutions which are not used. Although the *Ley Lerdo* primarily targeted the Church, its effects on the indigenous people and villages were disastrous. The broad definition of the corporate body included the land owned communally by the Indian villages. In addition, the properties taken from these corporate bodies were not redistributed, but sold. Therefore, only the rich could afford to buy these lands and "most sales failed to benefit the small farmer and rancher, whom the liberals proclaimed to be the basis of the ideal society."¹⁰⁹ Furthermore, taking away the communal land from the indigenous, as well as the absorption of the indigenous communities by the municipalities destroyed the indigenous autonomy. Although "free and equal Indians could vote along with non-Indians for the municipal government", "the Indians... rarely gained office even when they constituted the majority."¹¹⁰

In addition, Liberals' attack on the Church led to another war, the Reform War. The war continued for three years from 1858 to 1861 and resulted in Liberal victory. However, Juárez, who was elected president in 1861 came to power in a state that was devastated by war. Besides, the conservatives, although being defeated, continued to create unrest. In the face of these economic problems and unrest, Mexico was not able to pay its debts and the congress suspended internal and foreign

¹⁰⁷Russell, 2010, 216.

¹⁰⁸Kirkwood, 2000, 100.

¹⁰⁹Russell, 2010, 218.

¹¹⁰Foster, 2007, 134.

debts for two years. France, Spain and England signed a convention in order to occupy the custom houses in Veracruz, however, soon it became clear that France had far-reaching ambitions in Mexico such as establishing a monarchy and controlling Mexico. On the famous date *Cinco de Mayo*, May 5, 1862, the Mexican army commanded by General Ignacio Zaragoza and Brigadier General Porfirio Díaz defeated the French army, which marched in order to invade Mexico. However, this victory was not enough to prevent the French to occupy Mexico City in 1863. After the French occupation the second Mexican empire was established and the Austrian archduke Maximilian became the emperor of Mexico. However, this second empire did not last long, either and ended in 1867. Maximilian was executed on June 19, 1867.

After 1867, Mexico enjoyed a brief period of stability until 1876. In 1867, Juárez was elected president for third term and after his term ended he again stood for presidency and was elected despite the objections made on the ground that he disregarded the liberal principle against reelection. In an economy devastated by war, Juárez had to satisfy all sectors of the society. He gave great privileges to *hacendados* in order to gain their support, which upset Indians and caused rebellions. In order to control the army and cut the military expenses, he issued policies that would minimize the army, which upset the soldiers and caudillos. However, freedom of speech and political freedom increased during the Juárez presidency. Free elections could be held, press was free and open criticism of president was possible.¹¹¹ After the death of Juárez in 1872, Sebastián Lerdo de Tejada was elected president. However, when Lerdo declared that he would stand for reelection in 1876, “in an action reminiscent of the methodology frequently used to acquire power, Porfirio Díaz pronounced the Plan de Tuxtepec against the Lerdo government and seized power.”¹¹² Díaz’s slogan was “no reelection” and he opposed reelection on the basis that it would trample “on the constitutional rights of Mexican citizens. He claimed that by preventing Lerdo de Tejada from serving another term, he would spare Mexico another experience with prolonged one-man rule.”¹¹³

¹¹¹Ibid., 139.

¹¹²Kirkwood, 2000, 113.

¹¹³Russell, 2010, 230.

All in all, Eric Wolf argues that the independence movement had three contradictory components. One was the assertion of commercial-industrial-agricultural periphery against the bureaucratic center in Mexico City, the second was the military raised by the landowners and merchants, which wanted the status of the Spanish troops sent from Spain and finally, the third one was the part that wanted social reform such as Morelos. According to Wolf, "the movement for independence which had begun with demands for social reform ended in the maintenance of elite power."¹¹⁴ When looked from the perspective of the indigenous people, "independence saw an instrumentalization of the indigenous population for the purpose of justifying the attempts to shake of Spain's control. The wrongs committed against the Indians were one of the arguments used by the leading criollo (American-born Spaniards) elites against Spain."¹¹⁵ However, in the aftermath of the independence the indigenous were accepted as citizens and their special status during the Colonial period was removed. "The paternalistic colonial laws, which resembled a discernable if not always uniform Indian policy, were also abolished with Independence. And in a political or legal sense, Indians ceased to exist and became peasants, *campesinos*."¹¹⁶ Nevertheless, while the equality remained in word, the laws that opened communal lands to sale worsened the conditions in which the indigenous people lived while benefiting the rich landowners. "Freedom for the landowner would mean added freedom to acquire more land to add to his already engorged holdings, freedom for the Indian - no longer subject to his community and now lord of his own property - would mean the ability to sell his land, and to join the throng of landless in search of employment."¹¹⁷ In this regard, it might be argued that independence, which abolished the servitude under the Colonial rule while creating a new form of servitude for the indigenous people.

¹¹⁴ Eric Wolf, *Peasant Wars of the Twentieth Century* (New York: Harper, 1969), 9.

¹¹⁵ Claudia Haake, *The State, Removal and Indigenous Peoples in the United States and Mexico, 1620-2000* (New York: Routledge, 2007), 91.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 92.

¹¹⁷ Wolf, 1969, 13.

3.3. The *Porfiriato* (1876 - 1911)

After Díaz's rebellion resulted in the defeat of Lerdo, Díaz was elected president for the 1877-1880 term and when this term ended he remained loyal to his slogan "no reelection" only after he made sure that a stand-in candidate was elected. That candidate was General Manuel González, who was not effective enough to undermine Díaz's own political power and authority. When González's term ended in 1884, Díaz was again elected president, which started the long period called *Porfiriato*. Díaz remained in power during this period between 1884 and 1910.

Díaz atomized and divided power in order to ensure that no one could challenge his authority. All individuals holding power and position owed their holdings to Díaz. He provided the army with latest technology and due to the establishment of modern rail network, the army could be easily mobilized. While the army was controlled by the ministry of war, the *rurales* governed by the ministry of interior were also created. The *rurales* initially fought against the bandits, however, after this threat became insignificant, they were used against the opposition. Actually, the *rurales* themselves consisted of "notorious bandits who were permitted to murder anyone and justify their acts by the *Ley Fugo*: 'Shot while trying to escape.'"¹¹⁸

In addition to suppression, Díaz was quite successful at co-opting individuals as well. Liberals, conservatives, clergy, military leaders, foreign investors, landowners and intellectuals many of whom were positivists were included in his coalition and formed an elite.¹¹⁹ The army was given a bigger budget and new weaponry while it was both depoliticized and decentralized as rotation among regions was increased. On the other hand, the *rurales* were created to compete with the army, among other aims as stated. The Reform Laws were not actively enforced so that the church's support was gained. Furthermore the intelligentsia, middle class and *Creoles* were satisfied with the economic conditions due to the attraction of foreign capital.¹²⁰

¹¹⁸Foster, 2007, 145.

¹¹⁹Russell, 2010, 232.

¹²⁰Foster, 2007, 145.

Initially, Díaz began with accepting liberal ideals however, later it was revealed that was not the case. The military became a part of the ruling elite class, anti-clerical policies of the liberals were abandoned, opposition was repressed, his slogan “no reelection” was abandoned as he made a final amendment in the constitution that eliminated all limitations on presidential elections after a few amendments that first banned and then permitted reelection.

When it comes to modernization, a small group of *científicos*, positivist advisors, were included in Díaz’s small clique and they formulated policies. Positivism became the major intellectual movement in Mexico. *Científicos*’ answer to Mexico’s modernization problem and other developmental problems was applying statistics and rational thinking. However, these scientific policies were also affected by Social Darwinism, which aimed “to preserve the privileges of Creoles and the ruling class, who argued that only they were fit to govern. Mexico wasn’t ready for democracy, Justo Sierra said from the Ministry of Education. And the indigenous masses, inferior according to these *científicos*, would never be ready.”¹²¹

Until the beginning of the twentieth century, economic growth and the repression of the opposition prevented the dissident voices. However, as the new century begins the elite started to be divided within itself, economic conditions started to deteriorate and Díaz’s attempts to be reelected started to create dissent. "Newly affluent industrialists, merchants, professionals, and intellectuals, the product of economic growth, were excluded from political power, as were miners, industrial workers, and schoolteachers. The generation coming of political age at the turn of the century no longer viewed Díaz as the national hero who had saved Mexico from France, but as an aging tyrant clinging to power."¹²²

Liberal clubs were established in order to challenge Díaz’s anti-liberal actions, particularly his tolerance for the church. The club members, most of whom were from the elite of the society, established the Mexican Liberal Party (*Partido Liberal Mexicano* - PLM) in 1901. Although this party generated opposition that would not bother Díaz and that could be tolerated by him, later, with the influence of the younger and relatively poor members such as Flores Magón the PLM was rapidly

¹²¹Ibid., 151.

¹²²Russell, 2010, 235.

radicalized. The party advocated forcing those who invested in Mexico to become Mexican citizens, ending presidential reelection, and land reform. It targeted industrial workers, demanding the eight-hour day, a minimum wage, equal pay for equal work, accident compensation, and other reforms workers themselves had been seeking.¹²³

After this kind of radical actions, the PLM faced repression, Magón was arrested, his newspaper was closed, after his release he had to go to exile in the US as well as other several members of the PLM. In 1906, PLM members who were in exile in the US called for a revolution through a manifesto that demanded universal and free education, abolishing of the child labor and job security. However, this call for revolution was not successful.

Later in 1906, some labor conflicts emerged and they were oppressed violently. The Díaz regime was unsuccessful in dealing these conflicts in a peaceful manner. The cooption and negotiation which were prominent in the early years were abandoned, which caused the weakening of the regime in later years. Furthermore, the United States faced a recession in 1907 and this recession spread to Mexico as well. As a result, *científicos* were blamed for the worsening economic conditions and dissent toward the Díaz regime increased.¹²⁴

In October 1910, Francisco Madero, who came from an aristocratic family of the north, declared the Plan of San Luis Potosí:

A tyranny, the likes of which we Mexicans have not suffered since we won our independence, oppresses us in a manner which has become intolerable. In exchange for that tyranny we have been offered peace, but it is a shameful peace for the Mexican people. It is based on force, not law. Its goal is not the greatness and prosperity of our homeland, but the enrichment of a small group which, by abusing public positions, has converted them into sources of personal wealth, unscrupulously exploiting concessions and lucrative contracts.¹²⁵

¹²³Ibid., 236.

¹²⁴Ibid., 238.

¹²⁵Ibid., 296.

This plan called for a rebellion against the tyranny of the Díaz regime which would start on November 20, 1910. On that day, small guerilla bands led by local leaders and formed by people from all professions, the unemployed, *hacendados* and peasants took action. "The radical and liberal, wealthy and poor, no matter their differences, united against Díaz."¹²⁶ Díaz's attempts at defeating these guerilla bands were successful in many regions, except for the state of Chihuahua where the movement was led by Pascual Orozco, Jr. and Pancho Villa. Madero returned Mexico from the United States in February 1911 and joined Orozco and Villa. "Victories in Chihuahua reignited the rebellion in other states— Coahuila, Puebla, and Morelos—and soon revolutionaries such as Emiliano Zapata controlled most of the Mexican countryside. On May 8, Orozco and Villa captured the first large city, Ciudad Juárez."¹²⁷ On May 21, 1911 Madero and the federal army signed the treaty of Ciudad Juárez. Later, on May 25, Díaz resigned. Even though the Díaz regime could be overthrown as the result of this treaty, the political system did not change fundamentally. The treaty was followed by a bloody struggle period: "More than a victory for those who opposed Díaz, the 1911 treaty epitomized a revolution that forced individuals to choose sides, shattering any sense of national unity."¹²⁸

The fundamental policy of the Porfiriato regarding the indigenous people can be explained with the positivist ideology of the regime. *Científicos* considered the indigenous inferior and incapable of development without the help of the "whites".¹²⁹ The goal was to modernize the country and build a modern nation-state while the indigenous were seen as a hindrance in this way. While the regime violently oppressed the indigenous on occasion, the indigenous had to be exploited as much as possible for the capitalistic modernization of the country. Therefore, measures like extermination or deportation were taken when assimilation failed.¹³⁰ The effect of positivism and modernization on the indigenous was that they no longer could exist as the indigenous people but they had to become Mexicans. "While

¹²⁶Foster, 2007, 162.

¹²⁷Ibid., 163.

¹²⁸Kirkwood, 2000, 131.

¹²⁹Wolf, 1969, 14.

¹³⁰Haake, 2007, 95.

colonial rule had, it could be argued, in many respects created the (category) Indian, post-Independence governments to an extent strove to eliminate it, along with the benefits and protections it had afforded them especially with regards to land and labor."¹³¹

3.4. Revolution and the Single Party Rule (1911 – 1982)

It is supposed that Díaz said “Madero has unleashed a tiger; let’s see if he can control him” while he was leaving Mexico. Later, this would prove to be a correct statement.

A provisional president was elected upon Díaz’s resignation: Francisco León de la Barra. He made some reforms in terms of education and labor, established the National Agrarian Commission in order to deal with disputes over land, ensured the freedom of press and disbanded the revolutionary forces. Eventually Madero was elected president in November 1911. However, during his presidency he did not touch the remaining bureaucracy which was a legacy of the Porfirio dictatorship. What he did was simply to change the top personnel of this bureaucratic system. He did not remove his old enemies from offices while he did not reward his followers by giving them offices. Furthermore, the peasants still worked under same conditions as before. Madero’s electoral reforms, which introduced universal suffrage and banned reelection meant nothing to the poor majority of the society.¹³²

What was more crucial, however, was Madero administration’s failure to make the land reform, which led to Emiliano Zapata’s declaration of Plan of Ayala in late November 1911. Zapata declared that he no longer recognized the president, accused him with abandoning the revolution. He called for action and overthrow of Madero because: "the immense majority of Mexican pueblos and citizens are owners of no more than the land they walk on, suffering the horrors of poverty without being able to improve their social condition in any way or to dedicate themselves to Industry or Agriculture, because land, timber, and water are monopolized in a few hands"¹³³ According to Plan, peasants could reclaim their stolen lands and one-

¹³¹Ibid., 96.

¹³²Russell, 2010, 300.

¹³³In Russel, 301.

third of the haciendas would be bought in order to give it to the landless. In addition, Zapata did not demand political power, instead he demanded the election of a new government.¹³⁴

Madero faced other rebellions as well, which undermined his authority. By the end of 1912, the demands of peasants and workers were not met, which in turn led to strikes and land occupations. On the other hand, landowners, businessman, investors thought Madero could not establish law and order and could not guarantee the protection of private property. Eventually, a coup was organized and Félix Díaz was released from prison. Madero charged General Huerta with fighting the rebels, however, Huerta and Díaz joined forces and defeated Madero. Madero was killed on the way to prison. In 1913, Huerta became president, and he “established a government with the backing of *hacendados*, bankers, rich merchants, high clergy, the federal army, British oil interests, and the U.S. business community.”¹³⁵

However, Huerta presidency faced with opposition as well. Venustiano Carranza, a *hacendado* from the north declared the Plan of Guadalupe, openly challenged Huerta presidency and established the Constitutional Army of the North, an army whose name was in line with his “proclaiming adherence to the 1857 constitution.”¹³⁶ At this point, Mexico turned into a battle ground on which the caudillos including Carranza, Pancho Villa, Álvaro Obregon, Plutarco Calles and Emiliano Zapata, and Huerta’s federal army fought. Eventually Huerta was defeated and went into exile and “on August 15, Obregón led the first troops of the Constitutional Army into the capital and Carranza, as first chief, proclaimed victory for the revolutionaries.”¹³⁷

Nevertheless, the defeat of Huerta did not bring peace to Mexico, either. The reason was the shared realization of the factions that they had different aims, after the victory. “Villa and Zapata represented the radical left tendencies in the revolution, Carranza the right, and Obregón the centre.”¹³⁸ Aside from the disagreements caused by the personality differences among these caudillos, there

¹³⁴Ibid., 301.

¹³⁵Ibid., 303.

¹³⁶Kirkwood, 2000, 141.

¹³⁷Foster, 2007, 169.

¹³⁸Alex Khasnabish, *Zapatistas: Rebellion from the Grassroots to the Global* (Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing, 2010), 38.

were class differences. Zapata's army included indigenous peasants who were denied the use of their land and water while Villa's army comprised of different sectors of the society all of whom were poor and hungry and Carranza led an army mostly consisting of the middle class. "As Villa said to Zapata in their historic meeting in Mexico City, the Carrancistas 'are men who have always slept on soft pillows. How could they ever be friends of the people, who have spent their whole lives in nothing but suffering.'"¹³⁹

Among these factions, Carranza held the dominant position since he was obtaining arms from the USA and had control over important ports. On September 13, 1914, he called for a meeting in order to elect a temporary president that would be in rule until the elections were held. On October 10, the delegates of all factions met at Aguascalientes. "The delegates negotiated between the desires of Carranza, the land reform issues enunciated by Emiliano Zapata, and the conservative goals of Pancho Villa, who desired to restructure the status quo as outlined by Madero."¹⁴⁰ Although the meeting began in a hostile manner, the parties soon agreed on labor and agrarian reforms. However, disagreement emerged again when Eulalio Gutiérrez was elected as the provisional president instead of Carranza. Carranza and the Constitutionalists left Mexico City and Villa and Zapata took the city. Nevertheless, later, Zapata left the city to retreat to Morelos. "Zapata and his men viewed the city as a strange and uncomfortable place; moreover, they were not certain as to their role there."¹⁴¹ Arturo Warman states that this retreat and not taking power and control over city was: "the result, not — as it is frequently presented — of the fear of power... but of their congruence with a revolution that was being made from below and that still had not triumphed. The capture of the State, ever the enemy of the peasants, was not the Zapatistas' revolutionary objective; it was the consequence of a revolution at the base, in the free and sovereign villages."¹⁴² This principle of not taking power or seizing state control, as will be seen, is evident among the EZLN's political principles as well.

¹³⁹In Foster, 2007, 170.

¹⁴⁰Kirkwood, 2000, 142.

¹⁴¹Kirkwood, 2000, 143.

¹⁴²Arturo Warman, *'We Come to Object': The Peasants of Morelos and the National State* (Baltimore MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976) in Khasnabish, 2010, 40.

Although the Zapatistas and Villistas could meet on the common ground through their opposition to Carranza, soon they split. While Zapata was influential in the state of Morelos in the south, the home region of the Zapatistas; Villa was influential in Chihuahua, Durango and the Laguna area, in the north. Their major difference was the nature of their armies as the Liberation Army of the South of Zapata mainly comprised of peasants whereas Villa's army was a multiclass coalition: "It included former military colonists, agricultural workers, miners, railwaymen, and other industrial workers, large segments of the middle classes, and even some revolutionary *hacendados*, mainly from states other than Chihuahua."¹⁴³ These different characteristics of the armies were the main reason why Villa's and Zapata's approach to land reform was different. Villa approached to land reform as a regional issue that would be discussed and implemented by regional administrations, while Zapata considered the reform as a national issue. His Plan of Ayala was a national agenda, from the start.¹⁴⁴

Carranza, who used this split to his advantage, defeated Villa with the help Alvaro Obregón, a general of the Constitutionalist army. After Carranza could strengthen his position, he felt the need of a constitution in order to legalize his rule. In Querétaro, 200 delegates, from whom Zapatistas and Villistas were excluded, gathered on December 1, 1916. However, Carranza could not impose the constitution in his mind. The result was dramatically far from Carranza's draft for constitution. The most crucial article was Article 27 on land reform:

...it eliminated all monopolies on water and mineral resources and, reverting to the Spanish law that Díaz had repealed, it gave the nation rights to such natural resources. It made the communal Indian ejidos inalienable and limited the size of estates. It provided for land redistribution to be paid for by government bonds. And it restricted foreign ownership to those who agreed to be treated like Mexicans: no foreign interventions were to be allowed on their behalf.¹⁴⁵

¹⁴³ Friedrich Katz, *The Life and Times of Pancho Villa* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 439.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 436.

¹⁴⁵ Foster, 2007, 172.

Nevertheless, Khasnabish interprets this article as an “attempt(s) to integrate the peasantry into the post-revolutionary architecture of power in Mexico.”¹⁴⁶ During the anarchy of the civil war and revolution process, peasants began an autonomous land reform by claiming their stolen lands, however, this was unacceptable from the perspective of the government. The land reform issue had to be de-radicalized and monopolized in the hands of the state. This article might be seen as an antecedent of the institutionalization and corporatism that would be observed during the PRI rule later.

Another important article was the Article 123, which gave substantial rights to the workers and improved their conditions relatively. A minimum wage, work hours and a day to rest, unemployment insurance and the right to strike were provided. This article also might be interpreted as a way of incorporating workers to the system.

Nonetheless, there was one sector that was not incorporated. “...the post-revolutionary Mexican state’s official position with respect to indigenous peoples was one aimed at their disappearance...the post-revolutionary Mexican state sought to valorize an imagined and glorious indigenous past while consigning actually existing indigenous peoples to oblivion in the present.”¹⁴⁷

Carranza, unhappy with the result of the constitutional convention, did not openly challenge the Constitution, instead he did not implement it. He opened a war on unions, repressed strikes, he gave the communal lands to the followers of Porfirio Díaz, fought Zapatistas relentlessly and killed Zapata in an ambush on April 10, 1919. “His (Zapata’s) white horse escaped the gunfire; people would speak for years thereafter of sighting the horse on the nearby hilltops—occasionally with Zapata riding it.”¹⁴⁸ Carranza named a successor in 1919 however, Alvaro Obregón, Plutarco Elias Calles and Adolfo de la Huerta challenged Carranza with their Plan de Agua Prieta declared in April 1920. Later Obregón gained the upper hand, Carranza was captured and shot while he tried to escape.

¹⁴⁶Khasnabish, 2010, 43.

¹⁴⁷Ibid., 44.

¹⁴⁸Kirkwood, 200, 151.

Obregón became president in 1920 and “his victory signaled more than his ascension to the presidency, it marked a new change in Mexico: For the first time since 1910, it appeared that stability had returned.”¹⁴⁹ In addition to the amnesty granted to every faction and giving offices to Zapatistas and Villistas, he was committed to the implementation of social reforms. The indigenous' titles to their stolen lands were acknowledged and peasants who occupied lands during the Revolution were allowed to keep those lands. However, since quick action before the small enterprises started operate properly would decrease agricultural production, land redistribution remained limited to 3 million acres.

In 1924, Calles was elected president after “he campaigned for the 1924 presidential election affirming support for Article 27 and other reformist provisions of the 1917 constitution. He also portrayed himself as an advocate for the ‘landless classes.’”¹⁵⁰ Nevertheless, his radical agenda dramatically changed after the successful election. Despite Obregón, he invoked the concept of Revolution mostly to use it for political purposes. He started with land reform and distributed 7.34 million acres of land. However, the objective of this distribution was to establish a power base, after the consolidation of power in his hands land distribution decreased. He actually thought communal land as an obstacle before the agricultural needs in Mexico. Through providing funds to the large land owners, private agriculture was supported.¹⁵¹

When Calles’ presidential term approached its end, Obregón wanted to be reelected, which was supported by Calles. “It is believed that Calles and Obregón planned to alternate as president under the new constitutional amendment.”¹⁵² However, Obregón was assassinated and Calles continued to rule through puppet presidents between 1928 and 1934. In 1929, a party called National Revolutionary Party (*Partido Nacional Revolucionario*- PNR), which would eventually become the dominant party in Mexico, Institutional Revolutionary Party(*Partido Revolucionario Institucional*- PRI) was established. The PNR was established in order to prevent the problems with succession, politics based on personality and to conserve power,

¹⁴⁹Ibid., 156.

¹⁵⁰Russell, 2010, 341.

¹⁵¹Ibid., 341.

¹⁵²Foster, 2007, 182.

rather than contesting it. However, workers, peasants and middle class were excluded from the party.¹⁵³

In 1934, a new president, Lázaro Cárdenas, whose candidacy was approved by Calles since he thought Cárdenas would be easily controlled, was elected. His campaign “emphasized greater land distribution and agrarian assistance, more support of organized labor, the elimination of illiteracy, and less foreign dependence.”¹⁵⁴ Indeed, “Cárdenas addressed the issue of land reform quickly upon assuming office...During his tenure the Mexican government distributed almost 50 million acres of land – more than twice the amount distributed by all previous presidents since 1917.”¹⁵⁵ Most of these distributed lands were given to *ejidos*¹⁵⁶. In addition, Cárdenas went on supporting the *ejidos* by establishing a bank that would give credits to the *ejidos*. Labor and labor unions also were supported in line with Cárdenas’ promise in his campaign. Having support of the president labor unions could go on strike in order to increase their wages and became successful. Furthermore, Cárdenas nationalized the railroads and the oil industry.

The PNR, which was established by Calles, was transformed by Cárdenas into a new party, the Mexican Revolutionary Party (*Partido Revolucionario Mexicano*- PRM). The new party consisted of four sectors: peasants, military, labor and popular sector. Each sector within the party had the means to communicate with the government. Incorporation of the labor and peasants enabled them to increase their influence while making government’s control over them stronger and easier.¹⁵⁷ “This trend toward consolidating the political forces under one powerful governmental organization, begun under Calles and continued for decades by the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI), has been called “one party democracy”—as well as, more recently, ‘one party dictatorship.’”¹⁵⁸

In 1940, Cárdenas’ term ended, Ávila Camacho was elected president. Camacho’s election marked the beginning of a new period for Mexico, a period of

¹⁵³Russell, 2010, 344.

¹⁵⁴Foster, 2007 183.

¹⁵⁵Kirkwood, 2000, 171.

¹⁵⁶Ejido: area of common land. ("Ejido," <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/translate/spanish-english/ejido?q=ejido>, Accessed February 10, 2014.)

¹⁵⁷Russell, 2010, 349.

¹⁵⁸Foster, 2007, 191.

conservatism. Most of the reforms introduced by Cárdenas were reversed. However, the period between 1940 and 1970, Mexico experienced what is called the Mexican Miracle “- a 120 percent growth in the industrial sector and a 100 percent increase in agricultural production.”¹⁵⁹ The major cause of this miracle was the World War II. The decrease in the international trade led Mexico to produce the goods that had been imported, thus to substitute the imported goods while exports to the United States increased due to the war. Camacho, at first, stated that Mexico would not be a part of the World War II, however, after two Mexican ships were sunk by the German submarines as well as the U.S. pressure for Mexico’s entrance to war, Mexico declared war against Germany.¹⁶⁰

During Camacho’s term a law, the Law of Social Dissolution, was approved. The law, which was against fascism in appearance, was used in order to repress the working class and limit its power. The law broadly stated that anyone took part in an activity that threatened society would be jailed. This law was used for any dissident movement during the following thirty years. In addition, relatively progressive labor leaders were replaced with more conservative ones that supported the government, which facilitated for the government to act more aggressively while dealing with strikes, if there were any.¹⁶¹

Furthermore, it was Camacho who renamed the official party and transformed into the Institutional Revolutionary Party (*Partido Revolucionario Institucional*- PRI). This change that took place in 1946 was not only a change in name, the sectors of labor and peasantry and popular sector faced with reduced power within the party. The president and the National Executive Committee of the party concentrated power in themselves. Besides, the new election law passed in 1946 increased the central government’s and president’s influence on elections. Not only was it required that a candidate had to belong to a recognized party, but also establishing a new party was made more difficult.

By the end of Camacho’s term, close relations with the USA were established, the long dispute between the Church and government was overcome,

¹⁵⁹Kirkwood, 2000, 175.

¹⁶⁰Russell, 2010, 408.

¹⁶¹Kirkwood, 2000, 178.

president's power increased, an alliance between the government and the business that would influence the Mexican society for thirty years was established and workers and peasants were left leaderless through cooption of their leaders.¹⁶²

The new president elected in 1946, Miguel Alemán took upon a pro-industry approach during his presidency, leading to the government to be an intermediary between business and workers and business and public enterprises. Public works increased during his term, transportation, irrigation systems were developed and import substitution model began to be employed. However, the assistance given to large farms were not provided for the small farms in the south, which increased dissidence in the southern states like Chiapas. Although a substantial growth was achieved during Alemán's term, corruption also grew, land reform was abandoned, the peasantry's protests were repressed by military and the private armies of the landowners, labor movement was silenced and the middle class remained silent against the repressive actions of the government due to the strong economy.¹⁶³

Adolfo Ruiz Cortines, the official candidate of the PRI, was elected president in 1952. He had to face the corruption that grew in Alemán's term and in order to erase this reputation of PRI and Alemán, he acknowledged women's right to vote and passed laws against corruption. However, there were other problems such as the increasing size of population, inadequacy of the agriculture to sustain this population, which would eventually affect the middle class and immigration from the rural areas to the cities.¹⁶⁴

Adolfo López Mateos, elected president in 1958, "was acceptable to the various factions within PRI, ranging from former Cardenistas to those aligned with Alemán" and had "emerged as the candidate who promised to deliver social programs that had been neglected since the end of the war."¹⁶⁵ During Mateos' term, Mexico was brought into the international arena and was visited by eighteen heads of state. Also, Mateos' visits "provided him with the opportunity to proclaim Mexico's non-alignment in the Cold War and his country's adherence to the policies of self-

¹⁶²Russell, 2010, 410.

¹⁶³Kirkwood, 2000, 180.

¹⁶⁴Ibid., 183.

¹⁶⁵Ibid., 185.

determination and non-intervention.”¹⁶⁶ Mateos finished his term as a popular president and Gustavo Díaz Ordaz was elected president in 1964.

Díaz Ordaz, one of the most conservative politicians in the PRI, came into office during a period of student activism, protests and clashes with police throughout the world. The discontent that had already escalated due to the undemocratic and corrupt practices of the PRI broke out just before the 1968 Mexico City Olympic Games. "Like many outbursts of discontent, the student-initiated protests in 1968 had roots in longstanding dissatisfaction. In Mexico specifically, the students expressed dissatisfaction with the directions being taken by the PRI in regard to the goals of the revolution and a broad discontent toward the ruling system."¹⁶⁷

It should also be noted that there was discontent and dissatisfaction in rural areas as well. After Cárdenas, the agricultural policies had favored large landholders. Although there have been many developments in agriculture between 1950 and 1965 since agriculture was crucial for the Mexican economy, the aftermath of 1965 witnessed the allocation of resources to industrial sector and commercial agricultural products and decrease in the subsidies for traditional agriculture.¹⁶⁸ The *ejidos* and small farmers were unable to enter into the agricultural export market and continued to produce crops such as maize and beans, whose prices were kept low for the benefit of the urban consumers.¹⁶⁹ Furthermore, it became more difficult to get agricultural bank loans for the small farmers and *ejidos* while the subsidies were allocated to the export products and guaranteed prices decreased, which caused discontent among the peasantry.

On the other hand, the Mexican government, in order to show that Mexico was a developed country and that Mexican miracle was true, started a costly building of stadiums and infrastructure. Although it was stated that the budget, estimated between 150 million dollars and 200 million dollars, was excessive, the government officials responded by arguing that the income that would be generated during the

¹⁶⁶Russell, 2010, 414.

¹⁶⁷Kirkwood, 2000, 189.

¹⁶⁸ Aylin Topal, "Meksika'da Tarım Politikaları ve Kırsal Mücadele Dinamikleri" (presentation, 11th National Congress of Social Sciences, Ankara, Turkey, December 9-11, 2009), 9.

¹⁶⁹Russell, 2010, 463.

Olympics would compensate these costs. During these preparations students from two schools in Mexico City engaged in a fight and the mayor called the *granaderos*, riot police which uses excessive force and is despised for this reason. Eventually, most students who were not radical were politicized. Later, during the celebration of Cuban Revolution's anniversary, the *granaderos* used bazookas and provoked a riot. Students' demands for mayor's resignation and *granaderos*'s disbanding were not met¹⁷⁰ and during August and September students' protests continued as the government repression increased. As a result, neutral groups, who remained silent before, were radicalized. The lower classes started to support the students: "All of a sudden these were not simply the protests of dissatisfied students who feared that their education would not lead to adequate jobs." ¹⁷¹500 thousand people marched to the main square of the government building. The government met students with tanks, military took over the UNAM (National Autonomous University of Mexico)'s campus and 500 students were imprisoned. On October 2, 1968 a peaceful rally with 5000 participants in the Plaza of Three Cultures in Tlatelolco was held, which was tried to be repressed by army tanks and the *granaderos* using tear gas. Then gunfire was opened from the rooftops at the crowd and army. According to the government, terrorists were responsible for the gunfire and according to others the police started shooting from the rooftops. However, after 30 years it was revealed that the president had ordered the secret service to open fire. According to Díaz, there were 43 deaths while the New York Times claimed that there were several hundred.¹⁷²

The result was the lack of trust in the PRI as the youth was radicalized and searched for more progressive parties while others joined illegal organizations. On the anniversary of Tlatelolco, government building and newspapers were bombed by a terrorist group. the abstention rate in elections increased to 50.8 percent in 1979. Student protests and guerilla movements also increased as well as government's violent actions against them. "The struggle for reforms would preoccupy Mexico for

¹⁷⁰Foster, 2007, 205.

¹⁷¹Kirkwood, 2000, 190.

¹⁷²Foster, 2007, 206.

the rest of the century. And Tlatelolco became synonymous with the PRI's suppression of democracy."¹⁷³

Luis Echeverría, who was the minister of interior during Díaz's term and who was believed to be one of the responsible officials for the Tlatelolco Massacre, was elected president in 1970. In order to improve his reputation associated with the Tlatelolco, Echeverría released the students who were imprisoned, implemented policies that would assist the poor in the rural and urban areas, introduced price controls for basic goods to counter the rising inflation. These policies, together with rising government intervention into economy led to the alienation of the private sector and the movement of capital out of the country.

Although, Echeverría's term started relatively in peace, in 1971 that peace ended. Violent acts, such as bank robberies and kidnappings started. In 1973, Eugenio Garza Sada, the head of Monterrey Group, which was one of the most prominent industrial groups in Mexico, was killed by urban guerillas. The Monterrey Group established an alliance of business and declared independence from government interference due to the rising violence and government's actions regarding the strikes. This alliance ended the long-lasting relationship between the government and business in Mexico. Furthermore, government's policies regarding land distribution in order to decrease agricultural imports and prevent discontent in rural areas led to the discontent among large landholders. These developments together with the rising inflation brought an end to the Mexican miracle. In 1976, the peso was devalued, and lost more than fifty percent of value.¹⁷⁴

López Portillo, who was elected president in 1976 during a period of inflation, capital flight and crisis, aimed at regaining the support of the business sector and initiated a political reform which facilitated establishing new parties, gave access to media to all parties and increased the number of seats in Chamber of Deputies. Although there were economic concerns, they proved to be less pressing later, when new oil reserves were discovered in Mexico just when the oil price was rising. Trusting in the revenue that would be generated from oil, Mexican government started to borrow money and government spending increased. However,

¹⁷³Ibid., 207.

¹⁷⁴Kirkwood, 2000, 195-198.

in 1981 oil prices decreased as well as the prices of other Mexican exports. Again capital flight took place and peso was devalued. Consequently, "in 1981 and 1982, Mexico witnessed what was then generally considered as the gravest economic crisis in its history. From 1969 to 1982, Mexico's foreign debt climbed from US\$3.5 billion to over US\$100 billion."¹⁷⁵ In 1982, Portillo nationalized the private banks in Mexico. As a result, Portillo, who came into office hoping to regain the support of business, just increased the dissension among the business sector and the state.¹⁷⁶

3.5. Transition to Neoliberalism (1982 - 1994)

In 1982, Miguel De la Madrid was elected president and "upon taking office, de la Madrid faced rampant inflation, a huge budget deficit, massive foreign debt, collapsing oil prices, a shrinking economy, and growing labor unrest."¹⁷⁷ He devalued the peso, lifted the price controls on basic goods. As a result, all sectors of Mexican society suffered due to the increase in the price for food and the peso's loss of value. Furthermore, oil prices decreased again in 1985 and on September 19, 1985 Mexico City faced a massive earthquake of 8.1 on the Richter scale, which was followed by a hit having 7.3. The number of the dead people was estimated at between 7000 and 20000, the number of the people who lost their homes or were injured are over 100000. However, the Mexican people were united after the earthquake. The government's lack of ability to take action led people to group and save injured people, which resulted in a grassroots movement that later created voices for social and political change.¹⁷⁸

De la Madrid, in addition to cutting government expenditure, lifted government intervention into economy as well. Mexico joined the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and protective tariffs for many products were lifted.¹⁷⁹ With the lifting of the tariffs, the imported agricultural products from advanced capitalist countries and particularly from the USA would have lower costs

¹⁷⁵ Aylin Topal, "Transition to neoliberalism and decentralisation policies in Mexico," in *Economic Transitions to Neoliberalism in Middle-income Countries*, ed. Alfredo Saad-Filho and Galip L. Yalman (Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2010), 233.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., 199-201; Russell, 2010, 480-482.

¹⁷⁷ Russell, 2010, 483.

¹⁷⁸ Foster, 2007, 15.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., 216.

than the locally produced goods, it was argued that the subsidy policies should have abandoned and it was required to restructure the Mexican rural within the framework of comparative advantages principle. In this line, financial support for rural development decreased substantially between 1982 and 1986.¹⁸⁰

This indicates a major shift in the Mexican economy. De La Madrid "abandoned the model of an economy oriented toward the internal market with the state stimulating production in a Keynesian fashion and protecting industry from foreign competition."¹⁸¹ The aim was to create an export-oriented economy which is competitive internationally. "This complete reversal of Mexican postwar economic strategies would become the hallmark of the 1990s."¹⁸² RUSSELL. "The transition to neoliberalism involved the withdrawal of public subsidies, privatisation of state-owned enterprises, elimination of tariffs, opening of the capital market and increasing regional integration with North America."¹⁸³

In 1988, presidential elections were held in an environment in which opposition to the PRI and its candidate had grown strong. The candidate of the National Action Party (*Partido Acción Nacional* - PAN), Manuel Clouthier; Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas, son of Lázaro Cárdenas, the candidate backed up by the National Democratic Front (*Frente Democrático Nacional*) and the PRI's candidate Carlos Salinas de Gortari competed in the elections. However, during the elections it became clear that the PRI would lose and it was announced that the computers used for counting the votes encountered a problem and were temporarily shut down. When the system came back, Salinas had won with a slight difference and the ballot boxes and ballots were burned. Nevertheless, this time the people did not remain quite about the apparent fraud done by the PRI and people took to the streets, which eventually was suppressed, in some parts of the country using the military.¹⁸⁴ After being elected, however, "to counter public disgust over his 'election', he initiated

¹⁸⁰ Topal, 2009, 15.

¹⁸¹ Russell, 2010, 485.

¹⁸² Ibid., 216.

¹⁸³ Topal, 2010, 234.

¹⁸⁴ Kirkwood, 2000, 204-205.

reforms, giving greater access to the media and restricting party financing: no longer would the PRI be financed by the national treasury.”¹⁸⁵

The economic policies of De La Madrid's term continued during Salinas' term: privatization and foreign investment increased. However, probably the most important development during Salinas' term was the signing of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), an agreement among the United States, Canada and Mexico. The NAFTA membership negotiations began in the first months of 1991 and the representatives of the USA required the amendment of the Article 27 of the Mexican Constitution that regulated the collective ownership and use of the *ejidos* as the condition for Mexico's membership.¹⁸⁶ Consequently the article was amended. According to this amendment, peasants gained the right to sell their lands in the *ejidos*, which was argued, by the government, to be beneficial to the peasantry, although in reality it paved the way for wealthy landowners to buy the land of the poor peasants and increase their lands.

With the NAFTA, the movement of goods and money among these three countries were freed and tariffs among these countries were reduced. Although Mexico hoped that more money would enter into the country, more job opportunities would emerge and wages would increase, in reality Mexico would be exposed to the most powerful economy in the world. In terms of agriculture, the competition between the US and Mexico would be quite unfair as the US were advantageous due to its natural resources, technology, research development and subsidies.¹⁸⁷ Furthermore, “NAFTA and the Salinas modernization program required the jettisoning of the most fundamental principles of the revolution.”¹⁸⁸

Salinas' policies and NAFTA caused deep concerns in many people. It was felt that national sovereignty was threatened, it was feared that small businesses would be destroyed and it was predicted by economists that millions of jobs would be lost. Salinas disregarded the basic needs of people and widened the gap between the wealthy minority and poor majority. In order to develop the export-based

¹⁸⁵Foster, 2007, 224.

¹⁸⁶ Topal, 2009, 18.

¹⁸⁷Kirkwood, 2000, 207-208.

¹⁸⁸Foster, 2007, 226.

economy wages were kept low, so low that Salinas was forced to increase the minimum wage during the NAFTA negotiations.¹⁸⁹

As Harvey argues the transition to the free market was a decision that disregarded the realities in which the peasants lived. The price controls on almost every agricultural product except maize and beans had been lifted by 1989. The protection of maize and beans was also threatened as the two products were included in the negotiations that led to the NAFTA. "Recognizing maize and beans as 'sensitive crops' in the new free trade area, NAFTA provided for a fifteen-year phaseout of tariffs and import quotas. The rationale for NAFTA was that each country and region should produce goods and services in which they have comparative advantages."¹⁹⁰ However, as the United States had advantage in terms of productivity per hectare as well as in terms of technology, infrastructure and subsidies, this meant that maize producers in Mexico could not survive.

Nevertheless, January 1, 1994 would be the day that the NAFTA comes into force, while another event took place on that day as well: Zapatista Army of National Liberation (*Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional* - EZLN) emerged from the Lacandon Forest and declared war on the Mexican government.

¹⁸⁹Ibid., 229-230.

¹⁹⁰Harvey, 1999, 181.

CHAPTER IV

History of the Zapatista Movement

The crowd was looking at him with surprise and anxiety. ‘Are you going to let us go?’ a foreign visitor to the town asks. The tourists had been previously informed that they could return to their places on 2 January. ‘Why do you want to go?’ replied the man. ‘Enjoy the city.’ Some were asking, shouting, if they could go by car to Cancún. Everybody wanted to speak at the same time. A guide obviously annoyed raised his voice to say that he had to take some tourists to see the ruins of Palenque. Marcos lost his patience but not his sense of humour. ‘The road to Palenque is closed,’ he said. ‘We have taken Ocosingo. We apologise for any inconvenience but this is a revolution.’¹⁹¹

The war declared by the EZLN against the Mexican government and the federal army on the January 1st, 1994 took everyone, not only the tourists and inhabitants of the seven cities occupied in Chiapas, not only the Mexican state and army but also the international society by surprise. In addition to the national media, within the early days of the uprising, “news of the indigenous uprising had spread throughout the world ... and covered the front pages of the main newspapers.”¹⁹²

Although “the president’s confidence in his policies and the respect he received worldwide gave hope to many Mexicans that an era of prosperity and development would be theirs”, after the uprising, “Suddenly Salinas’s promise of a modern Mexico crashed against the reality of a Mexico that had been completely ignored by the policies of two successive conservative administrations. In Mexico’s indigenous states, such as Chiapas, 70 percent of the population lives below the poverty line.”¹⁹³

¹⁹¹ C. Tello Diaz, *La Rebelion en las Cañadas* (Mexico, D.F.: Cal y Arena, 1995) in Mentinis, 2006, 8.

¹⁹² Gloria Muñoz Ramírez, *The Fire and The Word: A History of the Zapatista Movement* (San Francisco: City Lights Books, 2008), 108.

¹⁹³ Foster, 2007, 50.

4.1. The Roots and Ten Years of Preparation

The Zapatista movement did not begin on January 1, 1994 out of nowhere. Most researchers agree that the roots of the Mexican revolutionary groups can be traced back to the Tlatelolco massacre on October 2, 1968. The undermined legitimacy of the PRI government due to the massacre and the successful Cuban revolution led to the emergence of revolutionary groups aiming at the overthrow of the government in Mexico. In 1969, a revolutionary guerilla group called National Liberation Forces (*Fuerzas de Liberación Nacional* - FLN) was established. The leader of the group was Cesar German Yanez, whose brother (one of the members of the FLN) would be one of the founders of the EZLN. The FLN established its first camp in the Lacandon Jungle in 1972.

Luis Echeverria, Minister of the Interior, who was accused of being responsible for the Tlatelolco massacre and who became the president in 1970 tried to improve his public image by pacifying the discontent among peasantry, workers and students and by promoting peasantry organizations. His policies remained inadequate for improving conditions in the rural areas while his populism added to the emergence of new *campesino* movements and increased activism. *Campesino* organizations, in addition to armed groups and political activities increased in Chiapas too. In 1974, an Indigenous Congress was held with the help of the Bishop of San Cristóbal, which later paved the way for the organization of K'ip Tic Talekumtasel (Quiptic), which means "we unite our forces to progress" in Tzeltal language, in 1975. In addition to these organizations, there were various other organizations ranging from Maoists to Trotskyists, from Guevarists to Leninists.¹⁹⁴ The FLN was another guerilla group that aimed at establishing a socialist system through armed struggle among others, however, the encounter with the indigenous people in the region transformed the group and gave birth to a new kind of movement. Subcomandante Marcos names this process the defeat by the indigenous:

...we learned that you can't impose a form of politics on the people
because sooner or later you'll end up doing the same thing you criticized.
You criticize a totalitarian system and then you offer another totalitarian

¹⁹⁴Mentinis, 2006, 2-3.

system. You can't impose a political system by force. Before, they said 'let's get rid of this system of government and put in this other kind of system.' We say, 'no, the political system can't be the product of war.' The war should only be to open up space in the political arena so that the people can really have a choice.¹⁹⁵

This defeat signifies the novelty of the EZLN, the novelty which distinguishes the EZLN from other guerilla groups. The rejection of vanguardism and hierarchy and the idea of equality of anyone to anyone became prominent points in the politics of EZLN upon the encounter with the indigenous and this defeat.

According to Subcomandante Marcos, the famous spokesperson of the EZLN, the Zapatista movement passed through seven stages before the war was declared. In the first stage, members of the EZLN were chosen based on the training sessions organized in the jungle to evaluate the qualified participants. The second stage, which is also described as the actual foundation of the Zapatista army, was "implantation", in which the six founders, three *mestizos* and three indigenous, started their journey to the mountains of the southeast Mexico and settled there. That trip, Marcos proposes to suppose, began on November 10, 1983 and the date that the first camp built at the first stop was November 17, 1983, which is accepted as the day of foundation of the EZLN according to Marcos. The third stage was to try to survive by hunting and collecting fruits as well as to study military strategies and tactics and learning to use guns. Marcos states that he arrived at the Lacandon Jungle during this stage. In this stage, camps like "The Wood Stove", "Recruits", "Baby Doc", "Of the Youth", "Watapil" were built. In the fourth stage, the guerillas made their first contact with the people in the region. The strategy was talking to one person, letting her to talk to her family, then letting the family talk to the village. After the village, then came the region. In this way the EZLN turned into "a well-known secret and a widespread conspiracy." In the fifth stage, the EZLN grew and its reach expanded beyond the Lacandon Jungle to Los Altos and Norte. During the sixth stage, the

¹⁹⁵ Subcomandante Marcos interview with Medea Benjamin *First World, Ha Ha Ha!: The Zapatista Challenge*, ed. Elaine Katzenberger (San Francisco: City Lights, 1995), 61.

decision to wage war was voted and the preparation for war began. The seventh stage covers the days before the day January 1, 1994.¹⁹⁶

The period between 1983 and 1994 passed in extreme security since the organization was not strong and broad enough to openly challenge the government and the army. The meetings were held at night, the insurgents who tried to recruit members or sympathizers from the indigenous people walked in disguise and the indigenous sympathizers or members hid the existence of the EZLN from their fellow villagers until they completely trusted in them.

The most important thing was security. What you knew, you held in your heart. No one else knew. Just other *compañeros*, and anyone who wasn't, no... When the insurgents arrived in a village, it was because the whole village had already been recruited, the whole village was *compa* (short for *compañero*). Then we had to look for a local supervisor and then a regional supervisor, because there were already a lot of villages.¹⁹⁷

In this fashion, the Zapatistas both organized militarily and expanded their civilian bases. "Fathers recruited sons, sons recruited brothers, cousins, and uncles. During the year of 1988 to 1989, the number of armed combatants grew from 80 to 1300... There was no massive or sudden sale of arms to the EZLN. Instead, they gradually and clandestinely built up their own collection of weapons and munitions."¹⁹⁸ "Within a few years the EZLN, from being a small guerilla group, had been transformed into an indigenous army of some thousands of men and women, and supported by a growing number of communities in the jungle and mountains of Chiapas."¹⁹⁹

Before appearing on the stage and declaring war on the government, 10000 indigenous poured into the streets of San Cristobal de las Casas in which the 500th anniversary of the Spanish conquest that was renamed "the meeting of two worlds" by the government was being commemorated on October 12, 1992 and knocked

¹⁹⁶Ramírez, 2008, 20-29.

¹⁹⁷CompañeroRaúl, interview, Ramírez, 49.

¹⁹⁸Harvey, 1999, 167.

¹⁹⁹Mentinis, 2006, 4.

down the statue of Diego de Mazariegos, the conquistador and the founder of the city.²⁰⁰ That was also the year the decision of war taken collectively by the indigenous communities.

4.2. Declaration of War and the First Years

The war began at dawn on January 1, 1994 and the EZLN occupied seven cities in the state of Chiapas. The First Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle was read from the balconies of the occupied municipal buildings. In this declaration, it was stated that choosing the way of armed struggle was a measure of last resort and this just struggle would not end unless the basic demands of work, housing, land, education, food, health, freedom, democracy, justice and peace were not met.²⁰¹

Their motives and why they chose armed struggle are explained in *El Despertador Mexicano* (The Mexican Awakener), a newspaper published by the Zapatistas:

For hundreds of years we have been asking for and believing in promises that were never kept. We were always told to be patient and to wait for better times. They told us to be prudent, that the future would be different. But we see now that this isn't true. Everything is the same or worse now than when our grandparents and parents lived. Our people are still dying from hunger and curable diseases, and live with ignorance, illiteracy and lack of culture. And we realize that if we don't fight, our children can expect the same. And it is not fair.²⁰²

The official declarations made just after the occupation tried to undermine the rebellion and in order to be able to manipulate the public, accused the rebellion of having roots in foreign countries. Furthermore, comments that the indigenous did not have the ability to use technological weapons and that they were not capable of

²⁰⁰ Khasnabish, 2010, 60.

²⁰¹ Ramírez, 2008, 105-106.

²⁰² "Editorial – El Despertador Mexicano," flag.blackened.net, accessed July 18, 2013.
http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/mexico/ezln/ezln_editorial.html.

rebellion due to their genetics were made. These indicate that racism toward the indigenous, a remnant of the previous century continued in 1990s as well.²⁰³

On January 5, 1994, President Salinas made a speech and stated that those who left their arms would be pardoned. However, civil society started to feel sympathy towards the movement, mostly since the conditions in which the indigenous had been living had long remained obscured and the declaration of war made by the movement clearly stated these conditions, and organized protests that demanded the ending of the violence. With this support, the EZLN declared its conditions for a dialogue with the government: recognition, ceasefire, withdrawal of the troops, end of bombing and the establishment of National Commission of Intermediation. On January 12, 1994, a mass demonstration was held in Mexico City calling for a ceasefire and Salinas had to declare a ceasefire due to the pressures. The demonstrations meant that the public did not want a war and this was shown to the government as well as to the EZLN, which chose to the way of words instead of guns, which they had been prepared for ten years, to continue their struggle.²⁰⁴

The pardon offered by the president was answered by a communiqué by the EZLN titled “What Will We Be Pardoned For?”, one of the texts that explain the reasons of the movement in a plain way:

What are we supposed to ask pardon for? What are they going to pardon us for? For not dying of hunger? For not being silent in our misery? For not having accepted humbly the giant historical burden of contempt and neglect? For having risen up in arms when we found all the roads blocked? Who should ask for pardon and who should grant it? Those who, for years and years, sat at a laden table and ate their fill while death sat with us, death, so everyday, so ours that we stopped being afraid of it? Those who filled our pockets and souls with declarations and promises...²⁰⁵

²⁰³Mentinis, 2006, 9.

²⁰⁴Ramírez, 2008, 110-113.

²⁰⁵Mentinis, 2006, 10.

Eventually the parties agreed to start a dialogue. Before the beginning of the dialogue that would take place in San Cristobal de las Casas, of which the Bishop Samuel Ruiz would be the mediator, on February 20, 1994, the Zapatistas released General Absalon Castellanos Dominguez, whose not being executed showed the good faith and political-ethical principles of the movement. During the dialogue, the EZLN found the opportunity of reaching more people as they were interviewed by journalists from all over the world, could encounter members of NGOs, parties, organizations and people from civil society.

Subcomandante Marcos, accompanied by several commanders, represented the EZLN and Foreign Minister of the Mexican government, Manuel Camacho Solis, the leader of the pro-negotiations wins of the government, represented the government in these peace negotiations, the “Conversations in the Cathedral”. The first conversations concluded with the agreement on some of the Zapatista demands. The Zapatistas returned to their base communities in order to discuss the conclusions reached during the first conversations and these were rejected as many of their key demands were not included. The discussion of the negotiations’ conclusions is an example of the decision-making in Zapatista communities. The democracy within the communities requires the participation of every single individual in the community and the statement of every single individual’s idea. This is actually a good instance of the Zapatista principle “*Mandar Obedeciendo*” (Rule by Obeying), which means that the people, not the leaders or the governors should decide. This is the basic principle of the Zapatistas, which has been derived from the indigenous culture and signifies the importance of democracy, equality and the denial of hierarchy in Zapatistas’ understanding of politics. Although these proposals were rejected and the negotiations with the government broke down, the indigenous and the EZLN decided to continue the ceasefire and the dialogues with the civil society.

The main reason for the rejection of the conclusions and the breaking down of the peace process was that “the Zapatistas and the government each had different ideas about the scope and dimensions of the issues on the table.”²⁰⁶ The official Zapatista response to the Conversations in the Cathedral states that the EZLN

²⁰⁶ Raúl Benítez Manaut, Andrew Selee, Cynthia J. Arnson, “Frozen Negotiations: The Peace Process in Chiapas” *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 22, no: 1 (2006): 138.

presented 34 demands, some of which addressed to the needs of the entire population and some of which addressed to the needs of the indigenous people while the government tried to reduce these demands to local and indigenous level, even to four townships in Chiapas. The national demands of the EZLN were not answered, The EZLN demands concerning the *campesinos* were partially or locally answered, the demands concerning the indigenous people were partially answered and the demands at the state level were not answered. And the response ends with these words:

The supreme government presented its peace accord proposals during the dialogue in San Cristóbal de las Casas. The EZLN responded by explaining that it had to consult all of its members; the people who make us up are those who gave us the order to go to war and only these people can order us to make peace. After a period of time, we have finished with the consultations. This is our response to the government's proposals.

Through the foregoing communique', and in light of the free and democratic vote of those who are part of the EZLN, we say NO to the supreme government's peace accord proposals. We see this as a close to the dialogue of San Cristobal. We reiterate our disposition to continue in search of a political solution that will lead to a peace with justice and dignity. We call on all progressive and independent sectors of society to attend a national dialogue for a peace with democracy, freedom, and justice.

We will not surrender!

Democracy!

Freedom!

Justice!²⁰⁷

Furthermore, the Second Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle was announced and the EZLN called for the establishment of the National Democratic Convention in order to organize the civil society to demand free and democratic elections. It was held between August 5 and August 9, 1994 and was attended by

²⁰⁷“The rejection of the Dialogue for Peace and Reconciliation in Chiapas,” flag.blackened.net, accessed November 7, 2013.

http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/mexico/ezln/ccri_di_reject_jun94.html.

nearly 7000 Mexicans, “representatives of grassroots organizations, artists, intellectuals, indigenous people from all over the country, workers, homosexuals, peasants and Zapatistas.”²⁰⁸ The scope of the convention and its attendants actually indicates that the movement reached beyond being an indigenous movement and that it is quite ready to listen to every sector of the society. The openness of the convention is quite in line with the Seven Principles of the Zapatista ‘Good Government’, which would be clearly formulated in the speech given by Comandante Tacho at the Second Encounter of the Zapatistas with the peoples of the World in 2007: “to lead by obeying; to represent, not replace, to work from below and not to seek to rise; to serve, not self-serve; to convince, not conquer; to construct, not destroy; to propose, not impose.”²⁰⁹ As it is seen, the convention seeks to collect peoples’ proposals and obey them, represent peoples without replacing them, work from below, serve peoples’ interests, convince them, not to impose them and constructing something meaningful without destruction. The place where the convention was held is also significant. The town of Guadalupe Tepeyac would host the convention however, it was named *Aguascalientes* as a reference to the city in which the revolutionaries held a convention in 1914.

On December 19, 1994, the EZLN took thirty towns without using violence and declared these towns rebel, autonomous municipalities.²¹⁰ Later, the Third Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle was declared on January 1, 1995 and called for the organization of a movement for national liberation. Although the peace process was in effect, the government initiated an attack on the EZLN on February 9, 1995. While the army attacked the Zapatista communities, the police started to arrest activists and supporters of the EZLN. However, civil society, again, did not remain silent. 100,000 people gathered in a demonstration in Mexico City and protested the breaking of the ceasefire. In addition to the demonstrations held in Mexico, people protested the government’s offensive throughout the world by organizing

²⁰⁸Ramírez, 2008, 117-120.

²⁰⁹“Seven Principles of “Rule by Obeying/MandarObedeciendo” of the Zapatista ‘Good Government’ and the National Congress of Indigenous Peoples”, [zapatismo.florycanto.net](http://www.zapatismo.florycanto.net), accessed October 24, 2013.

<http://www.zapatismo.florycanto.net/docs/zapatistasevenprinciplesgoodgovernment.pdf>.

²¹⁰Ramírez, 2008, 123.

demonstrations in front of the Mexican embassies.²¹¹ “Detentions, skirmishes, assassinations, rapes, looting of whole villages, presumed Zapatistas detained and tortured in Toluca, Mexico State and Yanga, Veracruz and more than 30,000 people displaced – all of this occurred as a result of the offensive.”²¹²

Nevertheless, in March 1995, the Law for Dialogue, Conciliation and Dignified Peace in Chiapas was approved in the Congress and the Commission for Concordance and Pacification (Comisión para la Concordia y la Pacificación - COCOPA) was established. In April, peace talks, which would take place in San Andrés Sacamchen de los Pobres, were initiated again. First five rounds of the meetings did not result in any concrete agreements. During these meetings, however, another political action was taken by the EZLN: the National Consultation for Peace and Democracy was held with 1,088,000 Mexicans who voted in more than 10,000 polling tables as well as an international consultation was held with 100,000 people from fifty countries. These consultations were about the future of the EZLN, which were again showed that the EZLN was quite different from the traditional guerrilla groups. In line with their political principles, the EZLN consulted the national and international public about its political future. The result was that over one million people voted for the EZLN’s transformation into an independent and new political force.

In the sixth round of the talks, the parties agreed on the working groups: “indigenous rights and culture, democracy and justice, welfare and development, conciliation in Chiapas, women’s rights in Chiapas and end of hostilities.” Yet, the tension grew for once more when Fernando Yanez Muñoz was arrested for the accusation of being one of the *comandantes* of the EZLN. The Zapatistas declared a red alert, and later Yanez was released. In December four more Aguascalientes were established by the EZLN, which added to the growing tension.²¹³

²¹¹Ibid., 125 - 127; Mentinis, 2006, 16.

²¹²Ramírez, 2008, 127.

²¹³Ibid., 128-130.

4.3. The Fourth Declaration

On January 1, 1996, the Fourth Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle, which called for the establishment of the Zapatista Front for National Liberation (*Frente Zapatista de Liberación Nacional* - FZLN) was announced. The FZLN would comprise of those without a political party, those who do not aim to have positions in the government and to take power. The FZLN would not be a political party, it would collect the proposals of the citizens and direct them through obedience. It would be "a political force which struggles against the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few and against the centralization of power. A political force whose members do not have any other privilege than the satisfaction of having fulfilled its commitment."²¹⁴

This organization, in line with the voting results of the National Consultation for Peace and Democracy, would be established as an independent and new kind of political organization built from the bottom, organized by the Zapatista principle rule by obeying, not pursuing political power, not a vanguard but an organization that collected and organized people's proposals.²¹⁵

On February 16, 1996, the parties reached an agreement on the Indigenous Rights and Culture section and the first peace accords were signed. The government agreed to recognize the autonomy right of the indigenous in the constitution, to expand their political representation, to guarantee their access to justice, to guarantee their political, legal and cultural right as well as to recognize them as subjects of public rights.²¹⁶ In October 1996, Comandanta Ramona travelled to Mexico City and gave a speech. In this way, the Zapatistas made their first public appearance in the capital. "Her speech culminated with the slogan that had accompanied the struggle for the recognition of indigenous rights and culture: 'Never again a Mexico without us.'"²¹⁷ In the meantime, although it was agreed by the parties that the COCOPA's draft, with the reservation of the EZLN that some crucial points made in the San Andrés Records were left out of the draft, for the constitutional reforms on the

²¹⁴"Fourth Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle," struggle.ws, accessed July 24, 2013. <http://www.struggle.ws/mexico/ezln/jung4.html>.

²¹⁵ Kara Ann Zugman, "Zapatismo and Urban Political Practice," *Latin American Perspectives* 32, no: 143 (2005): 133.

²¹⁶Ramírez, 2008, 138.

²¹⁷*Ibid.*, 147.

indigenous rights and culture would be accepted or declined without any modification, the government made profound changes in the draft. Faced with these changes, the EZLN rejected the government's proposal and declared that the peace talks would be suspended until government's compliance with the Accords. In February 1997, 10,000 Zapatistas marched and protested government's non-compliance in San Cristobal de las Casas. The peace talks came to a halt and government's violent repression increased.²¹⁸

"The event, however, that marked that year was *La Marcha* of 1,111 Zapatistas, representatives of their respective autonomous communities, to Mexico City in September."²¹⁹ The walk began on September 8, 1997.

The huge mobilization pursued several objectives: a) to mobilize national and international civil society during the post-election period when government was dictating by decree that since there was a member of the opposition PRD heading the Mexico City government, democratic conditions now existed in the country to incorporate the EZLN into institutional life; b) to explain along the march the causes of the uprising, the conditions of militarization and paramilitarization and the process of autonomy; c) to publicize the San Andrés Accords, protest the failure to comply, and collect endorsements for approval of the law on Indigenous Rights and Culture drafted by the COCOPA in the context of a new Congress; d) to break through the military and paramilitary wall of containment extended around the communities in resistance; e) to establish direct contacts with civil society, nonpartisan political organizations, nongovernmental organizations, ecclesiastic base organizations, university members, workers and farmers and indigenous people from all over the country; f) to explain their struggle and find out about others'; g) to walk and ask questions...²²⁰

The march ended in Mexico City on September 12, 1997 and the Zapatista members participated in the Congress of the Founding of the Zapatista Front for

²¹⁸Ibid., 148 – 152.

²¹⁹Mentinis, 2006, 20.

²²⁰Ramírez, 2008 160.

National Liberation and the Second Assembly of the National Indigenous Congress. The next months witnessed the dirty war engaged by the government, paramilitary groups' violent attacks and assassinations grew, which led to the Acteal massacre, the killing of forty-five unarmed indigenous people, most of whom were children and women.²²¹ The year 1998 saw more repression, persecution, military attack and more protests.

From December 22, 1997 (the day of the Acteal massacre) to January 13, 1998 (the day after the assassination of Guadalupe Méndez), there were mobilizations in 130 cities in twenty-seven countries of five continents. On January 12, dozens of actions, big and small, were carried out in Mexico and other parts of the world, all with the same demand: stop the war of extermination, punish those responsible for the Acteal murders and comply with the San Andrés Accords.²²²

However, government's repressive actions, persecutions, arrests continued, the autonomous municipalities were attacked, foreign Zapatista sympathizers were expelled from the country and the EZLN decided to use silence as weapon and to resist peacefully against military provocations.²²³ In the Fifth Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle published in July 1998, the EZLN explained this silence:

Silence, dignity and resistance were our strengths and our best weapons. With them, we fight and defeat an enemy which is powerful but whose cause lacks right and justice. From our experience and from the long and shining history of indigenous struggle which we inherited from our ancestors, the first inhabitants of these lands, we pick up these weapons again and convert our silences into soldiers, our dignity into light, and our walls into resistance. Despite the fact that, during the time our remaining quiet lasted, we kept away from direct participation in the primary national problems with our position and proposals; although our silence allowed the powerful to create and to spread rumors and lies about

²²¹Ibid., 160-165.

²²²Ibid., 170.

²²³Ibid., 173, Mentinis, 2006, 21-22.

internal divisions and ruptures within the zapatistas, and they tried to dress us in the cloth of intolerance, intransigence, weakness and renunciation; despite the fact that some grew discouraged from the lack of our words and that others took advantage of their absence to pretend to be our spokespersons, despite those sorrows, and also because of them, we have taken, and are taking, great steps forward.²²⁴

The EZLN also called for a consultation that would ask whether the indigenous people should be a part of the national project and construction of a new Mexico, whether the peace should be achieved through dialogue and without military operations, whether the indigenous rights based on the San Andrés Accords should be included in the constitution and whether the government should rule by obeying. These four questions were asked in 2,500 municipalities of Mexico by 5,000 Zapatista representatives, half of whom were women and half of whom were men. Although 3 million Mexicans voted in favor of the EZLN, the government ignored this consultation.²²⁵

4.4. The New Millennium

In 2000, Zedillo's term ended and Vicente Fox from the PAN was elected president. Fox had taken a moderate approach towards the EZLN, avoiding military confrontation and maintaining dialogue, during the campaign. The EZLN, on the other hand, remained silent until June 19, 2000, on which they released a communique about the presidential elections. The communique stated that the elections would take place during a war, criticized that the election campaign reminded a series of advertisements, argued that the possible opposition victory would not mean the victory of democracy, explained the importance of autonomous legislative power as a part of democracy and stated that the elections were not the way of Zapatistas since democracy was built from the below and engaged by all according to them. In a press conference held on December 2, 2000, three minimal conditions required for resuming dialogue were stated: approval of the Law on

²²⁴Fifth Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle," struggle.ws, accessed July 24, 2013.
http://www.struggle.ws/mexico/ezln/ccri_5_dec_lj_july98.html.

²²⁵Mentinis, 2006, 22.

Indigenous Rights and Culture, liberation of Zapatista prisoners and withdrawal of the army from seven positions they held. Furthermore, the Zapatistas declared that they would organize a march of a delegation to Mexico City. The delegation would demand from the Congress the approval of the Law on Indigenous Rights and Culture drafted by the COCOPA. In December 2000, the army was withdrawn from the community Amador Hernandez, one of the seven positions mentioned during the press conference.²²⁶

The march, The Color of the Earth March began on February 24, 2001. “Twenty-three members of the EZLN *comandancia* left for Mexico City from five different points in rebel territory, with a first stop in San Cristobal de las Casas, Chiapas.”²²⁷ Joined by a twenty-fourth member, Subcomandante Marcos, and after meeting with civil society at numerous other stops, the members participated the Third National Indigenous Congress. After fifteen days, the members reached Mexico City, where they were welcomed by 250,000 people. The Zapatista delegation made the following announcement there:

Mexico City: We are here. We are here as rebellious color of the earth which shouts: Democracy! Liberty! Justice! Mexico: We did not come to tell you what to do, or to guide you along any path. We came in order to humbly, respectfully, ask you to help us. For you to not allow another day to dawn without this flag having an honorable place for us who are the color of the earth.²²⁸

As seen, the EZLN does not engage in any kind of vanguardism, their primary goal is to engage in dialogue.

The Zapatistas had done what the EZLN could not do in January 1994: they had taken Mexico City without firing a single shot and, to the great consternation of Mexico’s political class, they had rallied Mexicans —

²²⁶ Ramírez, 2008, 197-206.

²²⁷ Ibid., 212.

²²⁸ “Words of the EZLN in the Zo’calo of Mexico City”, struggle.ws, accessed November 22, 2013. http://struggle.ws/mexico/ezln/2001/march/zocalo_mar11.html.

and supporters internationally — to demand fundamental respect for the dignity of indigenous peoples and their capacity for self-determination.²²⁹

The march had been organized with the aim of meeting with the deputies and senators and speaking in the Congress. Although this aim caused a series of debates within the Congress, eventually they were allowed in the Congress. On March 28, 2001, to everyone's surprise, Comandanta Esther, not Subcomandante Marcos, gave a speech in Congress, which touched upon the indigenous women and COCOPA's draft of law on indigenous culture and rights. By then, Subcomandante Marcos had already become a popular figure, although he was only a spokesperson of the EZLN. That Comandanta Esther gave the speech indicates that the EZLN did not have any leader despite the fact that Marcos was seen as a leader since he was more visible publicly. Besides, both that the speaker was a woman and the issue that was talked was indigenous woman shows that the EZLN gave importance to the issue of women, especially the indigenous women, who were triply exploited for being indigenous women, for being women and for being poor women.²³⁰

Nevertheless, a constitutional reform on indigenous culture and rights, a reform that ignored the COCOPA's draft, was approved on April 25, as if that speech had been never given. The EZLN released a communiqué that stated that the reform did not meet the indigenous demands, that it betrayed the San Andrés Accords and that the EZLN did not recognize the reform. Protests against the reform were held and constitutional challenges before the Supreme Court were presented in order to prevent taking effect of the reform.²³¹ However, these challenges were rejected by the Supreme Court. While the government officials celebrated this decision and argued that the reform approved by the Congress was a sign that the government and the Congress were in favor peace and conciliation, the indigenous people, civil society, artists and intellectuals criticized both the law and the decision of the Supreme Court.²³² And, "for the Zapatistas, the actions of the Congress and Fox's administration meant that there remained no basis for continuing dialogue, and they

²²⁹Khasnabish, 2010, 151.

²³⁰Speech given by Comandanta Ramona in Ramírez, 2008, 214.

²³¹Ramírez, 2008, 224-230.

²³²Ibid., 238-242.

severed all contact with the Mexican government for the duration of Fox's regime."²³³

On January 1, 2003, the EZLN broke its silence and took over the streets of San Cristobal de las Casas with more than 20,000 indigenous people and protested the reform law. In July, they released "seven documents that made up the 'Thirteenth Stele (the continuation of the twelve-part Calendar of Resistance), in which they

announced the disappearance of the Aguascalientes, and the creation of the Caracoles and the Good Government Committees (JBG). Each one of the five Good Government Committees is formed by one or two delegates of the Autonomous Councils in said region, covering the 30 Rebel Autonomous Zapatista Municipalities."²³⁴

The reason of the death of *Aguascalientes* was explained in the Thirteenth Stele along with a short history of the movement until 2003. The objective of the *Aguascalientes* was to provide a space for the encounter and dialogue between the Zapatistas and national and international civil society.

I told you that we tried to learn from our encuentros with national and international civil society. But we also expected them to learn. The zapatista movement arose, among other things, in demand of respect. And it so happened that we didn't always receive respect. And it's not that they insulted us. Or at least not intentionally. But, for us, pity is an affront, and charity is a slap in the face. Because, parallel with the emergence and operation of those spaces of encuentro that were the "Aguascalientes," some sectors of civil society have maintained what we call "the Cinderella syndrome."²³⁵

²³³ Khasnabish, 2010, 154.

²³⁴ "Peace Process, War Process," sipaz.org, accessed July 28, 2013.
<http://www.sipaz.org/en/chiapas/peace-process-war-process/344-2003.html>.

²³⁵ "Zapatista Army of National Liberation decides on the death of Aguascalientes," flag.blackened.net, accessed November 7, 2013.
<http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/mexico/eZln/2003/marcos/deathJULY.html>.

In addition, the charity given by NGOs and international agencies was problematic as well.

It consists, broadly speaking, in their deciding what the communities need, and, without even consulting them, imposing not just specific projects, but also the times and means of their implementation. Imagine the desperation of a community that needs drinkable water and they're saddled with a library. The one that requires a school for the children, and they give them a course on herbs.²³⁶

In this regard, what the Zapatistas needed and *Aguascalientes* were established for was not charity but political support, “the support for building a small part of that world where all worlds fit”. In the same document, it is also stated that the poor material conditions in which the Zapatista communities lived were consciously chosen in the sense that if the Zapatistas wanted to live in better conditions with material aid and support they would prefer cooption with the government, which according to Marcos, would be willing to provide the best material conditions for the cooption. The poverty in which they lived was a lesson of dignity and consistent with their saying “For everyone everything, nothing for us”.

In August 2004, the EZLN implemented the San Andrés Accords themselves in their territories since the government has not taken any action towards the implementation of the Accords and the establishment of the Caracoles and the Good Government Juntas (*Juntas de Buen Gobierno* - JBGs) were officially declared:

On August 9th, at a major celebration in Oventik, attended by more than ten thousand people, they formally declare the death of the *Aguascalientes*, and the birth of the five autonomous Caracoles, political and cultural centres, and their Good Government Juntas, who "govern by obeying". This marks the full separation of the Zapatista civil and

²³⁶ Ibid.

military structures and authorities, and the symbolic creation of full autonomy.²³⁷

The functions of the JBGs were “to counteract unbalanced development in the Autonomous Municipalities and the communities; to mediate conflicts which might arise between Autonomous Municipalities, and between Autonomous Municipalities and government municipalities; to deal with denuncias against Autonomous Councils for human rights violations, protests and disagreements, to investigate their veracity, to order Rebel Zapatista Autonomous Councils to correct these errors and to monitor their compliance; to monitor the implementation of projects and community work in the Rebel Zapatista Autonomous Municipalities, making sure that they are carried out in the time frames and methods which were agreed by the communities; in order to promote support for community projects in the Rebel Zapatista Autonomous Municipalities; to monitor the fulfillment of those laws which, by common agreement with the communities, are operative in the Rebel Zapatista Municipalities; to serve and guide national and international civil society so that they can visit communities, carry out productive projects, set up peace camps, carry out research (ojo: those which provide benefits for the communities) and any other activity permitted in the rebel communities and to, in common accord with the CCRI-CG of the EZLN, promote and approve the participation of companeros and companeras of the Rebel Zapatista Autonomous Municipalities in activities or events outside the rebel communities; and in order to choose and prepare those companeros and companeras”.²³⁸

In 2005, the Sixth Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle, the last one until now, was released. The Sixth Declaration included six sections. The first section “What We Are” gave a short account of the movement from the Zapatistas’ perspective. The reasons of the rebellion were explained:

²³⁷ “Zapatista History,” kiptik.org, accessed October 24, 2013. <http://www.kiptik.org/history.html>.

²³⁸ “A Good Government,” flag.blackened.net, accessed November 7, 2013. <http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/mexico/ezln/2003/marcos/governmentJULY.html>.

Now, we, the zapatistas of the EZLN, rose up in arms in January of 1994 because we saw how widespread had become the evil wrought by the powerful who o-nly humiliated us, stole from us, imprisoned us and killed us, and no one was saying anything or doing anything. That is why we said “Ya Basta!,” that no longer were we going to allow them to make us inferior or to treat us worse than animals. And then we also said we wanted democracy, liberty and justice for all Mexicans although we were concentrated on the Indian peoples. Because it so happened that we, the EZLN, were almost all only indigenous from here in Chiapas, but we did not want to struggle just for own good, or just for the good of the indigenous of Chiapas, or just for the good of the Indian peoples of Mexico. We wanted to fight along with everyone who was humble and simple like ourselves and who was in great need and who suffered from exploitation and thievery by the rich and their bad governments here, in our Mexico, and in other countries in the world.²³⁹

One crucial point that must be noted here is that the struggle is not just for the indigenous, not even for the Mexican people but for all the people in the countries of the world. As evident in the Zapatista saying “For everyone everything, nothing for us”, Zapatista movement is not interested only in their own sufferings but in all sufferings around the world. Furthermore, this is not a struggle in terms of the economic and material conditions but also in terms of democracy as the bad governments in the statement refers to the undemocratic governments.

In the second section, “Where We Are Now”, the developments that had been achieved within the movement and the Zapatista territory, such as the autonomous rebel Zapatista municipalities, JBGS, separating the political-military from the autonomous and democratic aspects of organization in the Zapatista communities and the improvements in terms of the material living conditions within the communities, were explained.

In the third section, “How We See the World”, the effects of capitalism and neoliberalism in the world and in the fourth section “How We See Our Country

²³⁹“Sixth Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle,” anarkismo.net, accessed November 8, 2013. http://www.anarkismo.net/newswire.php?story_id=805.

Which is Mexico” same effects in Mexico were stated together with the struggles against neoliberalism.

The fifth section “What We Want To Do” gives the signal of a new campaign:

And, then, what we think is that, with these persons and organizations of the left, we will make a plan for going to all those parts of Mexico where there are humble and simple people like ourselves. And we are not going to tell them what they should do or give them orders. Nor are we going to ask them to vote for a candidate, since we already know that the ones who exist are neoliberals. Nor are we going to tell them to be like us, nor to rise up in arms. What we are going to do is to ask them what their lives are like, their struggle, their thoughts about our country and what we should do so they do not defeat us. What we are going to do is to take heed of the thoughts of the simple and humble people, and perhaps we will find there the same love which we feel for our Patria. And perhaps we will find agreement between those of us who are simple and humble and, together, we will organize all over the country and reach agreement in our struggles, which are alone right now, separated from each other, and we will find something like a program that has what we all want, and a plan for how we are going to achieve the realization of that program, which is called the "national program of struggle." And, with the agreement of the majority of those people whom we are going to listen to, we will then engage in a struggle with everyone, with indigenous, workers, campesinos, students, teachers, employees, women, children, old ones, men, and with all of those of good heart and who want to struggle so that our Patria called Mexico does not end up being destroyed and sold, and which still exists between the Rio Grande and the Rio Suchiate and which has the Pacific Ocean on one side and the Atlantic on the other.²⁴⁰

²⁴⁰ Ibid.

And in the last section “How We Are Going To Do It”, this new campaign is announced:

the EZLN will establish a policy of alliances with non-electoral organizations and movements which define themselves, in theory and practice, as being of the left, in accordance with the following conditions: Not to make agreements from above to be imposed below, but to make accords to go together to listen and to organize outrage. Not to raise movements which are later negotiated behind the backs of those who made them, but to always take into account the opinions of those participating. Not to seek gifts, positions, advantages, public positions, from the Power or those who aspire to it, but to go beyond the election calendar. Not to try to resolve from above the problems of our Nation, but to build FROM BELOW AND FOR BELOW an alternative to neoliberal destruction, an alternative of the left for Mexico. Yes to reciprocal respect for the autonomy and independence of organizations, for their methods of struggle, for their ways of organizing, for their internal decision making processes, for their legitimate representations. And yes to a clear commitment for joint and coordinated defense of national sovereignty, with intransigent opposition to privatization attempts of electricity, oil, water and natural resources. In other words, we are inviting the unregistered political and social organizations of the left, and those persons who lay claim to the left and who do not belong to registered political parties, to meet with us, at the time, place and manner in which we shall propose at the proper time, to organize a national campaign, visiting all possible corners of our Patria, in order to listen to and organize the word of our people. It is like a campaign, then, but very otherly, because it is not electoral.²⁴¹

La Otra Campana (The Other Campaign) signifies a new approach for politics, aims at consolidating non-electoral, anti-capitalist left rather than running candidates and it “is the Sixth Declaration in practice.”²⁴²

²⁴¹ Ibid.

²⁴² Ramírez, 2008, 317.

Instead of running candidates, the Other Campaign calls for the enactment of a new national constitution that would bar privatization of public resources and other neo-liberal outrages, and insure indigenous autonomy for Mexico's 57 distinct Indian peoples. The Other Campaign will also provide the EZLN with a platform from which to build an organization of indigenous and non-indigenous peoples in every state in the Mexican union.²⁴³

In its first stages, it consists of tours by delegations of the Zapatista insurgents to visit places throughout Mexican nation – to meet with leftist political organizations, landless peasants, the families of murdered women, repressed teachers, forsaken fishermen, exploited sex workers, jobless or underpaid workers, youths at risk, ostracized gays, lesbians and transgender persons, and a long list of people that covers the entire spectrum of Mexico from below.²⁴⁴

The tour began on January 1, 2006 with Subcomandante Marcos, who started to be called Delegate Zero, in that year the Campaign toured Mexico as thoroughly as possible and met with almost all indigenous groups in Mexico. The campaign was met with violence and repression of the government in some places. Perhaps the most violent attack took place against the Front of the Peoples in Defense of Land in San Salvador Atenco, the state of Mexico²⁴⁵, “during which 275 people are arrested and detained, two killed, and 23 women sexually abused by police.”²⁴⁶

However, presidential elections overshadowed the campaign and it was unable to attract as many people as the Zapatistas could attract in the past years.²⁴⁷

In the last days of 2006, the first Encounter between the Zapatistas and the Peoples of the World was organized in the Caracol of Oventik. During the encounter,

²⁴³ John Ross, “The Zapatista Challenge in Mexico’s Presidential Election,” *Counter Punch*, accessed November 11, 2013.

<http://www.counterpunch.org/2005/11/05/the-zapatista-challenge-in-mexico-s-presidential-elections/>.

²⁴⁴ Ramírez, 2008, 317.

²⁴⁵ Ibid. 318-321.

²⁴⁶ “Zapatista History”, kiptik.org, accessed November 26, 2013. <http://www.kiptik.org/history.html>.

²⁴⁷ Khasnabish, 2010, 160.

attended by more than 2000 people from 43 countries, the autonomy practiced by the Zapatista communities were explained. The representatives of the communities stated that “for us it means that the people determine their forms of struggle and political, economic and social organization; it is the people who decide the way they live based on their language and their culture.”²⁴⁸

In July 2007, The Second Encounter took place in three Caracoles, Oventik, Morelia and La Realidad. In addition to the Good Government Boards and autonomous municipal council members, members of Zapatista base communities attended to the second encounter. “The purpose of this encounter was for ‘people, groups, collectives and organizations that struggle against neoliberalism in Mexico and the world to learn, directly from the EZLN’s base communities, the process of building autonomy in the Zapatista indigenous communities of Chiapas.’”²⁴⁹ During the closing ceremony, a call for a third international encounter between the Zapatista Women and the Women of the World was made. This encounter took place in La Garrucha in January 2008, with the participation of 3000 people.

In the last days of 2008, the Global Festival of Dignified Rage started in Mexico City. “The Festival provided a forum for participants from Mexico and from around the world to discuss radical politics, social movements, history and analysis, under the theme of ‘Another World, Another Path: Below and to the Left’.”²⁵⁰ “The gathering, not only commemorates the path and history of the Zapatista movement but creates a space where all the “rebellious of Mexico and the world,” all these diverse rages could find, meet, learn, and relate to each other.”²⁵¹

The first stage took place between November 26 and 29, 2008. 270 speakers from 57 collectives from 25 countries gave speeches and 1155 people from 228 organizations in Mexico presented political and cultural proposals. Nearly 2500 people attended the festival and nearly 100 artistic groups shared their arts related to the struggles in Mexico and the world. The mornings witnessed discussions on the four wheels of capitalism (exploitation, dispossession, repression and disdain) while

²⁴⁸Ramírez, 2008, 327.

²⁴⁹Ibid., 332.

²⁵⁰Khasnabish, 2010, 160.

²⁵¹ “Zapatistas Hold First Global Festival of Dignified Rage,” *elkimbo.org*, accessed November 26, 2013. <http://www.elkilombo.org/first-global-festival-of-dignified-rage/>.

in the afternoons the other paths such as other social movements, another city, another history and another politics were discussed. The second stage, the celebration of the 15th anniversary of EZLN's war took place in Oventik. During this celebration, it was stated that the bad government supported paramilitary groups to threaten the Zapatista communities and tried to buy the Zapatista supporters. Although some fell into those traps, the Zapatistas' struggle was not for charity help, but for true democracy, liberty and justice for all. On January 2-5, 2009, the third stage took place in the University of Land in San Cristobal de las Casas. Nine roundtables were organized and the issues of another world and another politics were discussed with the participation of 3500 people.²⁵²

²⁵² "Zapatistas Organize the First Global Festival of Dignified Rage," [envio.org.ni](http://www.envio.org.ni), accessed November 26, 2013. <http://www.envio.org.ni/articulo.php/3940>.

CHAPTER V

A Rancièrian Account of the Zapatista Movement

The indigenous movement in which zapatismo is inscribed is not trying to return to the past, nor to maintain the unfair pyramid of society, just changing the skin color of the one who mandates and rules from above. The struggle of the Indian peoples of Mexico is not pointing backwards. In a linear world, where above is considered eternal and below inevitable, the Indian peoples of Mexico are breaking with that line and pointing towards something which is yet to be deciphered, but which is already new and better.²⁵³

The political is the encounter between two heterogeneous processes. The first process is that of governing, and it entails creating community consent, which relies on the distribution of shares and the hierarchy of places and functions. I shall call this process policy. The second process is that of equality. It consists of a set of practices guided by the supposition that everyone is equal and by the attempt to verify this supposition.²⁵⁴

This chapter will analyze the Zapatista movement in the light of Jacques Rancièrè's understanding of the political, politics and democracy. To this end, central themes in Rancièrè's thought such as the *police*/politics distinction, equality and subjectivization will be used. It will be investigated whether the conditions in which the indigenous people of Chiapas live could be described as the *police* and the Zapatista movement could be seen as a rupture in this *police*; whether the equality is something distributed or the equality of anyone to anyone is presupposed within the movement and whether subjectivization can be observed in the Zapatista movement.

²⁵³ Subcomandante Marcos, "Another Calendar: That of Resistance," struggle.ws, January 2003, accessed July 28, 2013.

<http://www.struggle.ws/mexico/ezln/2003/marcos/resistance1.html>.

²⁵⁴ Rancièrè, 1992, 58.

5.1. The Distinction between the *Police* and Politics and the Zapatistas

In this section, Rancière's distinction between the *police* and politics will be analyzed with respect to the Zapatista movement. The initial attempt here is to investigate whether the condition in which the indigenous lived before the emergence of the Zapatista movement could be interpreted as a *police* order.

At this point, it should prove useful to refer to post-revolutionary Mexico, in which the 50 percent of the society was mestizo and 35 percent was indigenous.²⁵⁵ This ethnic diversity was a problem for the nation building process in post-revolutionary Mexico. In 1921, *Secretaría de Educación Pública*, the Ministry of Public Education was created, the vision of José Vasconcelos, who proposed the creation of this new ministry, was that the Mexican national identity would be the *mestizo* and his answer to nationalization of the country was actually mestizoizing the country. Therefore, in the post-revolutionary Mexico, there would be no place for indigenous culture, the indigenous would be civilized and assimilated into the nation.²⁵⁶ This process of mestizoizing is a strict application of a *police* order. It is the 'partitioning of the sensible', which "defines the forms of part-taking by first defining the modes of perception in which they are inscribed."²⁵⁷ This partition is in a double sense, meaning both separating and excluding and allowing participation.

...police determines not just the part that any party has in society; it also determines the intelligibility of any party at all. To have no place within the police order means to be unintelligible - not just marginalized within the system, but made invisible by the system. Police orders thereby distribute both roles and the lack of roles; they determine who counts and they decide that some do not count at all.²⁵⁸

²⁵⁵ Lynn Stephen, *Zapata Lives! Histories and Cultural Politics in Southern Mexico* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press: 2002), 35.

²⁵⁶ Ibid., 40.

²⁵⁷ Rancière, 2001, 9

²⁵⁸ Samuel A. Chambers, "Police and Oligarchy," in *Jacques Rancière Key Concepts*, ed. Jean-Philippe Deranty (Durham: Acumen Publishing, 2010), 63.

In this sense, the police does not only decide on the part that the indigenous have but also decides on the intelligibility of them. The indigenous not only are marginalized, they are also made invisible and they do not count.

Although the government policies directed at the assimilation of the indigenous, known as *indigenismo*, did not affirm the idea that the indigenous were biologically inferior and instead asserted that the poverty of the indigenous was the result of indigenous social structure and cultural values, and the inequalities, exploitation and domination inherent to the indigenous and non-indigenous relations; *indigenismo* was not the product of the indigenous, on the contrary the indigenous were the object of *indigenismo*. It was applied without the participation, approval and awareness of the indigenous people.²⁵⁹ Even if it is assumed that the objective of *indigenismo* was to grant equality to the indigenous, this does not save *indigenismo* from being a tool of the *police* order. As stated in the first chapter, equality is not something distributed or granted, it is something presupposed by the very ones who are not taken into account as equals. Distributive equality requires a distributor who decides on the existence or non-existence of the parts and on the shares that parts will receive. As a manifestation of distributive equality, *indigenismo* implies a *police* order.

Furthermore, during President Cárdenas' term (1934 - 1940), the Mexican Revolution and the legacy of Emiliano Zapata were appropriated.

In the 1930s, the sanitization of Emiliano Zapata and his re-creation as a popular national hero, the writing of songs about the Revolution, the promotion of civic rituals on the day of Zapata's death to reinforce his memory, the use of the Mexican Revolution, Plan de Ayala, and Zapata's image to sell, celebrate, and codify agrarian reform and agricultural programs, the SEP-sponsored radio shows emphasizing the revolution—all of these events, texts, and interactions created a common set of national symbols received in widely varying segments of Mexican society.²⁶⁰

²⁵⁹ Russell, 2010, 365-366.

²⁶⁰ Stephen, 44.

Besides, the use of Zapata as a national symbol and consequently attempting to nationalize the country, Zapata depicted by the government was in favor of the distribution of the land by the government: "[B]ecause of this, our Government is taking care of distributing land to peasants"²⁶¹, "His desire that land be distributed to all of the people in the countryside is being realized"²⁶², "In the present, thanks to legislation that we have, land is being distributed to peasants and to the communities that the *ejidos* belong to. . . ."²⁶³ This depiction of Zapata by the government also indicates the *police* logic of the government as well as the attempt to partition the sensible, which in this case is the legacy of Zapata. Making an official history, first in line with the ideology of indigenismo that excludes the indigenous from the history, which is "a history where the indigenous heritage – the great Mesoamerican civilization – is often romanticized for the benefit of tourism, whereas reality for an estimated 10million indigenous peoples (10% of the entire Mexican population) remains the reality of subjugation and exploitation"²⁶⁴, and then re-defining the legacy of Zapata is an example of the partition of the sensible. This is the partition of the history, on the one hand, which determines the part of history that is meaningful, visible and audible in the *police* order and which does not take into account the other part since it does not exist; and on the other hand, through this partition of the history, the society is also partitioned: the indigenous are excluded from the history as well as from the society: "Indians may be Mexico's ideal ancestors, but mestizos are Mexico's ideal citizens."²⁶⁵

Alex Khasnabish also argues that the post-revolutionary elite would be threatened by the mobilized urban and rural masses and in order to build a modern nation-state, these masses had to be demobilized by being bound to the regime. Land distribution was a way of creating these bounds. The autonomous reclaiming of lands

²⁶¹Lucio, Gabriel, *Simiente, Libro 2*. Libro primero para escuelas rurales. México, D.F.: Secretaría de Educación Pública, 24, in *Ibid.*, 49.

²⁶²Lucio, Gabriel, *Simiente, Libro 2*. Libro primero para escuelas rurales. México, D.F.: Secretaría de Educación Pública, 94-96, in *Ibid.*, 48.

²⁶³Lucio, Gabriel, *Simiente, Libro 4*. Libro primero para escuelas rurales. México, D.F.: Secretaría de Educación Pública, 47, in *Ibid.*, 49.

²⁶⁴Patrick T. Hiller, "Contesting Zapata: Differing Meanings of the Mexican National Idea," *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences* 1, no: 2 (2009), 264.

²⁶⁵María Josefina Saldaña-Portillo, "Reading a Silence: The 'Indian' in the Era of Zapatismo," *Nepantla: Views from South* 3, no: 2 (2002), 295.

that have taken place during the revolution also had to be de-radicalized. The article 27 of the 1917 Constitution, although it should not be denied that it was a major gain, probably the most crucial gain of the revolution, helped the creation of these bounds. The previously radical and autonomous reclaiming of lands was monopolized in the government's hands. Khasnabish also refers to the ideology of indigenismo as the peasantry was included along with workers and the middle-class in the three pillars of support while the indigenous were left to oblivion whereas a glorious imagined indigenous past was created by the post-revolutionary state. The indigenous would have to disappear unless they chose to modernize and assimilate into the nation.²⁶⁶

The de-mobilization and de-radicalization of the masses and the incorporation of the indigenous into the nation are again acts of *police* order as counting and naming the parts. The mobilized and radicalized masses of the post-revolutionary Mexico could be placed within the *police* order emerged after the revolution. As the police is “the set of procedures whereby the aggregation and consent of collectivities is achieved, the organization of powers, the distribution of places and roles, and the systems for legitimizing this distribution”²⁶⁷; the consent of these masses was achieved through the land distribution as it became a legal procedure monopolized by the government. The masses, once reclaimed their lands autonomously, was given their place and role in the *police* order, which was to receive their share designated by the *police*. This distribution of their roles and shares, in turn, were legitimized by the use of the legacy of revolution and Zapata, which were given new meanings.

Moreover, although the policy of indigenismo was questioned and abandoned after Cárdenas' term and the National Indigenous Institute (*Instituto Nacional Indigenista*) was created in order to address the assimilation, the Institute followed contradictory policies such as promoting both autonomy and incorporation. “The creation of such an institution suggests again that the central policy question was how Mexico's indigenous population should be described, identified, and positioned as citizens.”²⁶⁸

²⁶⁶Khasnabish, 2010, 43-44.

²⁶⁷Rancière, 1998, 28.

²⁶⁸Stephen, 86.

In the 1990s, the national-building efforts of the post-revolutionary Mexico transformed into new efforts of building a nation compatible with the globalization and the incorporation of Mexico into the global economy. A new office, Agrarian Attorney General's Office (*Procuraduría Agraria*) was created in order to promote the Program for the Certification of Ejido Land Rights and the Titling of Urban House Plots (*Programa de Certificación de Derechos Ejidales y Titulación de Solares Urbanos* - PROCEDE). The message that PROCEDE gave was quite differing from the post-revolutionary state's message. Instead of messages such as "petition for land" and "form an *ejido*", "Employees of the *Procuraduría Agraria* promoting PROCEDE urged ejidatarios to 'defend your rights to your individual parcel,' to 'measure, map, and title your land,' and to 'guarantee your individual freedom.'"²⁶⁹

In line with the neoliberal policies and the NAFTA, the Article 27 of the Constitution was amended. One of the main changes was that "*Ejidatarios* were given the legal right to purchase, sell, rent, or use as collateral the individual plots and communal lands that make up the *ejido*."²⁷⁰ With that amendment, the government also would no longer be constitutionally obligated to the redistribution of land with the petitions of the landless peasants and the communally held *ejido* lands would become open to privatization. Plus, although their shares would not be above 49 percent of the capital, foreign investors would also be able to buy these *ejido* lands. This amendment surely caused some concerns, first of which was that the opening of *ejido* lands to privatization could cause the concentration of the land in the hands of a few large landholders. Secondly, the collateral use of the *ejido* could lead to foreclosures of farms and losing of land rights. And lastly, the pending petitions for land redistribution would be rejected.²⁷¹

The promotion of the PROCEDE seems quite significant here as the government used the legacy of the Revolution and Zapata once more, this time to defend the amendment of the Article 27. The slogan "*Tierra y Libertad* (Land and Liberty) was transformed into "Liberty and Justice for the Countryside" while the

²⁶⁹Ibid., 62.

²⁷⁰Harvey, 187.

²⁷¹Ibid., 187-188.

liberty referred here described the individual liberty to property instead of collective decision-making rights of the ejido. The brochures published and distributed for the promotion of the PROCEDURE included this new slogan along with references to the Revolution. In addition to the fact that PROCEDURE was intensely promoted in Morelos, Zapata's home state, there were references to the struggle to create the *ejido*, the *Plan de Ayala*, Zapata's struggle for land reform as well as there were included photographs of Zapata.²⁷² Furthermore, President Salinas de Gortari directly referred to Zapata in public speeches and openings: "Yesterday's promise is today's reality for the benefit of the children of Morelos, the dignified descendants of General Emiliano Zapata"²⁷³ and

With these acts, we are realizing the ideal of Emiliano Zapata. We do honor to the memory of Emiliano Zapata because with peace and harmony, promoting acts of justice and progress, [that] is how we honor the memory of Emiliano Zapata and how we maintain his memory as he wanted—in favor of the peasant communities, towns and families. . . . Long live Morelos, my compatriots. Long live Emiliano Zapata.²⁷⁴

Appropriation of the legacy of Revolution and Zapata in order to promote "the value of the individual and individual initiatives, private property, unfettered trade and commerce, and the needs of global capitalist development—key ideological aspects of NAFTA"²⁷⁵ appears again as a tool of *police* order: "The police order assigns individuals to particular positions in society and assumes that their way of behaving, and thinking will follow from their position."²⁷⁶ The fact that "the bearers of PROCEDURE also brought a new message on how to be a rural Mexican citizen: protect your individual rights to land"²⁷⁷ suggests that the *police* order does

²⁷²Stephen, 67- 70.

²⁷³ Dan Hallin, *Dan Hallin Unmasks Jacobo Zabludovsky on Televisa in Chiapas* (1994; La Jolla: Department of Communications at the University of California, San Diego, 1994 Videotape, in Stephen, 70.

²⁷⁴ Dan Hallin, *Dan Hallin Unmasks Jacobo Zabludovsky on Televisa in Chiapas* (1994; La Jolla: Department of Communications at the University of California, San Diego, 1994 Videotape, in Stephen, 71.

²⁷⁵*Ibid.*, 72.

²⁷⁶Davis, 78.

²⁷⁷Stephen, 65.

not only decide on the share the rural Mexican citizen would receive, but also who will be counted as a rural Mexican citizen. The use of Revolution and Zapata, in turn, are attempts to legitimize this system of distribution of shares and roles. This, of course, does not mean that the previous acts of land redistribution did not indicate a police order. The point here is that the amendment of the Article 27 signifies a change in the police order. As stated in the first chapter, there may be better police orders and worse police orders. The amendment of the Article 27 transformed the police order into a worse one.

However, what is more striking are the effects of neoliberalism, trade liberalization and the NAFTA on the indigenous people of Chiapas. Subcomandante Marcos summarizes these in an impressive way starting by stating "This chapter tells how the supreme government was affected by the poverty of the Indigenous peoples of Chiapas and endowed the area with hotels, prisons, barracks, and a military airport. It also tells how the beast feeds on the blood of the people, as well as other miserable and unfortunate happenings."²⁷⁸ In 1989, 1,222,669,000,000 pesos were taken from Chiapas whereas 616,340,000,000 pesos were invested. Everyday 92,000 barrels of petrol and 517,000,000,000 cubic feet of gas are drilled. While *campesinos* are punished with a fine which is ten times the minimum wage and jail when they cut trees in the forests, petrol companies are allowed to cut. 35 percent of the coffee produced in Mexico is produced in Chiapas. 55 percent of hydroelectric energy and 20 percent of the overall electric energy is produced in Chiapas while there is no electricity in two thirds of the houses in Chiapas. Half of the corn produced in Chiapas goes to the domestic market. Two-thirds of people living in Chiapas, which is populated by 3.5 million people, live in rural communities, half of them do not have drinkable water, two-thirds does not have sewage service. 72 percent of children don't finish the first grade, more than half of the schools does not have above third grade education and only have one teacher. 1.5 million people have no access to medical services. For every 1000 people, there are 0.2 clinics (one-fifth of the national average), 0.3 hospital beds (one-third of the national average), 0.5 doctors and 0.4 nurses (half of the national average) while for 100000 people there is

²⁷⁸ Subcomandante Marcos in *Zapatistas! Documents of the New Mexican Revolution* (New York: Autonomedia, 1994), 19.

one operation room (half of the national average). 54 percent of the population suffers from malnutrition. On the other hand, there were 139 restaurants, 6,270 hotel rooms and 42 travel agencies in 1988.²⁷⁹

The indigenous communities of Chiapas constitute the poorest, the most marginalized part of the country. Malnutrition, high rate of infant and adult mortality due to curable diseases, social and economic marginalization and cultural indiscrimination presents a chronic situation. Life expectancy, which is 70 years in Mexico, drops to 45 years in Chiapas, for example... Chiapas is Mexico's richest state in terms of natural resources while the poorest state in terms of human development indicators.²⁸⁰

Despite these sheer realities of the Chiapas, government's investments in tourism, energy sector and building military bases presents a contrast. This contrast indicates the excluded situation in which the indigenous live as well as the *police's* aim to disregard these realities by asserting that there is nothing to see, say and hear in Chiapas. The deaths, diseases, poverty faced by the indigenous in Chiapas were not taken into account. Subcomandante Marcos, while talking about the death affected him most,

...told how a girl of three or four years old, Paticha (her way of saying Patricia), had died in his arms in a village. She had started a fever at six o'clock in the evening, and by ten o'clock she was dead: there was no medicine in the village that could help to lower her fever. 'And that happened many times, it was so everyday, so everyday that those births are not even taken into account. For example, Paticha never had a birth

²⁷⁹Ibid., 20-23.

²⁸⁰Sibel Özbudun, "Latin Amerika'da yerli kadınların üçlü mücadelesi: Yoksul, yerli ve kadın olmak (EZLN örneği)," Latin Bilgi, February 12, 2011/Accessed on January 10, 2013.
http://www.latinbilgi.net/index.php?eylem=yazi_oku&no=3707.

certificate, which means that for the country she never existed, for the statistical office (INEGI), therefore her death never existed either...'²⁸¹

Faced with the exclusion, marginalization and not being taken into account, not being counted; the Zapatistas had nothing to do except engaging in armed struggle and declaring war on the Mexican government, which they saw as their last resort: "We, the men and women, full and free, are conscious that the war that we have declared is our last resort, but also a just one."²⁸² Although armed struggle is not a way of doing politics according to Rancière, he gives its due to some extent. Considering the French tailors' strike in 1833, he argues that previous violent acts had paved the way for the tailors to assert their equality: "...the reasonable arguments of the strikers of 1833 were audible, their demonstration visible, only because the events of 1830, recalling those of 1789, had torn them from the nether world of inarticulate sounds and ensconced them by a contingent forced-entry in the world of meaning and visibility."²⁸³ Bearing in mind that Poggiali refers to the common narrative of the Chiapan peasants that the 1911 Mexican Revolution started when the "word" was exhausted and violence is still seen as an outgrowth of this exhaustion of the "word"²⁸⁴; the initial armed struggle of the Zapatistas could be seen as an attempt to revive the "word". Although it might be argued that the Zapatistas describe their declaration of war as a last resort in order to justify their violence, their compliance to the ceasefire despite the Mexican army's latter offensives against them proves their sincerity on this emphasis on the last resort. Once they were able to reach out their word, to ensure they were audible, they ceased the armed struggle and did not turn to violence.

At this point, Rancière's examples of the Aventine Hill and Scythian slaves could be useful. Rancière argues that the Scythian slaves could demonstrate their equality in war by revolting, building a fortified camp and defeating their masters,

²⁸¹ Subcomandante Marcos, interview with Radio UNAM, 18 March 1994: EZLN, La Palabra, Vol. II, p.69-70 in John Holloway "Dignity's Revolt," in *Zapatista! : Reinventing Revolution in Mexico*, ed. John Holloway (London: Pluto Press, 1998), 163.

²⁸² "First Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle", struggle.ws, accessed February 20, 2013. <http://struggle.ws/mexico/ezln/ezlnwa.html>.

²⁸³ Rancière, 1995, 49.

²⁸⁴ Poggiali, 2005, 9.

however they could not transform this equality into equality in terms of politics. The partition of the sensible was not disrupted by the slaves' revolt as they established quite a similar order to their masters', an order that rested upon the weapons and fighting. On the other hand, what the plebs on the Aventine Hill did was unthinkable for the Scythian slaves according to Rancière as "they establish another order, another partition of the perceptible, by constituting themselves not as warriors equal to other warriors but as speaking beings sharing the same properties as those who deny them these."²⁸⁵ Rancière's main interest in the Aventine Secession is two accounts of the event, Livy's account written four hundred years after the Secession and Pierre-Simon Ballanche's account written in 1830. According to Rancière, Livy considers the Secession as a simple show of force while Ballanche considers it as a struggle regarding the plebs' existence as a political entity. Ballanche's account emphasizes that the plebs, to some extent, establish their own city and political structure, they have their own oracles and representatives, sovereignty lies in them. This is not a violent revolt but it is an interruption of the *police* order, in which the plebs have no part, by presenting their equality and capacity for reason and showing that they actually have a part.²⁸⁶

It might be argued that the Zapatistas' declaration of war is similar to the Scythian slaves' revolt as both involved fighting and weapons, however, as suggested it is much more plausible to consider the use of violence by the Zapatistas as a cry to be heard, to become audible. Once they succeeded to present themselves as audible, there was no more use for violence. The declaration of war by the Zapatistas can be read as similar to the secession of the plebs in the sense that the secession of the plebs makes possible for them to be audible as they are sent an emissary, Menenius Agrippa. In the case of Zapatistas, after the initial war that lasted 12 days, they became audible both by the civil society and the government. This war, just as the secession of the plebs, paved the way for the peace talks that culminated in the San Andres Accords. The initial uprising actually transformed what was invisible to visible. "Suddenly Salinas's promise of a modern Mexico crashed against the reality of a Mexico that had been completely ignored by the policies of two successive

²⁸⁵Rancière, 1998, 24.

²⁸⁶Davis, 2010, 82.

conservative administrations. In Mexico's indigenous states, such as Chiapas, 70 percent of the population lives below the poverty line "²⁸⁷ The partition of the sensible by the *police* order presented a world in which Mexico was a modern and developing country which would prosper in the future with the help of neoliberal policies, on the other hand, there was an invisible world that has been not taken into account, the world of poor Mexico. The uprising interrupted the police *order* by creating another partition of the sensible, by showing this other Mexico.

Furthermore, development of autonomy in the Zapatista communities might easily be considered as an interruption in the *police* order, similar to the secession of the plebs. After the initial uprising on January 1, 1994; the Zapatistas mainly resisted by establishing autonomous communities, through which they put the autonomy, which was accepted by the government in the San Andres Accords but was not included in the constitutional reform that held no resemblance to the San Andres Accords, into practice. Government interventions, programs and services were refused in these autonomous communities and the entire infrastructure was built, all public services were provided by the members of the community. The creation of the autonomous communities and municipalities was a response to the denial of the entitling autonomy to the indigenous people by the Congress. Although the San Andres Accords, and hence the autonomy of the indigenous was expected to be approved almost until the time the Accords were denied in the Congress; the creation of autonomy might not only be considered as a reaction to the Congress' decision but also might be read as the presupposition of the equality in the form of autonomy. "Politics, in short, a truly democratic politics, is collective action emerging from the presupposition of equality."²⁸⁸ May argues here that a *police* order is hierarchical and this hierarchy does not only exist in societies but also in traditional political theories. A value is justified and it is argued that this value should equally be distributed to every member of the society, which implies a hierarchy in the sense that there are distributors and the receivers to whom this value is distributed. Politics, on the other hand, is not the distribution of the equality, on the contrary its presupposition. In the

²⁸⁷Foster, 2007, 50.

²⁸⁸ Todd May, "Wrong, Disagreement, Subjectification" in *Jacques Rancière Key Concepts*, ed. Jean-Philippe Deranty (Durham: Acumen Publishing, 2010), 70.

case of Zapatistas, the approval of autonomy by the Congress would mean the distribution whereas putting it into practice by the Zapatistas is the presupposition. In this regard, the Zapatistas realized that they did not need permission to organize autonomous communities: "It's time for us all organize and from our autonomous townships. Don't wait until the bad government gives permission. We should organize as real rebels and not wait until someone gives us permission to be autonomous, with or without law."²⁸⁹ Moreover, the Zapatistas had their own political structures in which all political decisions are made collectively, which will be the topic of the next section on equality.

However, before proceeding to the next section, it should be noted that the reference made to Zapata by the EZLN also bears significance in terms of the distinction between *police* and politics. It might be true that "Emiliano Zapata is the hero who best symbolizes the traditions of revolutionary struggle of the Mexican people"²⁹⁰ and as Hiller states there are parallels between the original Zapatistas in the Revolution and the modern Zapatistas as neither of them tries to gain political power, both of them have incorruptible demands and both of them make demands that directly affect themselves as well as directed to the benefit of larger groups.²⁹¹ However, the significance of the use of Zapata is not limited to these. The appropriation of Zapata by the Mexican government, first in order to institutionalize the revolution and then to legitimize neoliberal reforms presents a partition of the sensible. Against this partition, the reference made to Zapata by the Zapatistas both in their names and in their communiqués challenges this partition and presents another partition of the sensible, therefore interrupts the *police* order.

5.2. Equality and the Zapatistas

As stated, politics interrupts the police order and what is essential in this interruption is the principle of equality, which is not something implemented by politics or something distributed, which is something presupposed. In this section, equality in the Zapatista movement will be analyzed from a Rancièrian perspective.

²⁸⁹Comandante Brus Li in Ramírez, 2008, 255.

²⁹⁰Fuerzas de Liberación Nacional, 1980 in John Jr. Womack, *Rebellion in Chiapas: An Historical Reader* (New York: New Press 1999), 196 in Stephen, 152.

²⁹¹Hiller, 2009, 14.

Subcomandante Marcos refers to a defeat while telling the seven stages of the EZLN's development: "At this stage the EZLN was no longer what we had conceived when we arrived. By then we had been defeated by the indigenous communities, and as a product of that defeat, the EZLN started to grow exponentially and to become 'very otherly'"²⁹². This defeat actually signifies the defeat of an order of hierarchy. "...contemporary Zapatismo originated out of the encounter between indigenous communities in the Lacandon Jungle and highlands of Chiapas and the urban revolutionaries who arrived in the state in the early 1980s."²⁹³ The urban revolutionaries, who aimed at taking state power through armed struggle, were in Chiapas in order to organize and revolutionize the indigenous people in Chiapas, which implies a hierarchy in which the urban revolutionaries are superior to the indigenous and while they are in a position to teach them, the indigenous are in a position to be taught. However, the result of this encounter was an interaction between the two, which led to the novelty of the Zapatista movement with regard to the other guerilla organizations: non-hierarchical organization and not pursuing power.

The guiding principles of the Zapatista movement were born out of this encounter: "to lead by obeying; to represent, not replace, to work from below and not to seek to rise; to serve, not self-serve; to convince, not conquer; to construct, not destroy; to propose, not impose"²⁹⁴ along with "everything for everyone and nothing for ourselves". May argues that democratic politics in a Rancièrian sense has five elements: a democratic politics is not imposed from above but emerges from below. A democratic politics is *horizontally* egalitarian in the sense that all those participating are equal to each other. A democratic politics is *vertically* egalitarian as well, in the sense that those remain outside of the movement, those who are resisted against also are treated as equals. A democratic politics takes nonviolent action as

²⁹² Subcomandante Marcos, "Audio Message by *Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos* in Ramirez, 2008, 27-28.

²⁹³ Khasnabish, 2010, 69.

²⁹⁴ "Seven Principles of 'Rule by Obeying/Mandar Obedeciendo' of the Zapatista 'Good Government' and the National Congress of Indigenous Peoples", zapatismo.florycanto.net, accessed October 24, 2013.

<http://www.zapatismo.florycanto.net/docs/zapatistasevenprinciplesgoodgovernment.pdf>.

long as no other alternatives are left and that politics can emerge anywhere.²⁹⁵ These principles indicate that the Zapatista movement has emerged below as the officials who would govern according to these principles are ordinary people within the communities. The members of the communities are equal to each other as the ideas and thoughts of every single member counts. The people against the movement are also treated as equals since they are not "conquered" but convinced. And lastly, the movement took no violent action once the ceasefire started.

However, referring to the movement's principles is not sufficient in order to analyze equality, the organization and the practices of the Zapatista movement also should be considered. The Clandestine Revolutionary Indigenous Committee (*Comité Clandestino Revolucionario Indígena*- CCRI) has ultimate authority, until 2003, over the Zapatista communities. This committee is composed of one male and one female representative from each of the 11 indigenous ethnic groups and *mestizos*. While most of them are civilian, the committee governs the military operations of the EZLN and until 2003 has governed civilian affairs. All major decisions, including both military and political decisions, taken by the CCRI are firstly consulted within the indigenous communities and the CCRI cannot make any decision unless these consultations end and all of the communities approve the decision. As stated in the third chapter, the decision to go to war was also taken collectively by the communities. Assemblies take place at the levels of community, municipality and region. Attendance at the community assemblies is mandatory except valid excuses such as illness. In 2003, Good Government Juntas (*Juntas de Bien Gobierno* - JBGs) were established and the CCRI's authority on civilian matters was transferred to municipal and regional juntas. The juntas govern economic and civil matters in the municipalities and provide public services. There are approximately 38 municipal and 5 regional juntas. The regional juntas coordinate the municipal ones while municipal juntas function autonomously. Any Zapatista can serve in the juntas for everyone to serve so that people will not be mystified by the government.

²⁹⁵ May, 2010, 22.

Representatives are not paid for their duty in the juntas and their needs are taken care of by the other members of the communities during their services.²⁹⁶

The organization of the communities clearly indicates that the Zapatista principles listed above are not just words, but practices. The collective decision-making, albeit a slow process, is the practice of equality. The distinction between the speech and voice is significant here in analyzing equality. As stated this distinction between the voice showing only pleasure and pain, and the speech that can also discern just and unjust is the basis of distinction between the ones who can govern and who cannot in Aristotle. The collective decision-making does not indicate such a distinction between those who are suitable and proper for politics and those who are not and anyone can participate in the decision-making process. Although elections take place as in electing the representatives within the communities, this clearly is not the electoral politics, which Rancière does not differentiate from the *police* order. Collective decision-making engages in serious discussions in which everyone has something to say. Kara Zugman states that in an interview conducted with the members of the FZLN "one member explained that in his union people would talk only to hear themselves talk and dominate the discussion... it surprised him to see the way the communities made decisions. Everyone listened to everyone else, and people did not repeat what others had already said."²⁹⁷ Listening is among the central tenets of the movement as the aim of the FZLN was to listen to people and collect political proposals, as during the Other Campaign, firstly Subcomandante Marcos toured the country in order to listen to the people from almost all sectors of the society and then a commission of commandantes did the same, as in the National Democratic Convention in 1994 nearly 6000 participants listened to each other and discussed as well as the participants in the encounters held by the Zapatistas listened to each other. Listening signifies that both parties think of each other as someone who has meaningful things to say, as someone who has speech, which is the manifestation of equality, the equality of any speaking being to another. Considering the elements of democratic politics as May see, the organization of movement is not top-down, but

²⁹⁶ Amory Starr, María Elena Martínez-Torres and Peter Rosset; "Participatory Democracy in Action: Practices of the Zapatistas and the Movimiento Sem Terra," *Latin American Perspectives* 38, (2011): 104-105.

²⁹⁷ Zugman, 2005, 139.

bottom-up, all participants are equal to each other as well those outside of the movement are treated as equals and the movement is oriented towards non-violent action.

Moreover, although the collective decision-making, and principles such as command by obeying exist in the indigenous culture; women are excluded from collective decision-making. This might be interpreted as a *police* order as well. As every other *police*, the *police* within the indigenous communities specifies the parts, who belongs to the parts and the share of these parts. Indigenous women, in this sense, were excluded and subjected to inequalities within this hierarchical order of the *police*. Zapatistas, on the other hand, did not accept this second-class status of the indigenous women and challenged the traditionally established order of the *police* just as politics challenges the police by implementing “a basically heterogeneous assumption, that of a part of those who have no part, an assumption that, at the end of the day, itself demonstrates the sheer contingency of the order, the equality of any speaking being with any other speaking being.”²⁹⁸

“The revolution within the revolution” or “a revolution to make a revolution possible” began before the uprising of the January 1st, 1994. “As Subcomandante Marcos would later relate, ‘The first uprising of the EZLN was in March 1993 and it was led by the women Zapatistas. They suffered no losses and they won.’”²⁹⁹ This uprising was the formulation, presentation and approval of the Women’s Revolutionary Law.

The Law states that women have the right to participate in the army as combatants and to assume leadership in the army; to decide how many children they want to have and when they will have them; to have primary consideration in access to health services; to an education; to the right to choose a marriage partner of their own free will, or to choose not to marry; to hold office if democratically elected in their communities; to work and receive a fair wage; and to be free from physical mistreatment from family members or strangers.³⁰⁰

²⁹⁸Rancière, 1998, 30.

²⁹⁹Khasnabish, 2010, 76.

³⁰⁰Poggiali, 2005, 15.

The way in which this revolutionary law was prepared is also significant in the sense that Comandanta Ramona, Major Ana Maria and EZLN activist Susana collected anonymous suggestions and propositions from the indigenous women and the law was formed according to these suggestions and propositions. It was a law made collectively as the other decisions made within the EZLN. The fact that this law was not imposed from above on the women, rather it was formed according to the propositions collected from them indicates the presupposition of equality. The women did not wait to be granted equal rights, the distribution of equality, they took action and formed a law through presupposition of equality. As May argues "the equality of every speaking being with every other speaking being is an equality that must be applied within as well as across groups."³⁰¹ Therefore, we see that this revolution within the revolution also emerges from below, is both horizontally and vertically egalitarian and is oriented towards non-violent action.

Of course, while being a major success in the indigenous society which "tended to restrict women's participation to supportive roles"³⁰², it cannot be said that this law meant that the inequalities between women and men in the communities were eliminated. However, the law signifies that women act out of the presupposition of their equality to men and assert this equality in a society in which they are not equal to men.

At this point, Rancière's example of Jeanne Deroin bears similarities to the Zapatista women's struggles. Deroin, in 1849, becomes a candidate for an election in which actually she cannot be a candidate. This is the revelation of the subject of women as included in the French society which has universal suffrage and in which everyone is equal before the law while the subject of women are excluded from these at the same time. This revelation is political in the sense that it presents the contradiction between the part of women and the definition of community.³⁰³ Zapatista women, too, reveals themselves as included in the indigenous communities while at the same as excluded from the collective decision-making process, as well as from making individual decisions. Just like in the French society at that time, "the

³⁰¹May, 2010, 91.

³⁰²Harvey, 1999, 223.

³⁰³Rancière, 1998, 41.

domestic space is thus at once that private space, separated from the space of citizenship, and a space included in the complementarity of laws and morals that defines the accomplishment of citizenship"³⁰⁴, the domestic space is a private space and excluded from the collective decision-making while at the same is included in the indigenous communities. The Zapatista women, who has no part in the communities shows that they actually have part through the formation of this law.

As can be observed from the principles and practices of the Zapatista movement, from the organizational structure and collective decision-making processes, the movement is not a hierarchical movement. From the CCRI to the community assemblies, non-hierarchical practices are at use. At the same time, the movement, through communiques and speeches, has made clear that their aim was not to assume a vanguard position, which is deeply connected to the non-hierarchical character of the movement since vying for a vanguard position would imply a hierarchy between the vanguard organization and the people who are led by this organization. In this regard, equality is seen something belonging to both the members of the Zapatista movement and the ones outside of the movement. Furthermore, this equality is not something to achieved by the political struggle of the movement, rather it is accepted at the outset as the initial uprising was a way to show that the indigenous people existed and they were equals, as the decision-making process, although the Zapatista women have been excluded in the indigenous culture, shows us that all members are equally treated and as the encounters and consultations with other people who do not take part in the movement show that they are also treated equally.

Black ski-masks, or *pasamontañas*, which have been a discerning characteristic for the Zapatistas from the beginning of their initial struggle, have a crucial symbolic meaning at this point. Of course, one objective of wearing masks is to hide from the enemy and to ensure security. However, providing security cannot be the primary reason for wearing masks. First of all, the masks do not cover the whole face. Since the face is exposed in large part, the identification of the person wearing the mask could be easy in certain situations. Secondly, the Zapatistas do not

³⁰⁴Ibid., 42.

wear masks in their daily lives and since they generally live in the same communities, it is again not too difficult to identify them.³⁰⁵ The primary reason is directly related to equality. In an interview conducted on January 1, 1994, Subcomandante Marcos is asked about the masks:

The mask is so that there is no protagonism,.. So now, since it is not well known who is who, probably in a little while another will come out, or it could be the same one... We know that our leadership is collective and that we have to submit to them. Even though you happen to be listening to me here now because I am here, but in other places others, masked in the same way, are talking. This masked person today is called Marcos here and tomorrow will be called Pedro in Margaritas or Josue' in Ocosingo or Alfredo in Altamirano or whatever he is called. Finally, the one who speaks is a more collective heart, not a caudillo.³⁰⁶

The usage of masks, in this sense, is an activity against hierarchy and vanguardism, both within the movement and in respect to the non-members. It creates an anonymity that reflects equality of anyone to anyone, which is not provided by wearing the masks. Wearing a mask where every other member of the movement wears one also signifies that one acts out of the presupposition of equality.

Wearing masks has also another dimension, subjectivization, which will be discussed in the next section.

5.3. Subjectivization and the Zapatistas

As stated in the first chapter, politics does not have a proper subject since politics is the very struggle to be counted, to exist as political subjects by the part that has no part, the part whose existence is not recognized in the *police* order. Consequently, politics is the process of political subjectivization, which has three main characteristics.

³⁰⁵ Mentinis, 2006, 168.

³⁰⁶ *Zapatistas! Documents of the New Mexican Revolution* (New York: Autonomedia, 1994), 49.

The first one is argumentative demonstration involving rational argument and language. One example is the French tailors who went on strike in 1833 and developed an argument, the "syllogism of emancipation". This argument goes as follows: the major premiss (equality of all French people) contradicts the minor premisses (unanswered demands of workers, inequality between the bosses' federation and workers' federation and a state official's declaration on workers' inequality), therefore either the major premiss or the minor premisses have to be changed. Of course, "the first alternative Rancière cites is offered ironically. The strike, then, presses the boss and the prosecutor to act differently. It is a demand for equality."³⁰⁷

In the case of Zapatistas, the declaration of war presented in the First Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle is remarkable: The declaration refers to the Article 39 of the Constitution stating that "National Sovereignty essentially and originally resides in the people. All political power emanates from the people and its purpose is to help the people. The people have, at all times, the inalienable right to alter or modify their form of government."³⁰⁸ The one-party system and the government are also declared illegitimate and the nation is asked to restore legitimacy by overthrowing the dictatorship. Furthermore, the declaration states that their struggle follows the Constitution. This reference to the Constitution might be read as an attempt to legitimize the struggle, however, in the light of Rancière's thought it might also be interpreted as an example of argumentative demonstration.

First of all, reference to the Article 39 of the constitution is a sign of acting out of presupposition of equality as the Zapatistas present themselves a part of the people by declaring the government illegitimate and invoking their inalienable right to alter or modify the form of government. As stated before, the indigenous, through appropriation of their history and writing an official account of the history together with appropriation of Zapata and legacy of the Revolution, through the ideology of *indigenismo*, are not taken into account and are not counted as a part of the people, as the citizens of Mexico unless they assimilate into the nation. Their reference to the

³⁰⁷ May, 2008, 54.

³⁰⁸ "First Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle," *struggle.ws*, accessed December 20, 2013. <http://struggle.ws/mexico/ezln/ezlnwa.html>.

Article 39, constituting themselves as a part of the people and presenting as equals interrupts the *police* order.

Moreover, their reference to the Article 39 might be formed as a syllogism whose major premiss is that we are the people and have the right to modify or alter the form of government: "We are the inheritors of the true builders of our nation. The dispossessed, we are millions..."³⁰⁹ The minor premiss, on the other hand, is that we, as the people, are denied land, work, health care, food and education and cannot modify the form of government which denies these to us: "They don't care that we have nothing, absolutely nothing, not even a roof over our heads, no land, no work, no health care, no food nor education. Nor are we able to freely and democratically elect our political representatives..."³¹⁰ We, the people, declare this government and one-party system illegitimate while we are excluded from political participation. On the one hand, the major and minor premisses contradict: Do we, the people, have the right to modify or alter the form of government or not? On the other hand, as in the case of French tailors in which "the minor premiss would run something like this: now Monsieur Schwartz, the head of the master tailors' association, refuses to listen to our case. What we are putting to him is a case for revised rates of pay. He can verify this case but he refuses to do so. He is therefore not treating us as equals. And he is therefore contradicting the equality inscribed in the Charter"³¹¹; the Zapatistas demand the satisfaction of their basic needs as land, work, health care, food and education while the government refuses to listen their case. Therefore the Zapatistas "after having tried to utilize all legal means based on our Constitution"³¹² refer to the Article 39, since they are not treated as equals, which contradicts with the Article 4 of the Constitution³¹³ although the Zapatistas do not refer to that article. Thus, the reference to the Constitution might be considered as an argumentative demonstration.

The second characteristic of subjectivization is theatrical dramatization. Rancière argues that in a public demonstration police as the coercive apparatus does

³⁰⁹Ibid.

³¹⁰Ibid.

³¹¹Rancière, 1995, 46.

³¹² "First Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle," struggle.ws, accessed December 20, 2013. <http://struggle.ws/mexico/ezln/ezlnwa.html>.

³¹³ "All people, men and women, are equal under the law. This article also grants all people protection to their health, a right to housing, and rights for children. Everyone has a right to an appropriated ecosystem for their development & welfare."

not aim to arrest the demonstrators but to break up the demonstration: "It is, first of all, a reminder of the obviousness of what there is, or rather, of what there isn't: 'Move along! There is nothing to see here!'"³¹⁴ This is similar to the *police* order's partition of the sensible as determining the visible, sayable and audible. "Politics, in contrast, consists in transforming this space of 'moving along' into a space for the appearance of a subject."³¹⁵ In this regard, politics always has a dimension of creating a spectacle, a spectacle which is the appearance of a subject, who has been invisible and unheard, through subjectivization, into a space of visibility and audibility. What is more, the presupposition of equality requires that the subject acts like she is equal to anyone whereas in the *police* order she is not actually equal. "This assertion implies a most peculiar platform of argument. The worker subject that gets included on it as speaker has to behave as though such a stage existed, as though there were a common world of argument- which is eminently reasonable and eminently unreasonable, eminently wise and resolutely subversive, since such a world does not exist."³¹⁶ Acting as if that stage exists is creating a spectacle, a demonstration states that "you do not take us into account, however, we exist and we are here we are to be taken into account". Therefore, the becoming of subject and appearing in the perceptible space is called theatrical dramatization by Oliver Davis.

In the case of Zapatistas, as stated, the perceptible is determined by the *police* order and there is no place for the indigenous within this perceptible. Furthermore, President Salinas' statement that "there is a stable social climate across the country"³¹⁷ and the statement of Minister of Interior, Patrocinio González, that assures there are no guerillas in Chiapas³¹⁸ after the discovery of a guerilla camp in Chiapas in May 1993 in addition to the declaration made just after the uprising's beginning that the indigenous are not capable of using weapons or even of rebellion and that the rebellion has foreign connections point out the partition of the sensible.

³¹⁴Rancière, 2001, 10.

³¹⁵Ibid., 10.

³¹⁶Rancière, 1998, 52.

³¹⁷ C. Montemayor, *Chiapas: La Rebelión Indígena de México* (Mexico, D. F.: Joaquín Mortiz, 1997) in Mihalis Mentinis, *Zapatistas: The Chiapas Revolt and What It Means for Radical Politics* (London: Pluto Press, 2006), 6.

³¹⁸ B. De la Grange and M. Rico, *Marcos: la Genial Impostura* (Mexico, D.F.: Aguilar, 1997) in Mihalis Mentinis, *Zapatistas: The Chiapas Revolt and What It Means for Radical Politics* (London: Pluto Press, 2006), 6.

Besides, the same statement of the Minister of Interior that says “a delicate situation has presented itself in just four of the 110 municipalities of Chiapas, in the remaining 106 conditions are normal”³¹⁹ and other numerous statements that argued everything was normal in Chiapas show affinities with Rancière’s argument that the police’s main objective is to assert that there is nothing to see: Move along! There is nothing to see here!”

On the other hand, the initial uprising of the Zapatistas that began on January 1, 1994 might be considered as a creation of spectacle. In addition, appearing in a space in which the perceptible determined by the *police* order does not have something to be seen or heard, and presenting that there is something actually.

And so we took up arms and we went into the cities where we were considered animals. We went and we told the powerful, "We are here!" and to all of the country we shouted, "We are here!" and to all of the world we yelled, "We are here!". And they saw how things were because, in order for them to see us, we covered our faces; so that they would call us by name, we gave up our names; we bet the present to have a future; and to live..we died.³²⁰

It is significant how Marcos states that they are considered animals in the cities. Together with the demonstration of "they are there", this bears significances to the distinction between the speech belonging to humans and voice belonging to animals. The fact that they appear in a space where they are considered animals having voice and presenting themselves as equals is the political interruption of the *police* order.

Following appearances of the Zapatistas such as their appearance in thirty towns of Chiapas and declaring these towns autonomous rebel municipalities and their silent march, entrance to "the cities of San Cristóbal de las Casas, Ocosingo,

³¹⁹ Ramírez, 2008, 108.

³²⁰ Subcomandante Marcos, *Ya Basta!: Ten Years of the Zapatista Uprising*, ed. Žiga Vodovnik, (Oakland: AK Press, 2004), 115.

Las Margaritas, Comitán, and Altamirano, and occupying their central squares"³²¹ which were the same cities occupied on January 1, 1994 should be considered as creating spectacle, where the *police* order partitions the sensible in a way the Zapatistas have no place while, in turn, they present their places by marching.

While it might not be directly connected to subjectivization, the presence of wooden guns during the initial uprising as the Zapatista soldiers (some wearing boots but most in huaraches and a few barefoot) marched before the platform, most carrying wooden rifles, not real firearms"³²² and their symbolic bombing the military headquarters with paper planes³²³ might also be considered as creating spectacles. When looked at a war, one does not expect to see wooden guns or paper planes, the sensible is limited to the real guns, planes and bombs in the case of a war. The symbolic use of wooden guns and paper planes challenges this partition of the sensible. Their place is not a war just as the indigenous' place is not the streets of cities, is not to use guns and is not to rebel. This symbolic use of wooden guns and paper planes present themselves in a place there should not be as well as the indigenous present themselves in a place there should not be.

What is more, the masks are crucial in the sense that through covering their faces with masks, they become visible. In addition to the visibility of a subject, mask signifies the visibility of struggle: "'With my mask, I'm a Zapatista in a struggle for dignity and justice,'" replied the masked man to whom this question was posed. 'Without my mask, I'm just another damn Indian!'"³²⁴ This significance of masks leads us to the last characteristic of political subjectivization.

The last characteristic of subjectivization is impossible identification as the process of subjectivization "is the formation of a one that is not a self but is the relation of a self to an other."³²⁵ The answer given by Auguste Blanqui in 1832 when

³²¹ Leonidas Oikonomakis, "Zapatistas: 'to be heard, we march in silence,'" *roarmag.org*, December 21, 2012 / accessed on January 12, 2014, <http://roarmag.org/2012/12/zapatistas-march-chiapas-mayas/>.

³²² Dan La Botz, "Twenty Years Since the Chiapas Rebellion: The Zapatistas, Their Politics, and Their Impact," *A Socialist, Feminist, Anti-Racist Organization: Solidarity*, January 13, 2014 /Accessed on January 16, 2014, <http://www.solidarity-us.org/site/node/4082>

³²³ Ramírez, 2008, 191.

³²⁴ "FAQ About Zapatismo," Schools for Chiapas, accessed January 12, 2014. <http://www.schoolsforchiapas.org/english/resources/faq-about-zapatismo.html>

³²⁵ Rancière, 1992, 60.

asked his profession is crucial at this point. While for the prosecutor, who reflects the *police* order, profession means job putting one in her place and function, for Blanqui it is the declaration of belonging to a collective, which not identifiable by a social group but is "the class of the uncounted that only exists in the very declaration in which they are counted as those of no account."³²⁶ The logic of political subjectivization is, in this sense, a logic of the other since subjectivization is never a simple assertion of identity but also a denial of the identity given by the police order, it is also a demonstration that supposes an other, and always requires an impossible identification.

In this regard the mask signifies both an assertion of identity as a Zapatista struggling and the denial of identity given by the *police* order as another damn Indian. It might be argued that if the Zapatistas had taken the streets of cities without masks they would have been characterized as another groups of damn Indians, therefore their identity as Indians, which was nevertheless not taken into account, would have been reproduced, whereas wearing masks worked for their denial of identity as Indians and constituted them as struggling Zapatistas. They appeared in the streets not as identifiable to the sociable group of Indians, but as the class of uncounted. Furthermore, the masks indicate their demonstration of not being into account, which supposes an other, "even if that other refuses evidence or argument."³²⁷ The masks, in other words, constituted "a polemical commonplace for the handling of a wrong and the demonstration of equality."³²⁸

Of course, the argument for denial of the identity as Indians might be objected by arguing that the Zapatista movement is an indigenous movement. However, as Holloway argues the movement has never claimed to be only an indigenous movement. They fight for a broader cause, a struggle for all those "without voice, without face, without tomorrow. Their demands such as land, work, health care, education, democracy, freedom, justice are not limited to the indigenous people. Moreover, the "national" in the Zapatista Army of National Liberation "has more a sense of moving outwards than of moving inwards: 'national' in the sense of

³²⁶Rancière, 1998, 38.

³²⁷Rancière, 1992, 62.

³²⁸Ibid., 62.

'not just Chiapanecan' or 'not just indigenous', rather than 'national' in the sense of 'not foreign'" according to Holloway.³²⁹

The masks, in addition to being a demonstration and denial of the identity given by the *police* order, might be considered as a tool for impossible identification. "The anonymity afforded by the mask is thus not merely practical, but also symbolic. It 'represents' those who are not currently represented: the face-less, voice-less minorities—which in numerical terms is the vast majority."³³⁰ This is one way of impossible identification: the Zapatista can form a one that is not merely herself, an indigenous, but that is a relation of herself to an other, the faceless and voiceless, by wearing a mask. A second way is the mask allows anyone to be a Zapatista in the sense that a person can form a one that is the relation of herself to a Zapatista through the symbol of mask: "Marcos explains his message to the world television audience: he is not a leader but his 'black mask is a mirror, reflecting each of their own struggles; that a Zapatista is anyone anywhere fighting injustice, that We are you'"³³¹ The mask as a mirror, in this regard, works in two directions. On the one hand, it reflects all those excluded, all those not taken into account, all those invisible into the Zapatista movement, and on the other hand, it reflects the Zapatista movement into anyone struggling against injustices, inequalities and exclusion. Moreover, "by covering their faces as a political action, the Zapatistas are able to create a unique political anonymity (open to anyone, and yet unambiguously against neoliberalism) that rejects identity-based models of subjectivity in favor of a collective subject of the event itself."³³² The mask is the declaration of membership in a collective, which is not identity-based, not identifiable by a social group, which on the contrary the class of the excluded, invisible and uncounted.

In line with these, Subcomandante Marcos, when "accused" of being a homosexual answers in the following way:

³²⁹Holloway, 1998, 167.

³³⁰Tormey, 2006, 150.

³³¹Seamus McGreal, "The Zapatista Rebellion as postmodern revolution." *Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science* 5, no: 1 (2006): 60.

³³² Thomas Nail, "Zapatismo and the Global Origins of Occupy," *Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory* 12, no: 3 (2013): 36.

Marcos is gay in San Francisco, a black person in South Africa, Asian in Europe, a Chicano in San Isidro, an anarchist in Spain, a Palestinian in Israel, an Indigenous person in the streets of San Cristóbal,...a dissident against neoliberalism, a writer without books or readers, and a Zapatista in the Mexican Southeast. In other words, Marcos is a human being in this world. Marcos is every untolerated, oppressed, exploited minority that is resisting and saying, "Enough!" He is every minority who is now beginning to speak and every majority that must shut up and listen. He is every untolerated group searching for a way to speak, their way to speak. Everything that makes power and the good consciences of those in power uncomfortable-this is Marcos.³³³

It is clear that Marcos cannot be all of those listed above, however, in this way he constitutes not a self but a relation of a self to an other. Further, the use of "Enough" here or of "*Ya Basta*" (Enough is Enough) in other communiques and declarations is significant considering the distinction between speech and voice. "*Ya Basta*" might be understood as a voice indicating pain by the police order, however the Zapatistas' argumentative, logical demonstrations that a wrong exists through the syllogism of emancipation, their emergence into realm of visibility and perceptible through theatrical demonstration, and their presupposition of their equality to the counted parts of the society as well as to all those unaccounted through impossible identification indicate that their "*Ya Basta*" is actually speech pointing out the injustices and inequalities within the social order.

It should also be noted that the impossible identification is not only observed in Marcos' words but also in the words of other Zapatistas such as Zapatista Major Ana María:

Behind us are the we that are you. Behind our balaclavas is the face of all the excluded women. Of all the forgotten indigenous people. Of all the persecuted homosexuals. Of all the despised youth. Of all the beaten migrants. Of all those imprisoned for their word and thought. Of all the

³³³ Subcomandante Marcos in *Zapatistas! Documents of the New Mexican Revolution* (New York: Autonomedia, 1994), 320.

humiliated workers. Of all those who have died from being forgotten. Of all the simple and ordinary men and women who do not count, who are not seen, who are not named, who have no tomorrow.³³⁴

Therefore, referring to the Zapatista movement as only an indigenous movement would actually not be true as Holloway argues. The Zapatista movement is of all those forgotten, of all those excluded, of all those not being into account and of all those invisible.

³³⁴Zapatista Major Ana María in "Discurso inaugural de la mayor Ana María," *Chiapas* 3, 103 in John Holloway "Dignity's Revolt," in *Zapatista! : Reinventing Revolution in Mexico*, ed. John Holloway (London: Pluto Press, 1998), 189.

CHAPTER VI

Conclusion

The main argument of this thesis is that the Zapatista movement has a political character in line with Jacques Rancière's thought. The Zapatista movement is significant since they have shown the exclusion, inequalities and marginalization that had been faced by the indigenous people of Chiapas to all Mexico and the world, and they inspired other movements throughout the world. What is more is that they have given way to the method of armed struggle quickly after the armed conflict was over, they have employed a horizontal organization structure which differed from the previous guerilla organizations, presented an alternative politics based on democracy and equality and finally they have become more than an indigenous movement. It is argued that Rancière's alternative to politics that exist today, which he renames as the *police*, is particularly useful in order to analyze the Zapatista movement because presupposition of equality is the starting point of both. Moreover, both the movement and Rancière do not suggest a certain program for emancipation, for engaging in politics except from the equality's presupposition.

As explained in the second chapter, Rancière's understanding of the political is based on the distinction between *police* and politics, and equality. The *police* is the order that counts, names and allocates places and shares to the parts comprising the society. The partition of the sensible, which is the main function of a *police* order, decides on which parts are the parts that form the society, which means that the *police* does not only determine how the shares and places are allocated to the parts, but also which parts are counted as parts. Politics, on the other hand, happens when a rupture in this logic of *police* is interrupted, which is an interruption that rests on equality. What is referred as equality here is not the equality that is distributed from above, nor is it something that will be achieved through politics. It is something presupposed. Politics implements "a basically heterogeneous assumption, that of a part of those who have no part, an assumption that, at the end of the day, itself

demonstrates the sheer contingency of the order, the equality of any speaking being with any other speaking being”³³⁵. Politics, in this sense, points out that the *police* order is based on contingency. Although *police* presents a world in which that order is something natural, inevitable and unchangeable; politics presents the possibility of another world by showing that the *police* order is not something naturally given and it is, in reality, changeable.

In order to analyze the Zapatista movement, it is necessary to look at the history of Mexico and the place of the indigenous people in this history as the movement initially emerges as an indigenous movement and refers to a 500 years of struggle. In the third chapter, a brief of history of Mexico was presented in order to address these issues. Later, in the fourth chapter the history of the Zapatista movement, starting from the preparation period that lasted ten years, was given along with the examples that would help the analysis of the movement.

In the fifth chapter, it was argued that the indigenous people were not taken into account during the nation-building process in the post-revolutionary Mexico. Moreover, the appropriation of the Mexican Revolution and Villa Zapata by the Mexican state appears as a partition of the sensible and rewriting of history which helped the de-radicalization of the radical segments of the society, allocation of their roles by and reconfiguration of the police order. The same appropriation operated as legitimizing the neoliberal reforms in 1990s as well while the indigenous people particularly in Chiapas continued to be not taken into account. It was also argued that the initial armed uprising of the Zapatistas was a rupture in this police order, not because the uprising was an armed one, but because it presented the conditions in which the indigenous lived, the marginalization and exclusion they have faced to all of Mexico, even to the world. The partition of the sensible by the *police* order presented a world in which Mexico was a modern and developing country which would prosper in the future with the help of neoliberal policies, on the other hand, there was an invisible world that has been not taken into account, the world of poor Mexico. The uprising interrupted the police *order* by creating another partition of the

³³⁵Rancière, 1998, 30.

sensible, by showing this other Mexico. In addition, reference made to Zapata by the Zapatistas challenged the partition of the sensible by the police order.

Later, it was asserted that the Zapatista governing principles as well as practices such as autonomous municipalities, the organizational structures and decision-making process used by the movement and the use of masks in order to prevent vanguardism were based on the presupposition of equality. In addition, it was argued that three characteristics of subjectivization process in Rancière's understanding of political, which are argumentative demonstration, theatrical dramatization and impossible identification can be observed in the Zapatista movement.

As stated, the objective of this study is not to approach the Zapatista movement as a case study that will be placed within the framework of a grand theory. First of all, as Holloway argues "The open-ended nature of the Zapatista movement is summed up in the idea that it is a revolution, not a Revolution... It is a revolution, because the claim to dignity in a society built upon the negation of dignity can only be met through a radical transformation of society. But it is not a Revolution in the sense of having some grand plan, in the sense of a movement designed to bring about the Great Event which will change the world."³³⁶ The Zapatistas do not consider themselves as vanguards that will show the way to emancipation to others. They consider themselves as a part of a greater struggle that fight in their own way. Rancière, in turn, suggests that politics might arise anywhere, by anyone and every political struggle, despite being based on the presupposition of equality, is fought in its own way. In this regard, neither the Zapatistas nor Rancière seems to suggest a program, a schedule for political struggle. What they have common is the struggle to be visible, heard; the struggle to present the exclusion and marginalization, which are based on the presupposition of equality of anyone to anyone.

The analysis of the Zapatista movement from a Rancièrian perspective shows that although democracy is somehow reduced to an understanding that is based on regular, supposedly fair elections, an alternative exists both in Rancière's

³³⁶Holloway, 1998, 168.

thought and in the Zapatista movement. This alternative posited against what Rancière calls police orders is based on equality of anyone to anyone. This equality, or rather the presupposition of equality brings the hope that anyone excluded, marginalized, anyone that are not taken into account can act from the presupposition of equality can challenge the police order in which they live. As there is no proper subject of politics, anyone can engage in politics. While in Rancière we see the possibility of this hope, the Zapatista movement shows us the reality of the hope, albeit neither suggests only one way to realize this hope.

Finally, Rancière claims that politics is something that happens rarely and momentarily: "... to grasp the concept of police reveals the impossibility of eliminating police in favor of politics. Any effort to disrupt the police order will always be subject to co-optation by that very police order."³³⁷ However, it might be argued that the Zapatista movement seems open to challenge any police order that might arise and that eliminating police in favor of politics might be possible as the Zapatista movement becomes the movement of all those excluded, visible and not taken into account. Nevertheless, this discussion requires a deepened analysis of Rancière's thought, which is off the limits of this study.

³³⁷Chambers, 2010, 68.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "A Good Government." flag.blackened.net. Accessed November 7, 2013.
<http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/mexico/ezln/2003/marcos/governmentJULY.html>.
- Burbach, Roger. *Globalization and Postmodern Politics: From Zapatistas to High-Tech Robber Barons*. London: Pluto Press, 2001.
- Chambers, Samuel A. "Police and Oligarchy." In *Jacques Rancière Key Concepts*, edited by Jean-Philippe Deranty, 57-69. Durham: Acumen Publishing, 2010.
- Davis, Oliver. *Jacques Rancière*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2010.
- "Editorial – El Despertador Mexicano." flag.blackened.net. Accessed July 18, 2013.
http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/mexico/ezln/ezln_editoral.html.
- Egan, Daniel. "Rethinking the Zapatistas: Frantz Fanon and Resistance to Neoliberalism," *Humanity & Society* 30, no. 1 (2006): 67-83 .
- "FAQ About Zapatismo." Schools for Chiapas. Accessed January 12, 2014.
<http://www.schoolsforchiapas.org/english/resources/faq-about-zapatismo.html>
- Fifth Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle ” struggle.ws. Accessed July 24, 2013.
http://www.struggle.ws/mexico/ezln/ccri_5_dec_lj_july98.html.
- "First Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle." struggle.ws. Accessed December 20 , 2013.
<http://struggle.ws/mexico/ezln/ezlnwa.html>.
- "Fourth Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle." struggle.ws. Accessed July 24, 2013.
<http://www.struggle.ws/mexico/ezln/jung4.html>.
- Foster, Lynn V. *A Brief History of Mexico*. New York: Checkmark Books, 2007.
- Gilbreth, Chris and Gerardo Otero. "Democratization in Mexico The Zapatista Uprising and Civil Society." *Latin American Perspectives* 28 no.4 (2001): 7-29.
- Gilly, Adolfo. "Chiapas and the Rebellion of the Enchanted World." In *Rural Revolt in Mexico: US. Intervention and the Domain of Subaltern Politics*, edited by Daniel Nugent, 261-333. Durham & London: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Hamnett, Brian. *A Concise History of Mexico*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Haake, Claudia. *The State, Removal and Indigenous Peoples in the United States and Mexico, 1620-2000*. New York: Routledge, 2007.

Harvey, Neil. *The Chiapas Rebellion: The Struggle for Land and Democracy*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1999.

Hiller, Patrick T. "Contesting Zapata: Differing Meanings of the Mexican National Idea." *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences* 1, no: 2 (2009), 258-280.

Holloway, John. "Dignity's Revolt," in *Zapatista! : Reinventing Revolution in Mexico*, edited by John Holloway. London: Pluto Press, 1998.

Johnston, Josée. "Pedagogical guerrillas, armed democrats, and revolutionary counterpublics: Examining paradox in the Zapatista uprising in Chiapas Mexico," *Theory and Society* 29, no. 4 (2000): 463-505.

Katz, Friedrich. *The Life and Times of Pancho Villa*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Khasnabish, Alex. *Zapatistas: Rebellion from the Grassroots to the Global*. Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing, 2010.

Kirkwood, Burton. *History of Mexico*. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2000.

La Botz, Dan. "Twenty Years Since the Chiapas Rebellion: The Zapatistas, Their Politics, and Their Impact." *A Socialist, Feminist, Anti-Racist Organization: Solidarity*. January 13, 2014 /Accessed on January 16, 2014. <http://www.solidarity-us.org/site/node/4082>.

Manaut, Raúl Benítez; Andrew Selee; Cynthia J. Arnson, "Frozen Negotiations: The Peace Process in Chiapas." *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 22, no: 1 (2006): 131-152.

Márquez, García and Roberto Pombo. "The Punch Card and the Hourglass." *New Left Review* 9, (2001): 69-79.

May, Todd. *Contemporary Political Movements and the Thought of Jacques Rancière*. Cheshire: Edinburgh University Press, 2010.

May, Todd. *The Political Thought of Jacques Rancière*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008.

May, Todd. "Wrong, Disagreement, Subjectification." In *Jacques Rancière Key Concepts*, edited by Jean-Philippe Deranty, 69-80. Durham: Acumen Publishing, 2010.

McGreal, Seamus. "The Zapatista Rebellion as postmodern revolution." *Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science* 5, no: 1 (2006): 54-64.

Mentinis, Mihalís. *Zapatistas: The Chiapas Revolt and What It Means for Radical Politics*. London: Pluto Press, 2006.

Nail, Thomas. "Zapatismo and the Global Origins of Occupy." *Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory* 12, no. 3 (2013): 20-38.

Nugent, Daniel. "Northern intellectuals and the EZLN," *Monthly Review* 47, no. 3 (1995): 124-138.

Oikonomakis, Leonidas. "Zapatistas: 'to be heard, we march in silence.'" roarmag.org. December 21, 2012 / accessed on January 12, 2014. <http://roarmag.org/2012/12/zapatistas-march-chiapas-mayas/>.

Özbudun, Sibel. "Latin Amerika'da yerli kadınların üçlü mücadelesi: Yoksul, yerli ve kadın olmak (EZLN örneği)." *Latin Bilgi*. February 12, 2011/Accessed on January 10, 2013.

http://www.latinbilgi.net/index.php?eylem=yazi_oku&no=3707.

"Peace Process, War Process". sipaz.org. Accessed July 28, 2013. <http://www.sipaz.org/en/chiapas/peace-process-war-process/344-2003.html>.

Poggiali, Lisa. "Reimagining the Possible: Zapatista Discourse and the Problematics of Rights." *University of Sussex Journal of Contemporary History* 8 (2005): 1-21.

Ramírez, Gloria Muñoz. *The Fire and The Word: A History of the Zapatista Movement*. San Fransisco: City Lights Books, 2008.

Rancière, Jacques. *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy*. Translated by Julie Rose. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.

Rancière, Jacques. *On the Shores of Politics*. Translated by Liz Heron. London: Verso 1995.

Rancière, Jacques. "Politics, Identification, and Subjectivization." *October* 61 (1992): 58-64.

Rancière, Jacques. "Ten Theses on Politics." *Theory & Event* 5, no: 3 (2001): 1-18.

Ross, John. "The Zapatista Challenge in Mexico's Presidential Election." *Counter Punch*. Accessed November 11, 2013.

<http://www.counterpunch.org/2005/11/05/the-zapatista-challenge-in-mexico-s-presidential-elections/>.

Russell, Philip L. *The History of Mexico*. New York and London: Routledge, 2010.

Saldaña-Portillo, María Josefina. "Reading a Silence: The 'Indian' in the Era of Zapatismo." *Nepantla: Views from South* 3, no: 2 (2002), 287-314.

"Seven Principles of "Rule by Obeying/Mandar Obedeciendo" of the Zapatista 'Good Government' and the National Congress of Indigenous Peoples." [zapatismo.florycanto.net](http://www.zapatismo.florycanto.net/docs/zapatistasevenprinciplesgoodgovernment.pdf). Accessed October 24, 2013.
<http://www.zapatismo.florycanto.net/docs/zapatistasevenprinciplesgoodgovernment.pdf>.

"Sixth Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle." [anarkismo.net](http://www.anarkismo.net/newswire.php?story_id=805). Accessed November 8, 2013. http://www.anarkismo.net/newswire.php?story_id=805.

Stahler-Sholk, Richard. "Resisting Neoliberal Homogenization: The Zapatista Autonomy Movement." *Latin American Perspectives* 34 no: 2 (2007), 48-63.

Starr, Amory; María Elena Martínez-Torres and Peter Rosset; "Participatory Democracy in Action: Practices of the Zapatistas and the Movimiento Sem Terra." *Latin American Perspectives* 38 (2011): 102-119.

Stephen, Lynn. *Zapata Lives! Histories and Cultural Politics in Southeastern Mexico*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press: 2002.

Subcomandante Marcos. "Another Calendar: That of Resistance." [struggle.ws](http://www.struggle.ws). January 2003, accessed July 28, 2013.
<http://www.struggle.ws/mexico/ezln/2003/marcos/resistance1.html>

Subcomandante Marcos. *First World, Ha Ha Ha!: The Zapatista Challenge*. By Medea Benjamin, edited by Elaine Katzenberger San Francisco: City Lights, 1995.

Subcomandante Marcos. *Ya Basta!: Ten Years of the Zapatista Uprising*, edited by Žiga Vodovnik. Oakland: AK Press, 2004.

Topal, Aylin. "Meksika'da Tarım Politikaları ve Kırsal Mücadele Dinamikleri." Presentation at the 11th National Congress of Social Sciences, Ankara, Turkey, December 9-11, 2009.

Topal, Aylin. "Transition to neoliberalism and decentralisation policies in Mexico." In *Economic Transitions to Neoliberalism in Middle-income Countries*, edited by Alfredo Saad-Filho and Galip L. Yalman, 230-242. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2010.

Tormey, Simon. "'Not in my Name': Deleuze, Zapatismo and the Critique of Representation." *Parliamentary Affairs* 59, no: 1 (2006): 138-154.

“The rejection of the Dialogue for Peace and Reconciliation in Chiapas.” flag.blackened.net. Accessed 7, 2013.
[http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/mexico/ezln/ccri di reject jun94.html](http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/mexico/ezln/ccri%20di%20reject%20jun94.html)..

Wolf, Eric. *Peasant Wars of the Twentieth Century*. New York: Harper 1969.

“Words of the EZLN in the Zo’calo of Mexico City.” struggle.ws. Accessed November 22, 2013.
http://struggle.ws/mexico/ezln/2001/march/zocalo_mar11.html

“Zapatista Army of National Liberation decides on the death of Aguascalientes.” flag.blackened.net. Accessed November 7, 2013.
<http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/mexico/ezln/2003/marcos/deathJULY.html>.

Zapatista History.” kiptik.org. Accessed October 24, 2013.
<http://www.kiptik.org/history.html>.

Zapatistas! Documents of the New Mexican Revolution. New York: Autonomedia, 1994.

“Zapatistas Hold First Global Festival of Dignified Rage.” elkimbo.org. Accessed November 26, 2013.
<http://www.elkilombo.org/first-global-festival-of-dignified-rage/>.

“Zapatistas Organize the First Global Festival of Dignified Rage.” envio.org.ni. Accessed November 26, 2013.
<http://www.envio.org.ni/articulo.php/3940>.

Zugman, Kara Ann. "Zapatismo and Urban Political Practice," *Latin American Perspectives* 32, no.4: 133-147.

APPENDIX A: TURKISH SUMMARY

Bu çalışma, Zapatista Ulusal Kurtuluş Ordusu'nun (*Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional* - EZLN) 1 Ocak 1994 tarihinde Chiapas'taki birkaç belediyenin kontrolünü ele geçirip kamusal olarak görünürlük kazanmasından sonra ortaya çıkmış olan Zapatista hareketini incelemektedir. Belediyelerin EZLN tarafından işgali uzun sürmese de, Zapatista hareketinin ortaya çıkışının önemli etkileri olmuştur. Denildiği gibi, 1 Ocak 1994 günü kamusal olarak görünürlük kazandıysa da aslında 1983 yılından beri etkin bir hareket olan Zapatista hareketi, SSCB'nin ve dolayısıyla iki kutuplu dünyanın dağılışının ertesinde ortaya çıkarak hâlâ mücadele umudu olduğunu gösterdiği için önemli bir harekettir. Bunun dışında, hareket, Seattle Dünya Ticaret Örgütü protestoları ve Dünya Sosyal Forumu'nun kuruluşu gibi dünya çapında sistem karşıtı hareketlere de bir ilham kaynağı olmuştur. Ancak, bu tezde de bahsedildiği gibi Zapatista hareketini asıl önemli kılan; bir gerilla organizasyonu olarak ortaya çıkması ve daha sonra bir sosyal harekete dönüşmesidir. Hareketin, bu dönüşüm sırasında ve öncesinde geleneksel gerilla organizasyonlarından ayrıldığı noktalar da hareketi önemli kılmaktadır. Bu noktalar kısaca silahlı mücadele yoluyla iktidarı ve/veya devleti ele geçirme gibi önceki gerilla grupları tarafından kullanılan geleneksel yöntemlerin bir kenara bırakılması, hiyerarşik örgütlenmeden vazgeçilip eşitlik temelinde örgütlenme ve öncü bir pozisyon benimsememe olarak özetlenebilir. Buna ek olarak, Zapatistalar, yeni siyasal mekanlar açarak Meksika'daki siyasete bir alternatif getirmişlerdir. Siyasal iktidarı ele geçirme, hareketin gündeminde olan bir konu değilken, seçimlere katılmak veya seçimlerde belli adayları desteklemek de Zapatistaların siyaset yapma yöntemleri değildir. Zapatistaların amacı siyasal elit tarafından kontrol edilmeyen ve eşitlik temeline dayanan otonom demokrasinin kuruluşudur. Bu bağlamda, Zapatista hareketinin önemi sadece yerlilerin karşı karşıya olduğu eşitsizlikleri ve dışlanmayı göz önüne sermekten değil, aynı zamanda alternatif bir siyaset öne sürmekten kaynaklanmaktadır. Jacques Rancière'nin de siyasetin sonu, tarihin sonu gibi tartışmaların ortaya çıktığı bir dönemde siyaseti ve siyasal olanı kavramsallaştırması hâlâ siyaset yapma umudu olduğunu göstermektedir. Rancière, siyaseti, *polis* düzeni dediği şeye antagonistik olarak kurarak aslında bir kısımlara ayırma, bu hiyerarşik

kısımları yönetme düzeni olan *polis* düzenine bir alternatif getirmektedir. Tezde de Zapatistaların öne sürdüğü alternatif, Rancière'nin siyaset, siyasal ve demokrasi kavramsallaştırması üzerinden incelemiştir. Siyasetin ve siyasalın incelenmesi; şu anda geçerli olan siyaset yapma anlayışının eleştirisiyle alakalıdır çünkü şu anda geçerli olan siyaset yapma anlayışına bir alternatif sunarken siyasetin ve siyasal olanın ne olduğunun da tartışılması gerekmektedir. Rancière'nin Zapatista hareketi özelinde bu tartışmaya faydalı olacağı düşünülmüştür çünkü ilk olarak Rancière'nin siyaset/*polis* ayrımı siyasetin her zaman *polis* düzeni tarafından sistemin bir parçası haline getirebileceği tehlikesini göstermektedir. Bu tehlikeden korunabilmek için *polis* düzenini iyi anlamak gerekmektedir. Bunun dışında, ne Zapatistaların ne de Rancière'nin büyük bir kurtuluş planı olmaması ama benzer hareket noktalarından yola çıkmaları dikkate değerdir.

Bu bağlamda, tez dört bölümden oluşmaktadır. İkinci bölümde, Rancière'nin siyasal, siyaset ve demokrasi anlayışı; *polis*/siyaset ayrımı, eşitlik, yanlış hesap ve öznelleşme temaları çevresinde açıklanmıştır. *Polis*/siyaset ayrımıyla başlamak gerekirse; Rancière'nin siyasal anlayışına göre şu anda siyaset ve demokrasi denilen şey aslında *polis* düzenidir. *Polis*'in en temel özelliği kısımlara ayırmak ve duyulur/algılanır olanı belirlemek, dolayısıyla duyulur olanı kısımlara ayırmaktır. Bu kısımlara ayırma, yöneten ve yönetilen arasındaki hiyerarşi gibi bir hiyerarşi oluşturmaktadır. *Polis* düzeninde, toplumun, tüm kısımları bilinen, sayılmış ve bir harmoni oluşturacak şekilde düzenlenmesi gereken bir bütün olarak düşünülmektedir. Fakat *polis* düzeninde bu kısımların ayrılması ve adlandırılması üzerine bir anlaşmazlık olacağı düşünülmemektedir. Ayrıca *polis* neyin söylenebilir, neyin görülebilir olduğunu da belirlemektedir. *Polis* düzeni görünür ve söylenebilir olanın düzenidir. Yani sadece toplumdaki kısımların nasıl bir pay alacağını değil, bu kısımların anlaşılabilirliğini ve görünürlüğü de belirlemektedir. *Polis*'in ortaya koyduğu, hesaba kattığı kısımların dışında kalan kısımlar *polis*'e göre var olmamaktadır. Burada Aristoteles'in söz ve ses ayrımından bahsetmek yararlı olabilir. Aristoteles'e göre söz neyin adil neyin adaletsiz olduğunu ifade ederken, ses sadece haz ve acıyı ifade etmektedir. Böylece, Aristoteles'e göre iki kategori bulunmaktadır: logos'a sahip olanlar ve olmayanlar. Logos'a sahip olanlar, söz kapasitesini kullanabilirken, logos'a sahip olmayanlar sadece haz ve acıyı ifade

edebilmekle sınırlı olan ses kapasitesini kullanabilir. *Polis* de işte kimin sese, kimin söze sahip olduğunun ayrımını yapmaktadır. Öte yandan, Rancière, siyasetin; *polis*'in yaptığı kısımlara ayırmanın ve hesaba katmanın dışında bulunan ve *polis*'in yok saydığı kısımların da var olduğunu göstererek *polis* düzeninde bir çatlak yarattığını iddia etmektedir. Bu çatlak ise eşitlik sayesinde meydana gelmektedir. Burada Rancière'nin bahsettiği eşitlik ne dağıtılan bir eşitliktir ne de siyasetin bir sonucu olarak ulaşılabilecek bir eşitliktir. Eşitlik, daha çok, eşitliğin varsayımı aracılığıyla, var olan siyasal özneler olarak sayılma iddiasıdır. Bu noktada Rancière'nin Ballanche'e referansla verdiği pleb'lerin Aventine Tepesi'ne çekilmesi örneği anlam kazanmaktadır. Pleb'ler, patrici'ler tarafından yönetimden dışlanmaktadır ve isyan ederek Aventine Tepesi'ne çekilirler. Bunun sonucunda, patrici'ler, pleb'lere görüşmeci olarak Menenius Agrippa'yı gönderirler ve Agrippa, pleb'lere bir masal anlatır. Patrici'leri vücudun karnı ve pleb'leri de vücudun geri kalanı olarak tasvir eden ve dolayısıyla pleb'lerin toplumdaki görevinin patrici'leri beslemek olduğunu göstermeye çalışan bu masal toplumun hiyerarşik yapısını doğallaştırmaya çalışan bir masal olsa da, önemli olan nokta, bu masalın anlatılışına kadar pleb'lerin söze sahip olmadığını düşünen patrici'lerin artık pleb'lerin söze sahip olduğunu düşünmeleridir. Bu örnek, aynı zamanda, Rancière'nin eşitsizliğin ancak eşitlik aracılığıyla var olduğu iddiasını da desteklemektedir. Bu iddiaya göre, toplum düzeni bazılarının yönetmesi ve bazılarının yönetilmesi sonucu oluşur. Ancak, bu düzeni ve yönetilenlerin itaatini sağlamak için yönetilenlerin düzeni ve itaat etmesi gerektiğini anlaması gerekmektedir. Bu anlayış ise esasında yönetenler ve yönetilenlerin eşitliğinin varsayımıdır. Pleb'ler örneğinde olduğu gibi, yönetenler, yönetilenlerle karşı karşıya gelip neden itaat etmeleri gerektiğini açıklamak durumundadır. Bu ise, yönetilen ve yönetenlerin zaten eşit olduğunu anlamına gelmektedir.

Öte yandan, siyasal özneler olarak var olma iddiası bir öznelleşme sürecini gerektirmektedir. Öznelleşme sürecinin üç özelliği bulunmaktadır: tartışmacı gösteri, teatral dramatizasyon ve imkansız kimlik. Tartışmacı gösteri, özgürleşme tasımını kullanarak siyasal özneler olarak var olma iddiasını mantıklı temellere oturturken teatral dramatizasyon, öznenin duyulur/algılanır alana çıkışını işaret etmektedir. İmkansız kimlik ise bir kendinin şekillendirilmesi değil, bir kendi'nin bir başkasıyla ilişkisi olan bir'in şekillendirilmesidir.

Tezin üçüncü bölümü ise İspanyol Fethi'nden başlayarak Meksika tarihinin bir özetini vermektedir. Meksika tarihi bölümünün bu kadar uzun tutulma nedeni, aynı zamanda Meksika hükümetine karşı bir savaş ilanı olan, Lacandon Ormanı'ndan Birinci Deklarasyon'da Zapatistaların 500 yıllık bir mücadelenin ürünü olduklarını iddia etmiş olmalarıdır. Beş kısımdan oluşan bu bölümde, Zapatista hareketinin ortaya çıktığı arka plan anlatılmıştır. Bu kısımlar sırasıyla, Fetih ve Sömürge Dönemi, Bağımsızlık, Porfiriato, Devrim ve Tek Parti Yönetimi, ve Neoliberalizme Geçiş'tir. Her bir kısımda, Meksika'da yaşanan gelişmeler açıklanmış ve yerlilerin bakış açısından değerlendirilmiştir. İlk kısımda, sömürgeleştirme, İspanyol dili ve kültürünün dayatılması ve kurulan ırksal hiyerarşinin etkileri açıklanmıştır. Daha sonra, ikinci kısımda, 1810 ve 1821 yılları arasında gerçekleşen bağımsızlık mücadeleleri ve liberaller ve muhafazakarlar arasında yaşanan çekişmelerden kaynaklanan kaos ve çatışmalarla dolu olan bağımsızlık sonrası döneme değinilmiştir. Üçüncü kısımda ise, Porfiriato dönemi ve bu dönemin belirgin ideolojisi pozitivism açıklanmıştır. Daha sonra ise, Porfiriato dönemini izleyen Meksika Devrimi ve Kurumsal Devrimci Parti'nin (*Partido Revolucionario Institucional* - PRI) kurulmasıyla sonuçlanan devrimin konsolidasyonu analiz edilmiştir. Son olarak da, 80li yılların başına rastlayan Meksika'nın neoliberalizme geçiş sürecine kısaca değinilmiştir.

Dördüncü bölüm, Zapatista hareketinin ortaya çıkış sürecini açıklamaktadır. Bu bölümde, Zapatista hareketinin 80li yıllarda ortaya çıkışı ve gelişimi ve 1 Ocak 1994 günü kamusal alanda görünürlük kazanması anlatılmıştır. Daha sonra ise 1 Ocak 1994 tarihini izleyen günlerdeki olaylara değinilmiştir. EZLN'nin 1994 yılı öncesindeki gelişimi 1983 yılından itibaren açıklanmış, Subcomandante Marcos tarafından da anlatıldığı gibi hareketin 1983 yılından itibaren geçtiği yedi aşama sunulmuş ve Zapatistaların yerli köylerindeki örgütlenmeleri anlatılmıştır. Sonrasında, bu gelişimin doruk noktası olan ve kolektif bir şekilde alınmış olan savaş ilan etme kararı ve 12 gün süren savaşı izleyen ateşkes kararı anlatılmıştır. Son olarak ise, Zapatista hareketinin ilkeleri ve hareketin eşitlik temeline dayanan hiyerarşik olmayan örgütlenmesi; Zapatista hareketi ve toplulukları içerisinde uygulanan pratikler aracılığıyla açıklanmıştır.

Beşinci bölümde ise Zapatista hareketi, Rancière'nin siyasal, siyaset ve demokrasi anlayışındaki üç tema üzerinden analiz edilmiştir: *polis*/siyaset ayrımı, eşitlik ve öznelleşme. İlk olarak, devrim sonrası Meksika'ya bakıldığında, ulus inşa sürecinde, mestizo'nun yeni ulusal kimlik olarak tasarlandığı görülmektedir. Bu ulusal kimlik içerisinde yerlinin yeri bulunmamaktadır. Görkemli bir yerli tarihi inşa edilirken ve mestizo bu yerli tarihine dahil edilirken yerlilerin burada yerini alması ancak asimile olmaları, mestizo haline gelmeleri ve vatandaş olmaları sonucu olmaktadır. Asimile olmayan yerlilerin yeni ulusal kimlikte yeri bulunmamaktadır. Bu ulus inşa sürecinde Zapata'nın ve Meksika Devriminin de kullanıldığı görülmektedir. Bu da yine duyulur olanın kısımlara ayrılması olarak yorumlanabilir çünkü Zapata'nın ve Devrimin bu şekilde kullanılması, bir yandan tarihin kısımlara ayrılması ve görünür ve algılanır olan tarihin belirlenmesi, öte yandan da toplumun kısımlara ayrılması ve yerlilerin bu toplumun dışında bırakılması anlamına gelmektedir. Ayrıca devrim sırasında ve sonrasında gayet tartışmalı bir konu olan toprak dağılımının da yine devrim sonrasında hükümetin tek eline alınması sonucu; otonom toprak dağılımının engellendiği ve otonom olarak toprak işgal eden radikal ve mobilize kitlelere *polis* düzeninde bir yer verilip bu kitlelerin deradikalize edildikleri iddia edilebilir. 1990larda da neoliberal politikaların etkisiyle, Anayasanın 27. Maddesinin değiştirilmesi yine Zapata ve Meksika Devriminin mirasının kullanılmasıyla meşrulaştırılmaktadır. Meksika vatandaşının nasıl olması gerektiği ve bireysellik, özel mülkiyet savunusu gibi Meksika vatandaşının sahip olması gereken özellikler tasarlanmış ve bu özellikleri kabul etmeyenlerin vatandaş olamayacağı iması ortaya konulmuştur.

Ancak, bundan daha da önemli olarak, neoliberalizmin etkisi, Chiapas'ın en fakir ve en marjinal hale getirilmiş eyalet olması göz ardı edilmektedir. Hükümetin göstermeye çalıştığı gibi tek ve her şeyin yolunda gittiği bir Meksika bulunmamakta, aslında iki tane Meksika bulunmaktadır. Zapatista isyanının gösterdiği de bu diğer Meksika'nın var olduğudur. Bu noktada silahlı mücadelenin Zapatistalar tarafından son çare olarak ifade edilmesi önemlidir. Yerlilerin daha önceki barışçıl eylemleri ve protestoları hükümet tarafından gayet şiddetli bir şekilde bastırılmıştır. Silahlı eylem sözün tükendiği noktada bir çözüm ve sözün yeniden gündeme getirilmesi olarak görülebilir. Rancière'de de şiddetin duyulur, görülür olmak için son çare olduğu

görülmektedir. Rancière, 1833'teki Fransız terzileri grevinde, terzilerin duyulur ve görülür olmasının, 1830 ve daha öncesinde 1789'daki şiddetli eylemler sayesinde mümkün olduğunu öne sürmektedir. Zapatistaların silah son çaremizdi açıklaması kendilerini haklı gösterme çabası olarak yorumlanabilir fakat daha sonra, hareket görünürlük kazandıktan, sivil toplumun dikkatini çektikten sonra hareketin silahlı eylemden vazgeçmesinin bu son çare vurgusunda samimi olunduğu anlamına geldiği iddia edilebilir.

Bu noktada Rancière'nin verdiği pleblerin Aventine Tepesi'ne çekilmeleri ve İskit kölelerinin isyanı örnekleri anlamlı olabilir. Rancière'nin Herodot'a referansla anlattığı İskit köleleri hikayesine göre, İskitler, kölelerinin gözlerini kör etmektedir. Ancak, topluluğun savaşçılarının savaş amacıyla bir nesil boyunca sürecektir olan bir yolculuğa çıkmaları sonrasında yeni doğan kölelerin gözleri kör edilmemiştir. Bu kör olmayan kölelerin daha sonra efendileriyle aralarında bir fark olmadığını görmeleri sonucunda köleler isyan etmiş, topluluktan ayrılarak yerleştikleri toprağın etrafını çitlerle çevirmişlerdir. Savaştan geri dönen savaşçılar kölelerin bu isyanını bastırmak amacıyla kölelerle savaşmış ve yenilmişlerdir. Ancak, savaşçılardan birinin silah yerine kırbaçlarını çıkarma önerisi savaşçılar tarafından kabul edilmiş ve aynen bu savaşçının iddia ettiği gibi kırbaçı gören köleler toplumdaki yerlerini hatırlayıp isyana son vermişlerdir. Sonuç itibarıyla, Rancière'e göre İskit köleleri savaş açısından eşitliklerini gösterebilmiş fakat bunu siyasal eşitliğe çevirememişlerdir. Öte yandan plebler, kendilerini diğer savaşçılara eşit savaşçılar olarak değil, kendilerine sahip oldukları özellikleri tanımayan kişilere eşit olarak kurmuşlardır. Zapatistaların savaş ilanını da İskit kölelerin isyanına benzetilebilir fakat Zapatistalar daha sonra bunu siyasal eşitliğe dönüştürebilmişlerdir.

Son olarak devrim sonrası Meksika'da hükümet tarafından kullanılan Zapata imgesinin, Zapatistalar tarafından geri alınması da *polis*'in belirlediği, kısımlara ayırdığı duyulur olana bir alternatif getirerek *polis* düzenini sekteye uğratmıştır.

Eşitlik konusunda ise; Subcomandante Marcos'un bahsettiği kentten Lacandon Ormanı'na gelen kent gerillalarının yerlilerle karşılaştıktan sonra uğradıkları yenilgi oldukça anlamlıdır. Lacandon Ormanı'na gelen kent gerillalarının ilk amacı yerlileri bilinçlendirmek ve devrimcileştirmektir. Ancak, kent gerillaları ve yerlilerin karşılaşması bambaşka bir sonuç verdi: Zapatista hareketinin orijinalliğinin

doğmasına yol açan bir etkileşim meydana geldi. Kent gerillalarının yaklaşımı hiyerarşik bir yaklaşım olarak görülebilir. Gerillalar yerlilere devrimi öğretecek bir konumdayken yerliler de devrimciliği öğrenecek bir konumda görülmektedir. Daha sonra yerlilerin hayatına uyum sağlama gereği yüzünden bu hiyerarşinin terk edilmesi ise yine *polis* düzeninin, hiyerarşinin sekteye uğratılması olarak yorumlanabilir. Bu noktada hareketin ortaya çıkışı yerlilerin, gerillalarla eşit olduklarını varsaymalarına dayanmaktadır. Daha sonra ortaya çıkan Zapatista yönetim ilkelerinin de - itaat ederek yönetmek; dayatmamak, önermek; yürürken soru sormak - eşitliğin varsayımına dayandığı söylenebilir.

Ayrıca Todd May'in öne sürdüğü demokratik siyasetin beş ilkesi de bu Zapatista ilkeleriyle uyumludur. Zapatista hareketi, yukardan değil, tabandan gelir. Hareket yatay olarak eşitlikçidir, yani harekete mensup olanlar birbirine eşittir. Hareket dikey olarak da eşitlikçidir, hareketin dışında kalanlar da eşit olarak görülür. Hareket, ilk isyan haricinde şiddete başvurmaz ve siyaset her yerde ortaya çıkabilir.

Hareketin ilkeleri dışında pratiklerine bakıldığında da yine eşitliğin varsayımı görülmektedir. Gizli Devrimci Yerli Komitesi'nin (*Comité Clandestino Revolucionario Indígena* - CCRI) üyeleri yerli toplulukları tarafından seçilmektedir. Bu komite tarafından alınan tüm kararlar, sivil veya askeri kararlar olması farketmeksizin önce yerli topluluklarına danışarak alınmaktadır. Daha sonra kurulan ve CCRI'nın sivil yetkilerini devralan İyi Hükümet Cuntaları (*Juntas de Buen Gobierno* - JBGs) ve Otonom Belediyeler de yine eşitlik üzerine kurulmuştur. İsteyen her Zapatista bu cuntalarda ve belediyelerde görev alabilir ve görevler dönüşümlü olarak alınır. Bu noktada "dinleme" Zapatista hareketinin en temel özelliğidir denilebilir. FZLN, Öteki Kampanya, Ulusal Demokratik Kongre gibi örnekler Zapatistaların dinlemeye verdiği önemi göstermektedir. Bu noktada dinlemek, karşıdakinin söyleyecek anlamlı şeyleri olduğunu, karşıdakinin söze sahip olduğunu varsaymak olarak yorumlanabilir. Bunun dışında geleneksel olarak kolektif karar almadan dışlanan kadınların ilk olarak 1993 yılında yaptıkları Kadınların Devrimci Yasası aracılığıyla, karar almada söz sahibi olma talepleri de hareket içinde yer alan kadınların, eşitliğin varsayımı üzerinden hareketin içinde bulunan *polis* düzenini sekteye uğrattıkları söylenebilir.

Sonuç olarak, Zapatistalar hiyerarşik bir örgütlenmeye sahip değildir ve öncü bir konum almak istememektedir. Öncü konum alma konusundaki isteksizlik hareketin hiyerarşik olmayan yapısıyla doğrudan bağlantılıdır çünkü öncü konuma gelmeye çalışmak öncü örgüt veya kişi ile bu örgüt veya kişi tarafından yönlendirilen kişiler arasında bir hiyerarşinin olduğu anlamına gelmektedir. Öncü konuma gelmeme isteği, sadece Zapatista hareketi tarafından yapılan açıklamalarda değil, hareketin simgesi haline gelen kar maskelerinin kullanımı konusunda görülmektedir. Kar maskelerinin güvenlik gereği kullanıldığı iddia edilebilse de, asıl amacının eşitlikle alakalı olduğu öne sürülebilir. Kar maskesi herkesin herkese eşitliğini yansıtan bir anonimlik yaratmaktadır. Hareketin diğer tüm üyelerinin kar maskesi giydiği bir durumda kar maskesi giymek, kişinin eşitliğin varsayımından hareket etmekte olduğunu göstermektedir. Kar maskelerinin bir diğer yönü ise öznelleşme konusuyla ilgilidir.

Daha önce de değinildiği gibi, Rancière'ye göre, siyaset, hesaba katılmayanın, siyasal varlığının tanınması mücadelesidir. İşte bu yüzden siyasetin kendine özgü bir öznesi bulunmamaktadır. Siyasetin kendine özgü öznesinin bulunduğu iddiası zaten, Rancière'ye göre *polis* düzeninin ta kendisidir. Bu yüzden Rancière'nin düşüncesinde siyaset aynı zamanda bir öznelleşme sürecidir. Başka bir deyişle, siyaset, *polis* düzeninde hesaba katılmayanların, sayılmayanların, görünmez veya duyulmaz olanların eşitliklerini varsaymaları, bunu onaylamaları ve siyasal özneler olarak var olma mücadelesidir. Bu siyasal özne olarak var olma mücadelesinin daha önce de söz edildiği gibi üç temel özelliği bulunmaktadır. Bu özelliklerin ilki olan tartışmacı gösteriye, Rancière Fransız terziler grevinde oluşturulan özgürleşme tasımını örnek vermektedir. Bu tasımın birinci öncülü tüm Fransız yurttaşların eşit olduğunu söyleyen yasa maddesiye diğerleri, işçilerin cevaplanmayan talepleri, karşılaştıkları eşitsizlikler ve savcının işçilerin eşit olmadığını iddia etmesidir. Bu noktada, terziler basitçe birincil öncülün sadece sözde geçerli olduğunu düşünmeyip bu öncüller arasındaki çelişkiyi göstermekte ve ya birincil öncülün ya da diğerlerinin değişmesi gerektiğini iddia etmektedir. Zapatistalara bakıldığında ise; hareketin Lacandon Ormanı'ndan Birinci Deklarasyon'da Meksika Anayasasının 39. Maddesine referans verdikleri görülmektedir. Bu madde, egemenliğin halkta olduğunu, siyasal iktidarın halktan kaynaklandığını, amacının halka yardım etmek

olduğunu ve halkın her zaman mevcut olan hükümet şeklini değiştirme hakkı bulunduğunu söylemektedir. İlk olarak bu maddeye referans, hesaba katılmayan yerlilerin eşitlik varsayımından yola çıkarak kendilerini eşit olarak ve halkın bir parçası olarak kurduklarını göstermektedir. İkinci olarak ise bu referans bir tasım olarak düşünülebilir. Yerliler ilk öncül olarak halk olduklarını, hükümeti değiştirme haklarının bulunduğunu göstermekte, diğer öncül olarak ise halka yardım etmesi gereken iktidarın, yerlilerin taleplerini karşılamadığını, halkın ise hükümeti değiştiremediğini öne sürmektedir. Dolayısıyla bu iki öncül çelişmektedir. Bu noktada anayasaya referans bir tasım olarak ele alınabilir.

Öznelleşmenin ikinci özelliği ise teatral dramatizasyondur. Ranciere'ye göre bir gösteri sırasında polisin asli görevi katılımcıları tutuklamak değil gösteriyi dağıtarak gösterinin meydana geldiği yerde görülecek bir şey olmadığını göstermektir. Bu noktada görülebilir, duyulabilir ve söylenebilir belirleyen *polis* düzeninin duyulur olanı belirlemesi ve kısımlara ayırması akla gelmektedir. Siyaset ise bu görülecek bir şeyin olmadığı alanı, bir öznenin ortaya çıkabileceği alana dönüştürmektir. Yani siyaset görülecek bir şey yaratır. Ayrıca, eşitliğin varsayımı, kişinin olmadığı bir şey gibi, *polis* düzeninde eşit olarak bulunmayan kişinin eşitmiş gibi davranmasını gerektirir. Bu yüzden öznelleşmenin teatral bir yanı bulunmaktadır. Zapatistalara baktığımızda ise, hükümetin her şey yolunda açıklamalarına karşı Chiapas eyaletinin belli başlı belediyelerinin işgali *polis* düzeninin görülecek bir şey yok dediği yerde görülecek bir şeyler yaratmak olarak okunabilir. Yani bu belediyelerin işgali, *polis*'in "görülecek bir şey yok" dediği yerde aslında görülecek bir şeylerin olduğunu göstermektir. Bunun dışında öznelleşmeyle doğrudan ilgisi olmasa da, bazı Zapatistaların ilk ayaklanma sırasında tahta silahlar taşıması ve askeri bir karargahın kağıt uçaklarla sembolik olarak "bombalanması" da görülecek bir şeyler yaratmak olarak yorumlanabilir. Tahta silahların ve kağıt uçakların olmamaları gereken yerde ortaya çıkmaları, yerlilerin olmamaları gereken yerde, şehirlerde bulunmalarıyla birlikte *polis* düzeninin duyulur olanı belirleme, kısımlara ayırma fonksiyonunun sekteye uğratılmasıdır.

Öznelleşmenin üçüncü özelliği ise, imkansız kimliktir. Öznelleşme süreci, Rancière'e göre bir kendi değil, bir kendi'nin bir başkasıyla ilişkisi olan bir'in şekillendirilmesidir. Öznelleşme sadece bir kimliğin öne sürülmesi değil, *polis*

tarafından verilen kimliğin reddedilmesidir. Bu noktada Zapatistaların kar maskeleri önem taşımaktadır. Maske aracılığıyla mücadele eden bir Zapatista kimliği öne sürülürken, *polis* düzeni tarafından yerlilere verilen yerli kimliği reddedilmektedir. Kendisine neden maske taktığı sorulan bir Zapatista'nın şu cümleleri "Maskemle, onur ve adalet için mücadele eden bir Zapatista'yım. Maskem yokken ise lanet olası başka bir Yerliyim!" bu noktada gayet önemlidir.

Yani, maskenin diğer önemli olduğu bir nokta ise imkansız kimlik kurulmasına olanak sağlamasıdır. Maske, şu anda temsil edilmeyenin, yüzü olmayanın, sesi olmayanın temsil edilmesine yardımcı olmaktadır. Maskeli bir Zapatista, sadece kendisi olmayan, bir yerli olmayan; ama yüzü ve sesi olmayan bir diğeriyle ilişki kuran biri olarak kendini kurmaktadır. Öte yandan maske, aslında bir Zapatista olmayan birinin de maske takarak bir Zapatista'yla ilişki kuran biri olarak kendini kurmasına da olanak sağlamaktadır. Başka bir deyişle, maske bir ayna olarak; tüm dışlanmışları, hesaba katılmayanları, görünmeyenleri Zapatista hareketine yansıtmakta öte yandan da adaletsizliğe, eşitsizliğe, dışlanmaya karşı mücadele edenlere de Zapatista hareketini yansıtmaktadır. Bu bağlamda, Zapatista hareketinin sadece bir yerli hareketi olmadığı, tüm dışlanmışların, hesaba katılmayanların, görülmeyenlerin, duyulmayanların hareketi olduğu öne sürülebilir.

Sonuç olarak; Rancière'nin siyasete özgü bir özne yoktur, siyaset her yerde ortaya çıkabilir ve herkes tarafından yapılabilir iddiası, eşitlik varsayımının dışında siyaset için bir yol veya program belirlememektedir. Zapatistalar da kendi hareket tarzlarını diğer hareketlere öğretecek, onlara mücadele etmeyi öğretecek bir konumda bulunmadıklarını öne sürmektedirler. Öte yandan Zapatista hareketinin Rancière'nin siyasal, siyaset ve demokrasi anlayışına referansla incelenmesi, demokrasinin seçimlere ve siyasi partilere indirildiği bir dönemde, hem Rancière'nin düşüncesinin hem de Zapatista hareketinin bu demokrasi anlayışına bir alternatif sunduğunu göstermektedir. Bu alternatife göre, siyasetin kendisine özgü bir öznesi bulunmadığı için herkes siyaset yapabilir. Rancière bunun olanaklılığını gösterirken, Zapatista hareketi de bunun gerçekliğini göstermektedir.

APPENDIX B: TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü

☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

☐

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü

☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü

☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü

☐

YAZARIN

Soyadı :

Adı :

Bölümü :

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) :

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans

☐

Doktora

☐

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.

☐

2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.

☐

3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz.

☐

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: