Università degli Studi di Ferrara

DIPARTIMENTO DI ECONOMIA, ISTITUZIONI, TERRITORIO

Corso Ercole I D'Este n.44, 44100 Ferrara

Quaderni del Dipartimento

n.2/2004

Serie "America Latina"

Quaderno n.11

January 2004

**Social Movements vs. New Social Movements:
The Montoneros Vs. The Zapatistas**

Luigi Laraia

Social Movements vs. New Social Movements:
The Montoneros Vs. The Zapatistas

Luigi Laraia[*]

Abstract

This dissertation presents an unusual comparison: 'old' social movements Vs new social movements (NSMs). Two case studies are introduced: the Zapatistas rebellions in Chiapas and the Montoneros in Argentina.

This distinction is made possible by a tendency in the literature on NSMs to generalise about two substantially different waves of protest movements. On the one hand, the traditional old labour movements commonly engaged in class-based politics; on the other hand, there are new social movements frantically entrenched in politics of identity. Authors on NSMs introduce various elements that constitute the celebrated watershed between 'how it is used to be' and 'how it is now'. These issues are identity, political style, motivation to participate, communication strategies, ideology. Furthermore, NSMs are believed to carry out a struggle on a global scale. Authors tend to define them 'Transnational social movements" united in the fight against a new enemy. It is what Castells calls "the New Global Order" perpetrated by unregulated market exchanges and processes of modernisation, which repeatedly marginalise large sectors of society.

This paper gives support to the distinction between old and new forms of rebellions but at the same time, "warns" that such generalisations should be handled with care. The theory on NSMs gives an insight on the peculiarities of these new protest groups, shedding light on complex issues with regard to the internal nature of movements such as the Zapatistas. The reader is also reminded that such theoretical positions might engender claims about the revolutionary figures of today of mythical proportions. NSMs are no better or worse than other traditional social movements; what should be generally accepted is that conceptualisations about the concept of 'revolution' have changed. Revolution must be understood as a question, no longer as an answer. Consequently, the means by which a revolution is carried out have been deeply revised.

[*] luigilar@yahoo.co.uk

Acknowledgements

Chapter 1   Introduction

1.1 The aim of this paper

This work attempts to analyse <u>to what degree the struggle for social change incorporated in the New Social Movements (NSMs) has changed over the past decades</u>. In the attempt to assess the developments of social movements, two case studies will be analysed: the 1994 Zapatistas uprising and the Argentinean Montoneros.

This project contains four sections. The first part includes the introduction followed by the review of the literature. Here the academic sources employed as a framework for the thesis of this paper will be presented. The third section is both descriptive and analytical at once. The two chapters on Montoneros and the Zapatistas contain the comparative analysis drawn from the chosen theoretical frame of reference. The literature review has been kept close to the analysis with the purpose of spelling out clearly the relevance of the literature to the central arguments. The conclusion is the last section of this work. Here, main points will be summarised and observations by the author will be presented.

New literature on social movements allows us to generalise about two different waves of protest groups. On one side, traditional labour and social movements, and on the other side, a new wave of protest groups engaged in "identity politics" (Dalton, 1990). Various authors have envisaged general developments, which sweep across social movements worldwide. This trend is partly acknowledged as the networks of wealth, technology and power have extended their reach to areas previously almost unknown or not known at all. It is the global process of "informationalisation" (Castells, 2001). Della Porta and Kriesi (1999) cross-national analysis

based on diffusion and protest emphasises the expanded capacity for cross-national communication. "Ideas and people travel easily in the global village" (Della Porta, Kriesi, 1999:2). Following this lead, the Zapatistas struggle can be understood as an attempt to challenge the new "global order" exploding in Chiapas but extending its reach on a global scale (Castells, 2001).

Recent changes in technology, power and information networks triggered a resistance which confronts domination globally (Castells, 2001). Following several arguments on NSMs fashioned by many academics, it is possible to demonstrate on several accounts such as ideology/ies, base of support, motivation to participate, organisational structure and political style, how the resulting mass of case studies has fed the urge to typologise on a qualitative different modus vivendi et operandi of Social Movements in the modern era (Dalton, 1990). However, the point is not to compare two different examples of social movements by dismembering them and analysing their features one by one, against each other. The objective of this paper is to prove that, according to the literature on NSMs, one case study fundamentally belongs to a line of thought, whereas the other example is somehow relegated to a different anthology of social movement.

1.2 How can we define NSMs?

One word above all applies to the panorama of New Social Movements (NSMs) and that is *interaction*. One could start from the definition elaborated by Tarrow (1998) and Tilly (1994) who both define social movements as uninstitutionalised groups of unrepresented constituents engaged in sequences of contentious interaction with elites or opponents. The framework of reference for this paper and indeed one of the most influential ideas behind NSMs is that they are structured around struggles over collection consumption. This main characteristic leads to other specificities about new protests groups. In the contemporary era, discontent from below is substantially based on cultural specificity, ideological diversity and it is defensive rather offensive. It also aims at minimisation of damage and maximisation of information (Castells, 2001). Since the 1960s students' movements, the following peace movements, the ecology movement and the youth movement (Melucci, 1988:247), authors' efforts have focused on factors that, some directly some indirectly, appear to more effusively explain the rise, consistency and meaning of such movements, emphasising lifestyle, identity and ethical

concerns. The underlying contention is that these new protest groups call for democracies to 'open up' in order to adapt and change according to the demands of culturally richer civil society. By contrast, the challenge of traditional, class-based labour and resistance movements was a revolutionary attack against the system asserting that "a single political economical transformation would solve the whole range of social ills" (Calhoun, 1994:148).

1.3 How to handle the distinction?

At a first rather careless glimpse, there seem to be a neat distinction between what might be crudely called 'old social movements' and 'new social movements'. The latter crucially focused on identity politics, whereas the former exclusively focused on radical, political change. But it might be extremely easy to generalise and speculate about the shift from an old, internally and externally, form of resistance to a substantially new one. Traditional labour movements were not necessarily entrenched in Marxist politics. Montoneros themselves cannot be considered substantially inspired by Marxist beliefs. At the same time, in the modern era, protest groups might not be solely focused on ideological diversity and identity issues. One has to handle the comparison with care. Questions remain: is there any legitimacy in speaking about a whole new substantial wave of social movements as opposed to the so-defined old labour social movements? How thin is the dividing line between social movements commonly identifiable on premises such as identity and cultural heritage and social movements whose agenda focuses on issues such as inequalities and labour exploitation? (Calhoun, 1994). The underlying contention of this dissertation sustains the notion developed by Calhoun which opposes the tendency that social scientists have to compartmentase social movements. The point is, as Tarrow (1998) suggested, that what we need to observe is the newness of each single movement rather than a whole new wave of movements. However, Calhoun himself sees social movements as an ever-developing mode to influence patterns of social action that depend on the participation of numbers of people in concerted and self-organised collective action. The fundamental question then, and indeed the question that the author of this dissertation poses, concerns the changing nature of these institutionalised groups of resistance.

The supposed transition between old and new social movements might not be as crude as recent authors prophetically emphasize. The overlapping between the two forms of resistance is present and confounding. What needs to be acknowledged however is a new

interplay of movements, a fresh search for complicity with actors across national borders, an extensive network facilitated by the speed of modern technology and negotiation of many. This runs parallel to the Kriesberg's theory of Transnational social movements organisations (TSMOs) as "interactive components of a world currently in the process of rapid transformation" (Kriesberg, 1997). In short, fighting and resisting in a time of globalisation entails the utilisation of different strategies which cannot ignore the essential function of means of communication and intelligentsia. The Leninist notion of the "vanguard role" of the guiding elite, morally superior and coherent, culturally homogeneous, supposed to enlighten the path and emancipate the masses has been mortifyingly proved disastrous. This notion argues that one of the main functions of the rebels that take up arms against the oppressors is to "prepare the masses". A notion tailored to the Latin American guerrilla warfare needs by Régis Debray. His book *Revolution in the Revolution?*, published in 1964, caused a storm of controversy in leftist circles. The vanguard elite argument, or rural guerrilla *foco* theory, was ill-fatedly actualised by revolutionary hero Ernesto Che Guevara "… people will seize power, here and in the whole world. The bad thing is that they have to become civilised, and this can't happen before, but only after taking power" (Anderson, 1997:259). And yet, from the days of *Comandante* Che Guevara to the times of *Subcomandante* Marcos, social movements have established new social paradigms. It is quite undisputable that the expansion of student movements and the following peace movements has broadened the discourse on social movements from elite base to mass movement participation (Dalton, 1990). My case study sustains this notion: the Zapatistas are not class-based and they reject any accusations of being elitists (and they are not ideologically homogeneous). Furthermore, they do not make claims of being purveyors of any societal project. This represents a fundamental difference from earlier struggles. However, there can be detected a thin fundamental thread that links 'new' Zapatistas to the Zapatistas of Emiliano Zapata: many of the dissatisfactions, grievances and ideals that inspired the rebellion in the 1910s can still be perceived as necessary drives of the 1994 uprising. Nonetheless, the 'masked' struggle of the Zapatistas in Chiapas is not only a struggle against exploitation, but against impoverishment (Nash, 2001), and, in its modalities, it is an essentially a new form of opposition (Castells, 1997).

Concluding, resistance, in the contemporary era, despite being inspired by antique and mythical memoirs of heroic combatants (the rebels in Chiapas bear the name and the tradition

of Emiliano Zapata's group), proposes to challenge certain aspects of the establishment rather than overthrow it. It is not a class that took to the streets but peoples of various backgrounds (Nash, 2001). But at the same time it is still legitimate to speak of revolution; a revolution motivated by the desire to change the world.

"This wind from below, the wind of rebellion, the wind of dignity carries a hope, the hope of the conversion of dignity and rebellion into freedom and dignity". When the wind dies down, *"when the storm abates, when the rain and the fire leave the earth in peace once again, the world will no longer be the world, but something better"*. Subcomandante Marcos (Holloway, 1997)

Chapter 2   Literature Review

There is an extensive literature on social movements. The author of this work is aware that various theories exist on this topic. However, only the so defined 'cultural perspectives' theories, which represent the theoretical framework of this paper, will be extensively discussed in this section.

2.1 State-centred theories

The functionalist theorists and even neo-pluralist perspectives have studied social movements in terms of political opportunities and mobilisation of resources. Both schools of thoughts are consistently state-oriented without giving sufficient weight to the work that goes into creating a consciousness of a shared interest or generating an identity. These views portray social movements as pathologies of the political system due to a variety of unresolved stress (Smelser, 1984). Furthermore, the state is considered at the same time target and enemy of social movements. A particular emphasis is then placed on the interaction between protest groups and the State (Craig Jenkins, 1995). A notion strongly accepted by Tilly (1984) who describes social movements as sustained series of interactions between the state and challenging groups. The underlying point of these varied arguments is that they all depict the State as a central locale in which social movements are shaped, facilitated in their making and

supplied. However, views that focus on cultural issues allow interpreting the inherent characteristics of NSMs.

2.2 Cultural perspectives

Various authors concentrate on cultural diversity, innovatory strategies and internal flexibility as causal factors for the development of collective action (Nash, 1995). This stream of literature might be defined as "cultural perspective". These theorists have developed an ever-growing amount of research on social movements. It is most commonly know as new social movements' theory. In the attempt to put some order into this ensemble of disparate material on social movements, it is useful to start from the beginning.

2.2.1 Touraine

The genesis of new social movements literature can be roughly associated with the innovative 1960s writings of Alaine Touraine, somehow the father figure of the group. Touraine's typology of social movements includes three features; according to the author's vocabulary, social movements are defined by identity, adversary and the societal goal. This typology represents the point of departure for a distinctive anthology of social movements. The cultural perspective is considered to be far complex and richer than the narrowly political state-centred perspectives.

This new group of social scientists looks at the inherent characteristics of social movements. These novelties will be classified in greater detail later on in the work. They represent the vertebral column of the analysis of the paper. They are several criterions of assessment used to generalise about two different waves of social movements. These principles have been recurrently employed by authors like Dalton (1990) and Castells (2001) in their conceptualisation of NSMs.

2.2.2 Melucci

The theorist Melucci (1988), a former student of Touraine, argued that social movements operate in the pre-political dimension of everyday life. That involves engagement in issues such as lifestyle and identity that had not been so predominant in the agenda of social

movements. For Melucci, collective actors, within the informal networks of the movement, collaborate in the laboratory work of creating new meanings and testing them out. It is a continuous feedback process with flexible attitude towards the procedure of the group. A social movement is not seen as a unified 'subject', but always as a composite action system, in which widely differing means, ends and forms of solidarity and organisation converge in 'unstable' manner. Another point related from this perspective calls for caution in indicating objective problems. They come to exist as problems because people are capable of perceiving and defining them as such within processes of interaction. Melucci also argues that shared living or lifestyle and reflexive communication shape new identities and can then develop into collective movements. These practices of 'cultural invention' can be submerged and invisible, but will lay the foundations for a social movement to emerge. This view is less state specific that other theorists although Melucci admits that the cultural landscape social movements seek to influence will largely be contained within a state boundary due to the importance of language, media, proximity and context in forming new cultural identities.

2.2.3 Beck, Dalton, Castells, Mc Adam, Nash, Holloway

Other authors also put forward the argument that protest groups are more oriented toward civil society that the state (Beck, 1992, Nash, 2001, Inglehart). The significance about collective action is that a more or less stable, composite, collective identity must be constructed out of very different ends, means and forms of solidarity and organisation. It must be understood as an ongoing process through which actors communicate and negotiate the meanings which produce the social movements as such. Mc Adam (1996) suggests that social movements advocate a new social paradigm. This is partly reflected in the practices of the group. All the cultural innovations created during the process of individuals working on themselves in negotiation or conflict with others, and that is language, uniforms, sexual customs, etc., constitute collective action which modifies the social order. These authors present the tendency of disengagement form politics due to participation, creation of identity, non-instrumentality and various concerns being all aspects of social movements. This is an idea developed by John Holloway (1997) in his innovative work *Change The World Without Taking Power*. New social movements can be, to a great degree, and are metapolitical. Movements can contain a metapolitical dimension in that they publicise the existence of basic dilemmas of modern

societies which cannot be resolved by means of conventional political decisions. However, the way in which these issues can be resolved, it is never spelt out. This is one of the main critiques on NSMs (see Conclusion).

Dalton (1990) invites us to look at distinctive features of new social movements. By so doing, he argues, we must regard previous models of social movements as incorrect or incomplete. They include Gurr's dissatisfaction model, Olson's rational choice model and resource mobilisation. Conversely Dalton, drawing on the three-point model of Alain Tourraine, highlights five areas which make social movements new. These are: ideology, base of support, motivations to participate, organisational structure and political style. Mao said that the guerrilla fighters have to keep moving in the countryside like fishes in the water in order to stay alive; Dalton borrowed the words "new social movements are like sharks, they have to keep moving to stay alive" (1990:88). The concept 'moving' involves internal flexibility, strategic elasticity and internal and external informality. Again, as the analysis will attempt to show later in the paper, these concepts closely relate to the way in which the Zapatista struggle has been internally conducted and the way it externally signified.

Beck (1992), echoing Dalton, argues that, in a highly technological, modern risk society, new social movements are distinguishable from others on the basis that they are non-instrumental, that is expressive of universalistic concerns, organised in informal, loose and flexible ways, and ultimately highly dependent on the mass media through which appeals are made and protests are staged. Theorists such as Nash and Castells greatly developed this concept highlighting the fundamental importance of the function of means of propaganda.

The underlying assumption of the literature discussed thus far suggests that a richer and more complex theoretical framework needs to be adopted in order to understand today's struggles. This, in turn, implies that the struggle for social change has incorporated new meanings and forms and adapted different concept of the struggle. One of these concepts, which represent a watershed between old and new social movement, is the concept of revolution. The theoretical efforts of John Holloway however, remain the greatest watershed in the literature dealing concepts have been 'revised' by NSMs. He argues that the concept of revolution has undergone a dramatic change. "Revolution today must be understood as a question, not as an answer" (Holloway, 2002:197). This sentence has serious implications on the previous theoretical assumptions nurtured by traditional Marxist theory of revolution,

which centres on taking state power. The Zapatistas long for a new world; they want to create a more humanised world, a world of humanity and dignity, but without taking power. (Holloway, 2002). All of this entirely hint at the fact the state ceases to be the locale of the struggle. Social discontent today is expressed far more diffusely. The resonant rebellion in Chiapas proved to be a new revolutionary focus. It is the new mirage: changing the world without taking state power. However, they have never been able to practically explain how that might be achieved.

The bulk of literature on new social movements analysed in this section argues that protest movements such as the Zapatistas, fight for radical change in terms that have nothing to do with taking power (Holloway, 2002). On the other hand, previous failed revolutionary attempts such as the Montoneros in Argentina, as the literature suggests, must be understood in terms of an organisation whose members strongly believe that the world can only be a better place if one system of governance is overthrown and replaced by another. This represents the striking contrast between old and new social movements.

The perspectives briefly outlined thus far unquestionably suggest that a new theoretical framework is required in order to analyse and possibly comprehend the struggle of most recent social movements. A criterion has been used to assess the developments that have taken place along the line. Since traditional labour movements began to dissipate their struggles and utopian dreams, social discontents in recent years, on the footsteps of the Zapatistas uprising, crystallised a new trend of rebellion.

Chapter 3   The Montoneros

The most powerful urban guerrilla in Latin America, the Argentinean Montoneros, seemed to belong to the category of what authors define as old social movements. They began their activity as a social movement whose prime objective was to reinstate the Peronist party in the political system and ultimately bring Perón back to Argentina. Ideologically class-based (they regarded the Peronist supporters as a class in strict Marxist tradition, a notion highly debated by other Argentinean leftist social groups), strongly nationalist and, towards the end of their existence, heavily influenced by Marxism and socialism, Montoneros resorted to urban armed guerrilla tactics and finally dissociated from the *peronismo de base*.

This paper will purposely omit to illustrate the historical backdrop in which the Montoneros struggle originated. Far from being superfluous, they are important and worthy of attention. But the aim of this paper is to show how the inherent characteristics of this protest group are grounded into a particular theoretical thinking. The issue is not to scrutinise the historical peculiarities of the two case studies and to compare them. The whole point rather, is to prove that, according to the theoretical framework of reference employed here, the methods and means and meanings of today social movements have undergone profound transformations.

3.1 Their objective and motivation to participate

The first question in dealing with the factors that are essential in assessing the changes between 'old' and 'new' might be: what do these people seek? What did the Montoneros wish to attain?

Montoneros sought to remake the whole of society fighting offensively for radical political, social and economical change. They have been unquestionably committed to a thorough restructuring of humanity. The 'trademark' slogan used as a signature in communiqués, newspapers articles and even graffiti on city walls is emblematic: *patria o muerte* (mother country or death). They adopted a clearly defined position on 'who the enemy is' and 'how to best fight against it'. The organisation's objective was the conquest of state power and then the use of that revolutionary power to change society.

The authoritarian, illegitimate military government was not the only foe to whom the battle was addressed. The army represented the executive arm of a system that perpetrated social injustices and class polarisation. So it is true to say that the focus of the movement concentrated on removing the authoritarian unelected government as a means to pave the way for the reinstitution of a particular body of governance. The former was simply seen as a necessary step in order to arrive at the final goal. Russell J. Dalton (1990), possibly the most persuaded author on NSMs, distinguishes social movements on the basis of 'motivation to participate'.

This concept runs parallel to Touraine's typology and Castells's argument. The catchphrase "mother country or death" particularly implies a clear sense of direction imprinted on the minds of the Montoneros: an uncompromising position, an 'either or' unambiguous attitude. 'Old' social movements are therefore seen as protest groups with a categorical ideological drive. Compromise was regarded as the demise of the initial project and the

annihilation of the movement itself. On the other hand, new social movements embody "a call for democracies to change and adapt". In contrast, the Montoneros represent a "revolutionary attack against the system" (Dalton, 1990:155).

The argument that can be used to clarify and uphold Dalton's theory is rooted in the Montoneros' concept of *death*. The idea is strictly related to the concept previously elaborated by Che Guevara of the '*Hombre Nuevo*' (New Man). It is a utopian modus vivendi attainable through a variety of sacrifices, including the ultimate price individuals have to pay: death. Death is good; through death common goods are achieved. Thus, the goals of old social movements and of the Montoneros themselves were instrumental. Richard Gillespie (1982) emphases how, especially towards the end of the Montoneros activities, the monolithic organisation exacerbated by excessive militarism and bureaucracy, grew to be an isolated gang of fanatical and superior guerrilla fighters. Collective action was generally traced to a sense of self-interest consistent with the policies of the movement.

The moral premises animating the Montoneros were based on the individual concerns of the top members of the organisation. They were not representative of a general discontent among the broader population. In contrast, Nash (2001) argues that NSMs are motivated by a variety of concerns that affect peoples in other corners of the globe.

3.2 Ideology

The defining characteristic of new social movement is their advocacy of diverse ideology orientations. Touraine's definition of identity or self-definition of the movement coincides with Dalton's analysis. When assessing the contrast between new and old movements, ideology is the primary factor in the literature.

Contrasting with populist, participatory values of NSMs (Dalton, 1990), their historical predecessors have been diagnosed as bureaucratised, hierarchical and often corporatist organisations. Montoneros can be understood in these terms. Initially the group gave many the opportunities to expand ideological horizons; it facilitated a fusion of diverse creeds and orientations. Montoneros was believed by many to be a convivial locus where far-left Peronism and moderate Peronism could peacefully and constructively interweave. However, as the battle intensified, the movement shrank into an ideologically monolithic structure whose prime concerns revolved around class and politics issues. Discipline followed by a religious

dedication to militarism, became the predominant feature of the organisation obscuring other once-celebrated distinct ideologies. The clamp down on ideological diversity resulted into difficulties in mobilising participants, creating unresolved tensions within the structure (often revolutionary tribunals and executions were resorted to) and reducing the possibility of strategic choices.

The ideology of Montoneros, despite originating from a catholic, middle-class background, had been strongly influenced by traditional Marxism and Leninist teachings on 'vanguardism' in the revolution. The uncompromising principles of the leading members of the group[1] aimed at destabilising the state by violent means until it finally crumbled, unable to control a disrupted society. The organisation conquered state power and then used that revolutionary power to change society. By contrast, NSMs represent a contemporary new aspect of democratic politics due to the fact that new political identity gives rise to a new form of interest representation.

3.3 Organisational structure

The organisational pattern of old social movements is often identified with a centralised, bureaucratic, hierarchical structure. The Montoneros are no exception. They actually embody the rigid make-up of a dying organisation bent on rules of engagement doomed from the onset of the struggle. It comes to mind Max Weber's concept of rational bureaucratic authority. The Argentinean guerrilla organisation might be described as a pressurised aircraft unabashedly en route to its final destination, deaf to ideological external contribution and/or political compromises. The unmistakable ideological orientation of Montoneros bore effects on the organisational structure of the group and vice versa. The two components, factors that cannot be ignored in studying social movements, feed each other, ultimately impinging upon the fate of the group. The solid organisational structure of Montoneros is not only a clear reflection of the ideology of the movement; it also arises from its hierarchical base (Dalton, 1990, Gillespie, 1982). The members of the group were not integrated into a defined social network. A well-defined net of relations among the participants can be easily mobilised and used to support the group's efforts. In contrast, the hermetic structure and the closed social milieu created by such rigidity caused great lack of communication between members and poor mobility.

Furthermore, the network of relations within Montoneros was directed by the organisation's top officials and not created by the individuals themselves.

The literature on NSMs suggests that a distinct cultural background facilitates the smooth progress of activities and enables feed backed communication among members. Old social movement are accused of being elite-directed, exclusive, cohesive and clientelistic (Dalton, 1992). Any of these descriptions can be used to exemplify Montoneros. Such structure serves the purpose of isolating the movement from the original base of support and prevents the group from making any claims of any representiveness of the common feelings of the population. If in the case of NSMs, an open social milieu is considered to be the essential prerequisite for a concerted and representative action (*"Todos somos Marcos!"*, "We are all Marcos!", as the slogan goes), on the other hand, Montoneros found themselves politically isolated and lacking a genuine base of support. The Montoneros' message was directed to a particular class or group of people. And this was due to their ideological rigidity and highly militarist and bureaucratic internal structure. The Zapatistas on the other hand, as will be identified later, appealed to a broader population spreading their significance to 'civil society'.

There is an emphasis in the literature over the insistence that the organisational forms of the movement must reflect the values the movement seeks to promulgate (Calhoun, 1994). The organisations therefore are also ends in themselves (Castells, 2001). Failure seems unavoidable as soon as the structure does not exemplify the value. Many socialist and communists parties and organisations had institutionalised internal hierarchies and decision-making apparatus strongly at variance with their professed values. This would make them highly incredible to the broader public. Montoneros, despite allegedly fighting for the "Peronist class" and their expressed pursuit of freedom and a more humanised world, were unarguably antithetical to such values. This apparent contradiction made them lose a substantial support of the population. Today, analysts that speak of NSMs envisage a consistent relationship between external conducts and internal organisation of protest movements (Castells, 2001, Nash, 2001, Holloway, 1997). This feature constitutes a clear contrast in the comparison studied so far and an indication of a transformation taking place at the heart of the movements.

---

[1] Mario Roberto Firmenich was the leader.

3.4 Political style

Dalton (1990) refers to this issue as a fundamental feature in the distinction between social movements. It is not enough for the movement to keep moving in order to stay alive but it is how it moves, that is the praxis of the organisation. Traditional revolutionary movements approached governments directly by becoming involved in conventional politics. The Montoneros were considered a legal political organisation during the Perón administration. They operated through conventional channels of politics and their discontent was expressed through a limited way of activity. This is the key point in assessing the contrasts between old and new social movements. Today NSMs may or may not utilise conventional means of political expression. However, they "seemingly prefer to influence policy through political pressure [exercised in varied ways] and the weight of public opinion" (Dalton, 1990:14). There seem to be new means by which discontent can be channelled. Holloway (2002) refers to it as new areas of "anti-power". That is the discovery of locales where expression of dissent from below can be staged. It corresponds to a "weakening of the process by which discontent is focused on the state" (Holloway, 2002:20). For the Montoneros however, and for the majority of traditional revolutionary social movements, the area of activity was uncomfortably limited. Formal political confrontations and armed struggle was resorted to as only means through which discontent could be publicised. In most cases, the broader population perceived these resonant actions as uncontrolled and violent political outbursts of a doomed gang of terrorists. Indeed, due to an astute propaganda campaign performed by the military, fear spread among the population and even the original Peronist base of support of Montoneros alienated itself from the political style of the organisation. This runs parallel to the argument that old social movements with a solid social base and formalised members tend to express themselves in a unidirectional way. The highly militarised and ideologically unified internal structure did not allow Montoneros to seek alternative political inspirations. The authors' theories imply that old social movements embark upon a predictable, formal course of action often based on institutionalised ties with political parties or participation on government commissions. In contrast, the unconventional political style of NMSs forces them to be highly concerned with mobilising resources and continuous "organisational maintenance" (Dalton, 1990:18). By so doing, the repertoire of collective action is constantly nurtured and new ways of outwitting authorities and disrupting the status quo are experimented.

A last element, which will be analysed in greater detail in the next section, includes the use of mass media as a method of mobilising public opinion. Political style of new social movements is directed to a larger audience thanks to the impact provided by the media's modern age opportunities. Live broadcasting of events and TV's featuring of political demonstrations increases the possibility of sympathy and manipulation of people's feelings[2]. The reach of traditional social movements was limited due to poor or non-existent use of information. Communication means were not used to diffuse the message of the movement. That in turn, resulted into political isolation, impossibility of liaising with potential allies and circulation of news distorted by the government. It is true to say that in the 1970s, as in the case of Montoneros, there was limited access to forms of communication. However, Firmenich's group had overlooked the importance of establishing alliances with groups outside Argentina or Latin America (Gillespie, 1982); they left it until it was too late.

Today, the 'art of twisting' news and distortion of information on the part of the powerful of the earth can be circumvented by highly technological and fast means of communication accessible even to ordinary people. Montoneros never enjoyed that privilege.

Chapter 4   The Zapatistas

The Zapatistas comprise the EZLN (*Ejercito Zapatistas de Liberación Nacional*), a revolutionary group of non-indigenous peoples of various classes, and Mayan Indians, called *campesinos*. They are of all ages and include both genders. These people are displaced from the highlands of southern Mexico and resettled on *ejidos (*rural communal production units) in the Lacandon Jungle. In the forest, they received military training and basic notions of rural guerrilla warfare. Before becoming soldiers they were cultivators, land less wage laborers, artisans, and a small minority of intellectuals. They derive their name from Emiliano Zapata. Their leader or spokesman, as he preferred to be described, is the 'masked' Subcomandante Marcos.

The main point of this section of the paper, and indeed of the previous section, is not to purely describe the Zapatistas uprising. The aim is to show that this particular form of rebellion

---

[2] The calculatedly repeated television broadcasting of the United Airlines planes almost surreally crashing into the

falls into the paradigm of new social movements advocated by the authors. To explain modern social movements in term of identity concerns would be reductive (Nash, 2001). This conceptualisation of struggles would limit the explanation of other constructed categories such as class or ethnicity. However, analysing indigenous social movements (Castañeda, 1997) on the basis of identity formation might give us an insight on who these people really are (Castells, 2001). It could be useful to bear in mind that the initial categorisation on social movement in terms of identity was expressed in Touraine's *principe d'identité*. Since the first formulation more unambiguous conceptualisations have been piling up. "New social movements have been crucially focused on identity politics" (Aronowitz, 1992:6). The literature suggests that NSMs work outside formal institutional channels and emphasise ethical and identity concerns rather than solely political, economic goals. By so doing it is still possible to influence and disrupt the system. The Zapatistas are said to have transformed Mexico making public corrupt politics and unjust economy (Castells, 1997).

4.1 Identity politics

It corresponds to ways of forging identity/ies that were previously unknown or repressed. The Zapatista uprising indeed has been able to forge new identities. Marcos spoke on behalf of the oppressed, primarily to the indigenous communities of Chiapas but his message was directed to a wider audience. "We are all Marcos", the slogan can epitomise the struggle: it is an opposition, geographically born in Mexico but destined to radiate on a global level to reach all those who feel they want to fight the exclusionary consequences of economic modernisation. The EZLN and the Tzeltales, Tzotziles and Choles local communities joined in a strong rejection of the NAFTA (North American Foreign Trade Agreement). The privatisation measures endorsed by the agreement literally dismantled the local economy, the struggle against the penetration of unregulated market exchanged (Nash, 2001) strengthened a new Indian identity. In the wake of the struggle, peoples of various indigenous backgrounds had the unprecedented opportunity to amalgamate thus realising what they really shared: democracy, land and dignity (Castells, 1997).

Something in the Zapatistas 'methods' has been transplanted to other areas where discontent is visible through other struggles. In other protest movements there is a hope that

World Trade Centre might serve as the best example.

they can take home to their own city or region "something" of the Zapatistas revolt, like in the Guatemala and Peru peasants' communities. Hence, the popularity of the call from the EZLN to 'be a Zapatista wherever you are'. So, although the Zapatistas remain isolated in the jungles and mountains of southeastern Mexico their ideas have influenced many activists across the globe. One of the causes that moved the group to fight reflects the need of the fighters to "know who they are". One of the main focuses of concern is indeed identity but not as a given element but as something that was "constructed through the struggle" (Castells, 2001). The success of NSMs is largely due to the nature of the combat as a "movement through events", as Holloway (1997) describes. In contrast, as identified in the case of Montoneros, traditional social movements, calculations of blind self-interest in motivating individuals to participate outweighed ideological goals (Dalton, 1990). Zapatistas are much more identity-based then its predecessors, both in Mexico and in the rest of Latin America. This is one of the defining characteristics that separate the Zapatistas revolution in 1911 and the 1994 uprising.

The new conceptualisation on identity issues of NMSs emphasises how modern protest organisations continue to develop these traits of identity concerns and expand their influence worldwide. To highlight the importance of identity issues, the example of the mask that the Zapatistas wear, is believed to be emblematic. It accentuates the little importance of each single combatant features, but rather it underscores the fundamental significance of being a movement in which different identities can mesh regardless of individual faces. In a desperate attempt to disrupt the successful suspense manufactured by this astute masking, President Ernesto Zedillo publicly exposed Marcos as the Mexico City intellectual Rafael Sebastián Guillén Vicente. However the calculated move designed to suspend this suspense and erode support for the movement embarrassingly failed. Hundreds of thousands of people responded, taking to the streets of the *Districto Federal* chanting *"Todos Somos Marcos,"* "We are all Marcos."

Calhoun (1994) suggests that identity concerns cannot fully explain the rise of new social movements. It is true to say that movements such as the Zapatistas have roots in previous revolutionary groups who were partly engaged in politics of identity. Even the Montoneros in the early stages of the struggle, evoking the spirit of the rebellions of the Montoneros, the indigenous people in northern Argentina, emphasised issues of identity. In order to avoid the "hazardous task of interpreting the true consciousness of the movement", it

is important to realise that social movements must be read in their own terms: "they are what they say they are" (Castells, 2001:70). They are not necessarily Mexicans, not necessarily oppressed indigenous communities in Chiapas, not necessarily Latin-Americans, probably they represent all those who are excluded and marginalised. However, in the case of the Zapatistas, it makes sense to speak of a search of 'identity'. The concept of defining one's own identity is strictly related to the idea of 'recognition'. Therefore, the struggles of the Zapatistas occasioned by identity politics need to be understood as a search of recognition and legitimacy as fundamental precondition for defining the group's identity. In the quest of their own identities, the Zapatistas have been able to enjoy a vast array of means of communication. They have placed great emphasis on the media as a method of mobilising public opinion.

4.2 Communication strategies

The international circulation through the Internet of the struggles of the Zapatistas in Chiapas, Mexico has become one of the most successful examples of the use of computer communications by grassroots social movements.

The success of the Zapatistas is largely due to their clever use of media. Castells (1997) calls them the *first informational guerrilla movement*. NSMs adopt the utilisation of different means of intelligencia and propaganda that were underestimated or unknown by their predecessors. In the case of social movement, the creation of a media event is twofold: to diffuse the message of the movement (negotiation) and to protect themselves against repression[3].

Castells argues that, in the new social order, information is "more powerful than bullets". It is another way of stating that today information is the most valuable commodity. There is a shift from warfare strategies to courses of action that aim at spreading the message rather than exacerbating violence: minimising violence in order to maximise propaganda. Autonomous communication was a paramount objective for the Zapatista (Castells, 1997). That is the opportunity of getting their point across avoiding interference and sanctions from governing bodies and outflanking the enemies. Modern social movements seem to enjoy of fast

---

[3] However, the televised thumping of peaceful demonstrators in Genoa, Italy – July 2001 - by the Berlusconi's militia doesn't prove that protest groups safety is always guaranteed by 'media coverage'!

and direct means of communication that allow a struggle to be staged on an international level. Thanks to successful ways of communication such as the internet[4], telecommunications, videos and autonomous publications (like the Latin American newspaper *Noticias*), the Zapatista captured the imagination of people around the world encouraging intellectuals to travel to Mexico to study the events. The lack of a rigid hierarchical structure and a strong organisational control in a social movement is 'compensated' by a clever "communication bridge with the media". Anywhere in the world, "everybody could become Zapatistas by wearing a mask" (Castells, 1997:79). The well diffuse communication links helped create a network of support groups almost instantly. As the battles and penetrations of the Mexican army into Chiapas raged on, an international public opinion movement made it impossible for the army to resort to large-scale repression (Castells, 1997). "The revolutionary forces of the future may consist increasingly of widespread multi-organisational networks that have no particular national identity, claim to arise from civil society, and include aggressive groups and individuals who are keenly adept at using advanced technology for communications, as well as munitions" (Arquilla and Rondfeldt 1993 in Castells, 1997:81). This might not be a prophecy anymore; it might well apply to the revolutionary forces of today.

4.3 Motivation to participate

The Zapatistas represent a contemporary new aspect of democratic politics due to the fact that new political identity gives rise to a new form of interest representation. There is a growing body of scholars that sustain the notion the NSMs have abandoned grand visionary plans. NSMs do not aim specifically at overthrowing a system but rather they seek to challenge particular aspects of the system. In contrast, authors writing on new social movements argue that former protests groups, such as labour and other social movements were motivated to fight by the pursuit of a common, utopian goal: to change society.

The demands of NSMs are more limited in their scope than those of their predecessors. Montoneros envisaged only two possibilities: *patria o muerte*. The philosophy behind this short slogan is visionary in that the only foreseen alternative to taking state power and reconstructing *la patria* was dying a heroic death. A society without their imprint was not a place worth living for. Old social movements take uncompromising positions: their demands are not negotiable. Conversely the Zapatista demands differ substantially from previous

---

[4] As of August 31st 2002, the Zapatista official web sites received three millions visits.

national liberation movements in that they have explicitly disavowed any intention of capturing state power, and have instead proclaimed their favor for "democracy." Their most basic program focused on the reform of the Mexican electoral system which is widely perceived to be corrupt[5].

NSMs seemed to have arisen out of "exhaustion of utopian energies" (Habermas, 1990), socialism, a comprehensive utopian project, was the main trait of the ideological drive of many past social movements. It proved to be a mirage. New forms of rebellion consolidated and institutionalized personified in the Zapatistas, on the wake of embarrassing debacles from the "traditional left". Literature suggests that new protest groups are replacing the efflorescence of more utopian groups. Marcos himself asserts that the Zapatistas are fighting for a more humanized world. And yet, the watershed between 'old 'and 'new' movements lies in the praxis of their actions. Castells distinguishes between defensive and offensive movements. The latter put political and military confrontation with the enemy at the forefront of their agenda. The Zapatistas, on the other hand, are depicted as reactive and defensive rather than "purveyors of a societal project" (Castells, 2001). The dividing line is sharply drawn between these two strategies. Grand visionary plans that aim at overthrowing a system will induce an organization to act accordingly; Montoneros did not conceive any possible negotiations with the state in the actualization of their whishes. In contrast, NSMs cannot tear the state down because in their reactive and defensive policies, they might need the state (Craig Jenkins, 1995). Castells (2001) himself is puzzled at observing the contradictory relationship between social movement and political institutions. Let us not forget that Zapatistas demanded the democratization of the political system, and by so doing they became entangled into often-incongruous negotiations with the political system[6].

The Zapatistas, regardless of negotiations with politicians and the transformation of sections of their organization into a political party, have contributed to challenge the Mexican political system. The struggle has been fought on many stages; in the government in the Districto Federal, in the streets, in the forest, on the Internet, on the captured imagination of

---

[5] The Zapatistas demanded the resignation of then-president Carlos Salinas de Gortari who they accused of having come to power amidst wide-spread electoral fraud, and insisted on new elections not sponsored by the ruling PRI (Institutional Revolutionary Party).

[6] For a comprehensive self-critique of the relationship between the Zapatistas and Mexican political institutions see Marcos' interview by Gabriel Garcia Marquez.

people around the globe. This shows that NSMs have broadened the discourse and praxis of politics. Channels inside and outside the political system have been utilized for their voices to be heard on a national and on an international level.

Castells's argument comes in at this stage of the analysis underlying the significance of the Zapatistas uprising on a global scale. The revolt can be read as an accusation of 'crimes' committed by an elite of "globapolitans" acting on an international level. Although most Zapatista demands relate to local concerns of economic structural injustice (work, land, shelter, food, health care, and education), their elaboration of others (independence, freedom, democracy, justice, and peace) demonstrates that they are aware that their local concerns are thoroughly enmeshed in the global political economy (see conclusion).

Holloway (1997) claims that the fight for dignity is not peculiar to the indigenous peoples of the southeast of Mexico. The argument is that the struggle to convert "dignity and rebellion into freedom and dignity" (Subcomandante Marcos: 1997) is the struggle of human existence in an oppressive society, as important in Johannesburg, Los Angeles, Buenos Aires as it is to the peoples of Chiapas. The implication is that NSMs politicise a rage of new phenomena -ethical or identity issues, lifestyle, human dignity- that induce people to demonstrate their rejection in many areas of the world. Kriesberg (1990) emphasizes that this 'global dissatisfaction' is a crucial element in the emergence of social movements. Furthermore, there is a growing convergence of values that has NSMs as launching platform; "there are signs of diversity as well as commonalities". The spread of a global civil society triggered the recognition of basic human rights. At the same time the value of tolerance of social and cultural diversity connect peoples struggle. "The promotion of and support for tolerance of diversity in particular has many of the qualities of an international social movement" (Smith et al, 1997:9). In looking for support, or in forming links with other struggles, they have appealed, not to the working class or the proletariat, but to 'civil society'.

4.4 Ideology

The rejection of forwarding their message to a particular social stratum brings us to the new element of the discussion: the ideological background of the Zapatistas. The EZLN do not use the concept of 'class' or 'class struggle' in their discourse, in spite of the fact that Marxist theory has clearly played an important part in their formation. They have preferred, instead, to

develop a new language, to speak of the struggle of truth and dignity. Their varied ideological base allowed the Zapatistas to create a richer communication destined to appeal to a wider audience. Marcos (1997) states that "we saw that the old words had become so worn out that they had become harmful for those that used them."

Ideology has been considered a fundamental issue in the division between new and old social movements. The distinction has often been made on ideological premises. The Zapatistas advocate a new social paradigm which is in striking contrast with those of traditional labor movements. '*Preguntando caminamos*' ('asking we walk'). They have emphasised time and time again the importance for them of taking all important decisions through a collective process of discussion. The way forward cannot be a question of their imposing an uncontestable line of thought, but only through opening up spaces for discussion and democratic decision, in which they would express their view; but, then again their view should count only as one among many.

Their process of discussion reflects the open ideological premises on which decisions are made. 'Asking we walk', in striking contrast with the Montoneros' 'homeland or death', symbolizes the open-ended nature of their ideology and the flexibility of mind. The possibility of 'being mistaken' is seriously taken into consideration. By the same token, the desire to consensus and the willingness to employ a collective dialectical process are reflections of a refusal of impositions and ideological inflexibilities.

They challenge assumptions about evolutionary thinking and the single mode of production that were central to Marxist economic theory. The protest is phrased in moral terms and the right to survive in a self-subsistence world rather than the end of exploitation (Nash, 2001). This however is highly debatable. Who can actually deny that the Zapatistas uprising is also about doing away with exploitation of the peasants communities?

One of the central ideas behind NSMs is that they are structured around struggles over collection consumption (Castells, 1997). The Zapatistas have highlighted particular political and metapolitical concerns previously neglected. The fundamental issue of these new ideological premises is the focus placed on cultural and quality life issues. NSMs and indeed the Zapatistas advocate greater opportunities to participate in the decisions affecting one's life. The EZLN ideological beliefs led the group to challenge what hitherto was considered consensual social goals (Dalton, 1990). In particularly, the ideology that inspired the Zapatistas

is based upon a rejection of processes of globalization and the one-sided logic of modernization (Castells, 2001). These processes are: deterritorialisation, which is the process whereby people, due to land seizure, loss of subsistence resources, search for wage work, pollution, are forced to abandon their native lands and migrate to highly populated urban areas. Fragmentation of social relationships; it correspond to commodification of social exchange, alienation. And finally: deculturation or loss of one's cultural heritage and identity. These were the ideological premises that animated the Zapatistas to act. They embody indigenous peoples and people in general that are least integrated in the "communication and exchange networks". Its struggle is for all those 'without voice, without face, without tomorrow', a category that stretches far beyond the indigenous peoples. The demands they make, work, land, housing, food, health, education, independence, freedom, democracy, justice and peace (Nash, 2001, Holloway, 1997) are not demands limited to the indigenous: they are demands for all. The Zapatista movement aspires to be a movement for national liberation, a movement not just for the liberation of the indigenous but of all.

The real enemy in the Zapatistas' ideological imagination is a New Global Order (Castells, 1997, Nash, 2001), defined by superpowers acting on a global level and propelled by unregulated market exchanges. The NAFTA liberalizing reforms failed to include Indians and peasant's communities into the modern transformation process, hence the fight against exclusionary consequences of economic modernizations. These modernization global processes threaten the people of Chiapas on two levels: economically and culturally. Ideology based upon cultural issues represents a peculiarity of social movements. This ideological orientation determines what is really new about NSMs. This distinct ideological premise influences the type of supporters they mobilize, their organizational structure and their choices of political strategies (Dalton, 1990).

A further effort is needed when dealing with such a rich and complex ideological matrix. In order to comprehend the limits of the ideological framework of the Zapatistas two concepts need to be analyzed: the concept of revolution and the concept of 'dignity'.
Dignity encapsulates in one word the rejection of the separation of the personal and the political (Holloway, 1997). Dignity was presumably not part of the conceptual baggage of the revolutionaries who went into the jungle or fought in urban areas. It is not a concept that appears very much in the literature of the Marxist tradition. It could only emerge as a

revolutionary concept in the course of a revolution by a people steeped in the dignity of struggle. But once it appears as a central concept, then it implies a rethinking of the whole revolutionary project, both theoretically and in terms of organisation. The whole conception of revolution becomes turned outwards: "revolution becomes a question rather than an answer". Hence 'Preguntando caminamos: asking we walk' becomes a central principle of the revolutionary movement, the radically democratic concept at the centre of the Zapatista call for 'freedom, democracy and justice'. The revolution advances by asking, not by telling (Holloway, 1997).

The Zapatistas' ideology is also based upon a new concept of revolution. That is a revolution that listens and continuously seeks reaction from 'civil society', a revolution that takes as its starting point the dignity of those in revolt. It is a revolution that believes that distinguishing between 'rebel' and 'revolutionary' is superfluous. "This revolution is a moving outwards rather than a moving towards" (Holloway, 2002:13). The implication of these last remarks is that there is not a transitional program or a definite goal. There is, as observed earlier, an aim: the achievement of a society based on dignity, or, in the words of the Zapatista slogan, 'democracy, freedom, justice' (Holloway, 2002, Castells, 1997). There has been often confusion about the concrete steps that need to be taken to achieve this. Nor Marcos has ever been able to explain it. He has at times been criticised by those educated in the classical revolutionary traditions as a sign of the political immaturity and ideology inconsistency of the Zapatistas. But the concept of revolution that has predominated in this century has been overwhelmingly instrumentalist: a conception of a means designed to achieve an end. However, this conception breaks down as soon as the starting point becomes the dignity of those in struggle. The revolt of dignity initiated by the Zapatistas has compelled authors to employ a new theoretical framework when talking about revolution. The rebellion of the Zapatistas cannot be rigidly defined or confined, simply because it is a rebellion that flows. It is a revolution that is "by its very nature ambiguous and contradictory" (Holloway, 1997).

In both cases, the Zapatistas and Montoneros, it is legitimate to talk about revolution. The EZLN's revolution, however ideologically ambiguous and contradictory, makes sense because the claim to dignity in a society built upon the negation of dignity can only be met through a radical transformation of society (Holloway, 1997). Revolution then still equates to transformation. In the case of Montoneros revolution cannot be ambiguous, much less

contradictory. It is 'the' Revolution that paves the way to the 'Great Event' which will change the world. The claim to be revolutionary, in the Marxist tradition and especially in the Guevaran Latin American application of the 'new man' theories, lies in the preparation for the future Event. The present is just a transitory phase for the man to await what's to come. In the Zapatistas' lexicon revolution refers to "present existence, not to future instrumentality".

Chapter 5   Conclusion

In the previous two sections the main points in perpetuating the comparative analysis have been highlighted. Authors have selected these issues in the conceptualisation of new social movement: ideology, motivation to participate, organisational structure, the use of media, and nature of political issues. All these factors have been considered in the analysis as fundamental elements that make a movement, or a wave of movements, distinct from others. However, the debate surrounding the legitimacy in advocating a new social paradigm when talking about NSMs rages on. It has not been resolved. Yet, headway on the topic has been made.

5.1 Critiques

There is a tendency in the literature to associate traditional labour movements with class-based politics; whereas new social movements have been relegated to the sphere of identity politics. This paper has attempted to demonstrate that, despite a new trend of political demonstration has been widely acknowledged, the comparison between a fundamental waves of social movements must be handled with care. There are substantial overlapping, given the fact that the Zapatista, as Subcomandante Marcos has often declared, have been inspired by the Zapata rebellions at the time of the Mexican revolution and several others Latin American Marxist-oriented guerrilla groups.

These concluding remarks aim at dispelling the myth surrounding the intriguing figure of Marcos or the Zapatistas as a highly successful revolutionary movement. This paper challenges the idea that the Zapatistas revolutionary strategies are necessarily 'good' or 'better than' the Montoneros. The questions about the efficacy of the Zapatistas uprising remain. What have they really achieved? Have the conditions of the Chiapas peasants' communities actually

improved thanks to the rebellions? To what extent have the Zapatistas changed the Mexican political system? How can they practically 'change the world' without taking state power?

The Zapatistas, as opposed to the Montoneros, have been clever in their use of the media as a means to avoid repression by the armed forces. Montoneros, on the other hand, not enjoying privileges such as the Internet, have been wiped out in large numbers. The former survived; the latter have been exterminated.

A Marxist-Leninist view would also stress that the prerequisite for radical change to a more just society is taking state power. This critique could also be stretched further; one could argue that the Zapatistas have weakened the idea that a social revolution must be the only way by means of which radical change is implemented. Have they weakened the image and dissolved the energies of the left to maintain a strong, unified identity? Have they caused ideological confusion among the left circles? Does Holloway say that 'revolution,' for the Zapatistas and NSMs, is a question rather than an answer exactly because they were not able to find an answer? Can the Zapatistas uprising be read as a sign of defeat of the revolution and an indicator of the diminishing ambitions of the oppressed?

5.2 New awareness and the 'New Enemy'

The comparison between the Zapatistas and Montoneros tells us that, however realistic the demands from below have become and however 'reduced' the revolutionary demands are, notable accomplishments have been reached by the Zapatistas. The wave of political demonstrations after the Chiapas uprisings has crystallised a new trend in the modes of protest.

The indigenous character of the Zapatista rebellion has provoked new awareness, respect and study of the much broader phenomenon of indigenous revival and struggle in this period. The joint efforts of the EZLN and the peasant's communities of Chiapas successfully publicised issues that had been otherwise neglected.

The aim of the Zapatistas and NSMs in general, is to demonstrate that there are ways of disrupting the system without necessarily attempting to tear the state down. They have also pointed the finger at a new 'enemy'. It might not be a social class anymore or if it still is, it is well disguised. Sklair's (1997) elucidation of a new global or transnational capital class proves that the enemy is everywhere and it has extended its reach. The enemy resembles Hydra, the mythological monster with several heads that relentlessly reproduce them after they have been

cut off. The new enemy is ignorance, the Zapatisas say. The UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation) Institute for Statistics announced that the world illiteracy rate dropped to 20.3%. In Africa it reaches 40.2, in Southwest Asia rounds at 44.7 and in the least developed countries soars at 49.4 per cent (July 2002). But today the real plague is what the ITU (International Telecommunication Union) labels *technological illiteracy*. Only 6% of the population in developing countries have access to the Internet. Not to mention that the population of developing countries represent 84 per cent of the total world population (ITU 1999 Internet Report for Development).

The Zapatistas today might represent the best reply that the excluded of the earth can offer to the crisis of representative democracy and the disintegration of control over lives, environment, jobs, economies, governments. This is considered to be the new enemy: rich, global and Western. The New International Division of Labour (NIDL) is allowing production sites on solitary islands and barren hills. Free movements of goods and resources escape national and international control over production processes and labour conditions (Nash, 2001:3). The new enemy expresses itself through unregulated market exchanges eroding human relationships (Castells, 1997).

In the past decades, and the last few years particularly, there have been a wave of political demonstrations that have puzzled and stimulated the mind of many intellectuals and academics. The Zapatistas, Seattle, Gothenburg, Genoa and who know where else, people have taken to the streets to shout *¡Basta Ya!* (Enough!). They do not have a clear-cut identity and do not aim at taking state power. Diverse ideologies combine together; people form left, right, moderate, radical, curious, unhappy, and restless, in need of being themselves join into a numerous ensemble of hopes. Most of them reject violence. Today they seem to be the new ways of rebelling. Successfully or not, they embody the revolutionary force of the present.

Bibliography

Books

Anderson J.L.	*Che Guevara A Revolutionary Life*. Bantam Press UK 1997
Buechler S.M.	*Social Movements in Advanced Capitalism: the political economy and cultural construction of cultural activism*. Oxford University Press 2000

Beck U.   *Risk Society: Towards a new Modernity*. Sage Publications London 1992

Calhoun C.   *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*. Blackwell Oxford 1994

Castells M.   *The power of Identity*. Blackwell Press Cambridge 1997

Craig Jenkins J. & Klandermans M.(eds)   *The Politics of Social Protest: Comparative Perspectives on States and Social Movements*. UCL Press London 1995

Dalton R.J. & Krüechler M.(eds)   *Challenging the Political Order: New Social and Political Movements in Western Democracies*. Polity Oxford 1990

Della Porta D., Kriesi H. & Rucht D. (ed.)   *Social Movements in a globalizing world*. Mac Millan Press, Great Britain 1999

Gillespie R.   *Montoneros Soldiers of Perón*. Oxford University Press 1982.

Jameson F. & Miyoshi M. (eds)   *The Cultures of Globalisation*. London Duke University Press1998.

Holloway J.   *Change the world without taking power- The meaning of revolution today*. Pluto Press, London 2002

Melucci A.   *Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society*. Hutchinson London 1988

Melucci A.   *Challenging Codes: Collective Action in the Information Age*. Cambridge University Press 1996

Mc Adam D., McCarthy & Zald M.   *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements*. Cambridge University Press 1996

Nash J.   *Mayan Visions. The quest for autonomy in an age of globalization*. Routledge New York 2001

Nash K.   *Readings in Contemporary Political Sociology*. Blackwell Malden 1999

Schulz M. & SmithJ. (eds)   *Transnational Social Movements*. Blackwell London 1997

Sklair L.   *Sociology of the Global System*. John Hopkins University Press 1995

Smith J., Chatfield C. & Pagnucco R.	*Transnational Social Movements and Global Polities: Solidarity beyond the State*. Syracuse University Press 1997
Stewart A.	*Theories of Power and Domination: The Politics of Empowerment in Late Modernity*. LSE London 2001
Tarrow S.	*Power in Movements: social movements and contentious politics*. Cambridge University Press 1998

Internet sites

http://www.eco.utexas.edu/Homepages.Faculty/Cleaver/zapsincyber.htm/ - 15. August 2002

http://www.ezln.org - 30. August 2002

http://www.providence.edu/polisci/projects/zapatistas/zapatistas.htm - 21. August 2002

http://www.chiapaslink.ukgateway.net/ - 25. August 2002

www.geocities.com/Capitolhill/Holloway   Dignity's revolt, 1997 - 29. June 2002

Articles

Richard Stahler-Sholk, R.	*Massacre in Chiapas (in Revolutionary Responses),* Latin American Perspectives, Vol. 25, No. 4.
Stephen, L.	*The Zapatista Army of National Liberation and the National Democratic Convention*, Latin American Perspectives, Vol. 22, No. 4.