Lento, Pero Avanzo: Indigenous Mayan Influence in Zapatista Speech & Imagery

Taylor R. Genovese

Please cite as:

Genovese, Taylor R. 2016. *Lento, Pero Avanzo: Indigenous Mayan Influence in Zapatista Speech & Imagery*. Unpublished MS, Department of Anthropology, Northern Arizona University.

Introduction & Background

This paper will examine the *Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional* (EZLN)—perhaps known more widespread as the Zapatistas—with a focus on how Mayan cosmology and identity affected and shifted the goals of the EZLN as we enter into their twenty-second year of occupation and insurgency in Chiapas, Mexico. For the purpose of this paper, when I refer to the EZLN, I do not only refer to the *ejército* (Army, or military wing of the Zapatistas), but also the socio-political-economic structures that exist within Zapatista-held territories. In order to analyze the EZLN through the lens of Mayan cosmology, I will examine their history—as well as their six officially released Declarations—and track how the end-goal of the EZLN changed from one that was a Marxist-Leninist-Guevarist, *foco*-centered protracted guerrilla war to one that is focused on decentralized, anti-authoritarian village occupations utilizing Indigenous Mayan values and symbols.

On November 17, 1983, a small group of three Indigenous and three *mestizos* marched into the Lacandón Jungle and established the EZLN, then a Marxist insurgent group who intended to utilize the *foco* theory of revolution to overthrow the Mexican state and establish a communist government (Ramírez 2008). *Foco*—also called *foquismo*—is a Spanish word for “focus” and refers to the revolutionary theory formulated by the French intellectual Régis Debray who researched the tactical elements that were utilized during the Cuban Revolution and, more specifically, from the book *La Guerra de Guerrillas* (Guerrilla Warfare) by Che Guevara (1961). *Foquismo* drew on the strategy of a protracted people’s war—a tactic utilized by the Chinese communist revolutionary Mao Tse-Tung (2001)—in which small bands of revolutionaries attempt to draw the enemy into the rural areas of the country while maintaining a

positive image with the people. However, instead of relying on traditional Marxist theory of waiting on “objective conditions” for the people’s revolution (Marx & Engels 1906), *foco* theory re-interprets Lenin’s theory of revolution and argues that a small vanguard of revolutionaries fighting in the rural areas could in itself generate the people’s support and jumpstart a revolution (Guevara 1961).

Not much is known about what led the EZLN to abandon its *foco*-based Marxist insurgency and utilize a more cooperative, non-hierarchical Indigenous-based autonomous ideology, but on January 1, 1994—the day the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) came into effect—3,000 armed Zapatistas emerged from the jungle and seized six Indigenous cities and towns that were allied with the EZLN (Ramírez 2008). That same day, the world was introduced to the EZLN’s primary spokesperson and ideological thinker: a masked man—who has referred to himself as a “brilliant myth” and a “hologram” (Hayden 2002)—named Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos. In one of the liberated cities, San Cristóbal de las Casas, the Zapatistas freed prisoners from the jail, set fire to police stations, destroyed land deeds from the registrar’s office and Marcos announced to the world the existence of the EZLN while reading aloud the First Declaration From the Lacandón Jungle (Hayden 2002).

The Declarations From the Lacandón Jungle

Prior to delving into the interpretations of the Declarations From the Lacandón Jungle, it is important to have a grasp on what each declaration entails. I will summarize each of the six declarations and provide context when necessary, utilizing translations of the first four declarations from Hayden’s (2002) book and the last two from internet sources (EZLN 1998; 2005). These declarations are claimed by the EZLN to be written by consensus-based assemblies

and were delivered either electronically or by speech, usually by Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos (Hayden 2002).

First Declaration From the Lacandón Jungle

The First Declaration was short and intense, read aloud by Marcos from the balcony of a municipal building in San Cristóbal de las Casas on January 1, 1994, and later distributed before the EZLN had to retreat back into the jungle due to the advancement of the Mexican Army. At its core, this was a declaration of war against the Mexican state—with the appropriated slogan *¡Ya Basta!* (Enough is enough!) shown prominently at the beginning of the statement. However, they “break quickly from calls for socialism or vanguard notions of replacing the state with a ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’ or any other new apparatus” (Hayden 2002, 217) and instead call for the implementation of a reformist agenda—“our struggle follows the Constitution, which is held high by its call for justice and equality” (Hayden 2002, 219).

The declaration places itself within the genealogy of Mexican struggle without making reference to other revolutionary traditions. However, it does cite and claim authority over Article 39 of the Mexican Constitution which says: “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*” (Hayden 2002, 219; emphasis my own). The declaration then outlines its lofty orders for the EZLN: to advance on Mexico City, defeat the Mexican Army, submit to the Geneva Convention, allow for the people to elect their own administrative authorities, and initiate summary judgements on all Mexican Army soldiers and political police that have repressed the population (Hayden 2002). Finally, the EZLN summarizes its platform within

familiar revolutionary Mexican ideals: “struggles for work, land, housing, food, health care, education, independence, freedom, democracy, justice, and peace” (Hayden 2002, 220).

Second Declaration From the Lacandón Jungle

This declaration, issued six months after the January 1994 uprising, was a call to civil society—shifting the revolutionary focus away from the *foco*-vanguardist guerrilla. After the 12-day shooting war had ended, guerrillas did not rise up in other parts of Mexico, the assault on Mexico City did not happen, and the revolution that was incited in the First Declaration did not synthesize (Hayden 2002). However, this declaration did recognize the outpouring of support from the Mexican people and acknowledges civil society’s call for nonviolence by agreeing to a ceasefire so that organizing efforts might continue and “political parties of a new type” (Hayden 2002, 221) might be formed. There is also a call for a National Democratic Convention to be hosted by the EZLN for Mexicans of all backgrounds. This convention was staged in August of 1994 and was attended by thousands (Hayden 2002).

In this declaration, we also see the emergence of a proto-motto that eventually distills into one of the Zapatista’s chief slogans: *Para todos todo, para nosotros nada* (For everyone, everything. For us, nothing). While the EZLN’s goal develops slowly from Marxist revolution to non-hierarchical governance, this declaration—particularly in the development of the above philosophy—begins to hint at the Zapatista’s future. However, rather than utilize this phrase as a slogan—like the First Declaration’s *¡Ya Basta!*—it is instead interpreted through traditional Indigenous cosmology. This will be discussed in further depth in the next section.

Third Declaration From the Lacandón Jungle

The Third Declaration was released one year after the uprising and calls for the creation of a National Liberation Movement. In December of 1994, Ernesto Ponce de Leon Zedillo was elected President of Mexico. After taking office, the peso collapsed and Zedillo blamed the Zapatistas, threatening to ramp up the military presence around Chiapas (Hayden 2012). In southern Mexico, Amado Avendano—a pro-Zapatista journalist-turned-politician—was defeated in a fraudulent election, causing civil society to erupt in protest; 25,000 people marched in San Cristóbal de las Casas and the EZLN declared autonomous zones in several additional communities (Hayden 2002). After Avendano was declared “governor in resistance,” the EZLN surprised the Mexican Army by occupying and declaring autonomous zones in 38 more municipalities; Marcos famously quipped in a letter to Zedillo: “it is my duty to inform you that you have an Indian rebellion in the Nation’s southeast” (Hayden 2002, 232).

The Third Declaration was not as poetic as the Second Declaration—in fact, it was more like the First Declaration in that it was a warning to the Mexican government, and Zedillo specifically. This declaration demanded that the newly elected government be replaced by a transitional one that would guarantee “clean elections, credibility, equity, and nonpartisan and nongovernmental civic participation” (Hayden 2002, 232). One month after this declaration was issued, Zedillo ordered the Mexican Army to hunt down and capture Marcos and the other EZLN commanders, but the Zapatistas were able to elude the army (Hayden 2002). Zedillo’s plan to pacify the EZLN and their allies failed as hunger strikes and protests erupted across the country, including a solidarity protest in Mexico City that drew 100,000 participants (Hayden 2002). In February of 1995, Zedillo called off the army offensive in Chiapas.

Fourth Declaration From the Lacandón Jungle

The Fourth Declaration—released two years after the initial uprising—expands upon the Third Declaration’s call for a National Liberation Front with the call for the creation of the Zapatista Front of National Liberation (Hayden 2002). The difference between the Third and the Fourth declarations is that the Fourth Declaration took steps to create a National Front by sending 40,000 pro-EZLN activists across the country to conduct a referendum among the existing solidarity groups. “By late August, 1.2 million people had expressed their preferences. Ninety percent approved a ‘broad opposition front,’ though only 57 percent [approved the] EZLN’s restructuring into an independent political force” (Hayden 2002, 239-240).

The Fourth Declaration returned to the poetic prose of the earlier declarations and is the first to take a distinctly Indigenous focus. It lists 47 Indigenous groups that the rebellion had spoken to and suggests that this struggle is one against oblivion. Hayden (2002) sums up the struggle succinctly: “In a war for indigenous identity against oblivion, the identity itself comes to the foreground” (240). The EZLN makes this very clear at the end of the declaration: “only those who give up their history are consigned to oblivion” (Hayden 2002, 250). The Zapatista rebellion had just explicitly become one of Indigenous identity.

The Fourth Declaration further illustrates that the politics of the EZLN were—and still are—formed within the struggle, rather than the idea that Zapatistas descended from the mountains with a fully developed politic. The EZLN shows that politics sometimes come into focus *through* the struggle, not before it. This concept is important for engaged social scientists to appreciate, especially those who are working directly with marginalized or oppressed communities.

Fifth Declaration From the Lacandón Jungle

The Fifth Declaration was released in July of 1998 and was a direct response to the betrayal of the Mexican government following their disregard for the San Andrés Accords. The San Andrés Accords was a series of meetings to discuss terms for peace between the Mexican Federal government and the EZLN. The EZLN demanded respect for the Indigenous, natural resource preservation, autonomy for Indigenous communities, the release of political prisoners being jailed for being “Zapatistas,” and the disarmament of anti-EZLN paramilitary groups that were operating in northern Chiapas (Maddox 2003). The Mexican government proposed a counter to the EZLN demands that the Zapatistas said were completely altered and unacceptable (Hayden 2002).

The Fifth Declaration announced that the San Andrés Accords were a façade by the Mexican government to justify further aggression and that a war was still being waged on the EZLN and the Indigenous population of Chiapas (Hayden 2002). The Zapatistas also announced that a *Consulta Nacional* (National Consultation) should be held “concerning the legal initiative on Indigenous rights...and for an end to the war of extermination” (EZLN 1998). The EZLN invited the Indigenous population of Mexico, the National Indigenous Congress, and the entire population of Mexico in order to move towards “peace with justice and dignity” (EZLN 1998).

Sixth Declaration From the Lacandón Jungle

The Sixth Declaration, released in 2005, reiterates the EZLN’s support for the Indigenous communities of Mexico. It also expresses the EZLN’s solidarity with—and pledges to provide material aid to—the people of Cuba, Bolivia, Ecuador, Chile and others who stand in solidarity

with the Zapatistas (EZLN 2005). The declaration also renews commitment to the alter-globalization movement and calls for those opposed to globalization efforts to join the EZLN.

Perhaps the most important aspect to the Sixth Declaration is *la otra campaña* (the other campaign) (EZLN 2005). The Other Campaign was a tour that one would expect from a traditional electoral campaign, but was meant to create a conversation about alternatives to electoral politics—with Marcos as the spokesperson. The ultimate goal of the Other Campaign was to pressure the Mexican government to rewrite the national constitution to protect Indigenous rights and autonomy as well as to abandon the tenants of neoliberal capitalism (Marcos & Navarro 2008).

Analysis of the Declarations

There are many ways in which these declarations can be interpreted. For the purpose of this paper, I will be focusing on how these declarations address Mayan cosmology—or how one thinks about the world and universe—as well as Mayan and Indigenous identity and symbology. Furthermore, I will address how the ideology behind the EZLN—sometimes referred to as *Neozapatismo* (EZLN 2005)—is distinctly Mayan, as opposed to a Western label of libertarian socialism, communism, or anarchism.

The First Declaration makes no mention of the Indigenous population within Chiapas or the EZLN aside from the preamble of “we are a product of 500 years of struggle...” (Hayden 2002, 218), which is a reference to the Spanish Conquest of the Maya. This oversight may seem odd given the current stance on Indigenous autonomy that the EZLN currently espouses. This could be due to an end-goal that was still nebulous within the EZLN leadership. After all, this First Declaration was a declaration of war with the intention of overthrowing the Mexican state.

The declaration itself was still working within the framework of reforming state institutions, rather than creating autonomous communities. As Enrique Krauze points out, the Zapatistas “had been planning the uprising for 10 years, with the original intention of establishing a guerrilla foco...in Chiapas, in territory under their control, from which they hoped a revolution could spread” (Hayden 2002, 396).

The Second Declaration, by contrast, is filled with Indigenous imagery despite there being a lack of demands for Indigenous autonomy. For example, the chief Zapatista slogan mentioned in the summary of the Second Declaration above is interpreted through a Mayan cosmology: “Facing the mountain we speak with our dead so that they will reveal to us in their word the path down which our veiled faces should turn. The drums rang out and in the voice of the earth our pain spoke and our history spoke. ‘For everyone, everything,’ say our dead. ‘Until it is so, there will be nothing for us’ (EZLN 1994). As previously mentioned, this saying is not neatly packaged into a slogan that can be easily chanted—like *¡Ya Basta!*—but is instead wrapped into a profoundly Indigenous narrative cadence. It also begins to present the prominent worldview that exists within a majority of Indigenous groups in the Americas—including the descendants of the Maya in Chiapas—of approaching everything from a collective viewpoint as opposed to the Western approach of the individual (Smith 1999). This idea is not necessarily at odds with anarchist principles, however, some branches of anarchism tend to move quickly toward an *individual* recognition of natural principles, rather than starting with the collective.

The Fourth Declaration and beyond is really when Indigenous identity becomes solidified within the Zapatista ideology. The declaration begins with “the flower of the word will not die” (Hayden 2002, 241) and ends with “In the world we want, everyone fits. In the world we

want, many worlds fit” (Hayden 2002, 250). This is a pretty stark contrast to the First Declaration’s Marxist-like promise to march on Mexico City and free the people. Oikonomakis (2015) sums this transformation up quite well: “what began as the armed branch of a Castro-Guevarist, vanguardist and strictly hierarchical organization soon found its theories crushed by the indigenous reality and the will of the people they had come to ‘enlighten’ deep in the mountains and jungles of the Mexican southeast” (para. 14).

The change in writing style—from conventional, straight-forward declarations of war to baroque, mysterious prose—is also due to Indigenous influence on the Zapatistas. According to Gossen (1996), “the poetic and opaque language bears the clear mark of contemporary Maya oratorical style...” (532). There is little doubt that a major difference in creativity and clarity exists between: “our struggle follows the Constitution, which is held high by its call for justice and equality” (Hayden 2002, 219) and “our blood and our word have lit a small fire in the mountain...now protect our light and drink of the same fire” (Hayden 2002, 242). This further illustrates that these voices arise within the struggle.

Mayan Identity & Symbols in *Neozapatismo*

One of the major questions that I asked myself prior to researching this paper is: why does a blond, European, formally upper-middle class, cosmopolitan, ex-professor preside so frequently as the spokesperson for a distinctly rural Indigenous resistance movement? In other words, why—at least until Marcos stepped down as the face of the EZLN in 2014—has there not been an Indigenous spokesperson?

One possible reason could be the apparent desire to remain anonymous and protect Mayan identity from “outsiders” as expressed by one Maya:

We Indians have always hidden our identity and kept our secrets to ourselves. This is why we are discriminated against. We often find it hard to talk about ourselves because we know we must hide so much in order to preserve our Indian culture and prevent it from being taken away from us. So I can only tell you very general things about the *nahual*¹. I can't tell you what my *nahual* is because that is one of our secrets. (Gossen 1996, 534)

Could the importance placed on anonymity and secrecy in Mayan life be one of the reasons that there is no mention of the Indigenous struggle within the First Declaration? Marcos later claimed that the drafting committee for the First Declaration included Indigenous members and it was a deliberate choice to focus on the issue of national liberation instead of Indigenous autonomy (Hayden 2002). Furthermore, this could also explain why the Zapatistas are so often masked. While there certainly exists elements of guerrilla theater—as well as the practicality of military security—this Mayan “cognitive baggage [that is carried] in their languages, minds hearts and souls” (Gossen 1996, 534) could be a reason why the mask plays an important role in the Zapatista image.

Another layer that is important to consider is the concept of colonial hegemony. In building the Mexican state—and particularly in southern Mexico—there was an exerted effort to consider those who were biologically *mestizo* as being the “ladino...people of reason” (Burguete Cal y Mayor, 1994, 2), while the Indian was seen as lacking reason. “Indians were given a key role in the construction of the Mexican state, but only as dead Indians. Living Indians in contrast were denied” (Burguete Cal y Mayor, 1994, 2). This hegemonic practice led to the discrimination

¹ A *nahual* or *nagual* is a human being who possesses the power to turn themselves—either physically or spiritually—into an animal form (usually as a jaguar, puma, donkey, turkey or dog). In order to avoid the cultural connotations that “witch” has, the English translation of “transforming trickster” or “shape shifter” is commonly used. For further reading, see Nutini & Roberts (1993).

and devaluing of Indigenous people within Mexico, which could have in turn led to a desire to remain anonymous, especially while engaged in unresolved warfare with the Mexican state.

However, the ethnic make-up of the EZLN is quite diverse, consisting of Tzotzil, Tzeltal, Zoque, Chol, and Tojolabal speakers as well as Mexican *mestizos* and ethnically “white” Mexicans (Gossen 1996). What makes the Zapatista movement so unique is that despite this diversity, there exists a common Indigenous Mesoamerican goal—which takes the form of the *Neozapatismo* ideology—that is shared by all. What I argue is that within this Mesoamerican shared goal also exists a mythos of Indigenous Mesoamerican ideas of self and society, which include a discouragement to be self-aggrandizing or acting out of self-gain (Gossen 1996). Perhaps this is another reason why the Zapatistas remain masked, even in settings that do not involve interaction with outsiders—to show that the movement is not about a single Mayan personality (Gossen 1996). Perhaps this is also why an ethnic “outsider” such as Marcos was chosen to be the primary spokesperson for the Zapatista movement.

Beginning with the Second Declaration—and perhaps peaking with the Fourth Declaration—was the concept of *México profundo*: a rather essentialist theory that there is an ever-present Indigenous tradition that lies beneath all aspects of modern Mexican life (Batalla and Dennis, 1996). The EZLN has embraced this concept in not only the language and style of their declarations, but also the symbols that they use throughout their autonomous zones. I will focus on the *caracol* (snail), which holds traditional significance within the Indigenous Mayan belief system as well as having a modern importance to the Zapatistas of the 21st century.

In Mayan cosmology, the snail was an important symbol of community interaction. Traditionally, the Maya conch shell was used to call the community to an assembly, or to interact

Figure 1: An image of a snail in Chiapas. The text reads: “Slow, but advancing.” (Photo: www.athousandturns.net)

with neighboring communities (Oikonomakis 2015; Urban 2007). Due to this Indigenous influence, the offices of the governing councils in EZLN controlled communities—where decision-making assemblies are held—are called *caracoles*.

The Mayan symbol of the snail also

represented birth and death (Tozzer 1910). This could be another level of complexity within the EZLN use of *caracol* symbology. Marcos and the EZLN utilize birth and death imagery often in their declarations. For example, in their Fourth Declaration: “We were born of the night. We live in the night. We will die in her. But the light will be tomorrow for others...for those for whom death is a gift, for those who are denied life. The light will be for all of them” (Hayden 2002, 241).

The snail then represents the re-birth (Figure 2) of Mayan direct democracy, for lack of a better term—the snail now representing *la palabra* (the word) in EZLN communities (Oikonomakis, 2015)—by referencing back to the traditional Mayan symbol of the *caracol* as harbinger of assembly. At the same time, the EZLN is using the modern symbol of a snail (Figure 1) that creeps slowly but persistently—shell hardened against vulnerability—to represent resisting the imposing global neoliberal economic system (Urban 2007).

Figure 2: Mayan glyphs of humans emerging from—being born of—the *caracol*. (Photo: Tozzer, 1910)

Is *Neozapatismo* Anarchism?

This seems to be the question that titillates the European and American radical left. Perhaps it is due to the Western obsession with labels and categorization (Smith 1999) or perhaps it is the yearning for those who find affinity with the far-left—the ones on the fringes of encroaching fascism and kamikaze capitalism—to find a large-scale working model of the world they hope to live in. However, does imposing labels on a group that may have some shared principles and ideologies with anarchism a hegemonic or colonial act in itself?

In 2001-2002, the publication *Green Anarchy* published an article entitled “The EZLN is NOT Anarchist,” claiming that the methods that the Zapatistas utilized were not in line with mainstream anarchist philosophy, whatever that means². In response, the EZLN³ published a response in the same periodical that shed some light on the subtle colonialist tendencies some North American anarchists may have when analyzing resistance movements of the Other. Essentially, the article states that the EZLN is indeed not anarchist and has never claimed to be (EZLN 2002). The author goes on to say that:

in order for us to make concrete change in our social and political struggles, we cannot limit ourselves by adhering to a singular ideology...what we all have in common is a love for our families and our homelands. What we all have in common is a desire to make things better for ourselves and our country. None of this can be accomplished if we are to build walls of words and abstract ideas around ourselves. (EZLN 2002, para. 3)

² I have never understood the desire of some anarchists to (coercively) insist that all others in the anti-authoritarian struggle identify specifically as anarchist. To me, this line of thinking seems too much like an identity, a club, or a desire to find themselves in other people at a very individualist level. Rather than worry about whether some group or person identifies themselves as anarchist, it would be far more useful to ask if a group uses practices that are compatible with anarchist thought. This way, you could work with—and be around—people who call themselves an assortment of things, while striving toward actual anarchist goals such as autonomy, cooperation, mutual aid, etc.

³ Although *Green Anarchy* confirmed that the response was received from a reputable source within the Zapatista community, the author(s)—rather predictably—chose to remain anonymous.

Shedding researcher ethnocentrism and utilizing a culturally relativistic framework when studying revolutionary activity—particularly when it is happening in an environment of multidimensional oppression—is paramount for those in the social sciences, particularly if one is studying social movements. The author wraps up their response with an important point that should be heeded by the academic and activist alike:

Colonialism is one of the many enemies we are fighting in this world and so long as North Americans reinforce colonial thought patterns in their ‘revolutionary’ struggles, they will never be on the side of any anti-colonial struggle any where [sic]. We in the Zapatista struggle have never asked anyone for unflinching, uncritical support. What we have asked the world to do is respect the historical context we are in and think about the actions we do to pull ourselves from under the boots of oppression. At the same time, you should be looking at your own struggles in your own country and seeing the commonalties we have between us. This is the only way we have to make a global Revolution. (EZLN 2002, para. 8)

Conclusion

In 1983, six Mexicans walked into the Lacandón Jungle—each carrying sixty pound packs on their backs and dreams of a new revolutionary Mexico in their hearts—and founded the *Ejército Zapatista de Liberation Nacional* (Hayden 2002). The initial goal of this revolutionary group was to serve as the vanguard—utilizing *foco*-theory tactics—and initiate a widespread Mexican Castro-Guevarist communist revolution. Ten years later, 3,000 Zapatistas emerged from the jungle and established a *municipio autónomo* (autonomous municipality) out of several towns. Soon, they expanded and created multiple *zonas* (zones) of dozens of autonomous municipalities. What could have caused this drastic change in revolutionary strategy?

In this paper, I have outlined how the Indigenous cosmology of the region may have influenced the EZLN’s approach to generating revolution within Mexico. Traditional Mayan

beliefs such as the connection with the Earth, collective decision making, and the sense of self and society heavily influenced EZLN ideology during its early incubation period. These ideologies fused with Mayan symbology—especially that of the *caracol*—to reinvent and promote *México profundo* throughout the country. The EZLN is not a fully Marxist organization, nor is it a fully anarchist one. *Neozapatismo* is a distinct form of self-governance that is unique to the people and the environment in which the EZLN operates; and it does not wish for other revolutionary groups to copy what they are doing.

However, what I think the EZLN does wish to accomplish globally is to dare the world to dream—to breathe life and hope into the autonomous, radically democratic imaginary; not to recreate what the Zapatistas have done, but to explore and discover the particular form of self-governance that is right for the community in which it would inhabit. In August of 2013, hundreds of activists from around the world attended the *Escuelita Zapatista* (the little Zapatista school) and the farewell message to the activists is one that should be followed by all those who wish to live as if they are already free: “do what you decide to [do], in the way you decide to do it...we cannot and we do not want to impose on you what to do. It is up to you to decide” (Oikonomakis 2015, para. 52).

Works Cited

Batalla, Guillermo Bonfil, and Philip A. Dennis. 1996. *México Profundo: Reclaiming a Civilization*. University of Texas Press.

Burguete Cal y Mayor, Araceli. 1994. “Chiapas: Maya Identity and the Zapatista Uprising.”

Abya Yala News 8 (2): 1-7.

- EZLN. 1994. "Second Declaration of the Lacandon Jungle." Wikisource. Accessed December 17, 2015. https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Second_Declaration_of_the_Lacandon_Jungle.
- EZLN. 1998. "Fifth Declaration of the Lacandon Jungle." Wikisource. Accessed December 16, 2015. https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Fifth_Declaration_of_the_Lacandon_Jungle.
- EZLN. 2002. "A Zapatista Response to: The EZLN Is NOT Anarchist." Green Anarchy #8.
- EZLN. 2005. "Sixth Declaration of the Lacandon Jungle." Wikisource. Accessed December 16, 2015. https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Sixth_Declaration_of_the_Lacandon_Jungle.
- Gossen, Gary H. 1996. "Maya Zapatistas Move to the Ancient Future." *American Anthropologist* 98 (3): 528–38.
- Guevara, Che. 1961. *Guerrilla Warfare*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Hayden, Tom, ed. 2002. *The Zapatista Reader*. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press/Nation Books.
- Maddox, Robert Paul. 2003. "'Today We Say, Enough!': The Zapatista Rebellion, Autonomy, and the San Andres Accords." *Regent Journal of International Law* 1 (April): 47–105.
- Marcos, Subcomandante Insurgente, and Luis Hernández Navarro. 2008. *The Other Campaign: la otra campaña*. Bilingual edition. San Francisco: City Lights Publishers.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. 1906. *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. C.H. Kerr.
- Nutini, Hugo G. & John M. Roberts. 1993. *Bloodsucking Witchcraft: An Epistemological Study of Anthropomorphic Supernaturalism in Rural Tlaxcala*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Oikonomakis, Leonidas. 2015. "Why We Still Love the Zapatistas." *ROAR Magazine*. Accessed December 17, 2015. <https://roarmag.org/magazine/why-we-still-love-the-zapatistas/>.

Ramírez, Gloria Muñoz, Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos, and Hermann Bellinghausen.

2008. *The Fire and the Word: A History of the Zapatista Movement*. San Francisco: City Lights Publishers.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Zed Books.

Tozzer, Alfred Marston, and Glover Morrill Allen. 1910. *Animal Figures in the Maya Codices*. Cambridge: The Museum.

Tse-Tung, Mao. 2001. *On Protracted War*. Honolulu, HI: University Press of the Pacific.

Urban, Thomas M. 2007. "Caracol de La Resistencia: Zapatista Symbol References Maya Past." *Archaeolog*. <https://web.stanford.edu/dept/archaeology/cgi-bin/archaeolog/?p=141>.