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Chiapas is a place that represents a Canadian documentary of Zapastita, which is a liberation army for the soldiers and the lives of those for whom the army fights.

The director of the documentary is Nettie Wild. The documentary is an evasion done to the Mexican army, which took place in 1994. An army comprising of native people under the leadership of Sub-commandant Marcos, went out in a revolt in Chiapas, which is a southern state in Mexico. This liberation placed claims on NAFTA that aimed to claim extinction in the land distribution to the poor, especially the Indian farmers in the region. Their main reason for an armed response against the Mexican government was the demand for social justice (Xarxis, 2012). They also aimed at reclaiming their land from the white people who had evaded the area.

The EZLN had closed all the ways for agricultural products in the region, this was an action that destroyed the livelihood of the poor. In their first day of attack, they managed to capture a large number of ranches that had been snatched from the local residents. This revolt looked like an action that had no basis to the global awareness before it took place. In a short of time, the Internet was filled with Zapatista communiques where high-tech purpose statements from Chiapas rainforest were delivered (Burns & Charlip, 2007). These local resdents also posted their land reforms in the Internet.

In their place, attack as represented in the documentary demanded control of their lives and property. After some time, the two mercenary groups called for peace and justice. In the documentary, Sub-Commander, Marcos appears from the bushes carrying a red flag as an evocative of the helpless people. This documentary, “ A place called Chiapas” is a clear representation of what is in reality in terms of living a live in a contemporary Chiapas characterized with quietness and war. Therefore, the interpreter has the mandate of interpreting the true nature of social political and military of Zapatista liberation moment.

The film has abundantly crucial ideas to the audience. The film aims at showing the world how the poor and marginalized are taken advantage of the rich. The rich white minorities take advantage of the poor Indians in Chiapas by snatching away their ranches under no laid down reasons. These white people cut short all the help links such as imports and exports for their own benefits. This was a result of economic crisis and depression.

These economic disabilities led to political unrest, which resulted in the rise of liberation armies and government successions. The other idea is on the rise of the dictatorship whereby many leaders used the power they had to intimidate their eneemies. The white people are powerful and use the power they have to protect their life and property. On the other hand, they contravene the rights of the deprived and the powerless Indians in Chiapas. It is noteworthy that the Latin American region took another feature such that the Americans dominated it.

It remained that every activity took place under the rule of the white people. The third idea presented in the film is the liberation process. The rise of liberation organizations and army was in order to fight inhuman, which was practiced by the white minorities in Chiapas. This is what the documentary wants to show. It is also airing the Chiapas Indians problems to the other parts of the universe. The leader of the liberation army uses symbols to pass his message.

For example, he comes from the bushes carrying a red flag to symbolize the pain the poor are facing under the American rule in the Latin American region. In conclusion, the documentary has been used as a way of passing or airing of all the troubles that are undergone by the people in Chiapas. The director of the documentary was moved by the inhuman practices that were being practiced in Chiapas by the white minorities. The people who originally lived in these areas without a revolt could not have attained back their freedom. They revolted and acted against the wishes of the colonialist to get their ranches back.