

Guatemala

Ethnicity in Guatemala

Group selection

Guatemala's society and its political history are characterized by the dominant ladino-indigenous ethno-political cleavage (¹⁸⁴¹, 152-3; ¹⁸⁴², 111), basically a "division between Indians and non-Indians" (¹⁸⁴³, 6). The term "**Ladinos**" has come to encompass all of Guatemala's non-indigenous people (¹⁸⁴⁴, ¹⁸⁴⁵, 84, 104, 132).

The great majority of Guatemala's indigenous population belongs to the **Maya** group. There are about twenty different Maya language groups, of which the four largest, K'ichee', Mam, Kaqchikel, and Q'eqchii', make up almost 80% of the total Maya-speaking population (¹⁸⁴⁶, 13). They do not constitute a politically unified ethnic bloc (see e.g. ¹⁸⁴⁷, 18). Yet, because they were discriminated as Maya (independent of any linguistic differences) and because in the last 30 years there has been a strong national pan-Mayan political movement (¹⁸⁴⁸, 158; ¹⁸⁴⁹, ¹⁸⁵⁰, 279; ¹⁸⁵¹, ¹⁸⁵²), invoking a common "base Maya culture on a macrocultural level" (¹⁸⁵³, 17), the group is coded here as one single politically relevant ethnic category. (Note also that a national-level indigenous identity already began to emerge from 1944 on (Adams 1990).)

Population figures are highly disputed and range from about 40% of indigenous people to 60%. This analysis relies on Foster (¹⁸⁵⁴, 275) for an intermediate figure, which nevertheless acknowledges the demographic majority position of the indigenous people.

Calculating the relative size of the Maya group: From the 52% of indigenous people, specified in this source, we first need to subtract the 0.3% of people who identify as **Xinca**, a small indigenous group outside of the Maya language category. (According to the CIA, the non-Maya indigenous population makes up 0.2% of the country's population. However, the same source gives an estimate of 59.4% for Ladinos and Europeans, while the present coding (which follows ¹⁸⁵⁵) puts them at 48%. Thus, the figure of 0.2% was multiplied by the corresponding factor to arrive at an estimate of 0.3% for the Xinca in Guatemala.) Secondly, 0.2% of **Garifuna** were subtracted from this number of 52%. (The relative size of the Garifuna is based on absolute population figures by Ethnologue.) This leaves us with a remaining relative size of 51.5% of the Maya group.

¹⁸⁴¹ [Adams, 1990]

¹⁸⁴² [Azpuru, 1999]

¹⁸⁴³ [Smith, 1990b]

¹⁸⁴⁴ [Smith, 1990b]

¹⁸⁴⁵ [Taracena et al., 2009]

¹⁸⁴⁶ [Warren, 1998]

¹⁸⁴⁷ [Smith, 1990b]

¹⁸⁴⁸ [Adams, 1990]

¹⁸⁴⁹ [Fischer Brown, 1996]

¹⁸⁵⁰ [Smith, 1990a]

¹⁸⁵⁴ [Foster, 2000]

¹⁸⁵⁵ [Foster, 2000]

Power relations

Ladinos (in reality, a small "white" elite) have controlled the state for all of Guatemala's history (¹⁸⁵⁶, 153-4; ¹⁸⁵⁷, 18; ¹⁸⁵⁸, 279).

¹⁸⁵⁶ [Adams, 1990]

Whereas the immediate post-independence years were still dominated by a small white criollo elite – descendants of the Hispanic conquerors –, the so-called Liberal Revolution of 1871 represented the rise of the ladino group, originally the people of mixed European and Amerindian descent, to political power. It was their nation-building project that introduced the sharp ethnic dichotomy between a broad category of ladinos – now understood as the non-indigenous Guatemalans – and the indigenous people, which we still find today (¹⁸⁵⁹; ¹⁸⁶⁰). Under the new rulers, the state continued to be an instrument of the thin economic elite, especially the owners of the large coffee plantations. While Guatemala's liberal ideologues envisioned the cultural assimilation and national integration of the indigenous people, the actual policies implemented promoted ethnic segregation in the education sector, the labor market and the military, and the exclusion from citizenship. The economic success of the coffee elites was directly based on these policies of ethnic discrimination, as without a flourishing mining sector, the expropriation of communal indigenous lands and the forced recruitment of indigenous labor constituted the main sources of wealth (¹⁸⁶¹; ¹⁸⁶²; ¹⁸⁶³).

¹⁸⁵⁷ [Smith, 1990b]

¹⁸⁵⁸ [Smith, 1990a]

¹⁸⁵⁹ [Smith, 1990b]

¹⁸⁶⁰ [Taracena et al., 2009]

1946-1954

The first time period specified in this coding, from 1946 to 1954, refers to the short period of political and social liberalization under reformist presidents Juan Jose Arevalo and Jacobo Árbenz starting in 1944 (Guatemala's 10-year "democratic spring"). During their rule, citizenship was universalized and more liberal and progressive state policies were pursued, e.g. a land reform and the abolition of forced labor, from which the indigenous people living in the rural areas certainly benefited the most. The reforms significantly increased indigenous political participation at the local level (where they took over many political posts, like town mayors) and in general fostered indigenous collective organization (Dr. Ricardo Saenz de Tejada, Universidad de San Carlos de Guatemala, personal communication, August 4, 2014; see also ¹⁸⁶⁴). At the national level, these socio-political reforms did not change the de-facto subordination of indigenous people within Guatemalan society (¹⁸⁶⁵). Indeed, an ongoing ladino fear of Indian uprisings was omnipresent (Adams 1990). The status of the Maya within Guatemala's society during this period of social reform is well expressed in the following press editorials (quoted in ¹⁸⁶⁶), which mirror the mentality of that time: "The Guatemalan does not want to be Indian, and wishes his nation were not" (El Imparcial, January 10, 1945). "Our Indian - we are assured - is by nature lazy, ..." (El Imparcial, February 12, 1945). "Because of this, our Indians must be westernized or destroyed; but we should not keep them in their entrenched static state because we will then

¹⁸⁶⁴ [Adams, 2011]

¹⁸⁶⁵ [Adams, 2011]

¹⁸⁶⁶ [Adams, 2011]

be only a country for tourism; of curiosities; a kind of zoo for the entertainment of tourists; but never a nation” (La Hora, February 19-20, 1945). Nevertheless, the clear rupture with the past regarding the country’s citizenship regime and the possibility of free and open indigenous (i.e. Maya) mobilization in the countryside warrants a coding of the Maya group as powerless (as opposed to discriminated) in this period. The CIA-instigated coup d’etat in 1954 ended the short reformist interlude and marked the beginning of the army’s rise to Guatemala’s most powerful political (and social) institution.

1955-1995

From this point on, and until 1995, the political status of the Maya is most appropriately described as the victims of deliberate and targeted political discrimination - and often of violent oppression - by the Guatemalan state and the ladino population (¹⁸⁶⁷; ¹⁸⁶⁸, 111; ¹⁸⁶⁹, 432-3; ¹⁸⁷⁰, 385, 395-6; ¹⁸⁷¹, 187; ¹⁸⁷², 319, 322; ¹⁸⁷³, 2-3). As Brockett (¹⁸⁷⁴, 264) put it from an explicitly comparative perspective: As a contemporary manifestation of historical racism, “the people most likely to be victims of state terrorism in Central America in recent decades have been the Indians of Guatemala’s western highlands.” Central-America historian Dunkerley (¹⁸⁷⁵, 432-3), too, points at Guatemala’s exceptionality within the Central American region regarding the issue of the indigenous population: “..., their specific oppression as Indians underlies a singularity in the form of domination (...) with regard to the rest of Central America.” The year 1955 is the most appropriate year for the period change as the coup triggered a “de-facto recession in the dynamics of [Maya] political participation” (including a recapturing of local power by ladinos) (Dr. Ricardo Saenz de Tejada, Universidad de San Carlos de Guatemala, personal communication, August 4, 2014), which would eventually lead to a systematic repression of all autonomous Maya political organization by the ruling military.

Indeed, the 1970s first saw the birth of a national Maya movement, in the form of a loose collective of politico-intellectual leaders and semi-clandestine organizations (¹⁸⁷⁶, 102; ¹⁸⁷⁷, 62-5, 89-93). But the mobilization was soon crushed by the military’s “scorched earth” violence, during the heights of Guatemala’s 36-year civil war, that systematically targeted the indigenous population, considered to be the rebels’ natural support base (¹⁸⁷⁸, 89-94; ¹⁸⁷⁹, ¹⁸⁸⁰). While the war erupted within a purely classist, Cold-War framework, it soon took on an explicitly ethnic character, as the rebels recruited heavily from the indigenous population during the 1970s, and indigenous leaders in turn began to use the armed struggle for their own purposes (¹⁸⁸¹, 21-3). The military’s “scorched earth” strategy, that systematically targeted the indigenous population and indigenous leaders, was later classified as a genocide by the official Truth Commission in 1999 (Ball, Kobrak, and ¹⁸⁸²; ¹⁸⁸³; ¹⁸⁸⁴, 24; ¹⁸⁸⁵; ¹⁸⁸⁶; ¹⁸⁸⁷, 271-2; ¹⁸⁸⁸). Indeed, one of the main roots of the

¹⁸⁶⁷ [Adams, 2011]

¹⁸⁶⁸ [Azpuru, 1999]

¹⁸⁶⁹ [Dunkerley, 1988]

¹⁸⁷⁰ [Lunsford, 2007]

¹⁸⁷¹ [Perez-Brignoli, 1989]

¹⁸⁷⁶ [Cojti, 2010]

¹⁸⁷⁷ [Hale, 2006]

¹⁸⁷⁸ [Ball, Kobrak, Spierer, 1999]

¹⁸⁷⁹ [Falla, 1994]

¹⁸⁸⁰ [Schirmer, 1998]

Guatemalan civil war was precisely the total refusal of the military and the oligarchy to concede any meaningful political participation to the country's indigenous majority (1889, 395; 1890, 265-6). A civil-patrol system was created on the village level in the indigenous countryside, replacing the old community authority systems, and hundreds of thousands of indigenous men were forcibly recruited and coerced into monitoring (or terrorizing) their villages under direct military command (1891). Thus, the military came to control the indigenous countryside, and in this process whole villages were erased (1892, 25-8; 1893, 390, 394; 1894, 272, 275).

Superficial democratization, i.e. the holding of elections, from 1985 on did not really change the power structure in Guatemala; the military remained the most influential political force and the violence continued, albeit on a somewhat lower level (1895, 28-9, 32; 1896, 202; 1897, 1898, 274-5). For the sake of completeness, it must be noted that the military also implemented certain development projects in indigenous areas with the goal of economically, politically and culturally integrating indigenous people into Guatemalan society (1899, 275), but in light of the evidence it is safe to say that such integration would not have been as politically equals. Rather, the project must be seen as an attempt by the state to eradicate autonomously expressed indigenous culture (1900, 278-9; see also 1901).

1996-2017

In 1996, the Guatemalan peace accords were finally signed, including the separate 1995 accord on indigenous rights. Warren (1902, 149) refers to the peace process, started in 1994, as the actual "transition to democracy" where "the Maya could finally participate openly in national politics". The political opening served as a catalyst for Maya mobilization. Indigenous organizations, some newly created, some emerging from their previously semi-clandestine existence, took advantage of the peace process and became one of the main political forces (1903; 1904; 1905; Warren 1998). Indigenous issues were finally put on the public political agenda and Maya leaders received much attention from the mass media (1906, 111, 117-8; 1907, 150-2, 159). The national dialogues led to the recognition of Guatemala as a multiethnic and multilingual country.

However, the peace accords were non-binding in nature, to be implemented through congressional legislation and constitutional reform, and led to persistent political disputes, even within Maya organizations and communities (1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914). The national referendum on indigenous rights, emanating from the accords, but extenuated considerably by the legislative process, was defeated with 47% to 53% of votes in May 1999 (with an abstention rate of 81%). Parts of the campaign against the referendum were built upon strategies to scare voters based on images of ethnic conflict and fears of a "balkanization" of the country (1915, 1916, 189-213; 1917). The defeat of the constitutional referendum can also be

¹⁸⁹⁵ [Ball, Kobrak Spierer, 1999]

¹⁸⁹⁶ [Goodwin, 2001]

¹⁸⁹⁷ [Jonas, 1995]

¹⁸⁹⁸ [Smith, 1990a]

¹⁸⁹⁹ [Smith, 1990a]

¹⁹⁰² [Warren, 2004]

¹⁹⁰³ [Azpuru, 1999]

¹⁹⁰⁴ [Bastos Comus, 2003]

¹⁹⁰⁵ [Jonas, 2000]

¹⁹⁰⁶ [Azpuru, 1999]

¹⁹⁰⁸ [Bastos, 2010]

¹⁹⁰⁹ [Brett, 2010]

¹⁹¹⁰ [Carey, 2004]

¹⁹¹¹ [del Valle Escalante, 2009]

¹⁹¹² [Jonas, 2000]

seen as a sign of the declining political strength of the movement at the turn of the century (¹⁹¹⁸, 146; ¹⁹¹⁹).

Nevertheless, Guatemalan governments have proved to be more open towards indigenous issues since the peace accords, and some prominent Maya leaders have been appointed to governmental / administrative posts although not of major importance (¹⁹²⁰; ¹⁹²¹, 174-5). The new period inserted in 1996 reflects this change by dropping the discrimination coding. Instead, present-day Guatemala falls into what Hale (¹⁹²², ¹⁹²³) has termed "neoliberal multiculturalism", characterized by a rhetorical endorsement of cultural rights and formal equality combined with firm resistance to substantial changes in the distribution of political and economic power. The Maya are formally included in political processes, but often not more than rhetorically (¹⁹²⁴). Especially when important economic issues are at stake, indigenous people still suffer from acts of (violent) expropriation and state policies of repression and judicial persecution (¹⁹²⁵, 398; ¹⁹²⁶; ¹⁹²⁷, 196-204; ¹⁹²⁸). This situation is appropriately captured by the power status category of powerless. Correspondingly, the ladino Guatemalans are coded as dominant (instead of holding monopoly power) in this third time period.

Note that Maya group representatives do not hold effective political power above the local level (¹⁹²⁹; ¹⁹³⁰; ¹⁹³¹, 155). Therefore, the "regional autonomy" variable is coded as "no" throughout the whole time period covered in the dataset.

Xinca

While the vast majority of historiographic, anthropological, and political science literature has been concerned with Guatemala's Maya people, the history of the small Xinca group represents an outstandingly interesting case of "ethnic revival". The Xinca people are communities with communal landholdings in the southeast of the country that in the official colonial documents were still recognized as indigenous and that, in fact, feature the physical traits of Amerindian people, but which lost most of their cultural markers (including their language) over the course of the history, due to the strong presence and penetration of the Guatemalan state and economic activities in that region.

In the 1995 accord on indigenous rights, they were officially recognized as ethnic group at the instigation of the leftist guerrilla organization URNG. The URNG subsequently used the ethnic Xinca "label" strategically to create an electoral constituency for itself in that region. Since then, some people of these communities have readily taken up the ethnic bait, probably both partly out of a genuine concern with their historical roots and partly for strategic reasons. The funding available from international donors concerned with indigenous rights after the peace accords created an incentive to identify as Xinca, contributing decisively to the emergence of an albeit feeble Xinca ethno-political "movement". (The foregoing information

¹⁹²⁰ [Minority Rights Group International, 2014]

¹⁹²¹ [Warren, 2004]

¹⁹²² [Hale, 2004]

¹⁹²³ [Hale, 2006]

¹⁹²⁴ [Bastos Comus, 2003]

¹⁹²⁹ [Bastos, 2010]

¹⁹³⁰ [Minority Rights Group International, 2014]

¹⁹³¹ [Warren, 2004]

all stems from Prof. Dalila Gaitan, Universidad de San Carlos de Guatemala, personal communication, August 7, 2014).

The first political organization representing the group was the “Consejo del Pueblo Xinca de Guatemala” (COPXIG) founded in 1994, which also participated in the peace negotiations as a part of the Guatemalan civil society. In 2002, the “Consenso por la Unidad del Pueblo Xinka de Guatemala” (CONXIG) was founded and later became the “Parlamento Xinca” (also with the support of international donors) ⁽¹⁹³²⁾. Yet, this ethno-political resurgence has also caused serious divisions within these communities themselves, as many of those who “should be” Xinca are against the ethnic re-identification (Prof. Dalila Gaitan, Universidad de San Carlos de Guatemala, personal communication, August 7, 2014). Overall, thus, this can be considered a “borderline” case regarding political relevance, as defined here. However, since Xinca resistance against natural resource extraction in their territories has important repercussions in national politics, the group is coded as politically relevant (powerless) from 1996 on, i.e. after its official recognition in the peace accords.

¹⁹³² [Wikipedia, 2014]

Garifuna

A similar process of timid political mobilization can be observed in the case of another small minority in Guatemala: the black Garifuna group, a trans-national African-Caribbean people present in Honduras, Belize, Guatemala, and Nicaragua (with a large diaspora in the USA, especially in New York), which is also now attempting to politically constitute itself as a historical “nation” (Prof. Alfonso Arrivillaga, Universidad de San Carlos de Guatemala, personal communication, August 5, 2014). As in the case of the Xinca, the Garifuna group’s political activism has become noticeable at the national political level in Guatemala only since the 1995 accord on indigenous rights. As Hooker ⁽¹⁹³³⁾, 297, fn. 32) notes: “In Guatemala, (...) the Garifuna gained the same rights as the Maya by virtue of being included in the ethnic/indigenous group category ABSENT any demand on their part for such inclusion” (emphasis added).

¹⁹³³ [Hooker, 2005]

Today, they also mostly mobilize around the issue of the protection of their ancestral territories (in this case, mostly endangered by large-scale tourism projects). They are represented by ethno-political organizations, such as the “Organizacion Negra de Guatemala” (ONEGUA), “Buduru”, etc., although their mobilization also has become more intimately linked to traditional religious/spiritual movements in recent years (Prof. Alfonso Arrivillaga, Universidad de San Carlos de Guatemala, personal communication, August 5, 2014). Therefore, like the Xinca, they are coded as politically irrelevant in the first two periods and as powerless from 1996 on. It should be noted, however, that, just like the Xinca, the group is also a “borderline” case regarding political relevance as its mobilization at the national level is really marginal (see also e.g. ¹⁹³⁴).

¹⁹³⁴ [Minority Rights Group International, 2014]

Bibliography

- [Adams, 1990] Adams, Richard N. (1990). Ethnic Images and Strategies in 1944. In: Smith, C.A. (Ed.). (1990). *Guatemalan Indians and the State: 1540 to 1988* (141–162). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- [Adams, 2011] Adams, Richard, N. (2011). Democracy Delayed: The Evolution of Ethnicity in Guatemala Society, 1944-96. In: Smith, T. J. Adams, A. E. (Ed.). (2011). *After the Coup: An Ethnographic Reframing of Guatemala 1954* (134–149). Urbana, Chicago, and Springfield: University of Illinois Press.
- [Azpuru, 1999] Azpuru, Dinorah. (1999). Peace and Democratization in Guatemala: Two Parallel Processes. In: Arnson, C. J. (Ed.). (1999). *Comparative Peace Processes in Latin America* (97–125). Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.
- [Ball, KobraK Spirer, 1999] Ball, Patrick, KobraK, Paul Spirer, Herbert F.. (1999). *State Violence in Guatemala, 1960-1996: A Quantitative Reflection*. Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- [Bastos, 2010] Bastos, Santiago. (2010). La (ausencia de) demanda autonómica en Guatemala. In: M. Gonzalez, A. Burguete Cal y Mayor and P. Ortiz (Eds.). (2010). *La autonomía a debate. Autogobierno indígena y Estado plurinacional en América Latina* (317-353). Quito: FLACSO.
- [Bastos Brett, 2010] Bastos, Santiago Brett, Roddy (Eds.). (2010). *El movimiento maya en la década después de la paz (1997-2007)*. Guatemala City: F&G Editores.
- [Bastos Comus, 2003] Bastos, Santiago Camus, Manuela (2003). *Entre el mescal y el cielo. Desarrollo del movimiento Maya en Guatemala*. Guatemala City: FLACSO.
- [Brett, 2010] Brett, Roddy. (2010). De movimiento indígena a complejidad política: la evolución de las políticas indígenas 1996-2007. In: Bastos, Santiago Brett, Roddy (Eds.). (2010). *El movimiento maya en la década después de la paz (1997-2007)* (55–92). Guatemala City: F&G Editores.

- [Brockett, 1991] Brockett, Charles D. (1991). The Structure of Political Opportunities and Peasant Mobilization in Central America. *Comparative Politics*, 23(3), 253–274.
- [Carey, 2004] Carey, David. (2004). Maya Perspectives on the 1999 Referendum in Guatemala: Ethnic Equality Rejected? *Latin American Perspectives*, 31(6), 69-95.
- [Cojti, 2010] Cojti, Demetrio. (2010). La educación superior indígena y su relación con el movimiento y liderazgo indígenas." In: Bastos, Santiago Brett, Roddy (Eds.). (2010). *El movimiento maya en la década despues de la paz (1997-2007)* (93–133). Guatemala City: F&G Editores.
- [del Valle Escalante, 2009] del Valle Escalante, Emilio. (2009). *Maya Nationalisms and Postcolonial Challenges in Guatemala: Coloniality, Modernity, and Identity Politics*. Santa Fe, NM: School for Advanced Research Press.
- [Dunkerley, 1988] Dunkerley, James. (1988). *Power in the Isthmus: A Political History of Modern Central America*. London, UK: Verso.
- [Falla, 1994] Falla, Ricardo. (1994). *Massacres in the Jungle: Ixcán, Guatemala, 1975-1982*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- [Fischer Brown, 1996] Fischer, Edward F., Brown, R. McKenna. (1996). Introduction: Maya Cultural Activism in Guatemala. In Fischer, Edward F., Brown, R. McKenna. (Eds.). (1996). *Maya Cultural Activism in Guatemala* (1–18). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- [Foster, 2000] Foster, Lynn V. (2000). *A Brief History of Central America*. New York: Facts on File.
- [Goodwin, 2001] Goodwin, Jeff. (2001). *No Other Way Out: States and Revolutionary Movements, 1945-1991*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [Hale, 2004] Hale, Charles R. (2004). Rethinking Indigenous Politics in the Era of the 'Indio Permitido'. *NACLA Report on the Americas*, 38(2), 16–21.
- [Hale, 2006] Hale, Charles R. (2006). *Más que un Indio - More Than an Indian*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- [Hooker, 2005] Hooker, Juliet. (2005). "Indigenous Inclusion/Black Exclusion: Race, Ethnicity and Multicultural Citizenship in Latin America." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 37 (2):285-310.
- [Jonas, 1995] Jonas, Susanne. (1995). Electoral Problems and the Democratic Project in Guatemala. In: Seligson, M. A. Booth, J. A.. (Eds.). (1995). *Elections and Democracy in Central America*,

- Revisited (25–44). Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- [Jonas, 2000] Jonas, Susanne. (2000). *Of Centaurs and Doves: Guatemala's Peace Process*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- [Lunsford, 2007] Lunsford, Sharon. (2007). *Guatemala (1974-1994)*. In: De Rouen, K. R. Heo, U. (Eds.). (2007). *Civil Wars of the World: Major Conflicts since World War II (385–402)*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- [Manz, 2002] Manz, Beatriz. (2002). *Terror, Grief, and Recovery: Genocidal Trauma in a Mayan Village in Guatemala*. In: Hinton, L. A. (Ed.). (2002). *Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of Genocide (292–309)*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- [Martinez Pelaez, 1998] Martinez Pelaez, Severo. (1998). *La patria del criollo: ensayo de interpretación de la realidad colonial guatemalteca*. 2nd ed. Mexico, D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- [Minority Rights Group International, 2014] Minority Rights Group International. (2014). *World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples*. Minority Rights Group International 2007. Retrieved on 6.2.2014 from: <http://www.minorityrights.org/744/directory/world-directory-of-minorities-and-indigenous-peoples.html>
- [Montejo, 2005] Montejo, Victor. (2005). *Maya Intellectual Renaissance: Identity, Representation, and Leadership*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- [Perez-Brignoli, 1989] Perez-Brignoli, Hector. (1989). *A Brief History of Central America*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- [Plant, 1999] Plant, Roger. (1999). *Indigenous Identity and Rights in the Guatemalan Peace Process*. In: Arnson, C. J. (Ed.). (1999). *Comparative Peace Processes in Latin America (319–338)*. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.
- [Schirmer, 1998] Schirmer, Jennifer. (1998). *The Guatemalan Military Project: A Violence Called Democracy*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- [Sieder et al., 2002] Sieder, Rachel, Thomas, Megan, Vickers, George Spence, Jack. (2002). *Who Governs? Guatemala Five Years After the Peace Accords*. Cambridge, MA: Hemisphere Initiatives.
- [Smith, 1990a] Smith, Carol A. (1990a). *Conclusion: History and Revolution in Guatemala*. In: Smith, Carol A. (Ed.). (1990a). *Guatemalan Indians and the State: 1540 to 1988 (258–285)*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

- [Smith, 1990b] Smith, Carol A. (1990b). Introduction: Social Relations in Guatemala over Time and Space. In: Smith, Carol A. (Ed.). (1990a). *Guatemalan Indians and the State: 1540 to 1988* (1–30). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- [Taracena et al., 2009] Taracena, Arturo, Gellert, Gisela, Gordillo, Enrique, Sagastume, Tania Walter, Knut. (2009). *Etnicidad, Estado y Nación en Guatemala, 1808-1944*, vol. 1. 2nd ed. Antigua Guatemala: CIRMA.
- [Velasquez and Alicia, 2008] Velasquez Nimatuj Alicia, Irma. (2008). *Pueblos indígenas, estado y lucha por tierra en Guatemala: estrategias de sobrevivencia y negociación ante la desigualdad globalizada*. Guatemala City: AVANCSO.
- [Warren, 1998] Warren, Kay B. (1998). *Indigenous Movements and Their Critics: Pan-Maya Activism in Guatemala*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- [Warren, 2004] Warren, Kay B. (2004). Voting Against Indigenous Rights in Guatemala: Lessons from the 1999 Referendum. In: Warren, Kay B. Jackson, J. E. (Ed.). (2004). *Movements, Self-Representation, and the State in Latin America* (149–180). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- [Witte, 2005] Witte, Benjamin. (2005). Multinational Gold Rush in Guatemala. *NACLA Report on the Americas*, 39(1), 8.
- [Wikipedia, 2014] Wikipedia. (2014). Xinka people. Retrieved on 2.12.2014 from: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Xinka_people

Political status of ethnic groups in Guatemala

From 1946 until 1954

Group name	Proportional size	Political status
Maya	0.515	POWERLESS
Ladinos	0.48	MONOPOLY
Xinca	0.003	IRRELEVANT
Garífuna	0.002	IRRELEVANT

From 1955 until 1995

Group name	Proportional size	Political status
Maya	0.515	DISCRIMINATED
Ladinos	0.48	MONOPOLY
Xinca	0.003	IRRELEVANT
Garífuna	0.002	IRRELEVANT

From 1996 until 2017

Group name	Proportional size	Political status
Maya	0.515	POWERLESS
Ladinos	0.48	DOMINANT
Xinca	0.003	POWERLESS
Garífuna	0.002	POWERLESS




Figure 349: Political status of ethnic groups in Guatemala during 1946-1954.



Figure 350: Political status of ethnic groups in Guatemala during 1955-1995.




Figure 351: Political status of ethnic groups in Guatemala during 1996-2017.

Geographical coverage of ethnic groups in Guatemala

From 1946 until 1995




Figure 352: Map of ethnic groups in Guatemala during 1946-1995.

Group name	Area in km ²	Type
■ Ladinos	109 021	Statewide
■ Maya	52 082	Regionally based

Table 116: List of ethnic groups in Guatemala during 1946-1995.

From 1996 until 2017




Figure 353: Map of ethnic groups in Guatemala during 1996-2017.

Group name	Area in km ²	Type
Ladinos	109 021	Statewide
Maya	52 082	Regionally based
Xinca	330	Regionally based
Garífuna	82	Regionally based

Table 117: List of ethnic groups in Guatemala during 1996-2017.

Conflicts in Guatemala

Starting on 1949-07-17

Side A	Side B	Group name	Start	Claim	Recruitment	Support
Government of Guatemala	Military faction (Guatemala)		1949-07-17			
Government of Guatemala	Forces of Carlos Castillo Armas	Ladinos	1954-06-17	No	No	No
Government of Guatemala	FAR I	Ladinos	1963-03-21	No	Yes, from EGIP	Split
Government of Guatemala	FAR II	Ladinos	1970-12-30	No	Yes, from EGIP	Split
Government of Guatemala	EGP	Maya	1975-05-30	Explicit	Yes	Yes
Government of Guatemala	ORPA	Maya	1979-11-29	Presumed	Yes	Yes
Government of Guatemala	URNG	Maya	1982-03-30	Presumed	Yes	Yes