INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Development from Within: A Key to Lasting Peace and
Human Development in Guatemala

By

Elizabeth Leiva B.S.W (Hon.)

A thesis submitted to
The Faculty of Graduate Studies and research
in partial fulfilment of
the requirement for the degree of

Master of Social Work

School of Social Work

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario

April, 1997

© Copyright
1997, Elizabeth Leiva

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-22147-4

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research acceptance of the thesis

“Development From Within: A key to lasting peace
and human development in Guatemala”

submitted by Elizabeth Leiva, B.S.W.

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Social Work

Thesis Supervisor

Director, School of Social Work

Carleton University

April 28/97

ABSTRACT

Peace has come to Guatemala, and the civil war has come to an end after four decades of conflict. It is important to evaluate the basis upon which peace will be built, and how and if it will reverse the social, economic, political and cultural marginalization of indigenous peoples.

Drawing upon the concepts of eurocentrism and internal colonization, this thesis explores the conceptual root causes of civil war and attempts to determine whether or not the Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord, and the Right of Indigenous Peoples Accord, which are core Accords of the "Firm and Lasting Peace Plan", are likely to change or merely reflect the past.

This thesis comes to the conclusion that the policies embedded in these core Accords are very likely to continue to be governed by internal colonization and foreign eurocentric development prescriptions. Therefore, the only way to reverse this marginalization and to achieve a lasting peace is a more wholistic and inclusive form of development emanating from within, based on Guatemala's human, cultural and spiritual needs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank my advisor Allan Moscovitch for his time, patience and support. I would also like to express my sincere appreciation to my other committee members, Elizabeth Whitmore, and Manfred Bienefeld for all their support, friendly advice, and motivation they have given me.

I would like to thanks all my family and friends who generously encouraged and supported me. I am particularly indebted to my mother for all her help and support. I owe her the deepest intellectual debt. This thesis, and my education in general, could not have been possible without her support.

The history of Guatemala which we narrate is one of suffering, and pain, but also one of joy, perseverance, and endurance. We will speak of aggression, abuses, poverty and devastation of this country and its people, not to seek sympathy but rather to invite the world to start to listen, to reflect and to learn (The Committee of Campesino Unity of Guatemala (CUC in Nash, 1995: 23)

TABLE OF CONTENT

1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 RESEARCH DEFINITION	3
1.2 SOCIAL WORK AND SOCIAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	5
1.3 ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY	8
2.0 GUATEMALA'S INDIGENOUS PEOPLE: THE LEGACY OF HISTORY	10
2.1 INTRODUCTION	10
2.2 SETTING THE SCENE: GEOGRAPHY DEVELOPMENT AND ETHNICITY IN GUATEMALA	10
2.3 HISTORY OF GUATEMALA'S POLITICAL ECONOMY AND THE SITUATION OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES	16
2.4 THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF HOW PEACE CAME TO GUATEMALA	29
3.0 PRESENT SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND NATIVE PEOPLES MARGINALIZATION	38
3.1 INTRODUCTION	38
3.2 CURRENT STATE OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT	38
3.3 NATIVE PEOPLE, STATE, AND MARGINALIZATION	44
4.0 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK, SOURCES, METHODOLOGY, AND QUESTIONS	60
4.1 INTRODUCTION	60
4.2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	61
4.3 SOURCES, METHODOLOGY AND QUESTIONS	64
5.0 ANALYSIS OF THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC ACCORD AND THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES	74
5.1 INTRODUCTION	74
5.2 SOCIO- ECONOMIC AND AGRARIAN ISSUES ACCORD	82
5.3 THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS ACCORD	104
6.0 DEVELOPMENT FROM WITHIN: A KEY TO LASTING PEACE AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT IN GUATEMALA	116
6.1 INTRODUCTION	116
6.2 WHY DEVELOPMENT FROM WITHIN IS NEEDED IN GUATEMALA	116
7.0 CONCLUSION	130

CHAPTER 1

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Guatemala had been in a state of Civil War since the early 1950's. However, the bloodiest and longest war in the hemisphere has finally come to an end. Though it has left the country with an immense social debt. Approximately 100,000 people died, 75,000 were widowed, approximately 70,000 were orphaned, and about a 1,000,000 people had to seek refuge in other countries around the world.

Right now, the country is going through major changes. It is moving from war to peace, and it is more aggressively integrating into the global economy. The country is facing major economic changes based on economic deregulation, reduced fiscal spending and free trade. It seems likely that the "Firm and Lasting Peace Accord" signed on December 29, 1997 and the installation of the new president as of January 1996, will provide final closure to Guatemala's civil war, now more than four decades old. The end of the war will not be the end of Guatemala's problems, however. The socio-economic, cultural, and political conditions that gave rise to the armed conflict, far from having been improved, have actually deteriorated. Politically, postwar Guatemala will be characterized by a complex set of old and new demands that must be resolved if justice and lasting peace are to be achieved.

In theory, the "democratization" of Guatemala will create political stability which will in turn create the conditions required for market growth. In this context the devastation in which the country now lies will soon change for the better, since the country will enjoy a peaceful, prosperous, dynamic and efficient future. This will in turn create health, wealth and happiness for all.

In practice, however, the Peace Accord will first lead to a cease-fire between the two major players: the army and the guerrillas. It will also lead to an increase of international investment in the country, as Guatemala will no longer be on the list of countries in conflict. Instead, it will get onto the list of nations in a so-called "transition to democracy" and in the process of "strengthening civil society", phrases that are the talk of the day.

Further, in the short term, since Guatemala is now a member of the "democratic world", it will receive aid from international organizations. This will enable the creation of short-term remedial projects and consolidate peace without touching the roots of the civil war problems. The elites of the country are very pleased that signing this peace plan cannot lead to a return to the recent past, and they will be free to implement and continue their policies without any fear of social unrest. International institutions such as the

United Nations and the Organization of American States, the Group of Friends of the Guatemalan Peace Plan (Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela, Spain, the U.S, and Norway) and other Latin American countries, are major players in this discourse, praising and legitimizing this process. During the war, as throughout the history of the country, native peoples have been the primary victims of mal-development and societal inequalities within the country. The purpose of my study is to critically evaluate those Accords outlined in the peace plan which are intended to reverse native peoples' marginalization and disempowerment.

1.1 RESEARCH DEFINITION

War is over but development, well-being, and safe life are still to be achieved. If peace and democracy are to be solid and permanent, they will have to be built on sounder social and economic foundations (Vilas, 1996: 503).

This study will analyze the eurocentric development prescriptions practised by the Guatemalan state from colonization to the present time. It will also analyze the internal social structure of Guatemalan society. Based on this understanding, I will argue that both of these factors have led to the marginalization of indigenous peoples. These factors are therefore central to the understanding of civil war and peace in Guatemala. This study will analyze two core Accords of the Peace Plan: the Accord on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the Accord on Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues.

The first Accord is intended to deal with the societal marginalization of indigenous peoples. The latter is intended to deal with socio-economic and agrarian issues, focusing particularly on social development, land reform and its impact on native peoples. I will argue that these two Accords were signed having as a base the neo-liberal, eurocentric development model that fosters the continuation of societal structures and marginalizes social development. There is evidence that eurocentric prescriptions of development have not worked for Guatemala; instead they have broadened and perpetuated structural societal inequalities, and undermined social development.

The underlying socio-economic conditions that precipitated the revolutionary movement remain unchanged, and indeed in some respects they are more pressing now than they were three or four decades ago. Guatemala has emerged from its recent traumatic past with a large segment of the population living in poverty or under very unsatisfactory standards of health, education and housing. There are high levels of unemployment and under-employment, diminishing earnings, and a disturbing level of daily violence. Social inequalities related to race, gender and class are still deeper in Guatemala than they are in other countries of the hemisphere, not to mention other innumerable societal problems.

My argument is that these two Accords are intended to ameliorate structural societal inequalities and social development. However, they have been built on the same societal structure of internal colonization and a neo-liberal, eurocentric prescription of development. Further, I will argue that these two pillars cannot be the base on which sustainable democratic development and lasting peace are built in Guatemala.

1.2 SOCIAL WORK AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The social work profession takes on different forms of practice, according to where it operates. In the context of Latin America and thus Guatemala, the developmental approach to the improvement of the well-being of people is the model with which the majority of social workers operate. This model takes the form of community development, community education, community action, and social policy analysis.

The clinical approach to social work remains a luxury for most of the people in Latin America. Satisfaction of the most basic human needs is more important for people dealing with extreme poverty. Therefore, finding out how people could bring food on the table tomorrow, is more important than providing a few hours of individual clinical counselling today.

Due to the nature of the social work profession, social workers anywhere in the world have direct contact with the poor and marginalized sectors of the society and have experience dealing with the micro social impact of macro social development planning. Social development purposefully links social intervention to development. This requires the effective integration of social and economic policies within a wider developmental process. Economic development is meaningless unless it is accompanied by improvement in social welfare for the whole population. However, this has not been the case. Midgley summarized this in the following way:

Those responsible for economic development have shown little interest in social development and those responsible for social development have seldom considered how social programs affect economic growth. Generally, social development and economic development have been artificially separated (Midgley, 1996: 6).

The above difference is also made between social work and social development. Elliot explains how this happened:

The interdisciplinary nature of social development has tended to ignore individual social development at the micro-level and has emphasized economic planning. Social work is increasingly concerned with micro-clinical practice. It emphasizes the curative medical model and individual pathology and sees little in common with macro-theories (Elliot, 1993: 27).

The aim of my study, however, is to show that social work should be concerned with social development and also with the socio-political and economic framework in which macro planning takes place in developing and developed countries. Social

workers, by the nature of their direct relations with the people they serve, are well-equipped to understand both policy and practice when dealing with the marginalization of peoples in a society. Since social workers understand both policy and practice, there is a need to incorporate their views at the planning level of social development.

This study hopes to contribute to the understanding of the importance of the relationship between socio-economic development and the negative spill-over it has on the poor and marginalized with whom social workers stand. Finally, there is a relationship between the national and the international setting in which poverty takes place, and the people we serve in both the developed and developing countries. As Elliot stated:

"Social Work should act to prevent and eliminate discrimination and should act to expand choices and opportunity for all persons, with special regard for disadvantaged groups including the micro and macro level and also the international dimension" (Elliot, 1993: 23).

This thesis aims to link the micro and macro levels together with the international; it is in this context that the social work profession should operate. It deals with the macro component because it focuses on macro government planning and social development and the marginalization of native peoples. It touches on the micro level because it speaks to the ramifications of macro development planning on

marginalized sectors of the society. When macro social planning and micro social results are discordant, problems arise.

A social worker who combines these approaches will understand individuals as a part of their socio-economic and political context and will not use the "blaming the victim" approach. Instead, she/he will work to empower people by understanding both the micro and the macro components in which poverty and the marginalization of individuals take place.

1.3. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This thesis is divided into seven chapters. In Chapter Two, I will provide an analysis of major historical developments, including social, economic and political dimensions. These historical analyses will mainly provide the setting for an analysis of the two Accords. Particular attention will be focused on certain social, economic and political developments in Guatemala between colonization and the present time in order to show the role that these have played in shaping current developments in Guatemala. I believe that this historical analysis is necessary to explain the present day conditions of native peoples. Further, these historical analyses will provide the setting for an analysis of the two Accords.

In Chapter Three, I will briefly analyze the current state of native peoples regarding social development and their marginalization in the Guatemalan society. In Chapter Four, I will discuss the theoretical framework used in the analysis of this thesis as well as the sources and methodology used in the analysis of key Accords.

In Chapter Five, I will evaluate the Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord and the Right of Indigenous Peoples Accord, based on the theoretical framework outlined in Chapter Four. In Chapter Six I suggest "development from within" as a key to a lasting peace and democratic human development in Guatemala. Finally, Chapter Seven will provide a general conclusion and identify the lessons to be learned from this study.

CHAPTER 2

2.0 GUATEMALA INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' HISTORICAL LEGACY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I will provide first the geographical location of the native peoples and development of this areas. Secondly, I will provide an analysis of structures introduced by Spanish rulers in Guatemala, and the consequences these have had from post-colonial times to the present on native peoples, and also on major social, economic and political developments that have taken place in the country. Finally I will outline the political and economic framework within which peace came to Guatemala. This chapter will provide the setting in which I will conduct the long term analysis which appears later in this thesis.

2.2. SETTING THE SCENE: GEOGRAPHY DEVELOPMENT AND ETHNICITY IN GUATEMALA

The total area of Guatemala is 108,889 square km. Its population is estimated to be slightly over 10 million people, growing at an annual rate of 2.9%. Over 60% of the population is made up of Mayan people, approximately 1% is made up of Garifuna (African descents) and Xinca (a native group whose roots are traced to the indigenous Nahuas of Mexico). The rest of the population is ladino (mainly mixed

Spanish native) and white people (Munoz-Paz, 1994). Although urbanization is occurring at a rapid pace, Guatemala remains a primarily agrarian society as 59% of all Guatemalans live in rural areas (most of them indigenous Maya), despite an urban growth rate of 3.5% (Fao, 1994).

The central area includes the departments of Zacatepequez, Chimaltenango, and Guatemala. The first two departments hold a large native population, most of whom work in the tourist industry as small traders and sellers. The rest are small agricultural producers. Guatemala City holds 20% of the nation's populace, and most of the country's industry. Most of the native peoples living in the city are migrants from the countryside, from where they have been forced to migrate due to the war or in search of better life conditions after being displaced from their land. The majority of them inhabit the marginal areas of the city and live mainly in shanty towns under very unhealthy conditions (Munoz-Paz, 1994).

The western highlands hold approximately half of the country's population (Smith, 1990: 6). It is the Mayan heartland where most of the Mayan population lives. This is the place where they were first encountered by the conquistadors. This population is distinguished by many linguistic, cultural and religious cleavages. Some inhabitants

have access to some land on which they grow milpa (maize and beans) and some market crops. Approximately 37% of the rural population is landless. However, the land holdings of those who do have land have declined from 1.71 to 0.79 hectares per person over the last 40 years (Garder, 1991: 10). Another observer estimated a decrease from 1.3 hectares in 1950 to less than 0.85 hectares per person in 1980 (Davis, 1988: 10). Intensive farming, the subdivision of land among children, and massive deforestation continue to diminish the quality and plot size of the small-farm holding. Poverty is wide-spread throughout Guatemala. However, the levels of poverty found among the population of the western highlands are devastating (Carmarck, 1996).

Indigenous peasant communities are concentrated in the highland region on tiny farm plots, which are invariably too small to provide for adequate subsistence. They have been fragmented over time as demographic pressures have increased both landlessness and near-landlessness. In consequence, entire indigenous communities are forced to migrate for a few months of the year, mostly to the southern coast, where indigenous peoples from this region comprise the bulk of the seasonal labour supply for commercial agriculture. The expansion of coffee, cotton and sugar plantations, and the most recently of non-traditional products, including mainly fruit and vegetable farming, rests on the shoulders of this

indigenous migrant labour. Despite the region's lack of land, the process of diversification and decentralization, which is part of the structural adjustment package of the late 1980's, has targeted the western highlands to produce the so-called cash crops for export (Carmarck, 1996).

On the southern pacific coast, latifundia, or large holdings, predominate. In this fertile area, cotton, sugar cane and cattle ranching have grown in importance as exports since the 1950s. However, during the past decade, sugar and cotton exports have decreased in value, while valuable coastal land has been destroyed due to unsound agricultural practice. An environmental study done in Guatemala point out a disturbing picture:

Pesticide misuse on the pacific coast cotton plantations is responsible for what has been recognized as the region's --if not the hemisphere's -- most pressing environmental contamination and human health problems (Vilas, 1995: 30).

Vilas also describes the devastation of the region in the following way:

After four decades, Central America's cotton cycle has come to an end. New changes in international markets have sounded the death knell for the "white gold" that ruled the region from the beginning of the 1950s. The dethroned king leaves a trail of exhausted soil, lost forest, and sand and dust where there once was food and birds and streams (Vilas, 1995: 40).

The north and northeast part of Guatemala comprises the departments of Peten, Alta Verapaz, Baja Verapaz, and Izabal. The area of Peten is densely covered by tropical rainforest and is the country's least populated region. Here, there has been major devastation through forest destruction by small holders, migration, and pasture expansion, as well as by the wood industry stripping the most valuable woods from the area. The destruction of the forest is currently said to contribute up to 2% of the GDP and 1.5% of export revenues. Izabal, which is home of the Garifuna peoples (of African descent), is dominated by foreign, largely American owned, banana plantations. The area of Alta Verapaz and Baja Verapaz holds a large native population. In this region cardamon and coffee farms are found as well as silver and uranium mines and some oil fields. In this area, as on the southern coast, both native people's labour and the land is exploited immensely (Wilson, 1995: 32).

Only two native groups inhabit the eastern highland region: the Chorti in the department of Chiquimula and part of Zacapa, and the Xinca in the department of Santa Rosa. This area being mostly dry, the region is exploited mainly for cattle ranching and mining. Native peoples constitute the minority in this region; they are however, the poorest of the poor (Munoz-Paz, 1994).

Having explained the geographical location of indigenous peoples and broad patterns of development, I will explore the roots of native peoples' struggle in Guatemala. To do so, I will provide a brief history of the political economy of Guatemala from colonial times to the present, which includes: the beginning of capitalist mercantilistic development in colonial times, as well as liberal post-independence reforms that lead to the dispossession of native peoples from their land; secondly, the capitalist expansion of the 1950's, the struggle of native peoples, and state repression to keep control of the accumulation process, leading to the outbreak of civil war; thirdly, structural adjustment and stabilization policies of the 1980's, and, the associated political changes; finally, the end of civil war and the peace process and the current further globalization of Guatemala's economy. Only by understanding the political and economic context of the indigenous peoples' struggle can we attempt to explain the development of civil war in Guatemala. By looking at the colonial, post-colonial, democratic interlude, and authoritarian periods separately, it is possible to highlight a number of factors which are essential to understanding the past and the present of Guatemala.

2.3 HISTORY OF GUATEMALA POLITICAL ECONOMY AND THE SITUATION OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

2.3.1 Colonial Times

Guatemala became a Spanish colony in 1524. Under colonial rule, the creole (people born in the colony of Spanish parents) and peninsular (people sent by the crown) exploited the abundant natural resources and cheap indigenous labour to produce commercial products for export such as indigo, cacao, sugar and cochineal (Beer, 1992). Since colonial days, the Guatemalan economy has been characterized by a bimodal agricultural sector based on a very unequal power relationship between large landholders, who own plantations called latifundia, and peasants, who own small plots of land called minifundia (Beer, 1992; Handy, 1984).

2.3.2 Post-Independence

From Guatemala's independence in 1821 to the early 1940s, the country was ruled by a series of Liberal Caudillos, or military chiefs. During this period, the latifundia-minifundia system was transformed into one dominated by large modern agro-enterprises, but leaving rural subsistence peasants little affected. The pattern of concentration of power and wealth in the hands of a small group of large landowners and industrialists was little altered by this transformation (Beer, 1992). The coffee industry was run largely by German

interests, while the banana and fruit industry, as well as the utilities, shipping and transport sector were developed and dominated by American interests mainly, in the form of the United Fruit Co (Beer, 1992; Wright, 1992; Handy, 1984).

By the 1940s, frustrations were mounting in response to the lack of economic opportunities, increasing impoverishment and the increasing influence of US investment (Handy, 1984; Woodward, 1985). In early 1944, driven by the success of a similar movement in El Salvador, an alliance of students, professionals, military cadets and farmers forced the resignation of Jorge Ubico, the last of the Liberal era's Caudillo. Later that year in the October 20 Revolution, an election was called in which Juan Jose Arevalo was elected (Handy, 1984).

2.3.3 Democratic Interlude

Between 1944 and 1954 Guatemala passed through a democratic interlude. This period is usually referred to as the "10 years of spring" in Guatemala. The democratically elected presidents, Jose Arevalo and Jacobo Arbenz adopted radical reformist policies to democratize the country. They introduced major social and political reforms including the abolition of the forced Labour Law. They encouraged union organizations, set up social welfare programs, land reform programs, and nationalization of major companies such as the

American-owned United Fruit Company (UFCO) and the expropriation of land from the German coffee plantations (Handy, 1994).

The United States considered Arbenz's land reform to be a communist threat, (some of the land falling under the land reform belonged to the United Fruit Company) and in 1954, the Arbenz (the last president of the ten years of spring) government fell to a CIA-backed coup supported by the United Fruit company (Handy, 1994, Wright, 1992). The central aim of the coup was to protect the business interests of the companies that had been threatened by a series of land reforms and legislative changes during the decade of democratic interlude. The military dictatorship of Carlos Castillo Armas was installed after 1954 with the help of the U.S. The ten years of Spring of Guatemala thus came to an abrupt end, and from this time military regimes continuously ruled the country with an iron hand until 1986 (Handy, 1994: 15).

The full implications of the democratic interlude and the land reforms are still the subject of debate. Two things are true however: one is that, in the history of Guatemala, this is the only period in which the State intended to reduce the structural inequalities existing in the country. The other fact is that there were powerful external forces that opposed the changes taking place in the country.

2.3.4 Capitalist Expansion and the Break Out of Civil War

Since 1954, Guatemala's economy has increasingly diversified as the state has aggressively submitted the country to capitalist expansion (Torres-Rivas, 1980). As in most Latin American countries, import substitution industrialization policies were initially adopted, although in Guatemala these were primarily directed towards expanding intra-regional, rather than national, markets. Through the Central America Common Market (MCCA), Guatemala's industrial sector expanded rapidly during the 1960's to become the largest in the region. Tourism became a focus for investment. Traditional exports expanded, as in all of Central America, to include cotton, coffee, sugar, beef, bananas and cardamon. Large areas of Guatemala were brought into export production as a result (Torres-Rivas, 1980; Handy, 1984).

Throughout the 1950's, 1960's, and the 1970's, coffee, bananas, cotton, sugar, beef and cardamon earned the bulk of Guatemala's foreign exchange. Over this period, the amount of land under cultivation for export crops increased dramatically. Between 1950 and 1977, coffee lands increased from 162,000 to 270,000 hectares, while lands dedicated to banana production jumped from 17,000 to 59,000 hectares. The area used for sugar production more than doubled from 32,000 hectares in 1961 to 85,000 hectares in 1977. By contrast, in

these three decades, land devoted to producing the staple crop maize actually declined from 538,000 to 522,000 hectares, despite the fact that the population tripled in the same period (Colchester, 1991: 178). Increased use of land for cattle grazing has had particularly adverse effects on Guatemalan peasants. In the 1950's and 1960's, the cattle industry doubled from one to two million heads in pasture, almost exclusively for export to the US (Torres-Rivas, 1980; Colchester, 1991).

Heavily funded by US-AID and multi-lateral development banks, beef production accelerated deforestation and created a permanent condition of poverty for much of the population. Peasants are thrown off even the most marginal lands because cattle can be raised where other exports cannot. Further deforestation results as people dispossessed from their land move to higher, less arable land or migrate to the Peten. The cattle industry has increased unemployment, since cattle ranching requires fewer workers and displaces other, more labour intensive agriculture. This has led to the bitter irony that beef consumption within Guatemala is less than half of what it was ten years ago (EPOCA, 1991: 15).

Expansion of agro-exports, and some diversification into the production of processed agricultural commodities, have constituted the foundation of Guatemala's post-1954 development, providing much of the capital for the rising consumption of the minority of the population. During this period of rapid economic growth, the Guatemalan economy has recorded by annual growth rates of 5 percent or more. According to macro-economic indicators, export income was sufficient to mitigate the shocks of the first international

oil crisis in 1973 (Jonas, 1991: 76). The effects on the poor majority, however, were mostly negative. Numerous writers have intimately linked the last three decades of agro-export expansion in Central America to wide-spread impoverishment and the subsequent armed conflict which arose during this time. Poverty worsened; land that had been redistributed to the poor peasants between 1944 and 1954, was restored to the original landowners; and no major land reform has been carried out subsequently to reverse this process (Jonas, 1991).

Such neglect of agrarian reform has contributed to the sustenance of the distorted wealth and power distribution patterns that had originated in the colonial era (Beer, 1992). The result was a combination of massive poverty and therefore a deterioration of the basic social welfare of the population. This in turn, led to political upheaval and the outbreak of civil war in Guatemala, and the formation of the revolutionary groups. The country was ruled by very repressive military governments which did not allow people any other alternative to present their demands (Jonas, 1991; Vilas, 1995).

The 1950's were a crucial period for Central America. At this time, Central America experienced the full consolidation of the capitalist development model that had been introduced by the Spaniards at the time of colonization. Vilas (1995),

argues that:

The process of modernization did not originate with the post-1950 agroexport boom. There was a dramatic acceleration in forces and trends already in existence, the most significant roots of which probably lie is the rural dispossession of indigenous communities in the colonial times and that which follow by the liberal reform of the seconds half of the nineteenth century (Vilas, 1995: 52)

He further argues that there has been an enormous social cost of capitalist modernization, which has included the impoverishment and degradation of peasant economies and patterns of life (Vilas, 1995 :14).

The model for economic growth exacerbated the inequalities inherent in an agricultural society; once again, diversification and modernization of export agriculture were based on the gap between the sector based on vast land holding and capital investment, which responded to international demands, and the internal market sector, which had been reduced to a minifundia comprised of impoverished rural masses living below minimum subsistence level (Torres-Rivas, 1986: 50).

2.2.5 Structural Adjustment

In the early 1980's, to worsen an already bad situation, structural adjustment programs were imposed upon, and adopted by, states across Latin America as a response to the debt crisis of the early 1980's and the conditions attached by the international financial institutions primarily International Monetary Fund and the World Bank to the loans they made available in response. Adjustment has been applied with a very broad brush, and very little consideration has been given to the specific circumstances presented by different

economies. At the height of the Latin American debt crisis in 1984, Guatemala's total external debt as percentage of GDP was 26.3% (Moe, 1989).

The remedy for economic distress prescribed by the IMF and World Bank in recent years is essentially the old tonic stabilization (less Government spending and tighter credit) plus the new elixir of export promotion (CAPA, 1996: 18).

This has resulted in policies that have promoted the assembly of manufactured goods, or outsourcing. Some tariff-free assembly zones currently exist, and large numbers of Korean, Guatemalan and US-owned maquilas are operating there. Furthermore in Guatemala, as in many Latin American countries, the adjustment process brought a new emphasis on non-traditional agricultural exports. Although the term non-traditional is a relative one for each country, the general idea was to promote the cultivation of new agricultural products, for consumption in the north, in order to earn hard currency to pay the debt (Moe, 1989).

In the 1980's and 1990's this version of non-traditional export promotion has included products such as melon, snow peas, broccoli and flowers. In 1992, non-traditional exports were a \$43 million dollar business, and they have continued to since (Gexport, 1993). These agricultural products can be quickly shipped fresh, chilled or frozen, for consumption in the north, feeding the rapidly growing northern demand for

exotic and out-of-season fruits and vegetables. Despite more than 15 years of exporting vegetables, the benefits of this booming agro-export sector, like those of earliest booming exports, have not trickled down in any discernible way to the poor majority (Gexport, 1987) Vilas nicely summarized this in the following paragraph:

The extensive nature of agroexport development involved a drastic process of crop substitution and the displacement of subsistence crops towards marginal areas, while basic grains began to be imported for domestic consumption. The economy ceases to utilize land to produce food, instead producing exportable goods that generate income in foreign exchange. The majority of Central American peasants who stopped producing corn in order to grow vegetables did not switch over to eating imported corn: they simply began to eat less (Vilas, 1995: 44-45).

The Guatemalan counter-revolution of 1954 preceded capitalist modernization; modernization, when it came, carried the mask of a repressive state (Vilas, 1995: 171). Government repression of the people was exacerbated in the period of 1978-1985, a period marked by severe economic decline and political upheaval, the most brutal phase being that in the early 1980's under the command of general Rios Montt. At this time, an estimated 50,000 to 100,000 Guatemalans were killed, 400 native communities were burned down, a 250,000 people sought refuge outside the country, and up to 1,000,000 people were internally displaced in what is now commonly referred to as the "Violence" (Black, 1985). Labour unions, cooperatives, the church, community development leaders, academics,

students, teachers, nurses, social workers, anthropologist etc., were targeted. However, the indigenous peoples were so severely affected that the state has been charged with genocide by various human rights monitors and church groups (Black, 1985). Ultimately the rapid and violent capitalist modernization of the Guatemalan economy in the 1950's and the diversification into non-traditional crops in the 1980's, have created the following categories of people as gainers and losers.

As Vilas put it:

In Central America, however, capitalist modernization and the rebuilding of relations among the dominant fractions was grounded in the reproduction of the traditional relationship with the subordinate classes: intense exploitation of the labour force and repression of all efforts to organize. What Central America experienced was, consequently, a socially restrictive form of development (Vilas, 1995: 66).

Furthermore:

The deterioration of the working and living conditions of most of the rural population and the spread of urban poverty were part of a rapid process of economic growth and modernization that made the objective differences between the winners and the losers more notorious (Handy, 1994 :63).

2.3.6 End of Military Rule

In early 1986, the Guatemalan military ended its direct political control of the country after more than three decade of dictatorship; a civilian, Vinicio Cerezo Arevalo, assumed the presidency. At that point, the scorched-earth phase of the military's counterinsurgency program had done its work. The army's massive killing of the population in the countryside,

and more selective violence in the cities, had left the Guatemala National Revolutionary Unity (URNG) considerably weakened. In addition, most nonviolent groups, which had advocated major changes to the country's socioeconomic structure, had also been wiped out (Painter, 1997).

The move to democracy, however, was limited to elections only. Vital conditions that a broader definition of democracy would include were largely lacking, such as an independent and honest judiciary, the subordination of military power to civilian authority, a plurality of institutions representing a cross-section of society, etc. Also absent was any improvement in the conditions that had given rise to the civil war in the first place - particularly the unequal distribution of land. The optimism the country felt with the election of Cerezo quickly gave way to disappointment. Ultimately, the only real improvement accomplished by Cerezo's administration was to decrease the number of massacres and to increase the receipt of foreign aid (Painter, 1997).

With the election of Jorge Serrano Elias in 1991, little improved. His presidency's chief boast was that his election represented the first transfer of presidential power from one elected civilian to another in the country's recent history. But Serrano Elias' ostensibly democratic credentials were as shallow as Cerezo's. Social and democratic matters continued

on the same trajectory as during the previous administration, as did the human right situation. Real political power remained in the hands of the military (Jonas, 1996, Human Right Commission of Guatemala, 1991).

Nevertheless, the apparent stability of the new pseudo-civilian political system, the reduced frequency and severity of human rights violations, and most fundamentally a changing world context, all contributed to the beginning of some important political agreements. The terms for the return from Mexico of tens of thousands of Guatemalan refugees were agreed upon in October 1992, and the government and the URNG began a series of peace talks. These processes suffered a setback in May 1993 when Serrano orchestrated an "auto-golpe", or "self-coup", in which the man he had appointed human rights ombudsperson, Ramiro de Leon Carpio, was named President by Congress (Jonas, 1996).

In a mood reminiscent of the election of Vinicio Cerezo, optimism surrounded the rise of de Leon to the presidency. During his tenure as human rights ombudsperson, he spoke out frequently and unhesitatingly against the army and its Civil Defence Patrol (PAC). It was not long, though, before de Leon caved in to military pressure, and optimism once again faded in the face of the army's continuing stranglehold on the country's political life (Jonas, 1996).

2.3.7 End of Civil War and Globalization of the Economy

In January 7, 1996, Guatemalans elected Alvaro Arzu Irigoyen of the Conservative Party of National Advancement (PAN). Peace talks continued, emphasizing peace negotiations as the only vehicle that could potentially bring structural change to the country. Five Accords were signed since the government took office. These made it clear that Arzu's government will continue the currently favoured neo-liberal response to the crisis that faces Guatemala, by emphasizing economic deregulation, reduced fiscal spending, and free trade. Guatemala's economy has grown by 4 percent annually in the last two years, and inflation has stabilized at about 12.5 percent. However, the National Council of Agricultural, Commercial, Industrial and Financial business (CACIF) estimates that to reach a level of 8 percent unemployment by the year 2020, 3.2 million jobs will have to be created and, for this the economy would have to grow annually at 6 to 7 percent, as roughly twice the current population growth rate of 2.8 percent. To this end, CACIF have urged the new administration to work closely with the business community to continue the country's "favourable" economic performance and to address reconstruction needs outlined in the peace Accords (McCleary, 1996).

The economic model that the government of president Arzu' is following is one that advocates the "trickle-down approach"

to economic reform, which insists that the best way to raise the living standards of people is to increase economic growth. However, Guatemala's economic growth has done little to ameliorate the problem of massive poverty. As in many other countries, economic growth by itself has proven to be no guarantee of increasing the share of income accruing to the poorer sectors of the population. It is difficult to imagine the degree of economic reactivation that would by itself have a measurable impact in alleviating poverty in a country where unemployment and underdevelopment affect 50 percent of the economically active population (Vilas, 1995: 199)

2.4 THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF HOW PEACE CAME TO GUATEMALA

During the Central American crisis, the policy of the US toward the region consisted of stopping the revolutionary advance that "in their eyes had no other aim than to create another Cuba" (Vilas, 1995: 133). It provided arms training and financial aid for the repressive governments of the region to fight "the enemies of democracy" (Dunkerley, 1994: 10). The U.S. became one of the main contributors to a devastating period in the region that is now referred by some as the "Vietnamization of Central America" (Nuccio, 1989: 118).

Then, in the 1980s, after the region had been devastated by war and economic development austerities, the U.S policy towards the region changed. There are two important reasons

for this; one is that at the end of the Cold War, politically the Central America region no longer represented a threat to the U.S and the other Latin American countries. The other is that, with the end of the Cold War, the economic situation around the world was being redefined. Political stability was now needed in order to further integrate countries into the global economy. Accordingly, the U.S. changed its strategy from Cold War intervention to low intensity democracy. Instead of providing arms, it launched democratization campaigns around the world, including in Central America and also in Guatemala (Arson, 1989; North, 1990; Child, 1992; Dunkerley, 1994; Moreno, 1994; Brown, 1995).

At the beginning of peace negotiations in the region in the 1980's, U.S participation was through international bodies like the Organization of American States and the United Nations. But later on, it became an active member of the peace process in the region ("miembro de los amigos del proceso de paz") a group that included Colombia, Mexico, Panama, Venezuela, the U.S. and Norway (Arson, 1989; North, 1990; Child, 1992; Dunkerley, 1994; Moreno, 1994; Brown, 1995).

In January 8, 1983, the foreign ministers of Colombia, Mexico, Panama, and Venezuela, known as the Contadora Group, met on the Panamanian Island of Contadora, to consider the situation of Central America. As these countries border the

region they feared instability in the whole region both politically and economically. Firstly, they feared the spread of violence and "communism" into their territory, as well as the inflow of refugees. And secondly, they wanted to prevent another direct invasion of a Latin American country by the United States, and to reduce the economic and political instability of Latin America (North, 1985; and Commonwealth Office, 1990).

The Contadora initiative soon attracted wide international support and became regarded as the best means of reaching a comprehensive negotiated settlement between Central American States. The Contadora aimed to create a plan that the Central American countries would implement. However, in spite of all their efforts, after four years of negotiation they were not successful in reaching a definitive plan. Nonetheless, the Contadora initiative provided the basis upon which the final Peace Plan was eventually created (Arson, 1989; North, 1990; Child, 1992; Dunkerley, 1994; Moreno, 1994; Brown, 1995).

In August 1987, the Central American countries met again in Esquipulas Guatemala (a meeting known as "Esquipulas II") to proceed with the negotiations. Here, the president of Costa Rica, Oscar Arias, using the Contadora initiative as the basis, prepared a plan which was approved and signed by the

Central American presidents on August 7, 1987 (The Arias Plan). This document provided for the simultaneous implementation of a series of measures designed to establish peace and democracy throughout Central America by political means. Although the timetable proposed by the Arias plan was not kept, all the Central American governments in the region took some steps to comply with their commitments. Oscar Arias was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for this initiative and the process began to receive more international attention including that of the United Nations and the U.S. On 25 April 1990, Violeta Chamoro took power as the new president of Nicaragua and the Sandinist government of that country was brought to an end after 10 years in power, with the active help of the United States. In El Salvador, a definitive Peace Plan was signed on January 16, 1992 (Arson, 1989; North, 1990; Child, 1992; Dunkerley, 1994; Moreno, 1994; Brown, 1995).

In Guatemala, the war continued in the late 1980's at a low intensity, after the army's scorched-earth policies of 1981-1983. Both The URNG and the government recognized that the destruction of human life could not continue on this scale and that a resolution of the problems by political means was urgently required. And this was further reinforced by domestic pressures emanating from a variety of social and other groups. It was in this context that the first democratically elected president, Vinicio Cerezo, took office on January 14, 1986,

ending many years of military rule (Aguillera, 1993; Dunkeley, 1994; Brown, 1995; Padilla, 1995).

Taking advantage of the new (very limited) freedom that this government provided, the Catholic church, under the presidency of Bishop Rodolfo Quezada Torruno, took a leading role and proposed a national dialogue with URNG, in spite of strong opposition from the private sector, the army and the newly elected government. He eventually succeeded in organizing a meeting of members of various institutions of civil society, including political parties, private business leaders, popular and religious movements, and even including some representation of the government and the army (Aguillera, 1993; Dunkeley, 1994; Brown, 1995; Padilla, 1995; Jonas, 1996).

As a result, the National Reconciliation Commission (NRC) was created in 1990, and it signed basic accords supporting the search for peace by political means in Guatemala. This accord was reached after several meetings between the URNG and representatives of different civil society organizations, which led to pressure on the government to open a dialogue with the URNG and finally ended with Vinicio Cerezo meeting for the first time with the URNG (Padilla, 1995). After this historic meeting, the government of Vinicio Cerezo suffered several attempted coups, which so

retarded the continuation of the peace talks that no further achievements were made in the peace process during his presidency (Aguillera, 1993; Dunkeley, 1994; Brown, 1995; Padilla, 1995; Jonas, 1996).

After its initial complete refusal to meet with the URNG, the government of Serrano Elias eventually opened a dialogue in 1991 and between 1991 and 1992, some accords were signed. Following this period, a series of negotiations took place but without reaching any agreement. In fact, the Serrano government was more interested in the imposition of a cease-fire, than in the resolution of important issues, which led to stagnation of the peace process by the middle of 1992, and the almost total withdrawal of the URNG by the end of 1993. Due to Serrano's attempted coup, (explained on page 27) the peace process remained on hold for the rest for that year (Aguillera 1993; Dunkeley, 1994; Brown, 1995; Padilla, 1995; Jonas, 1996).

On June 6, 1993, Ramiro de Leon Carpio took office as the new president of Guatemala after Serrano's Coup. In 1994, negotiations with the URNG resumed. This time, the government requested the intervention of the United Nations as a mediator, and the URNG accepted this proposal. The United Nations, which up to this point had been just an observer, now assumed a direct role as moderator in the peace process, and

the international community's involvement became more active (Jonas, 1996). Ramiro de Leon Carpio completed Serrano's presidency term to December 1995 and, during this period several new accords were signed. However, the whole peace process was not completed as he had expected, due to disagreement among the parties with respect to some substantive accords (Aguillera, 1993; Dunkeley, 1994; Brown, 1995; Padilla, 1995; Jonas, 1996).

On January 16, 1996 Alvaro Arzu took power. During his campaign he had promised to respect the Accords already signed, as well as to speed up and conclude the peace process early in the year. This proved impossible due to several setbacks in the negotiations. However, the whole peace package was signed on December 29, 1996, after almost a full year of negotiations between the URNG and the government (Jonas, 1996).

The following Accords form part of the Lasting Peace Agreement signed by the Guatemalan Government and the URNG. They include substantive and operative accords:

The operative accords include (Minugua, 1996):

- The Accord on the Basis for the Reintegration of URNG in the Political Life of Guatemala and Definitive Cease - fire,

- The Accord for the Implementation, Enforcement and Verification of Agreements,
- The Accord on Definitive Cease-fire,
- The Accord on Signing the "Firm and Lasting Peace,"
(All the Accords signed Dec 29, 1996 in Guatemala city)

The substantive accords include (Minugua, 1996):

- The Global Human Rights Accord; calling for the immediate establishment of international mechanisms to monitor human rights,
- The Accord on the Resettlement of the Displaced Population,
- The Accord on the Truth Commission (commission for the historical clarification of the human rights violations and violent acts which have provoked the suffering of the Guatemalan people),
- The Accord on the Strengthening of Civil Society Power and Role of the Army in a Democratic Society,
- The Accord on Constitutional Reform and Electoral Regimes,
- The Accord on the Rights of Indigenous People,
- The Accord on Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues.

For the context of my study I will evaluate only the last two substantive accords: The Accord of the Rights of Indigenous People, and The Accord on Socio-economic and Agrarian Issues. I will argue that those two Accords are central to understanding the Guatemalan past and future as well as to the understanding of peace and war. In particular, this study will evaluate how the social development policies outlined in these two core Accords are likely to impact on the native peoples of Guatemala, who constitute the majority of population and who have been, and will be, affected more than any other sector in Guatemalan society.

CHAPTER 3

3.0 GUATEMALA'S CURRENT SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT; INEQUALITIES AND NATIVE PEOPLES

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I will briefly provide an analysis of the present conditions of native peoples with regard to their social development and their position within Guatemalan society.

3. 2. CURRENT STATE OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Development policies should be judged by the simple question. What is happening to the people? (IDRC, 1995: 48)

Wilmer (1993) explains that modernization represents the sum of attributes perceived by elites as endowing them with moral superiority, so that non-modern societies are therefore, by definition, morally inferior. These other cultures are seen as inferior they must catch up to the modern West, and assimilate. The following two statements capture how this happens:

Today the primary model of a healthy society is one measured by economic standards such as the gross national product, gross domestic product, income flow, capital accumulation and so on. Limited social resources are subsequently spent to improve short term economic conditions, development prescriptions thus fail to take a holistic social approach, nor do they incorporate the values of strong cultures and healthy people, such as respect for the elders and protection for the children and a pristine environment; an ethic of human rights and compassion within a society. Are not these values just as important, if not more important, in the measure of the health of a society (Poka, in Wilmer 1993 :54).

The same sentiment is expressed by Muutang:

The so-called progress means only starvation, dependence, helplessness and the destruction of our culture and demoralization of our people. We must not blindly follow the model of progress invented by western civilization. We may envy the industrialized world for its wealth, but we must not forget that this wealth was bought at a very high price. The rich world suffers from so much stress, pollution, violence, poverty, and most of all spiritual emptiness. The riches of indigenous communities lie not in money or commodities but in community, in tradition, and the sense of belonging to a special place. The world is rushing towards a single culture. We should pause and reflect on the beauty of diversity (Muutang, in Wilmer 1993: 106).

Economic indicators, the usual measure of a country's well-being, indicate that Guatemalan growth has been 4% to 5% in the last few years. However, the benefit that this growth represents has not been felt among poor people and particularly the native peoples who constitute the great majority of the poor in the country. The following statistics on poverty, health and sanitation, education, shelter, the state of children as well as the current crime rate, state repression and the legacy of the civil war provide a clearer indication of what is happening to the people in Guatemala.

The current poverty crisis is a product of more than four decades of capitalist modernization and of civil war compounded by the economic stabilization and restructuring measures that the country has recently adopted under pressure from the international financial institutions. As elsewhere

in Latin America, the poor and other marginalized populations, especially indigenous peoples, have borne the heaviest burden of these processes. This was expressed by the Guatemalan Catholic Conference of Bishops:

We have studied the problems that cause most anxiety among the people in Guatemala, among these are poverty and the question of peace. If poverty grows in the next year, we run the risk that the product will be a social explosion which will be the fruit of a people who live with hunger, malnutrition and frustration. This is the bitter fruit that has been given to us an economic model that truly appears to have been organized to produce poor people (Catholic Conference of Bishops of Guatemala (CEG), in ICCRLA Special Report, 1995: 10)

Poverty is one of the worst problems Guatemalan people are confronting now. The current economic development model has been unable to create the possibilities for "human development". According to a study done by the San Carlos University of Guatemala (1993), from 1960 to 1980, poverty in Guatemala was 31.5%. From 1986 to 1987, this increased to 64%, in 1989, it was 67%, and from 1990 to 1991, poverty reached 75% (USAC 1993: 4). According to the General Secretary of Economic Planning of Guatemala (SEGEPLAN), poverty affects 86% of the population living in the rural areas and 57% of the urban areas. In urban areas, 34% of the population live in extreme poverty; in the rural areas the figure is 72% with native peoples accounting for the majority (SEGPLAN, 1995). Extreme poverty in the Guatemalan context means that people cannot even afford to have their daily meals.

The disparity in income distribution in Guatemala is appalling. As of 1989, the poorest 20% of the population received 2.1% of the total income, whereas the wealthiest 20% received 63% of the income, with the top 10% alone accounting for 46% of the total (CECI, 1995: 220).

In terms of education, approximately 50% of the population over the age of 15 is illiterate. Illiteracy in rural areas reaches 70%. Two-thirds (800,000) of all children do not have access to schools. Only 34% of the children who attend school in rural areas finish elementary school, and it is estimated that, on average it takes 16 years for them to achieve this level. There are very few establishments providing high school education in rural areas. Forty percent of the elementary schools use one teacher for all the grades. Public expenses in education do not exceed 2.1% of the gross national product (UNDP: 1995).

Concerning health conditions, the current health policy places more emphasis on basic and curative assistance than on the most common epidemiological problems. However, the main causes of mortality are diarrhea (30%), acute respiratory infections (23%) and malnutrition. Fifty-eight percent of the children under the age of three suffer from chronic malnutrition. Two-thirds of the population is affected by malaria; cholera has been growing significantly in the last

years, and dengue fever, affects approximately 18,000 communities. Seventy percent of the health budget is concentrated in the capital city, while main causes for immuno-preventable diseases like diarrhea and cholera, originate from insufficient sanitation, and from the limited coverage of the services in the urban and rural areas. In 1992, only 64% of the population had access to clean drinking water (50% in rural areas) (UNDP, 1995).

With regard to housing, in 1992 the housing deficit was estimated at 861,000 units and it is likely that this deficit has increased each year since then, by 81,973 units. In addition, approximately another 230,000, urban houses do not fulfil the minimum conditions for living (CECI: 1995).

The quality of life in childhood is directly related to the socio-economic conditions of the Guatemalan family. Almost 325,000 children are born each year. In contrast, mortality figures indicate that each day 32 children die due to starvation, of which 68% are under the age of one. Eighty-five percent of the 4 million children under the age of 15 belong to poor families (CECI: 1995).

In 1993, 1.7 million children and teenagers contributed to family income. Most of them worked in the informal sector: street sales, and microshops. Rural children who migrate to

the cities with their families, mostly indigenous, are located in marginal areas of the capital city. They are affected by the rough nature of urban life, which includes coming in contact with violence, and losing their ethical values, ethnic customs, and language. It is estimated that there are between 1,500 and 5,000 street children. Many are forced into prostitution, robbery and drugs (CECI: 1995).

3.2.1 Crime Repression and Civil War Legacy

The state of social development of the Guatemalan population is also reflected in the following way. Right now, there is a huge crime wave sweeping the country, as poverty has been exacerbated in the last years. This is manifested by an epidemic of kidnapping both in the country-side and in the city. In Guatemala City alone, three kidnappings are reported every day, with the real number probably much higher. As a Guatemala-based Western diplomat said: crime here is out of control, and it's now affecting the upper middle class, who in the past were largely immune from this (ICCRLA Special Report, 1996; NINIGUA Report, 1995).

Furthermore, even as the country is supposedly moving towards peace, state repression of people continues, although not nearly, to the same degree as a few years ago. Members of unions, journalist, teachers, community leaders, religious leaders, native organizations and women's organizations are

still harassed by the government. Torture, kidnapping, and disappearances are still happening (ICCHRLA Special Report, 1995; NINIGUA, 1996).

Finally the legacy of civil war has touched the majority of the Guatemalan population in one way or another. Some people have been killed and others displaced internally, while others are forced to look for refuge in countries around the world. However, civil war has particularly affected native peoples in all aspects of life. Native peoples make up most of the people who were killed or displaced and whose communities were destroyed. And this legacy has left a very deep and unforgettable scar that is unquantifiable and difficult to express in words. The perpetrators of the longest and bloodiest war in the history of Latin America will never be able to compensate people for the atrocities that were committed.

3.3 NATIVE PEOPLES' MARGINALIZATION

Guatemala is a Mayan country in language, culture and population (Lovell, 1995; Handy, 1994; Smith, 1987; Jonas, 1996). However, the indigenous peoples have been deliberately marginalized by the state so, that they have very limited political, economic, social and cultural rights.

Lovell (1994) argues that the native peoples of Guatemala have been pushed to the margins since colonial times, first being conquered by imperial Spain with its mercantilistic capitalist ideas. He cites here the conquistador and chronicler Bernal Diaz del Castillo summing up Spanish aims "We came here to serve God and the King, and also to get rich." (Lovell, 1994: 30).

The second conquest was by local and international capitalism, supported by State terrorism in order to establish and preserve the capitalist system. Each of these cycles has produced, or has reinforced, certain geographical patterns that reflect basic and irresolvable fissures in the nature of Guatemalan social, economic and political life (Lovell, 1994: 27). It is summarized in the following paragraph by Lovell:

Three centuries of colonial rule cast a long and oppressive shadow, creating deep and enduring fissures in the nature of Guatemalan social, economic and political life. Certainly by the time of independence, which took place in 1821, little had changed (or was about to) in the fundamental way that Spaniards from all walks of life treated and related to Indians. For them, as for creoles and ladino also, Maya subordination was not an issue of polemic or debate: it was simply taken for granted, something that was regarded as a natural right, an unqueried fixture in the imperial enterprise (Lovell, 1995: 116).

3.3.1 Native Peoples and World View

It is important to remember that the individualistic development models, that have been implemented in the country for so long are contrary to the communal beliefs of the native

peoples. Guatemala is an agricultural country in which the conflict over land has been, and continues to be, central to an understanding the nation. Barry (1991) points out that land is central to the understanding of the past and the future in Guatemala, particularly for the native peoples (Barry, 1991).

A special seminar held in Whitehorse, Yukon, Canada, among the indigenous people of the Americas, including some from Guatemala, pointed out that "liberal and free-market approaches to economic development are in conflict with traditional indigenous notions of the land and environment, and communalism (UNES, 1996: 6-7). The wholistic way in which native people and other branches of humanity think about development, is not necessarily the Western way. This is summarized in the following statement by an indigenous author:

Among the obstacles to our well-being is that which they called "development" or progress, which has mistakenly led to unwise state policies, as a result of which indigenous peoples have been condemned to a cultural vacuum, to uprooting, to alcoholism, to prostitution, to repression through birth control, to extreme poverty, to the destruction of our economies of coexistence, even deforming our vision of the world and the cultural identity of each people (Pocatterra, in Wilmer 1994: 82).

3.3.2 Native Peoples Culture and Land

Agricultural production, particularly of maize, is central to the culture of the rural native population in Guatemala. The world view of indigenous people, who make up

the vast majority of Campesinos, tends to place a high value on ties between humans and land; according to Mayan creation beliefs, humans themselves were created out of maize (Burger, 1987). Therefore, land and agricultural production may be said to have significance that extends well beyond statistical measure. Working the land, cultivating one's milpa maize field is central to the existence of many rural Guatemalans, not only economically, but spiritually and culturally (Writh, 1992; Macreery, 1994; Handy, 1994).

The earth is the foundation of Indigenous Peoples. It is the seat of spirituality, the fountain from which our cultures and language flourish...Next to shooting Indigenous Peoples, the surest way to kill us is to separate us from our part of the Earth (Burger, 1987: 114).

A native author also expressed the same sentiment:

The native people and the land are inextricably bound together. When you heard the history of our people, the land and the people are described as one. If you take my land, you take my life (Davis, 1988: 4).

Writing about the devastating situation in which native people also find themselves in Peru, Mariategui, a Peruvian citizen, long ago expressed the key idea to understanding this problem. What he said more than six decades ago is still valid for Latin American countries and for Guatemala in particular:

The Indian problem in Latin America is in its essence a problem of the economic structure of the national and international development system as a whole. Therefore, the Indian question grows out of our economy. It has its roots in the system of land ownership. Any attempts to solve it by administrative policy measures, through education or road building, is superficial and beside the point (Mariategui, 1934: 27).

3.3.3 The Land Situation in Guatemala

The old prescription of development, and the current neo-liberal economic model that is being implemented in Guatemala, requires land for its expansion. The capitalist diversification of the economy, of the 1950s required land for the cultivation of sugar cane, coffee, cotton, cardamon and the cattle ranching industry. And the current diversification of the economy, based on cash crops for export, also requires land.

According to FAO, 59% of all Guatemalans live in rural areas, despite an urban growth rate of 3.5%. And approximately 49% of the economically active population is involved in agriculture (World Bank, 1995; FAO, 1994).

However, the agrarian situation in Guatemala is highly inequitable. In the most recent census, 54% of all farms were smaller than 1.5 hectares, with 31% smaller than 0.7 hectares. However, this 54% represents just 4% of the total farm area, or a mere 170,500 hectares. Fully 88% of all farms occupy 16% of the area. At the same time, while just over 2% of all farms were over 45 hectares, they represent 65% of farm area; furthermore, a mere 0.09% were over 900 hectares, yet they total 22% of the total area (Colchester, 1991). As a measurement of distributional inequality, the Gini coefficient for Guatemala is .85, among the highest in the hemisphere

(Schweigert, 1993). Moreover, according to a study by the United States Agency for International Development (1994), fully half of all farms over 50 hectares are seriously underused, so that an area of almost 1.2 hectares has been classified as "tierras ociosas", empty lands, and this could therefore be made available for distribution.

3.3.4 The Guatemalan State and Native Peoples

Throughout Latin America, the policies of the state have historically sought to advance the process of Ladinization or homogenization as part of a project of national integration and modernization. Through laws and the policies of government institutions, the Guatemalan nation-state has continually sought to extinguish indigenous language and culture (Wilson, 1995: 27).

The impact of development prescriptions on native peoples is exacerbated by internal societal structures and state policies that marginalize the native peoples economically, politically, socially and culturally. Although native peoples constitute the majority of the Guatemalan population, the country has been controlled economically, politically, socially and culturally by a tiny minority of ladino and white people. Although among the Ladino population, there is also economic and political marginalization of people, who have been adversely affected by development prescriptions, indigenous peoples constitute the most unprotected, marginalized and impoverished part of the population (CECI, 1994: 10).

Although most of the Guatemalan non-native population have native ancestry and, are therefore, partially indigenous, the state has purposely constructed and promoted non-native values (particularly Spanish) in all spheres of society, in order to preserve the dominant Ladino and white culture. In this way, native culture has been regarded as backward and without any value for Guatemalan society, except for touristic purposes. In fact, the categories of ethnicity have been socially constructed (Moe, 1989), so that the distinguished categories, seen as a type of social relation, serve as foundation for racial discrimination, whereby some groups exploit others (Stasiulis, 1980: 464, quoted in Moe, 1987: 11).

Moe (1989) explains that to understand how unequal relationships have evolved between native and non-native populations is to see the state's long-standing role in promoting these inequalities. From the colonial period onwards, the Guatemalan state has sought to control the Indian populace through control of townships, settlement patterns, land relations, and agricultural production:

Today, although the numerical majority, Guatemalan Indians are relegated to the margins of society. Isolated in terms of language and politics, their exploitation is the cornerstone of the national economy. Guatemala's agroexport system has been built on the backs of cheap Indian labour. Tourism, the country's second source of foreign exchange, is also dependent on the native community (Barry, 1991: 262).

Handy and Smith also point out the same theme:

Economic marginalization of the majority, (native population) the inequitable, social structure and authoritarian political institutions have been constant features of Guatemala's socioeconomic landscape. Ethnic discrimination is a cornerstone of the Guatemalan economy. Even if forced labour has been technically outlawed (since 1945), the major plantations still obtain labour largely through the coercive conditions in rural areas (Handy, 1994: 25).

According to the figures provided by SEGEPLAN (1995), 80% of the Mayan population lives in poverty, and some in extreme poverty. Seventy-two percent of Mayan children suffer from chronic malnutrition. Eighty percent of Mayan people do not have access to clean drinking water and lack infrastructure and sanitation services. Although Mayan people generate 56% of the agroexport national income, the average monthly wage does not exceed U.S. \$25 per person. Seventy percent of the indigenous population lacks cultivated land. In this sector, illiteracy is 70% and increases for women to 76%. Only 13% of the indigenous children attend pre-elementary school and only 10% attend elementary school (SEGEPLAN, 1995).

Inequalities and racism are manifested also in the ethnically divided labour force. The majority of the native population are agricultural workers, and Indians comprise the bulk of the agricultural labour force. While few Indians participate in professional, managerial, white collar and transport employment, they are very well represented in the

artisanal work and in the skilled trades (Carmarck, 1996).

3.3.5 The Impact on Native women

Bacher (1990) in her study of the western highlands of Guatemala (where the majority of native peoples live) explains how poor rural women in general, and native women especially, have suffered in the process of modernization and development expansion, as well as in the country's civil war. In her study she explains that although all the native peoples have been marginalized and exploited in Guatemalan society, women are most severely affected. This is explained by Sen and Grown (1987):

The present patriarchal economic system on the one hand denies or limits women's access to economic resources and political participation, and on the other hand, imposes sexual division of labour that allocate women the most onerous, labour intensive, poorly rewarded tasks inside and outside the home, as well as the longest hours of work, particularly for the poor and women belonging to minority groups (Sen & Grown, 1987: 15).

It is estimated that the civil war has left more than 75,000 thousand widows and 75,000 thousand orphans, most of them native women (UNHCR, 1995). The war has also affected native women as mothers and wives of the disappeared. As a result, women have become even more prominently as the primary providers of the family and extended family. And to do so, they've had to take underpaid and exploitative jobs, have had to work in very unsafe working and environmental conditions, and have often been physically abused. And this situation has

been especially difficult for native women because of their poverty, their lack of formal education, land and their extremely marginalized position in Guatemalan society (Carmarck, 1996). Poverty has forced them to take the most inhuman and under-paid jobs in order to survive. The following is one of the many examples.

As part of the drive to capitalize on the abundant and inexpensive labour supplies in the developing countries, many international companies have set up assembly operations (maquilas) in the Central American region. While industries owned by nationals of Guatemala traditionally employed mainly men, most maquilas employ primarily women. The explanation for these different employment strategies is found in the prevailing patriarchal ideology: men are the primary breadwinners for the family. Thus the salary of a woman is considered supplementary. This ideology, and the practices it generates, led to the concentration of the female labour force in the informal, self-employment sector of these economies (Carmarck, 1996).

Ironically, the "comparative disadvantages" of women, including their position in such a patriarchal society, their cultural, economic and social position and their marginalization in the country, have forced native women to accept lower wages due to the resulting lack of alternatives.

Thus, the Mexican economists Arizpe and Aranda argue that the "comparative disadvantages" of women have been translated into comparative advantages for companies, capital, and governments in the international markets (Arispe, 1986).

According to the Guatemalan Association of Non-traditional Exporters (Gexport), the number of maquiladoras operating in Guatemala increased from 20 to 500 between 1986 to 1993, making it Guatemala's fourth largest generator of foreign exchange. Women make up 95 percent of workers, with 40% under the age of 18. The majority are native women, earning about 5 percent of what textile workers earn in the United States, working 10.6 hours a day, six day a week. In the scope of this study, however, my focus will be mainly on native peoples, both women and men. I am nevertheless aware that native women suffer three fold because of being native, because of being a women in a patriarchal society such as Guatemala, and because of poverty (Gexport, 1993).

The following stories written by native peoples will help to illustrate more deeply the native peoples' situation, as it has been, and continues to be in Guatemala. In the native culture, there are different ways of creating and understanding knowledge. Story-telling is one way. This first-hand experience expresses the extreme exploitation of native people within in Guatemalan society.

Menchu (1997) begins by telling about her father, mother, brothers and sister, and about growing up in the remote highland village where she was born. She also recounts her time on plantations on the Pacific coast where her family, like most Indian families, spent part of each year picking coffee or cotton. They were severely exploited and some people died because of pesticide poisoning and malnutrition. Menchu also points out how the lack of job opportunities in her village pressed her to migrate to the city and to work as a maid in order to help her family. Here, she suffers abuse and degradation at the hands of her employers. She also explains how these abuses led her to join a peasant organization responsible for raising the political consciousness of rural workers. At this time, Menchu aligned herself firmly on the side of the insurgent, committed to revolution, as the only means of achieving peasant demands for human rights and social justice (Lovell, 1995).

Gonzalo is a young native boy now living in Canada, who, at the age of 14, crossed the border of the U.S. to escape government repression and to look for new opportunities in life. "I left things behind, my home, mother and sister, friends, a land, a people, a culture." Gonzalo at his early age has crossed the most palpable border in existence, the border between Mexico and the United States (Lovell, 1995). He said:

"I was told it was a free place, a place where there was no war, a place where you could work and study in peace. I was told that life there was easier". (Lovell, 1995: 102).

Mexican writer Carlos Fuentes considers "the line marked by the Rio Grande less a border than a scar, a scar that divides the rich from the poor, the strong from the weak, those whom history has blessed from those who history has damned" (Fuentes, 1983: 15 in Lovell, 1995).

Conclusion

The marginalization of native people through certain patterns of social development and extreme inequalities, are defining features of Guatemalan society. Any approach to development has to reverse these tendencies if it is to lay the basis for a lasting peace. And it must do so, even though Guatemala is a developing country that has a concentrated economy, highly dependent on external markets, and that is mainly an agricultural country whose industry is considered of secondary importance. Its agricultural sector produces cash crops for export, especially coffee, sugar, cotton, cardamon, bananas, fruits, vegetables, flowers, spices, etc., as well as cattle ranching (Vilas, 1995,). In spite of the negative effect that main-stream development prescriptions have had on Guatemala's native people, the State is continuing to implement the neo-liberal structural adjustment package that

was adopted in late 1982 and that is a prescription for economic growth through the globalization of the economy.

Globalization or rather rapid integration into the global economy is the latest prescription for economic growth, and it is the prescription that developing countries are required to follow by a growing body of international rules and institutions. The prescription ultimately aims to maximize the ability of capital, goods and services, to move without restriction throughout the world. (OXFAM, 1995: 10) Thus trade, and foreign investment are, more than ever, seen as the engines needed to keep the economic ship afloat, while globalization is the key to a renewed drive to expand the global economy more rapidly through the intensification of production and trade on a global scale (OXFAM, 1995). However, as Nurse explains, for most developing countries, the current downturn in the global economy has revealed that this process has left them with deeper forms of external dependency, greater poverty, higher unemployment and marginalization of the masses of their peoples (Nurse, 1996: 5).

Bienefeld also warns us that:

This New World Order (NWO) is witnessing the re-emergence of a more open and explicit form of imperialism, in which national sovereignty is more readily overridden by a hegemonic power pursuing its own self-defined national interest; and that the neoliberal policy prescription of the 1980s, will be more single-mindedly imposed in this more monolithic world, with potentially serious consequences for a large part of the developing world (Bienefeld, 1994: 1).

The government of Guatemala represents the interest of small groups of influential business people and landowners, many of whom stand to benefit from the further incorporation of the country into the global economy. But on the other hand, even governments more responsive to popular demands have almost no choice but to follow the most recent development prescriptions (OXFAM, 1995).

Therefore the following question must be posed:

How can democratization take place if economic power becomes more and more concentrated, either in the hands of local elites or foreign transnationals? (North, 1996: 24).

Until now, the mechanical linear development prescription that the Guatemalan state has pursued have undermined human development. Moreover, the resulting marginalization is manifested in the current conditions with deprive native peoples of their most basic rights and needs. Meanwhile, there has been a concentration of wealth and privilege in the hands of the few who exercise power over the majority of the Guatemalan population, by subjugating, exploiting and forcing them to assimilate.

Native peoples have not only suffered economic impoverishment, but also a loss of identity and a reduce ability to develop endogenously, and authentically, within their own culture and capacities. From my point of view, two

things are clear: first is the failure of economic development to provide people with the most basic human needs; second is the exercise of power by the state over the native population in order to achieve its objectives. It is in this context that the significance of the lasting peace process needs to be assessed.

CHAPTER 4

4.0 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK, SOURCES, METHODOLOGY AND QUESTIONS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I will discuss the theoretical perspectives which guide my study, and the relevance of these concepts for the research. I will also outline the methodology I have used for the research and the sources at the end of the chapter.

Guatemala is just awakening from its traumatic recent past with a large segment of its population living in extreme poverty or under very unsatisfactory health, education and housing standards, with high levels of unemployment and under-unemployment, diminishing earnings, and a disturbing level of daily violence. Social inequalities related to race, gender and class are still deeper than in other areas of the hemisphere. The above have an impact on all the poor people in Guatemala. However, native peoples bear the highest burden of the current situation since they have been marginalized economically, socially, politically and culturally by the state policies and the international development system which are highly intertwined. This theoretical framework seeks to analyze the state of poverty and marginalization of the native peoples in Guatemala. The framework will examine the likelihood that the Socioeconomic and Agrarian Situation, and

The Right of Indigenous People accords could reverse or at least ameliorate these situations. I believe that as long as the policies of these accords are tailored according to the current development prescription and societal internal inequalities, the policies outlined in these accords are very likely to lead to a further deterioration of the current situation.

4.2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

There are internal and external factors that need to be taken into consideration in the conceptualization and discussion of the situation in which native peoples find themselves. Therefore an examination of internal and external factors separately will help to shed light on the complex problems facing the country today. I will do the above in light of the concepts of "eurocentricity" and "internal colonization".

4.2.1 Eurocentricity

Existing economic and political structures tend to be highly inequitable between nations, genders, and ethnic groups. These structures are often the historical legacy of colonial domination. However, post-colonial development processes and strategies have often exacerbated these inequalities, and in some instances even worsened the level of absolute poverty. The interest of powerful nations and classes, both internationally and nationally, are enmeshed in these structures, and therefore often have a vested interest in their persistence. As a result, the survival of large sections of the population in the Third World has become increasingly uncertain and vulnerable. (Sen and Grown, 1987: 26).

This discussion of Eurocentricity, the first concept, is based mainly on the work of Mehmet (1995), as well as Wiarda (1987), Butz, Lonergan, and Smith (1991). The term "eurocentricity" is used by Mehmet to identify the mainstream economic theories (classic and neo-classical market theories of Western capitalism) which have been implemented in developing countries from colonization to the present time. Wiarda (1987) also points out that the categories and understandings of extant political development are derived from the Euro-American experience and have little or no relevance to the non-Western and non-developed world. Although he does not specifically use the term eurocentricity, he points to this by using the word ethnocentricity. The work of Butz, Lonergan and Smith (1991), also points to the same argument. They do not use the same terms, but they also argue that development prescriptions have failed in the developing countries because of what they called "lack of adequate perceptions of indigenous priorities".

Mehmet describes eurocentricity in the following way:

Eurocentricity is a European-centered worldview in which the interest or benefit of Europeans and their descendants is pursued at the expense of others while justifying this worldview by paradigms or ethical norms that proclaim universal benefit for all (Mehmet, 1995: 8)

In his study, Mehmet reviews the classical (pre-1914 economic development theories, post war neo-classical theories (1945-1973), the model building and macro planning theories, the new economic order (1973), and the latest-state-of-the-art: economic development theorizing since the 1980's. He points out why the main stream eurocentric development prescriptions of development have failed and will continue to fail in the majority of developing countries.

First, eurocentric prescriptions of development have existed since colonization, having as their inner logic mercantilism, the pursuit of trade balances by all means necessary. Land, he explains, was capitalized by colonial entrepreneurs as the indigenous inhabitants were pushed out or eliminated to make room for European interests operating as a monopoly or an oligopoly and extracting windfall profits (Mehmet, 1995: 23). In the process of capitalizing labour, local cultures, family and kinship systems were destroyed, which had devastating impacts on the people.

Second, Mehmet says that in the mainstream old and new theories of development, a Western worldview is the distinctive feature of these approaches to economic development. They are therefore unlikely to understand the more pressing needs of the developing countries (Mehmet, 1995: 1). This worldview, he argues, rests on a utopian presumption

of economics as value-free science, rational, analytical and technical, concerned with ranking investment priorities and choosing amongst alternative allocations of scarce resources to promote economic development. As a logical system, Western economics is a closed system in which assumptions are substitutes for reality, and gender, environment and the Third World are all equally dismissed as irrelevant except for their exchange values fixed in markets.

Third, Mehmet outlines how, in eurocentric theories, both old and new cultures are considered barriers to economic development. Thus, economic development has not been culturally-friendly and has effectively denied the cultural diversity that exists in non-Western branches of humanity, where groups and community rights are often held in higher esteem than individualism, and cooperation rather than competition is prized. Further he says, in this approach everything western is idealized; everything non-Western is inferior, constantly struggling to catch up to the superior West by imitating it. Developing countries have to see the political, economic and cultural development of Western countries as a point of departure for all single countries to follow.

Western countries are taken as universal references; everything non-European is judged by European norms.

Therefore, the gap between an idealizing market theory of mainstream economics and the practice of economic development is still with us because economic development theories have been Western, made in the West and based on experiences far removed from realities of developing countries, theories lacking cultural and social soundness.

Fourth, global capitalization monetizes, privatizes and extracts assets and values in all productive resources such as technology, ecology, human and natural resources, and converts them into private property to be acquired and controlled by capitalists motivated by individualism (Mehmet 1995: 7). He further says that under the rules of mainstream development economics, growth is capital-biased: capital-rich countries of the first world gain from capital-poor but labour-abundant and natural resource-rich countries of the Third World (Mehmet, 1995: 7).

Fifth, Western theories and prescriptions have failed in the Third World where there is rising mass poverty, civil wars, refugees and displaced persons and considerable social injustice. Third World countries are worse off than before. Though Eurocentric prescriptions of development have failed to work in developing countries, the prescribers have declined moral responsibility. Instead, another prescription, or another paradigm, is offered similar to Paris fashion or

misleading advertisement. Now, for instance, globalization is the medicine of the day that each country should take in order to be cured of the current world crisis.

The use of the eurocentricity concept is helpful to understand how international power has been used to construct theories of development aimed to benefit specific people in the world. It is also helpful to understand how internal power has been used in Guatemala to implement them. These theories adopted by powerful internal groups in the country have produced the marginalization of social development and exacerbated inequalities affecting the majority of the Guatemalan population: the native peoples in whose name development is said to be undertaken.

4.2.2 Internal Colonization

The concept of eurocentrism explains part of the Guatemalan situation as regards the marginalization of native peoples. However, it masks the responsibility of the state and powerful groups within a given country in the process of marginalization and oppression of another group in their country. The Guatemalan state and its powerful minority elite groups are equally responsible for the process of the marginalization and displacement of native peoples.

The second concept through which I will interpret the current situation of Guatemala is the concept of internal colonization or neo-colonialism, as used by Smith (1981). Internal colonization is useful in understanding the internal dynamics and their connection to eurocentrism.

Internal colonization assumes that societies are not homogeneous. In a given society there are different groups with different interests struggling for the control of resources and assets. In the above situation, there is a process in which some people get richer and others get poorer, resulting in massive inequalities which hinder the development process. Internal colonization also describes situations in which capital reaches only certain layers of the bureaucracy or socioeconomic sectors which, in turn, exploit human and other resources in the area without generating or redistributing development (Goldin and Saenz de Tejada, 1996: 1). This situation is manifested in the subordination of particular regions to the capital city, of rural to urban areas, of poor people to rich patrons, of semi-proletarian peasant to landowners, of one ethnic group to another and women to men (Goldin and Saenz de Tejada, 1996: 2).

Thus, this concept explains why a minority of the ladino (mixed Spanish-native people and white) population have adopted non cultural-centered development prescriptions and

used their power in the country to marginalize the native population economically, politically, culturally and socially. It also explains how the fruits of development have only benefited certain groups and condemned others to marginalization and poverty.

Finally, it explains why the culture of the minority ladino and white population has been the dominant culture and has been used for the assimilation of the native population and to pursue their own policies.

This contradicts the "blaming the victim approach", an argument according to which the native peoples are been blamed for their state of poverty and marginalization, which is said, by the State, to be due to their lack of incorporation into the main stream society. Further, it is argued that their poverty and marginalization can only be overcome if they assimilate into the main-stream "superior" society by surrendering their own values, their own accumulated knowledge and wisdom, and by forcing them to forget bonds of community in order to achieve development. The above issues are looked upon by development prescriptioners as pure externalities, i.e. as having nothing to do with economics.

4.3. SOURCES, METHODOLOGY, AND QUESTIONS

4.3.1 Sources of Data

First, I have carried out this research mainly through a survey of pertinent literature on the topic in primary source documents. Specifically this material includes the Social Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Accord outlined in the Peace Plan. These documents are publicly available in the Spanish language.

Second, I have been assisted in this task by the informal discussions I had in Guatemala during a trip there in the summer of 1996. At that time I was privileged to have had the opportunity to talk with different people including: researchers at the social science research centre of three universities in Guatemala. I have also had informal discussions with local and international NGO's in Guatemala. In addition, I have spoken with people in three native organizations, the Catholic church, peasant organizations, Foundation Mirna Marck, women's organizations and groups, and United Nations representatives in Guatemala. My discussions with these people, however, was limited to explaining to them my interest in evaluating these Accords and to seeing if they had some material relevant on the topic. Some of them explained to me their opinion in general; these discussions will not be used in the study, only the material I collected from them will. In spite of the above, it was helpful for me

to know the opinions of these organizations.

Finally, I also bring to bear many years of formal and informal work experience as a social worker and development practitioner and activist in Guatemala. This experience put me in direct contact with different communities including native and non-native communities performing multiple tasks in understanding and working for the improvement of these communities. It is from this experience that I am able to draw on a working knowledge of the interplay of the internal and external dynamics of socio-economic development, especially at the rural and grassroots level. My research, therefore, has more than academic interest; it is part of an immense personal effort to confront the issues and to find alternative solutions.

4.3.2 Methodology

Using the concepts of eurocentricity and internal colonization, with respect to the state's marginalization and disempowerment of the native peoples, I will complete an inductive analysis of the contents of the two major Accords, the Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Accords outlined in the Peace Plan.

My reason for doing an inductive analysis is that this provides a way of examining the content of the Accords as they

are actually written. An inductive approach allows me also to study the content of the Accords in considerable depth. Furthermore, I do not want, at this point, to impose categories from outside, or to attempt to do a quantitative analysis. These issues cannot be captured using empirical methods alone. To my knowledge such an analysis has not been done in relation to these two Accords.

4.3.3 Key Questions

I will use the two theoretical concepts noted to understand the foundation of the two key social Accords. It is in this conceptual and theoretical context that I will undertake the analysis of The Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues, and The Right of Indigenous Peoples Accords.

I will take the position that these two Accords reflect:

- the application of eurocentricity;
- the extension of internal colonization.

More specifically, I want to pose a further series of questions which are generated by the theory reviewed earlier in this chapter, which will present a more detailed examination of the Accords through the review of the key theoretical concepts.

In relation to eurocentricity I will evaluate the following assumptions:

- that there are external barriers the current government faces in realizing the overall goals outlined in these two Accords. As a consequence, the possibility of their success in the current economic climate may be limited;
- that the current development prescriptions, on which the two Accords are built, are not culturally centered;
- that land is extremely important for native peoples for both cultural and physical survival. The Accords' focus on these issues is limited;
- that the social development policies outlined in these Accords will not reverse the current level of poverty facing native peoples.

With regards to internal colonization I will evaluate the following assumptions:

- that there are internal forces restricting and guiding the goals of the Accords;
- that the current concentration of wealth will not be reversed;
- that these Accords are not designed to reverse discrimination of native peoples. Rather they are designed to assimilate the native peoples into the

development system undertaken by the state, the elite and the international market power.

CHAPTER 5

5.0 ANALYSIS OF THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND AGRARIAN ISSUES, AND THE RIGHT OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES ACCORDS

5.1.0 INTRODUCTION

The "Firm and Lasting Peace" Accord signed between the URNG and the Guatemalan government contains several Accords, but my study will evaluate only two key substantive Accords: the Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord, and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Accord. In particular, I will analyze the social development provisions, as well as the policies dealing with inequalities, as they pertain to native peoples. These aspects of the two accords deal with the marginalization of indigenous peoples socially, economically, culturally and politically. Thus, it is these policies, as, outlined in these particular Accords, that should be the basis of reversing, or at least ameliorating, the primary conditions that have given rise to the marginalization of Guatemala's indigenous peoples, whose poverty and marginalization have been key factors for political unrest and war. Only if these accords can succeed in this task can a lasting peace be achieved.

The importance of these two substantive accords, that are the focus of my study is explained and summarized in the following statement by a member of COFIGUA, (the Indigenous Confederation of Guatemala):

The Socio-Economic and Issues Accord, and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Accord, aim at addressing the causes of the war. The other accords, even though they are important, are themes derived from the conflict (Cofigua, 1996 in Critica 1996: 6).

In the following section, I will provide a brief summary of the most relevant provisions of each accord before proceeding to analyze them.

5.1.1 The Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord

Illuminated by the United Nations view that "enhanced social participation in all aspects of development is a key to both improved social justice and sustainable economic growth, the Guatemalan government and the URGN have agreed on one of the most important documents of the Guatemalan Peace Accord, the Socio Economic and Agrarian Issue Accord" (UN 1996).

The parties have agreed that social and economic change aimed at the common good of Guatemala's entire population must be the basis on which a lasting and sustainable peace and development process is built. Therefore, the parties agree that all of Guatemala's people must be allowed to participate fully in the decision-making process relating to socio-economic developments that affect their lives (Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord, 1996).

In order to pursue a true, functional and participatory democracy, the process of social and economic development should be democratic and participatory and include: (a) consensus-building and dialogue among agents of socio-economic development; (b) consensus building between the agents and State bodies in the formulation and implementation of development strategies; and (c) effective citizen participation in identifying prioritizing and meeting their needs (Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord, 1996: 4 Paragraph 1).

Moreover, the participation of Guatemala's women is said to be essential for the country's economic and social development. Thus, the state will strive to eliminate discrimination against women in every sphere, and ensure that women will have the same opportunities as men.

The active participation of women is essential for Guatemala's economic and social development, and the State has a duty to promote the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women. (Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord, 1996: 6 paragraph 11).

This will enable the creation of a functional and participatory democracy that will promote productivity and economic growth, lead to a more equitable distribution of wealth and human resources training, and reduce the economic, social, and political polarization of society. In addition, it should increase the transparency of the state policy process (Socio-Economic, and Agrarian Issues Accord, 1996).

The state assumes full responsibility for being the guardian of the course of economic development, for making necessary investments, and for providing universal social development policies with emphasis on health, nutrition, education and training, housing, environmental, sanitation and productive employment and pay. However, in order for the state to fulfil these promises, the country will need to achieve a rate of economic growth of at least 6 percent per annum (Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord, 1996: 8-9). Only this would ensure the creation of sufficient jobs to allow the enhancement of social conditions in the country.

Since the majority of the Guatemalan population lives in rural areas, land is understood to be central to the problem of rural development. Hence, the government has agreed to promote a more "equitable and efficient" agrarian structure by creating a land fund that is to make land available to many of the most needy of members of the rural population. Such land redistribution is to be complemented by the following support services: help in transmitting techniques to modernize production and cultivation methods; better environmental protection; the further clarification of property rights provisions to make better use of the land and labour force; and greater labour protection.

Land is central to the problems of rural development. From the conquest to the present, historic events, often tragic, have left deep traces in ethnic, social and economic relations concerning property and land use. These have led to a situation of concentration of resources which contrasts with the poverty of the majority and hinders the development of Guatemala as a whole. It is essential to redress and overcome this legacy and promote more efficient and more equitable farming, strengthening the potential of all those involved, not only in terms of productive capacity but also in enhancing the cultures and value systems which coexist and intermingle in the rural areas of Guatemala (Socio-Economic And Agrarian Issues Accord, 1996: 18, paragraph 28).

Finally the state has also outlined measures through which it proposes to modernize public administration, arguing that:

Government services should become an efficient tool of development. To this end, the government undertakes to: Deepen the decentralization and redistribution of powers, responsibilities and resources concentrated in the central Government in order to modernize, render effective and streamline government services (Socio-Economic And Agrarian Issues Accord, 1996: 27, paragraph, 1).

and to increase public revenue collection.

Fiscal policy (revenue and expenditure) is the key tool enabling the State to comply with its constitutional commitments, particularly these relating to social development, which is essential to the quest for common good. Fiscal policy is also essential to Guatemalan sustainable development, which has been impaired by low levels of education, health care and public security, a lack of infrastructure and other factors which militate against increasing the productivity of labour and the competitiveness of the Guatemalan economy (Socio-Economic And Agrarian Issues Accord, 1996: 27, paragraph 45).

In summary, the substantive issues covered by the agreement include: democratization and participatory development; social development; agrarian and rural development; modernization of government services; and fiscal policy (Socio-Economic And Agrarian Issues Accord, 1996).

5.1.2 The Rights of Indigenous Peoples

Both the URNG and the government acknowledge in this Accord that the Guatemalan nation is multi-ethnic, multicultural and multilingual in nature. However, they acknowledge that indigenous peoples, including Maya, Xinca and Garifuna, have been specifically subjected to discrimination, exploitation and injustice due to their origins, culture, language, economic and social conditions. The Accord points out that it is essential to respect and recognize the identity of these indigenous peoples, and to safe-guard their social, political, economic and cultural rights. The clear recognition of the aforementioned rights by state and society will be the only way to sustain a lasting peace (The Right of Indigenous Peoples Accord, 1995).

That indigenous peoples have been particularly subject to de facto levels of discrimination, exploitation and injustice, on account of their origin, culture and language and that, like many other sectors of the national community, they have to endure unequal and unjust treatment and conditions on account of their economic and social status (The Right of Indigenous Peoples Accord, 1995: 1)

With respect to the identity of indigenous peoples, the government has committed itself to the following measures: to promote in the Congress, a law that would make ethnic discrimination a crime; and to promote constitutional reforms that will protect indigenous cultural and linguistic rights (The Right of Indigenous Peoples Accord, 1995: 3-6).

In addition, it has agreed to promote the rights of indigenous women, including measures to ensure their fuller participation in development projects, and their equal access to credit, housing and land. Moreover, it will frame a law that will classify sexual harassment as a crime, and one that is to be treated more seriously when it is committed against an indigenous women (The Right of Indigenous Peoples Accord, 1995).

It is recognized that indigenous women are particularly vulnerable and helpless, being confronted with twofold discrimination both as women and indigenous people, and also having to deal with a social situation characterized by intense poverty and exploitation (The Right of Indigenous Peoples Accord, 1995: 2, paragraph, 1)

The government has also promised to promote indigenous rights through education, the media and other means. With respect to cultural, economic, social and political rights, the state is to assume responsibility for devising mechanisms that will ensure the fuller participation of native peoples. It will do so by respecting their customary authorities and

laws, and by promoting their participation in the decision-making process as it pertains to issues affecting them (The Right of Indigenous Peoples Accord, 1995: 10).

Finally, the government is to create a joint land management commission that will study the possibility of turning over land to indigenous peoples, either as individuals or as a collective (The Right of Indigenous Peoples Accord, 1995: 13).

To make the defence of these rights effective, the government is to create an indigenous advocate's offices, that will provide free legal aid services to low income native peoples (The Right of Indigenous Peoples Accord, 1995: 4).

Furthermore, the government has stated that it has submitted convention 169 of the International Labour Organization to Congress for its approval, and that it will sign the U.N. Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (The Right of Indigenous Peoples Accord, 1995: 5).

It will be henceforth, the responsibility of the state to inform indigenous communities of their rights, obligations and opportunities in different aspects of national life, and to do so in their own languages, and in a way that is suited to indigenous traditions. The government has agreed to promote

the study of indigenous knowledge and to facilitate its being put into practice with the help of educational institutions. Finally, the parties have called on the United Nations to oversee the fulfilment of the accord (The Right of Indigenous Peoples Accord, 1995: 6).

In summary, the substantive issues covered by this Accord include: recognition of the separate identity of indigenous peoples; support for the struggle against discrimination in both law and practice; and protection of the cultural rights of indigenous peoples, as well as their civil, political, social and economic rights, with particular focus on their land rights (The Right of Indigenous Peoples Accord, 1995).

Having summarized these two Accords, I will now proceed to evaluate them using the theoretical framework and the questions discussed in Chapter Four. First I will evaluate the Socio-Economic And Agrarian Issues Accord; and then I will evaluate the Accord on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

5.2 THE SOCIO ECONOMIC AND AGRARIAN ISSUES ACCORD

In the context of my study, I will focus on two types of measures outlined in the Accord and designed to tackle the extreme poverty faced by the majority of Guatemala's native peoples: mainly the increase in social development expenditures (health, nutrition, education and training,

housing, environmental sanitation and access to productive employment and decent pay), and the provision of land.

5.2.1 Peace and the Economic Challenge

The Accord was signed after the installation of the right wing government of Alvaro Arzu Irigoyen in January, 1996, a government which is continuing the economic policies that were first initiated in the 1980's and that focus on economic deregulation, reduced fiscal spending, and free trade (CIEN, 1996). Through these measures the government is committed to leading the country into an even deeper integration with the global economy, the latest prescription for sustaining economic growth. This commitment is stated very clearly in the Socio-Economic Accord:

Guatemala requires speedy economic growth in order to create jobs and enhance social development. The country's social development, in turn, is essential for its economic growth and for better integration into the world economy (Socio-Economic Accord, 1996: 8, paragraph 15).

On the one hand Guatemala is aggressively integrating itself more deeply into the global economy while, on the other hand, it is more explicitly assuming the responsibility of addressing the extreme poverty and the continued marginalization of its native population after several years of civil war. The government has on its shoulders a huge social debt; millions of people are waiting for it to act. This debt must be addressed if it is to avoid a return to its recent past.

It is obvious that the economic foundation of these Accords is the neo-liberal model that the government of President Arzu is proposing to implement in the coming years. There is little evidence to suggest that the country's special circumstances (40 years of civil war) were adequately discussed at the negotiating table where the signing of these Accords took place. Neither is there evidence to suggest that the main Bretton Woods institutions (IMF and World Bank, and the United Nations) have discussed these issues with the government of Guatemala. In fact, the Guatemalan government is pursuing essentially the same macroeconomic stabilization and structural adjustment policies that would have been allocated and prescribed by the international financial institutions (primarily the IMF and World Bank) had the country never been at war. In other words, the peace process did not significantly reshape the economic policies of the government. In fact, the Accord was simply superimposed on the standard neoliberal economic model.

The country's macro economic stabilization and adjustment policies, which began to be implemented as far back as the early 1980's, were not even on the table for discussion. Nor were many of the new challenges facing the country as a result of its recent, even more aggressive, integration into the global economy. The further integration of Guatemala into the global economy is likely, however, to exacerbate income

inequality and further increase social and economic polarization. That's because this policy package has detrimental consequences for people.

In fact, this means that trickle-down has been accepted as the country's basic social development policy, following the premise that growth and distribution are incompatible in the short term; thus we must emphasize growth first, and then deal with the redistribution of that growth later. In the case of Guatemala, this means that the political stabilization of the country is to be attempted within a context that leaves little scope for investment in people, or in social mobilization.

The government would need a huge amount of money to implement this core Accord as written. But the State faces large accumulated external debts that must be paid as a first priority under its present economic strategy. Most of the proposed social development programs and policies however will have to rely heavily on international funding, which is generally highly conditional and allows humanitarian issues to be addressed only within a narrowly defined, neoliberal policy framework. This funding is more conditional than humanitarian. The country recently received a loan of \$50 millions from the Inter-American Development Bank (IBD), which will be mainly allocated to support the agricultural diversification program.

This will largely benefit the U.S. economy in the long run as most of the cash crops final destination is the U.S. (Diario el Grafico, January 18, 1997; La Nacion, January 20, 1997). This means also that the country will have to incur further debt in order to fulfil the Accords.

Thus, how can Guatemala achieve both consolidation of peace and economic growth following a civil war? In other words, how can the country achieve the macroeconomic objectives of fiscal austerity and meet the expenditure requirements of peace building, if the current economic policies pursued by the government are more focused on the achievement of economic growth to satisfy foreign debt payment and improve the lives of the few, while ignoring the social and domestic demands of the majority of its citizens.

There is therefore, enormous tension between the rhetoric and the promises of the Peace Accords, and the basic economic and social policies assumed by the government. The neo-liberal nature of these policies makes the fulfilment of the Accords extremely difficult, especially since the government is also proposing to intensify the application of this policy approach. This would mean a further reduction of public spending, more privatization, broader deregulation, the enactment of more regressive taxes, and the adoption of international efficiency criteria that are likely to

marginalize broad sectors of small and medium producers and impair the process of employment generation. The intensification of these adjustment measures reflects the fact that the economic commitments that the Guatemalan government is making and likely to make the process of political reconciliation even more difficult.

There is little doubt that the liberalization of trade, privatization, and the strong encouragement of the private sector, will continue to favour the most privileged local groups and the foreign investors with whom they often collaborate, thus reinforcing their market power (North, 1995). Ironically this economic policy regime, which is part of the democratization program in many Latin American countries including Guatemala, (Boron, 1995) may therefore endanger the possibilities of genuine democratic progress, despite its apparent association with democratic progress throughout the hemisphere. In fact, the limits of the apparent complementarity between neoliberalism and democracy may become most readily apparent in countries like Guatemala with a weak and underdeveloped state capacity and a history of rule by despotic elites. The latter use their market power to marginalize the majority of their people, preventing them from enjoying the fruits of development (North, 1995).

Experiences from around the world tell us that real peace requires more than the signing of a piece of paper and the silencing of the guns. The case of El Salvador, a country that was embroiled in civil war and that signed a peace agreement on January 16, 1992, illustrates this point. According to certain economic indicators, the El Salvador economy is doing fine. On January 6, 1997, the president of that country stated in his annual address to the people that according to his government, the Peace Accords are fulfilled and "El Salvador is moving in the right direction to a sustainable progress" (Prensa Grafica, 1996: 4). However the reality is that five years after the signing of the peace agreement, chaos reigns in that country. Economic growth has not yet reached the poor; neither have the commitments made by the state to improve the level of living of the poor been fulfilled. Scepticism about the peace accord and democracy remains high so long as the oligarchy and international institutions have vastly more influence than domestic civil society in defining the best social and economic policy for the country. As stated by the Catholic church of El Salvador, "we have seen democracy and peace just on paper not in reality. We have a long way to go to encounter democracy and peace" (Prensa Grafica, 1997). In fact, the proportion of people living under inhuman circumstances has risen in the last five years. The crime rate has increased; there is massive unemployment; and strong social discontent exist,

which is the most vivid sign of the state of despair faced by the majority of the Salvadorean people (Prensa Grafica, 1997).

In El Salvador, as in many other countries like Guatemala, that are in the process of consolidating peace, economic policies, and their international compromises with the international financial institutions, are not on the table for discussion. In fact, such countries would not be allowed to pursue an alternative economic policy, even if it could be shown to be more suitable for their context. Alvaro de Soto, a leading negotiator in the peace process in El Salvador, describes this process as:

A patient laying in the operating table with the left and right sides of his body separated by a curtain and unrelated surgery being performed on each side. On one side is the Peace Accords, and on the other side the adjustment programs and the stabilization plan (De Soto: 1994: 74).

Although the U.N. Agenda for Peace states that the military, political, economic, social and environmental problems facing a country should be addressed in a unified way when a country is in transition to peace, this has rarely happened in reality. In general it seems that the driving force behind the peace agreements has been the urgent and understandable desire to stop the war, rather than the elimination, or even the alleviation, of the initial causes of the conflict. Under such circumstances one may well wonder in whose name peace and democracy are being promoted.

In such a context, the policies for improving peoples' lives that are outlined and promised in the Peace Accord, are most unlikely to succeed, so that real peace and democracy will prove difficult to consolidate. As Bienefeld explains:

Things could be very different if the international community encouraged and supported the adoption of more cautious nationalist strategies by providing debt relief, more appropriate technical assistance, and more concessional and less conditional aid and capital flows. That would allow investment to focus more on the satisfaction of domestic demands and less on debt service payment or hard currency remittances (Bienefeld, 1995: 6).

5.2.2 Democracy and the Market

"Democratization" has become a global crusade (Stabler-Sholk, 1995: 1). Thus, in the eyes of the rest of the world, Guatemala is a "democracy", or is "in transition to democracy". It is declared a democracy because people have "democratically" elected a new president, even though more than half of the Guatemalan population did not participate in this election. It is also considered a democracy because the country officially is no longer at civil war. This means that Guatemala meets the world's mainstream standards to be considered democratic. A true democracy however should involve more than this. It should include a degree of socio-economic equality and popular participation for all sectors of society (Berntzen, 1993). And if this is how we define democracy, the case of Guatemala is only a "facade democracy" (Berntzen, 1993: 3). In other words, the clothes may have changed, but

the clown inside them is the same: the domestic concentration of social, economic, political and cultural power remains largely unchanged, and in the hands of the same people.

A true democracy should provide people the opportunity to decide on the kind of society in which they want to live and the economic development model that is best suited to their particular circumstances (Vilas, 1995). Therefore, the majority of the Guatemalan people coming from civil war, of the magnitude of the war in Guatemala, should have been allowed to decide what development policies are best suited for the country or, at least, to make allowances to cope with the human, physical and other devastation of the country. As it was, the native peoples, who were most deeply affected by the war and by economic austerity in a society that has tended to marginalize them, were not even directly involved in the negotiations leading to the new "democratic" Guatemala (Demarck, in Lee Van Coott, 1996). As in the past, only a tiny minority decided on the shape of Guatemala's future. As one native person said:

The democracy that exists has teeth: it bites and destroys. It is not participatory. They talk about democracy, but they've never let Indians participate. This democracy "with teeth" breeds more mistrust among indigenous peoples (Demarck, in Lee Van Coott, 1996: 3).

Furthermore, according to a recent report on human rights in Guatemala in January 30 1997, by Jorge Mario Garcia-Laguardia, Secretary General for Human Rights in Guatemala, "even though structural violence in Guatemala has formally ended there still exist numerous violations of the rights of the people." In fact, union members, journalists and several other civil society organizations continue to be harassed and persecuted (Prensa Libre, January 30, 1997: 10).

In this context one can argue that the main impetus for the government's willingness to sign the peace agreement was largely based on the economic gains that the wealthy minority will enjoy if the country manages to achieve political stability, however temporarily. The main thing is to look better to the eyes of the rest of the world and especially the world's powerful investors. This is argued by Vilas:

Central American elites got along very well without democracy, and the democratic discourse they practice today appears to come primarily from fear of a return of the recent past, from the perceived need for social control, or from the usefulness of locating themselves within the prominent discourse of the international community (Vilas, 1995: 188).

5.2.3 The Social Development Provisions of the Socio-Economic Accord

Since the accords are built on the neo-liberal economic model, the social development policies outlined in the Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord are designed from the

perspective of this approach. And this current model of development tends not to concern itself explicitly with social development, which is treated as a "dependent variable". A strong economy, it is argued, will make permanent social policies unnecessary. Social transfers are generally considered government expenses, not investments. Poverty is a pathology, not a consequence of the economic system, and by isolating poverty from the process of capital accumulation and economic development, neo-liberals reduce the search for solutions to the design of temporary, targeted support policies (Vilas, 1996). Social development problems are considered overwhelmingly transitory: after an initial phase, which may impose social costs, sound policies are confidently expected to reestablish basic macroeconomic equilibrium, to promote economic growth without inflation and to create new jobs within the modern sector of the economy. Trickle down will raise income levels generally, leaving only a tiny proportion of the population in need of public assistance. Social policy is therefore a form of charity, directing carefully targeted aid toward the extremely poor. It is not about improving the working and living conditions of the victims of imperfect models, or of distorted development policies, or about preventing a further deterioration of the living standard of these segments of population that are already below the poverty line. Social policy is not designed to help such people get out of poverty; it simply tries to

prevent them from sinking into it, beyond a certain absolute level (Vilas, 1996).

Social policy of this kind is essentially concerned with putting out fires, so that extreme social tension does not become an even larger political problem. Neo-liberalism does fear the possibility that such problems could create a climate of instability that might negatively affect the inflow of foreign capital, putting the entire economic model at risk and restricting the elite's ability to multiply its wealth. In this purely instrumental sense, social development policy does become a priority issue in the politics of the moment. The neo-liberal model's response has been to focus attention on three policy responses: decentralization, privatization and targeting.

This approach to social development is clearly reflected in the language and the philosophy of the Socio-Economic Accord, which proposes two similar mechanisms to promote social development, mainly: a very limited increase in government social spending; and second, the creation of a land fund that is to distribute land to the landless.

The first policy thrust, is to call for some increase in government expenditure on social development, particularly in the areas of health, nutrition, education and training,

housing, environmental sanitation and productive employment and pay. But in order to make this possible, the country must achieve a sustained rate of economic growth of at least 6 per cent per annum. In the words of the Accord:

For its part, the Government undertakes to adopt economic policies designed to achieve steady growth in the gross domestic product of not less than 6 % per annum, which would enable it to implement a progressive social policy (Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord, 1996: 9, paragraph, 18).

In order to achieve the required growth to support a more effective social development policy, the government proposes to decentralize power over the provision of social support services, and over other decisions that directly affect peoples' lives, directly to the regions and municipalities of the country. Furthermore, the Accord states that, although the state will provide citizens with various social support services, it will also encourage private organizations to meet these needs, albeit under its strict supervision. Finally, it declares that all social support will be aimed at those sectors of the population that are most in need (Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord, 1996).

The claim is that these changes will enhance participation and improve the efficiency of service delivery. Decentralization, for instance, is said to permit social policy decision-making to be brought closer to the people, as

it is relocated to lower echelons of government including provinces, municipalities, communities, or eventually even to local non-governmental organizations representing the affected populations. This not only empowers people, but can give them a sense of the importance of working together to confront their problems. The Accord clearly points to this aim when it says that the government will seek to:

Improve the administration of government resources and investment by decentralizing them and making them less concentrated and bureaucratic, reforming budget performance mechanisms by giving them autonomy in decision-making and financial management to guarantee their efficiency and transparency, and strengthening supervisory and auditing mechanisms Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord, 1996:10, paragraph 19, section (d)).

Up to now, however, decentralization in the context of Guatemala's neo-liberal strategy, has focused primarily on program implementation, not on program design. This amounts to functional decentralization but not political decentralization (Vilas: 199). In this process native peoples are being given an opportunity to make decisions on how to implement given, or pre-determined programs, of health, education and culture within their own communities. However, they will have little freedom to decide on their preferred development policies, or on which policies they deem more appropriate for their circumstances.

Recognizing the role of the communities, within the framework of municipal autonomy, in exercising the right of indigenous peoples to determine their own development priorities, particularly in the fields of education, health, culture and the infrastructure, the Government undertakes to strengthen the capacity of such communities in this area (The Right of Indigenous Peoples Accord, 1996: 10, Section 4 paragraph 3).

Privatization is the second main social policy instrument the state has in mind. Privatizing social services is considered a way to alleviate the fiscal crisis, to make service delivery more efficient, and to avoid the micro-macroeconomic distortions that arise from free and subsidized public services. As is stated in the Accord:

Apply and develop the regulatory framework to guarantee the exercise of social rights and provide social services through public entities and, where necessary, through semi-public or private entities, and supervise the adequate provision of such services (Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord, 1996: 9, paragraph 19 section a).

Privatization implies the abandonment of the notion of public services made available to all citizens as a matter of right, replacing it with the notion that the services should be primarily provided by private, profit-making business to people in accordance with their willingness, and ability, to pay. Privatization of social services exacerbates social inequalities, by enforcing the effects of current income inequalities. Since only wealthier groups can make full use of the available services, health and education are no longer a right. They are now primarily commodities to be bought and

sold in the market place in accordance with people's ability to pay (Vilas, 1996).

A two tiered provision of social services by government, particularly in health and education, has always existed in Guatemala. However, this Accord goes much further in legitimizing and extending the role of the private sector in the provision of these services, on the basis of people's ability to pay. This obviously privileges those with higher incomes while it further marginalizes those who do not have the means to pay for such services. In Guatemala, the latter will be mainly native peoples, because of their profound poverty relative to other Guatemalans.

Meanwhile, the government has proposed to deal with these problems by giving priority to the most needy population and by specifically targeting this group in allocating the remaining publicly provided social support services. It argues that by careful targeting, it can more effectively reach the poorest of the poor, thereby allowing it to do more with less. Thus, the Accord proposes to:

Give priority to the neediest sector of the society and the most disadvantaged areas of the country, without short-changing other sectors of the society (Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord, 1996: 9, paragraph 19 section (c)).

Targeting, in theory, aims to fulfil a basic requirement of any public social policy, that is, to reach the intended constituency or population while optimizing the use of public resources. However, such approaches can turn out to be relatively costly, cumbersome to administer, demeaning to recipients, and often arbitrary and unfair in practice.

The main obstacle is to define the potential beneficiaries in accordance with the magnitude of these needs (Vilas, 1996). Moreover, in the case of Guatemala, this will be difficult since the majority of people live in absolute poverty by most comparative standards. Therefore, the targeting process will have to make some very fine and ultimately arbitrary distinctions in identifying the poorest of the poor from among this group.

5.2.4 Indigenous Peoples and Rural Landlessness

The second mechanism through which the government will seek to promote social development is via the attainment of "more equitable land tenure" through land distribution, as explained in the Accord:

It is essential for the State to increase and focus its efforts and its resources towards the rural area, and to promote agrarian modernization, in a sustainable manner, in the direction of greater justice and greater efficiency (Socio-Economic Accord, 1996: 31, paragraph 31).

This is to be done through the following means: the government will acquire land using government resources allocated to that end, grants from supportive international "friendly" organizations, and loans from international development agencies. In addition it will reallocate land that is alienated, on the basis of a national agricultural census that is to be done by the state, in order to identify uncultivated, but owned, land, and land that has been illegally settled. Such land will then become government property and will be distributed to the most needy (Socio Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord, 1996).

The redistribution will seek to:

Promote, through all means possible, the development of a dynamic land market that would enable tenant farmers who either do not have land or have insufficient land, to acquire land through long-term transactions at commercial or favourable interest rates with little or no down payment (paragraph 34 section (e), Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord, 1996:20, paragraph 34 section (e)).

The importance of this initiative is clear, since the inequality of land distribution has contributed greatly to socio-economic polarization in the country, while denying the country's indigenous peoples the most important means of surviving culturally and physically ever since colonial times. Today, the majority of native peoples are in desperate need of land merely to ensure their physical survival. As the majority are now landless, they rely for their subsistence on food grown on marginal land neglected by the export sector, which

controls most of the country's fertile land. Some do have small parcels of land, with a house and perhaps a garden. Others must rent land in the nearby villages in order to cultivate crops for their subsistence. However the majority work seasonally as labourers on farms and on the big plantations owned by the elite and foreign companies (Cartmarck, 1996: 356). Thus native peoples first of all need land for their physical and cultural survival. However, the quotes from the Accord make it clear that the State's main objective is to re-distribute small land holdings in order to further diversify agricultural production for export, not in order to improve the living conditions, or to secure the subsistence needs of the native communities. This means that what native people will produce on their small plots of land is pre-defined according to the government agricultural policy and is not based on people's necessities. This is well expressed by the following statement:

Establish a land trust fund within a broad-based banking institution to provide credit and promote savings, preferably among micro, small and medium sized enterprises (Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord, 1996: 19, paragraph 34 section (a)).

Pedro Bal Cumes, from the Maya news agency, expresses the following opinion about the Accord's treatment of the land question:

The government and the URNG will benefit politically with this accord, more than the native peoples. Our life will continue in the same conditions. There are two parties in this accord. There is the triumphant which include the business sector and the State and the frustrated people which means us the native peoples. CACIF for example proposes that this accord will promote social investment in which the market will be the engine of development. Thus, it is presupposed that all of us could be converted to entrepreneurs through grassroots associative enterprises. For the frustrated it means that this accord was designed by the cupula, it will create social uncertainty, but the status of the owners of the capital and the latifundistas will be guaranteed, as well as the semi-feudal system of the agricultural production and the private ownership of the land (Bal Cumes in Critica, 1996: 5).

Native peoples depending only on their labour as a productive asset will have to assume long term debts in order to gain access to a small plot of land. Standard banking criteria will apply to the interest that is to be paid on loans to purchase land or on agricultural loans made by the land trust bank that is to be founded by the state. One native person was quoted as saying bitterly that "we shed blood all these years in order to buy land at market prices"! (Bal Cumes, in Critica, 1996: 5). The possibility that poor people, living a miserable life, and with barely enough physical energy to ensure their subsistence, could undertake and finance major entrepreneurial projects requiring huge substantial investments is highly unrealistic (Paz, in Critica, 1996: 1). Such an approach to the more "equitable distribution of land" is clearly the neo-liberal way of approaching rural landlessness. In fact, it provides a way for neo-liberalism to be extended and consolidated in the rural

areas. People will be forced to give way to competitive market forces and the interests of banks and their wealthy clients, without taking into consideration the social aspects or political aspects of this process. In short, the Accord does not really concern itself with land reform or with rural equity, but rather with agricultural reform. This form of land distribution will see small plots of land consolidated so that the latifundio will be reinforced, even though it is the minifundio that is emphasized and legalized in the Accord. In this sense, the Accord is aimed at capital's and the state's objectives, not those of the people, let alone those of the native communities. The truth is that this Accord does not provide any viable means of resolving the problems caused by the excessive concentration of land that burdens Guatemala's attempts to achieve a sustainable peace.

Manuel Conde-Orellana, ex-president of the Negotiation Committee for Peace of Guatemala (COPAZ), when asked to comment about the land issues in the Socio-Economic Accord, explained that:

The Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord does not harm the interest of the capital. It is a good accord because it takes away fears, and it does not alter the internal order. It is one thing to say we will provide land to 100 thousand families, another to say we will have to distribute a large quantity of land. It does not treat the political and economic base of the elite, instead there is a restoration of the alliance between the government and the private sector (Prensa Libre, 1996: 6).

As explained, the provision of land to grow food to feed the empty stomachs of starving people is not the state's priority in this Accord. Rather it is to preserve and consolidate the current concentration of land, and to serve the interest of privileged land owners who want to promote agricultural diversification to expand the country's exports and to underwrite its present development strategy.

5.3 THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES ACCORD

In general, for a country like Guatemala in which the rights of indigenous peoples have never been formally or constitutionally recognized, this Accord represents a great achievement in the eyes of some native peoples. This Accord does not fulfil all our aspirations, "but is the minimum fruit of five centuries of resistance and more than four decades of armed conflict in which he have been the main victims.... This Accord itself does not solve the indigenous peoples' problem, it is a significant step forward in the recognition of the different indigenous peoples in Guatemala who in the past were denied even their existence" (Lopez, in Critica, 1996: 1).

In the discussion of this, and other, Accords, indigenous peoples views were represented through the Assembly of Civil Society (ACS) to which some of the indigenous peoples organizations belong (Lopez, in Critica, 1996: 2). Indigenous peoples themselves did not have the opportunity to present

their arguments, as indigenous peoples, reflecting the elite's arrogant belief that indigenous peoples are incapable of articulating their demands adequately and unable to speak for themselves. This mentality is well expressed in the following statement:

Indigenous peoples were not allowed to directly present their proposal for this accord. Indigenous representatives participated as mere observers while their demands were left in the hands of Monseigneur Rodolfo Quezada-Torruno who was the president of the ASC (Lopez, in Critica, 1996: 1 (a)).

The Accord encompasses two substantive areas, the identity of indigenous peoples, and their civil, political, social and economic rights, including the land question. The section which deals with indigenous peoples' identity and their cultural rights, is the section in which the government makes more serious commitments to the improvement of native people's lives. Here it is recognized that the native peoples' view of the world is a holistic one that is completely different from that of other people in society. Thus it is said that native peoples have:

A view of the world based on the harmonious relationship of all elements of the universe, in which the human being is only one additional element, in which the earth is the mother who gives life and maize is a sacred symbol around which Mayan culture revolves. This view of the world has been handed from generation to generation through material and written artifacts and by oral tradition in which women have played a determining role (The Rights of Indigenous Peoples Accord, 1995:3, paragraph (c))

5.3.1 Indigenous Peoples and their Economic Rights

The section on civil, political, social and economic rights in this Accord amounts to little more than a formal recognition of existing indigenous authorities; the administrative regionalization of services like education, health and culture; the legitimation of native people's participation in all levels in the country's political decision-making process; and the exercise of customary community law, as expressed in the Accord:

Recognizing the role of the communities, within the framework of municipal autonomy, in exercising the right of indigenous peoples to determine their own development priorities, particularly in the fields of education, health, culture and the infrastructure, the Government undertakes to strengthen the capacity of such communities in this area" (The Right of Indigenous Peoples Accord, 1995:10 paragraph 3, section (b)).

Unfortunately the Accord did not outline any procedure for establishing the right of indigenous peoples to decide on the kind of development that would be deemed most suitable for their circumstances and the speed at which they wanted that development to proceed. In fact, the recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples was not allowed to conflict with the dominant national development prescription, as indicated in the following paragraph:

The accord did not address the economic right of Native Peoples. A Guatemalan Maya-cackchiquel leader Demetrio Cojti Cuxil says, "we will have far to go to arrive at a true democracy in Guatemala, that reaches not only the ethnic sphere but also the economic sphere (Otzoy, 1996: 3).

5.3.2 Indigenous Peoples, Land Rights and the Market

The section of the Accord that deals with land, addresses issues such as: the regulation of the land rights of indigenous peoples; the administration of natural resources; restitution of communal lands and compensation for its alienation; the state's acquisition of land for the development of indigenous communities. The criteria which are to be used for the distribution of land are discussed in the land rights section of the Socio-Economic Accord.

However, there is a conflict between the section dealing with the recognition of native people's identity and cultural rights, and that dealing with indigenous peoples and land. Indeed, in the latter section no account is taken of the native peoples' holistic view of the world, in which land forms the basis of their identity and culture. No reference is made to the special meaning that land has for native peoples. In fact, the way in which land is described here is incompatible with the discussion of identity and cultural rights in the earlier section. Here, land is looked upon simply as an economic instrument (a factor of production) that can be exploited and from which profit can be extracted. No

thought is given to land as forming a central part of the holistic view of the world of Guatemala's native peoples.

5.3.3 State Policies in the Accord, and Indigenous Peoples

On balance it seems clear that the government's purpose in this Accord was to continue to control the decision-making process with regard to issues affecting the lives of the country's native peoples. Both The Right of Indigenous Peoples . Accord and the Socio-Economic and the Agrarian Issues Accord were signed with very little input from the Mayan peoples who were most affected by the civil war. As explained by several native peoples, the overall Accord was signed to satisfy mainly two principles: the western economic principles and the national elite principles (Critcica, 1996). Native peoples were not at the centre of the process as they should have been, both because they were the country's first inhabitants and because they form the majority of Guatemalan population. Instead, their concerns were added into a policy framework that mainly serves the interests, and reflects the views, of both the Guatemalan and the international elites.

The policies outlined in these Accords reflect the ultimate capitalist project of global integration or assimilation. This project is now widely espoused by the elites of Latin America, and it shapes their dominant economic development agenda (Lee Van Coott, 1994 and 1996). The Guatemalan government legitimizes these Accords by

claiming that they reflect, or fulfil, the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention of 1997 (ILO Convention No. 169) or the United Nation' Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. In fact, according to experts on indigenous peoples' rights, native peoples were not allowed to present their demands directly as native peoples in the negotiations leading up to the draft ILO convention, but participated mainly as observers (Gomez, 1995). Mexican analyst Diaz Polanco, has explained that the new way of looking at indigenous peoples in Latin America is dominated by an indigenist approach which assumes that indigenous problems can be best solved by integrating them into the dominant society. This approach assumes that such an integration of indigenous peoples into main-stream society will improve their quality of life, and often, that such progress is inevitable. This approach does not acknowledge, or leave room for, the possibility that indigenous peoples should have the right to chose a development path that they deem more suitable for their culture (Diaz Polanco, 1995).

This integrationist approach could explain why so much emphasis is placed on cultural rights, while economic, social and political rights are mentioned but in a way that has little substance. But, if a real change is to occur in the state's policy towards Guatemala's indigenous peoples, then constitutional reform must not only focus on cultural rights,

but must also extend to those sections of the Constitution dealing with economic and socio-political matters (Lee Van Cott, 1996).

Diaz Polanco (1995) describes the latest politics of "Indigenism" as it is applied to indigenous peoples in Latin America, as ethnophagous, which is a new variation of indigenist. "In this approach an effort is made to assimilate the "Indians", not because they are considered culturally inferior, but because their labour power and their control of natural resources (such as land, forest, subsoil, mineral and others), needs to be better harnessed to serve the economic projects of the state and international markets. In the end, this new approach is intended to support the state's economic strategy, by better integrating the indigenous peoples and their natural and economic sources into the economic process (Tresiera, in Lee Van Cott, 1995). Diaz Polanco defined this new indigenist strategy as:

Ethnophagia thus expresses the overall process whereby the culture of domination seeks to swallow up or devour the way popular cultures, mainly by virtue of the weight that the "national" patterns exercise over the ethnic communities. It does not seek to destroy through absolute denial of or violent attack on their identities, but rather is aimed at gradual dissolution through attraction, seduction, and self-transformation (Diaz Polanco, in Lee Van Cott, 1995: 200).

Education is one of the many instruments through which to pursue this approach to assimilation, as indicated by a

statement in the Socio-Economic Accord in a section dealing with Guatemala's educational goal. This exactly reflects the state's main goal in this policy area:

Education and training have a fundamental role in the country's economic, cultural, social and political development. They are central to the strategy of equity and national unity, and vital for economic modernization and international competitiveness (Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord, 1996: 10, paragraph 21).

Education, according to this point of view, will also contribute to the following:

To contribute to the application of technical and scientific progress and, consequently, to the achievement of higher productivity, the creation of more jobs and increased income for the population, and beneficial integration into the world economy (Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord 1996:10, paragraph, 21 section (c)).

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have analyzed two of the most important Accords of the Peace Plan of Guatemala: the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Accord and the Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord. These Accords are ostensibly intended to reverse the extreme poverty and marginalization of the country's indigenous peoples that have resulted from past economic, social and political policies. Such policies have proven unsuitable for even providing for the most basic needs of the native peoples throughout Guatemalan history. Furthermore, the policies enshrined in these Accords are very similar, if not identical in essence to those that have

created and perpetuated the marginalization of indigenous peoples. There is therefore no reason to believe that the future will not reflect that same past. Nor do these Accords adequately consider the special circumstances of the country emerging from a long and bloody civil war.

Certainly, insufficient thought appears to have been given to the negative social impact of the economic policies now being implemented by the government, especially in the short run, when political balances will necessarily remain precarious and unstable.

Since indigenous peoples form the majority of the Guatemalan population and since they also represent the great majority of the poor, any economic policy that hopes to heal the wounds of the past should be centred on the particular needs of native cultures and societies and not only on the interests and conditions of the dominant minority elite culture. Native cultural values and beliefs should have been allowed to have much greater scope in shaping these Accords, rather than being inserted uneasily and crudely into policy prescriptions that primarily reflect global and national elite concerns.

In the final analysis, the spirit of individualism that is so strongly associated with global free-market ideology has

been taken as given, and imposed upon a country in which the majority of the population continues to believe in the spirit of caring; in sharing and taking care of one another and in integrating human existence into a holistic view of nature and the world. Monetary initiatives are proposed for improving the conditions under which the indigenous peoples live, but those have proven more likely to destroy rather than build traditional cultural and spiritual values, and to do so without providing the people with a substantive or viable alternative form of existence. Such development policies continue to see people as objects. They value people not for who they are, as people, but for how well they fit into the plans and expectations of governments, and international development organizations and corporate investors. The resulting structures that are proposed, therefore, assume the desirability of certain values and attitudes: the spirit of individual entrepreneurship; the readiness to save and invest in development projects; and a business friendly ethic that extols the virtues of competition, rather than the spirit of cooperation to satisfy each other's needs. The only beneficiaries of this process will be the national and international elites who have consolidated their power and strengthened their position in society.

Development models when they are not culturally centred, are very unlikely to provide for the latent needs of the

indigenous peoples of Guatemala. Consequently, the development policies contained in these Accords are very likely to continue the marginalization and impoverishment of its indigenous peoples. In this context, genuine democracy and peace will not have a long life, because their foundation is a form of democracy through which the existence of most of the population will be steadily undermined.

Although the Accord on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples has strong progressive elements in the context of Guatemala, there are nevertheless several major limitations. While the section on identity and cultural rights provides signs of hope in recognising the separate identity and culture of indigenous peoples, the section dealing with economic, political, social and land issues, fails to provide indigenous peoples with substantial economic rights, and forgets that, for indigenous peoples, land is not only a means for physical survival, but a foundation of life whose meaning and values is beyond measurement. It stands not only for their physical survival, but also for that of their culture. Indeed, the country cannot claim to be a true democracy without giving native peoples back their right to choose a way of life that reflects their culture and values and ends the process that has marginalised the majority of the population for so long.

The alternative should be an endogenous and participatory development process in which native peoples can become central, not an addition to be fitted into the agenda that has already been set by others. I suggest, therefore, that the only alternative for Guatemala is to step back and step out of the Northern version of development and modernism, and to rededicate itself to an alternative form of socio-economic development; a form that allows native peoples to take the lead in defining the kind of development that is best suited for the country. It must be a form of development that is defined from within, and that is based on the distinctive culture of Guatemala, its needs, its existing resources, and its own definition of economic and social development. It must be a form of development that touches on the people's material as well as spiritual and cultural needs.

My purpose in constructing this argument is to suggest such an alternative and to gain insight into the critique of current development models. It is not to determine whether this is a realistic alternative in the current international and local political-economic context in which development takes place. Development from within will be discussed in Chapter Six.

CHAPTER 6

6.0 DEVELOPMENT FROM WITHIN: A KEY TO LASTING PEACE AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT IN GUATEMALA

The world needs many sacred dances, many wisdoms coming from non-developed societies in a creative and critical and constructive dialogue with the powerful scientific, technological, political and managerial rationalities of "development" societies. Only through such dialogue can we humans generate a wisdom to match our sciences and we can stop behaving as one-eyed giants (Goulet, 1992: 473).

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter Five shows that the strategies to improve the wellbeing of the majority of the Guatemalan population outlined in the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accords are very likely to continue to marginalize and impoverishing native peoples in Guatemala. This is because these Accords were designed to meet the priorities of the global economic system and the national elite minority but not necessarily the needs of the native peoples.

6.2 WHY DEVELOPMENT FROM WITHIN IS NEEDED IN GUATEMALA?

How can Guatemala work toward putting the majority of people's needs first, and instead of marginalizing native peoples and regarding them as an obstacle to economic advancement of the country. How can native peoples become the centre for proposing a new Guatemala based on the ancient wisdom of native peoples, based on the sense of community

caring for each other and protection of Mother Nature. There is overwhelming evidence that eurocentric mechanical, linear and materialistic prescriptions of development have failed the majority of the Guatemalan population and perpetuate societal inequalities. These development prescriptions have also failed the great majority of developing countries around the globe. All of these countries and their peoples are clamouring for another way of looking at development. Perhaps we should change once and for all the way in which development and progress have been looked upon until now.

There are many voices coming from many developing countries where the majority of the world's poor live. As a recent study done by the IDRC on development alternatives in developing countries explains, there are signs that many individuals from such diverse backgrounds, disciplines, experiences, peoples from many corners of the globe, are profoundly questioning the meaning of development. Their common insight is that the global free-market paradigm is neither viable ecologically in the long term, nor adequate in the short term, to meet even the most-basic needs of all peoples. The study concludes that there is not any definitive answer on how to go about solving the present crisis facing the majority of developing countries (IDRC, 1995: 41).

Based on my review of the literature on development alternatives it is clear that there are no easy solutions for solving the crisis facing developing countries. It is a fact also that there is a gigantic interdependency between global capital and the decisions made concerning the future of the people in developing countries, and thus the future of the people of a very tiny, devastated, country such as Guatemala. I am also aware that if countries chose to pursue their own way of development, these countries would be severely punished and isolated. But then, which other alternative is left for people to reclaim human development?

I am reluctant, however, to believe that the current prescription to progress is one and the same medicine that each country around the world has to take in order to be cured of all the sicknesses. All countries around the world have different needs and aspirations.

As with other people looking for alternatives on development, I do not have the answer either to the current crisis of the developing countries or for Guatemala. One thing I have in common with these people is a dream. This dream is that there is a need to change the way we regard development and the progress of nations. It has to go beyond growth to include many other non-quantitative components. I further agree with these people looking for development alternatives

that a wholistic approach to development, rooted in peoples' beliefs, cultural, economic and historical realities, is needed. It should be a wholistic process of social change that not only starts from the local community, but also from peoples' inner values and aspirations. As O'Manique (1992: 2) points out "development should be seen as a wholistic process or a self-actualization of the individual as a whole." These non-quantitative parts of development have been regarded as factors separated from growth and as such, having very little relevance to development (Goulet, 1995).

This wholistic way of looking at development has been suggested for a long time by many peoples around the globe. However their voices have been swallowed up or undermined by main-stream development prescriptions. These voices include women, indigenous peoples, grassroots movements and many others concerned about the way development of nations is perceived.

In the collection of essays edited by Sen and Grown (1987) and done mainly by poor women from developing countries around the world, the latter have crafted together a dream about how they wish the new world to look like. The following statement summarizes that dream:

We want a world where inequality based on class, gender and race is absent from every country, and from the relationships among countries. We want a world where basic needs become basic rights and where poverty and all forms of violence are eliminated. Each person will have the opportunity to develop her or his full potential and creativity, and women's values of nurturance and solidarity will characterize human relationship (Sen and Grown, 1987: 80).

Other grassroots groups such as the Sri-Lankan Sarvodaya movement have said the following:

We have to look at development as an awakening process-- a process by which both material needs and spiritual aspirations can be fulfilled. We will no longer place productivity, growth, resource mobilization, technology, markets and other such material arrangement on a supreme pedestal and push to the insignificant backyard spiritual virtues such a compassion, sharing, contentment, co-operation and joy of living... an awakening process where the human being is at the centre has to have certain characteristics which distinguish it from numerous other activities going on around us in the name of development (Ariyaratne, A. T., 1986: 145-146 (a)).

Furthermore, people such as Goulet argue that three basic components or core values should serve as a conceptual basis and practical guideline for understanding the inner meaning of development. These core values are life substance, self-esteem, and freedom, representing common goals sought by all individuals and societies. These fundamental principles are to be found in almost all the societies and cultures at all times (Todaro, 1996: 16).

Native people see the world in a wholistic way and also development. This wholistic view of looking at development is

not an alien concept to native peoples. It is consistent with many traditional rural practices that have been in place for many centuries. It is the basis on which native peoples survived and developed for many centuries before the arrival of the Europeans. This way of looking at development has been undermined by many years of colonialism, the continuing power and control of local elites and the adverse impact of international economic prescriptions and trading practices, as the case of Guatemala amply illustrates. However, native people's way of looking at the world and development can teach us how to save the world from the current world crisis (Carmarck, 1996).

As Ashley Montagu, an anthropologist and social critic, points out, aboriginal societies exemplify the principles of co-operation and interdependency which form the often acknowledged basis of human evolutionary success. In his recent book, **"Growing Young"**, Montagu has written that no early population of human beings could have survived had it not been for the dominant role that love and co-operation played in holding them together (CBC, Ideas, March, 1984).

This way of looking at development in a more wholistic way has been known in the world for a very long time. However it is still considered utopian, backwards and impoverishing. Then the following questions should be asked and answered: has

not the development prescription for economic growth, up to now, been also utopian, unrealistic and degrading for the majority of poor people in the developing countries? Has it not exacerbated the conditions of marginalized groups in society, such as women and ethnic groups in developing countries? Has it not created wars, famine, environmental degradation and many other human devastations?

People from developing countries representing the majority of the poor and dispossessed from the current development prescriptions, are still waiting for the benefits that "development" are supposed to bring. However, despite so many years of development:

More than three-fourths of the world's people live in developing countries, but they enjoy only 16% of the world's income--while the richest 20% have 85% of the global income (Todaro:1996:3, from the United Nations, Human Development Report, 1995).

So the long awaited king of progress has not yet appeared. At least, the majority of poor people in developing countries has not yet seen it, and it is very unlikely that it will appear in the near future.

I further believe that besides development including issues that cannot be measured, such as culture, spirituality and the development of the individual as a whole, development also has to be country-specific and that there should not be any universal definition of development. As Tri explains:

There is no such thing as a single, uniform development model: experience acquired in recent decades has shown that no development model can be viewed as being universal or universally transported (Tri, 1988: 4)

Development therefore has to be endogenous, i. e. a form which emanates from within, which is focused first and foremost on meeting the true needs and aspirations of peoples in order to ensure their genuine fulfilment as creatures of this planet. Development from within is defined as:

Development from within is the development of local people, by local people, for local people. It is a diversified process of social change which can prevent and alleviate the damage that modern western style of development has brought about. It is rural-, people-centred development, understanding development as a holistic process, rather than reducing it to economic terms. This approach aims particularly at restoring people's identity as a basis for self-reliance. Therefore, development from within starts not only from each local community, but also from people's inner values and aspirations... Development from within strives to tap the full potential of people's capabilities as actors in their environment... This is done based on their ecosystem and their traditional wisdom, skills, and culture (Mancy, 1987: 10).

Thus this concept explains not only that development should be viewed wholistically but also that it has to be country-specific and has to start from the bottom up and from the inner of the human being.

6.1.1 Development from Within: the Sri Lankan Case

The case of Sri Lanka's Sarvodaya Shramadana grassroots movement is a small but significant example of how people from many corners in the developing countries are moving in the

direction of seeing development wholistically and culturally specifically. This movement's way of approaching development is based on the cultural, economic, spiritual and historical realities facing rural people of Sri-Lanka.

The Sarvodaya Sharmadana Movement is a Sri-Lankan grassroots movement which is based on Buddhism and the indigenous traditions of Sri-Lanka. The movement understands development in a wholistic way: first, because it focuses first and foremost on the satisfaction of basic human needs and on emphasising self-reliance; second because the movement also emphasises the importance of people's self actualization as individuals, through their spiritual awakening (Macy, 1983).

This endogenous development initiative is completely different from the dominant development prescriptions. It regards development as wholistic, consisting of an integrated set of factors such as: social access of all people to physical and mental health, educational and cultural facilities; political rights, meaning the enjoyment of all fundamental rights by all including, the freedom to shape one's political environment; righteous livelihood; cultural accumulated beneficial experiences along with customs, beliefs, art, music, song, dance and drama, which help to keep a community of people together as a cohesive whole; spiritual

awakening of one's mind, through concentration on wisdom and unconditional happiness; and economic development meeting basic human needs (Goulet, 1981: 9).

The core of the movement's ideal is "awakening", which is expressed in its name: "Sarvodaya" means awakening of all, and Sharamadana means "sharing labour or human energy" (Kondoh, in Manoukian 1989: 227). Therefore, Sarvodaya Shramadana denotes "sharing labour or human energy for awakening of all". Moreover, their name is given a dual meaning; in addition to the awakening of all, it means the awakening of the total human personality or the building of a new person. Macy explains:

While the modern "developers" would view the goal of spiritual awakening as idealistic and irrelevant, the Sarvodaya Movement sees any development program as unrealistic which does not recognize and alleviate the psychological impotence gripping the rural poor. Sarvodaya believes that by tapping their innermost beliefs and values, one can awaken people to their Swanshakti (personal Power) and Janasshati (collective or people's power) (Macy, 1983: 32).

We can see that this awakening is not only confined to the personal awakening; the movement attempts to awaken the potential of one's family, of one's village, of one's country and one's world.

Ariyaratne, the founder of this movement, provides this definition of development:

I would define development as a process of awakening. This awakening should simultaneously take place within individuals, families, other small groups, villages and urban communities, national communities, and the world community. Also, this awakening should be an all-embracing and an integrated process in which people's spiritual, moral, cultural, social, political and economic life is inextricably involved (Manoukian, 1989: 283).

We can see that development here starts from one's personal awakening. Through this awakening, Sarvodaya aims at a "dual awakening", beginning by first awakening one's mind which in turn will lead to the transformation of the social environment in which one lives. Here we can see the actor-oriented approach of the movement, which first of all seeks to transform the actor and then the actual socio-economic structure, which is the very development "from within". Ariyaratne, the founder of the movement, criticizes mainstream top down approaches to economic development in which development is imposed from the outside. The movement makes an effort to promote participation of people in becoming self-sufficient.

The movement's economic ideal is not large industrialization or mechanization of agriculture as is often seen in main-stream development approaches. It seeks instead to meet basic human needs. The movement identifies ten basic needs. They include, adequate supply of safe water; food;

housing; clothing; health care; communication; fuel, clean, safe and beautiful environment, and very importantly, spiritual and cultural life and respect for each other (Goulet, 1981: 9). They believe that human beings should have a balance between the economic and the non-economic factors for the well-being of the whole community.

The movement emphasizes self-reliance by emphasizing the importance of people being aware of their needs and second, by emphasising the importance of living independently without help from outsiders. Sarvodaya attempts to fulfil the above with their basic human needs approach: people's participation, the utilization of local resources, and, especially, by sharing and taking care for one another. They believe that "self-reliance cannot exist without sharing" (in Macy, 1983: 51). In other words, the movement emphasizes that each individual in the community is important and has something to offer and share in order to overcome poverty. They further recognize that the most important and valuable resources in the community are people and their collective power as they together can make contributions even though she/he is poor. The movement believes that revitalizing the wholistic value to development is the starting point for the development of Sri Lanka (Nagamine, in Goulet, 1989).

The movement recognizes that it is hard for a community, a people, and a nation to release its energies and experience self-reliance, if it is pervaded by a sense of unworthiness and cultural inferiority (Macy, 1983: 43). It is the opposite which is always emphasized in main-stream development prescriptions, which wish the whole world to become alike. So their movement really centres development in the tradition and culture of Sri Lanka, incorporating them as the center of development for the country. From the bottom up and from each single individual and from the inner of each people, the movement is crafting a new society directly from their cultural principles, by challenging main-stream eurocentric international development prescriptions which have alienated societies around the world and have failed to provide many people even with the most basic human needs (Macy, 1983).

I believe that any model of development aimed at reversing the current conditions of native peoples in Guatemala should be a model that begins first by being centered in people's satisfaction of the most fundamental needs--which throughout the history of Guatemala and up to now have not been fulfilled. This model must also have respect for the local culture including land, which is the base of native culture and spirituality. These have been seen as obstacles to modernism. Only this model could reinforce the force of communalism and fairness, gender equality and

respect for cultural and ethnic differences. This respect has been lost because of cultural alienation and the homogenizing principles of individualism embedded in exogenous development models, and because of the country's control by a minority elite (Macy, 1983).

As the Sri Lankan people are trying to reclaim the inner meaning of development and to eliminate their cultural and spiritual alienation caused by many years of exogenous development prescriptions by undertaking grassroots initiatives, Guatemala also has to reclaim human development and awaken from the traumatic past and build a society that values its cultural and spiritual roots. It must craft a future based on equality for all women, men and native peoples. This can only be done by Guatemalan people themselves, not by outsiders; neither can it be achieved by euorocentric development prescriptions which do not allow room for cultural differences; their core principles are homogenizing, individualistic and alienating to other non-Western branches of humanity existing in the world (Macy, 1983).

Like any organism which develops according to its own structure, society can only ensure its genuine development along its own lines, for in order to develop, a society must never cease to be itself, as that which no longer exists can no longer develop subsequently, the development process must not lead to the destruction, alteration/and or alienation of the personality of peoples (Tri-Cao, 1997: 3).

CHAPTER 7

7.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The central purpose of this study was to analyze the policies outlined in the Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord and the Right of Indigenous Peoples Accord as two central Accords of the Guatemalan Peace Plan. The Peace Plan was signed to bring to an end a civil war that embroiled the country for more than four decades. The two key Accords were intended to improve the extreme poverty and marginalization of indigenous peoples in Guatemala. The evaluation contained in this thesis leads to the conclusion that the policies embedded in these Accords are based on the same eurocentric model of development and the same societal structure which predated the Peace Plan. It is this alliance between international capital which is the basis of eurocentrism and a minority elite which continues in power with an unchanged social structure that have created and will continue to perpetuate the marginalization and impoverishment of indigenous peoples in Guatemala.

Eurocentric economic ideology is designed to perpetuate privilege and to prolong social injustice. Its incorporation into Guatemalan development has allowed only a very tiny handful to reap the benefits while all the burdens are disproportionately borne by the masses of the people, where

native peoples constitute the majority. It is a system whereby some enjoy the fruits of development, while most of the population have only voting rights. The most vivid indicators of this unfairness is the marginalization of peoples' most basic needs, the dispossession of native peoples from their land, and their culture, their spiritual alienation, and the massive killing and devastation caused by the war.

In order to come to these conclusions I began first tracing back the root cause of the dispossession and marginalization of indigenous peoples from colonial times to the present. My aim was to highlight very crucial socio-economic and political events that have been key to this marginalization and impoverishment. This was done by reviewing the political economy in which this marginalization has taken place. The literature review has shown that it has taken place first through the structures imposed in colonial times on indigenous peoples, structures that have been followed after independence to the present time. The massive dispossession of native people from social economic and political rights in general, and in particular from their lands, intensified with capitalist expansion in the 1950's. It has been continued through the structural adjustment policies of the 1980's and finally by the more recent integration of Guatemala into the global economy of today.

Throughout the political economy review of the marginalization of indigenous peoples, it has been shown that the key actors in this marginalization have been the alliance between a tiny minority of local elites that control the country socially, politically, culturally and economically, and by international elites. The marginalization and impoverishment of indigenous people, started with the societal structures brought by and imposed by the colonizers with mercantilistic ideas of extracting wealth from the country at the expense of native peoples and dispossessing them from their land. The same structures continued after independence; as the rules implemented by Spanish colonizers have later been followed by the Ladino minority and white population. The war initiated in the late 1950's has also impacted more deeply on native peoples as they comprised the great majority of the people murdered during the war.

All of these cycles of marginalization have led to the current state of absolute poverty and degradation of the lives of native peoples, as is explained in Chapter Three. It is this current situation that the two substantive Accords are designed to reverse or at least ameliorate.

The theoretical framework that guided my analysis is based on the twin concepts of eurocentricity and internal colonization, since native peoples' oppression is due to the

alliance of these two forces. On the one hand internal colonization explains why it is that in all societies the benefits of growth have only reached certain strata of the population while the others are consigned to poverty. Thus it explains how a tiny elite minority of the Ladino and white population have benefited and monopolized all of the country politically, economically, culturally and economically, while dispossessing native peoples from all of their rights. Eurocentrism, on the other hand, explains how development prescriptions, which are disembodied from the socio-economic cultural and political context of countries around the world, have been aggressively imposed on different cultures around the world as the key instrument to achieve progress. These eurocentric prescriptions are only designed to benefit the interests of international capital and the elite minority in Guatemala that defend their interests. These Western prescriptions are far removed from the realities of developing countries. The prescriptions ignore the socio-economic, cultural and political realities of these countries.

In this context, the internal elite and the international economic community have played a detrimental role in continuing and perpetuating the existing Guatemalan structure. Native peoples have suffered at the hands of the small minority elite that have sought to assimilate them and control most of the country's wealth, and at the hands of imperialist

western prescriptions of development. This latter point is explained in Chapter Four.

With this theoretical framework, I have analyzed two important Accords of the Peace Plan: the Right of Indigenous Peoples Accord and the Socio-Economic Issues Accord. These are two Accords designed to alleviate the root causes of the marginalization and poverty of indigenous peoples in Guatemala. These Accords were based on a neo-liberal development prescription, a model which will be followed by the newly elected president Alvaro Arzu. This means that Guatemala will be further integrated into the global economy. This model is the latest prescription for achieving growth and development that developing countries, including Guatemala, have to follow. As the following statement expresses:

In reality Central American governments have very little space in which to define national or regional development strategy. The path towards reconstruction has already been drawn by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank... All the region's countries are applying stabilization and structural adjustment programs designed by these multilateral institutions (Nash, 1995: 13).

There is ample historical and contemporary evidence that in the case of Guatemala, this exogenous prescription has only resulted in a minority enjoying the fruits of development while marginalizing the majority. This in turn has already worsened the unjust social structure of Guatemala's society.

It has only brought on more poverty, perpetuating inequalities based on class, gender, and race without providing the mass of people with an alternative.

These two Accords were signed in light of the current neo-liberal or Eurocentric model of development. This Eurocentric model, as with those implemented in the past, is not really concerned with human development. Neither is it preoccupied with the injustice that comes in its wake. At the signing of these Accords, Guatemala's special circumstances of 40 years of war were not considered. The international organizations had prescribed for Guatemala the same medicine as if the country had never been at war.

In this context, even the most progressive promises made by the Guatemalan government in the two Accords are very unlikely to be realized. Since the country needs to have a stable economy that can support all this promises. Moreover, even if the government succeeds in providing these social development provisions, they will be piece-meal or short term alleviating medicine without touching the roots of the problem. Since Guatemala does not have the amount of money necessary to fulfil the promises made in these two Accords the country will have to rely on international lender organizations for loans to support the commitments made in these Accords. These loan are highly conditional. Even

though some of these loans have human development components, they require countries to follow a blue-print that will meet their criteria --not necessary the needs of the people. Relying on loans will lead the country into further foreign indebtedness and an inability to take on any other initiative. As is explained in Chapter Five, it will be very different if countries had debt relief or have loans that are less conditional to allow countries more space to do what the Guatemalan people consider more important and suitable for them.

In this context, the future is likely to reflect the past. There has not been any major substantive change in the country. The wealth of the country remains in the hands of a tiny elite minority and there is no viable solution to the age old concentration of wealth. Further, a eurocentric development prescription will exacerbate and promote the marginalization and poverty of indigenous people. This is eloquently stated by Vilas:

The obstacles to democratization in Central America are numerous: rigid patriarchy, vast social and economic inequalities, lack of respect for basic civil liberties, unrepentant armed militaries, and neo-liberal economic policies promoted by the industrialized countries that ignores the plight of the poorest sector of the society (Villas, 1995: 187-88).

The land provision outlined in the Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord is not really concerned with land

reform but with agricultural reform. Bank criteria for loans to purchase land from the land fund bank will be applied. This means that only those who have the means to purchase land can benefit. But those who manage to purchase a small plot of land will be required to fulfil the requirements of the government agricultural diversification plan. In this context, native people will be expected to produce mainly cash crops for export in their small plots not local crops for their subsistence.

Furthermore, the state and the international development institutions have not yet understood that land for native people is central to their culture and spirituality. Even though the government recognizes this in the section on native spirituality in the Right of Indigenous Peoples Accord, when it comes to practice it is not present. As native peoples remind us:

Land is not sold. Land is our mother. You don't sell your mother. Why don't they offer 100 million dollars to the Pope for the Vatican (Galeano, 1992: 16).

History teaches us not to repeat the same mistakes. As I have tried to show, the Guatemalan and international elites did not learn any lessons from this bloody war. How much suffering is needed for the elite and the international development organizations to really grasp what the needs are of most of the Guatemalan native population? The

prescriptions for building the new Guatemala are the same as the old ones--only now they have different names. They want to cure the Guatemalan sickness with the same old medicine. They have been proven unsuitable throughout the history of Guatemala. In this context, the most progressive provisions for Guatemala outlined in the Socio-Economic and Agrarian Issues Accord and the Right of Indigenous Peoples will be unlikely to take place.

Development, up to now, has been concerned solely with economic growth as the engine to improve the lives of people around the globe. A person's most basic human needs have not been at the center of this development and other non-quantitative factors such as culture and spirituality have been undermined. The only way in which the current situation facing native people can be reversed is through a development that comes from within Guatemala itself based on its cultural, spiritual, economic, and political situation. An alternative vision based on development from within was outlined in Chapter Six.

The lesson we can learn is that development has been understood for too long as merely economic growth, separated from a country's social, political, economical, cultural, and spiritual circumstances. In order to gain some greater understanding about economic growth we should be asking the

following questions: Why is it that despite many years of development the poverty facing the majority of people in Guatemala has worsened? Why is that despite "growth" there is massive poverty? Why do some countries engage in war? If we have learned nothing else from the experience of development, we should learn that development is more than economic growth. Development is firstly about people; people who have their own culture and spirituality and their own definitions of development. It is all of the above that make a country and it is each one of these pieces that really should be a part of the meaning of development. Otherwise as Goulet says: "It matters little how much information we possess about development if we have not grasped its inner meaning" (Goulet, 1996: 7).

Finally for people from different corners of the world who are searching for human development, I say: "our allies in the adventure of reclaiming human development from wealth-creation are everywhere, if we know how to recognize them and join with them in their struggles, which, in the end, are ours also" (Seebrook, 1993: 250).

The painful history of war in Guatemala and other developing countries should not be repeated and we should be able to learn from these tragedies to avoid future disasters. We can do this by respecting the way people want to pursue

their own progress based on their socio-economic, cultural spiritual and other needs. If this cannot happen then I have sadly to agree with Vilas that:

Geological earthquakes and volcanic eruptions are known by the Central American region. Social earthquakes and popular eruptions are like their geological counterpart: we can never safely say we have seen the last of them (Vilas, 1995: 8).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abasiekong, E. M., *Integrated Rural Development in the Third World*, Smithstown, New York: Exposition Press, 1982.
- Acevedo, Carlos, Barry, Deborah, Hernan Rosa, "El Salvador's Agricultural Sector: Macroeconomic Policy, Agrarian Change and the Environment", in World Development, Vol. 23, No. 12, 1995.
- Agrawal, Arun, "Dismantling the Divine Between Indigenous and Scientific Knowledge", in Development and Change, Vol. 26, No. 3, 1995.
- Aguilera, Peralta, Gabriel, *Las Propuestas Para la Paz*, Debates No. 20. Guatemala: FLASCO, 1993.
- Amin, Samir, *Imperialism and Unequal Development*, New York, Montly Review Press, 1977.
- Annis, Sheldon & Peter, Hakim eds, *Can Small Scale Development Be Large Scale Policy, Direct to the Poor: Grassroots Development in Latin America*, Lynn Reiner, Jamaica, 1987.
- Arangaden, C., "Sarvodaya, Dana", in International Journal of the Sarvodaya Movement, Vol. 16, No. 1, January, 1989.
- Arias, Arturo, *La Democracia en Guatemala: Actualidad y Perspectives*, Edited by Pablo Gonzales Casanova, and Marcos Roitman Rosenmann, *La Democracia en America Latina: Actualidad y Perspectives*, Madrid: Editorial Complutense, 1994.
- Ariyaratne, A. T., "Blazing a Path for the World's Poor and the Powerless Towards a No-Poverty Society" in Dana, International Journal of the Sarvodaya Shramadana Movement, Vol. 11, No. 4, February, 1986.
- Ariyaratne, A. T. *The Role of Youth in Rural Reconstruction & Peace*, Sri Lanka: Sardodaya, Vishva Lekha, 1986.

Ariyaratne, A. T., **Collective Work**, Vol. 3, Sri Lanka; Sarvodaya Research Institute, 1985.

Arizpe Lourdes, and Josefina Aranda, **Women Workers in the Strawberry Agribusiness In Mexico**. In **Women's Development and the Division of Labour by Gender**, Edited by Eleonor Leacock and Helen I. Safa, pp. 174-193. Greenwood, Massachusetts: Bergin and Garvey Publisher, 1986.

Armstrong, R., **"The Rural Roots of Social Struggle: The Peasantry in Guatemala, El Salvador and Nicaragua"**, in **North South**, Vol. 8, No. 15, May, 1983.

Aronson, Dan R., **Ethnicity as Cultural System: An Introductory Essay, Ethnicity in the Americas**, Frances Henry ed., Mouton Publishers: The Hague, 1976.

Barkin, David, **"The Impact of Agribusiness on Rural Development"**, in Scott, McNall, **in Current Perspectives in Social Theory**, Vol. 1, 1982.

Barry, Gill K. & Rocamora, Joel, **"Low Intensity Democracy"**, in **Third World Quarterly**, Vol. 13, No. 3, 1992.

Barry, Tom, **Inside Guatemala**, Albuquerque, New Mexico: The Inter-hemispheric Education Resource Center, 1992.

Beneria, Lourdes and Gita Sen, **Accumulation, Reproduction, and Women's Work Development and the Division of Labour by Gender**, Eleonor Leacock and Helen Safa eds., Bergen and Garvey: Massachusetts, 1986.

Beneria, Lourdes and Sen Gita, **"Accumulation, Reproduction, and Women's Role in Economic Development: Boserup Revised"**, in **Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society**, Vol. 7, No. 21, 1981.

Berberoglu, Berch, **The Political Economy of Development: Development Theory and the Prospects for Change in the World**, State University of New York Press: Albany, 1992.

Berger, Susan A., **Political and Agrarian Development in Guatemala**, Boulder: Westview Press, 1992.

Berger, Thomas R., **A Long and Terrible Shadow: White Values Native Rights in the Americas, 1492-1992**, Toronto: Douglas McIntyre, 1991.

Berntzen, Einer, "Democratic Consolidation in Central America: A Qualitative Comparative Approach", in Third World Quarterly, Vol. 14, No. 3, 1993.

Bienefeld, Manfred, **Is a Strong National Economy a Utopian Goal at the end of the Twenty Century?** In R. Boyer and D. Drache (eds) **States Against Markets: The limits of Globalization**, Routledge, New York, pp. 415-440, 1996.

Bienefeld, Manfred, "The New World Order: Echoes of a New Imperialism", in Third World Quarterly, Vol. 15. No. 1, 1994.

Bienefeld, Manfred, "Capitalism and the Nation State in the Dog Days of the Twentieth Century", in Socialist Register, 1994.

Bienefeld, Manfred, **Structural Adjustment and the Prospect for Democracy in South Africa**, Ottawa, Canada, Carleton University, 1994.

Bienefeld, Manfred, "The Significance of Newly Industrializing Countries for the Development Debate", in Studies in Political Economy, No. 25, Spring, 1988.

Bienefeld, Manfred & Godfrey, Martin eds 1982, **The Struggle for Development: National Strategies in an International Context**, John Wiley and Sons: London, 1982.

Binder, L., "The Natural History of Development Theory", in Comparative Studies in Society and History, No. 28, January, 1986.

Black, George, Milton Jamail, Norma S. Chinchilla, **Garrison Guatemala**, Monthly Review Press; New York, 1984.

- Blair, Harry W., "Approaches to Integrated Social Development Planning and the Implementation at the Local Level", in Regional Development Dialogue, Vol.7, No.1, Spring, Nagoya: The United Nations Centre for Regional Development (UNCRD), 1986.
- Blaney, David, L., Kamal Pasha, Musraoha, "Civil Society and Democracy, in the Third World: Ambiguities and Historical Possibilities", in Studies in Comparative International Development, Vol. 28, No. 1, Spring, 1993.
- Bodley, John h., ed. Tribal Peoples and Development Issues a Global Overview, California: Mayfield Publishing Company, 1988.
- Boisier, S., Chile: Continuity and Change Variations of Centre-Down Strategies Under Different Political Regimes, in Development from Above or Below, the Dialectic of Regional Planning in Developing Countries, Edited by Walter B. Stohr and d. F. R. Taylor, Chichester: J. Wiley& Sons, 1981.
- Boyce, James, K., "Adjustment Towards Peace and Introduction, in World Development", Vol. 23, No. 12, 1995.
- Borell, Victor, & Evelyn Klussman, Una Nueve Option para el Desarrollo en Guatemala, Ciudad de Guatemala, 1992.
- Boron, Astilio, State, Capitalism and Democracy in Latin America, Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publisher, 1995.
- Bossen, Laurel H., The Redivision of Labour: Women and Economic Choice in Four Guatemalan Communities, Albany, New York: Sate University of New York Press, 1984.
- Bowen, G., Guatemala: The Origin and Development of State Terrorism, In Schultz and Graham, Revolution in Central America and the Caribbean, Boulder: Westview Press, 1984.
- Braun, Joachim Von, D. Hotchkiss, I. Maaten, Nontraditional Export Crops In Guatemala: Effects on Production, Income, and Nutrition Research Report 73, Washington D.C. International Food Policy Research Institute, 1989.

- Brockett, Charles D., **Land Power and Poverty: Agrarian Transformation on Political Conflict in Central America**, Boston: Unwind Hyman, 1988.
- Brooks, David, **Beyond Catch Phases: What Does Sustainable Development Really Mean?**, IDRC Reports, October, Ottawa: The International Development Research Centre, 1990.
- Brown, David, **"Ethnic Revival: Perspectives on State and Society"**, in Third World Quarterly, Vol. 11, 1989.
- Brown, Terry, Arzu, and the New Right; **Modernization at the Expenses of the Poor**, in Americas Update (March-April) 1996.
- Briedland, D. et al, **Contemporary Social Work; An Introduction to Social Work and Social Welfare**, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1985.
- Buarque, Cristovam, **The end of Economics?**. London: Zed Books, 1993.
- Bulmer, B. & Warwicks, D., **Social Research in Developing Countries**, New York, John Willey and Son, 1983.
- Bulmer-Thomas, Victor, **The Political Economy of Central America Since 1920**, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1987.
- Buttari, Juan, J., **"Economic Policy Reform in four Central American Countries: Patters and Lesson Learned"**, in Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs, 1992.
- Butz, David, Steven Lonegan & Barry Smith, **"Why International Development Neglects Indigenous Social Reality"**, in Canadian Journal of Development Studies, No. 12, 1991.
- Burkey, Stan, **People First: A Guide to Self-Reliant Participatory Rural Development**, Zed Books: London 1993.

Calvert, Peter, **Guatemala: A nation In Turmoil**, Boulder: Wesview Profiles, 1985.

Cambranes, Julio, **Agrarismo en Guatemala**, Centro de Estudios Rurales Centroamericanos (CERCA), Servipresnsa Centroamericana: Guatemala, 1986a).

———, **Introduction a la Historia Agraria de Guatemala, 1500- 1900**, Serviprensa Centroamericana: Guatemala, 1986b.

———, **Coffee And Peasants; The Origin of the Modern Plantation Economy in Guatemala, 1853-1897**, Cirma/Plumstock Mesoamerican Studies: South Woodstock, Vermont, 1985.

Canada-Americas Policy Alternatives (CAPA), **Canada Aid in Guatemala**, Toronto, Canada, May, 1995.

Canada-Americas Policy Alternatives (CAPA), **Guatemala Revisiting the Issue of Land Reform**, Canada, March, 1996.

Canadian Centre for International Studies and Cooperation (CECI), **Democracy and Human Rights in Guatemala**, 1995.

Canada Library of Parliament, Research Branch, **Central America the Peace Process**, Ottawa, Ministry of Supply and Services, 1991.

Cao, Tri Huynh et al. **Strategies for Endogenous Development**, Oxford: UNESCO and Oxford & IBH Publishing Co, 1986.

Cardose, Fernando Henrique, **"Dependence and Development in Latin America"**, in New Left Review, July-August, 1972.

Cartmarck, Robert, Gasco, Janine, and Gosssen, Gary, H., **The legacy of Mesoamerica: History and Culture of a Native American Civilization**, Institute of Mesoamerican Studies, University of Albany, 1996.

Cartmarck, Robert M., "Indians and the Guatemalan Revolution", in Cultural Survival Quarterly, No. 7, 1993.

Casaus Arzu, Marta: **Guatemala, Linaje y Racismo**, San Jose, Costa, Rica, Flasco, 1992.

Chambers, Roberts, **Rural Development: Putting the Last First**, John Willey and Sons INC, 1983.

Chambers, Robert, **Sustainable Livelihoods, Environment, and Development: Putting Poor People First**, Discussion Paper 240, Institute of Development Studies University of Sussex: Brighton, 1987.

Child, Jack, **The Central American Peace Process 1983-1991: Sheathing Swords, Building Confidence**, Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1992.

CIEN (Centro de Investigaciones Economicas Nacionales) **Strategia de Desarrollo Economico Y Social para Guatemala 1996-1999**, Ciudad de Guatemala, 1996.

Cifuentes, Arlena Dinora, **Guatemala en la Encrucijada: Un Dialogo Sobre el Desarrollo Democratico y la Paz**. Guatemala, 1995.

Clavert, Peter., **Guatemala: A Nation In Turmoil**, Boulder: Wesview Profiles, 1985.

Colchester Marcus, "Guatemala: The Clamour for Land and the fate of the Forest", in Ecologist, Vol. 21, No. 4, July-August 1991.

Conelly, Patricia, and Murray, Tania, Macdonald Martha, Parpart, Jane, "Restructured World/ Restructured Debate: Globalization, Development and Gender", in Canadian Journal of Development Studies, 1995.

Conveys, D. **An Introduction to Social Planning in the Third World**, New York: John Willey, 1982.

- Conway, G. R., Barbier, **After the Green Revolution: Sustainable Agriculture for Development**, London: Earthscan Publications Ltd, 1990.
- Cox, R.W. & Brockett C.D., **"Power and Profit U.S. Policy in Central America"**, in Journal of Politics, Vol. 58, No. 2, 1996.
- Critica, (Local Guatemalan Journal), **Tres Opiniones Sobre Acuerdos de Paz**, No. 110, Guatemala City, May, 1996.
- Critica, (Local Guatemalan Journal), **Paz de Quien y Para Quien**, No. 111, Guatemala City July, 1996.
- Daly, Herman E. and Cobb, John B., **For the Common Good: Redirecting the Economy Towards Community, The Environment, and a Sustainable Future**, Boston: Beacon Press, 1989.
- Dasgupta, S., **Sarvodaya in Sri Lanka, A Rapid Appraisal**, Salt Lake City, Calcuta Bengal: Jayap Rukash Institute of Social Change, 1982.
- Davis, Sheldon H., **State Violence and Agrarian Crisis in Guatemala**, in Martin Diskin (ed.), **Trouble in Our Backyard: Central America and the United States in the Eighties**, New York: Pantheon, 1983.
- "The Social Consequences of Development Aid in Guatemala"**, in Cultural Survival Quarterly, No. 7, 1983.
- Davis, Shelton H. and Julie Hodson, **Witnesses to Political Violence in Guatemala: The Suppression of a Rural Development**, (Oxfam America), 1982.
- Dealy, Glean Caudill, **An Honourable Peace in Central America**, Pacific, Grove, Calif., 1988.
- Deere, Carmen, **"Rural Women and the State Policy: The Latin American Agrarian Reform Experience"**, in World Development, Vol. 13, No. 9, 1985.

De Soto, Alvaro, and Del Castillo, Graciana, "Obstacles for Peace Building in El Salvador", in Journal of Foreign Affairs, Vol. 94, Spring, 1994.

De Soto, Hernando, 1989, **The Other Path**, Harper: New York, 1989.

Diamond, Larry, **Political Culture and Democracy in Developing Countries**, Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publisher, 1993.

Diamond, Larry, Platter, Marc, **Economic Reform and Democracy**, Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1995.

Diamond, Larry, Linz, Juan, Martin, Seymour, **Politics in Developing Countries: Comparing Experiences with Democracy**, Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publisher, 1995.

Diario El Grafico, **Guatemalan New Paper**, January 18, 1997.

Diaz, Polanco, Hector, "Indigenism, Populism and Marxism", in Latin America Perspectives, Vol. 9, No. 2, Spring, 1982.

Dunkerley, James, **The Pacification in Central America, 1987-1993**, London: Verso, 1994.

Durning, Alan B., "People Power and Development", in Foreign Policy, No. 76, 1989.

Durning, Alan B. **Mobilizing the Grassroots**, in Brown, L. et al., **State of the World 1989**, New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1989.

Economic Commission for Latin America, "Popular Participation in Development", in Community Development Journal, Oxford: Vol. 15, No. 3, 1973.

Ekin, Paul ed. **The Living Economy**, London the Other Economic Summit, 1986.

- Elliot, Doreen, "Social Work and Social Development: Towards and Integrative Model for Social Work Practice", in International Social Work, Vol. 36, 1993.
- Elsbeth, Young, Third World in the First: Development and Indigenous Peoples, London: Routledge, 1995.
- Escobar, Arturo, Encountering Development the Making and Unmaking of the Third World, Princeton University Press 1995.
- Esman, Milton, Management Dimensions of Development: Perspective and Strategies, New York, Kumarian Press, 1991.
- Esteva, Guatavo, Development. Wolfgang Sachs (ed.), The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power. London: Zed Book, 1992.
- Esteva, Gustavo, "Regenerating People's Space", in Alternatives, Vol. 12, 1987.
- Faber, Daniel, Environment Under Fire, Imperialism and the Ecological Crisis in Central America, New York, Monthly Review Press, 1993.
- Fairol, George A., Loser, Eva, Guatemala's Political Puzzle, New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1987.
- Feiburg, Richard E., Bruce M. Bagley, Development Postponed: The Political Economy of Central America in The 1980's, Wesview Press: Boulder, 1986.
- Feres, Juan Carlos, The Magnitude of Poverty in Latin America, CEPAL Review 41, 1990.
- Fernandez- Kelly, Maria-Patricia, "Development and the Sexual Division of Labour: An Introduction", in Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, Vol. 7, No. 21, 1981.

Fletcher, Lehman B., Eric Graber, W. C. Merrill, and E. Thorbecke, **Guatemala's Economic Development: The Role of Agriculture**, Ames: Iowa State Press, 1970.

Foley, Michael, W., "Laying the Groundwork: The Struggle for Civil Society in el Salvador", in Journal of International Studies and World Affairs, 1995.

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), **Fao Yearbook**, Vol. 47, Rome: FAO, 1994.

Frank, G. **Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America**, Sadbury Press, 1967.

Frank, Andre Gunder, "The Development of Underdevelopment", in Monthly Review, Vol. 18, No. 4, 1966.

Fuentes, Carlos, **Latin America: At War with the Past**, Toronto: CBC Publications, 1984.

Fundacion para la Paz, la Democracia y el Desarrollo (FUNDAPAZD) **Acuedos Sustantivos entre el Gobierno de Guatemala y la URNG**, Marzo, 1995.

Galeano, Eduardo, "Reinventing America 1492-1992: The Blue Tiger and the Promised Land", in Report of the Americas, (NACLA), Vol. 24, No. 5, February, 1992.

Galeano, Eduardo, **The Book of Embraces**, Tyrnas, Cedric Belfrage. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1987.

Galeano, E., **Guatemala: Occupied Country**, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1969.

Galper, J. **Social Work Practice: A Radical Perspective**, Englewood Cliffs, 1980.

George, Vick & Wilding, Paul, **Ideology and Social Welfare: Radical Social Policy**, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1976.

- Gereffi, Gary, Hempel, Lynn, "Latin America in the Global Economy: Running Faster to Stay In Place", in Report on the Americas (NACLA), Vol. 29, No. 4, Jan/Feb, 1996.
- Gexport, Gremial the Exportadores no Tradicionales the Guatemala, Annual Report, Guatemala City, 1994.
- Gexport, Gremial the Exportadores no Tradicionales the Guatemala, Annual Report, Guatemala City, 1987.
- Gexport, Gremial the Exportadores no Tradicionales the Guatemala, Annual Report, Guatemala City, 1983.
- Gomez, Magdalena, Derechos Indigenas: Lectura Commentada del Convenio 169 del Organizacion International del Trbajo, Instituto National Indigenista de Mexico, Ciudad de Mexico, 1995.
- Goulet, Denis, Development Ethics: A Guide to Theory and Practice, Zed Books, 1995.
- Goulet, Denis, "Participation in Development: New Avenues", in World Development, Vol. 17, No. 2, 1994.
- Goulet, Denis, "Development Creator adn Destroyer of Values", in World Development, Vol. 20, No. 3, 1992.
- Goulet, Denis, Survival with Integrity: Sardodaya at the Crossroads, Colombo: Marga Institute, 1981.
- Goulet, D., The Cruel Choices: A New Concept in the Theory of Development, New York: Athenium, 1971.
- Graf, Willian, "The State in the Third World", in The Socialist Register, 1995.
- Gramsci, Antonio, Selections from the Prison Notebooks, New York: International Publishers, 1971.

- Gran, G., **Development by People**, Citizen Construction of a Just World, New York: Praeger Publishers, 1983.
- Haggar, Stephan, Kaufman, Robert, **The Political Economy of Democratic Transition**, Princeton; Princeton University Press, 1995.
- Handy, Jim, **Gift of the Devil: A History of Guatemala**, Toronto: Between the Lines, 1984.
- Handy, Jim, **Revolution in the Countryside: Rural Conflict and Agrarian Reform in Guatemala, 1944-1954**, University of North Carolina Press, 1994.
- Harris, Laurence, **"South Africa's Economic and Social Transformation, from No Middle Road to No Alternative", in Review of African Political Economy**, 1994.
- Healtley, R, **Poverty and Power: The Case for a Political Approach to Development and its Implications for Action in the West**, London Zed Press, 1979.
- Henry, Frances, ed., **Ethnicity in the Americas**, Mopuntion Publishers: The Hague, 1976.
- Hey, Hilde, **Gross Human Right Violation: A Sesearch for Causes A Study of Guatemala and Costa Rica**, Netherlands, institute of Human Right, University of Utrecht, The Netherlands, 1996.
- Hirschman, Albert O., **Balanced Growth: A Critique, The Strategy of Economic Development**, New Haven: Yale University Press, pp. 50-62, 1958.
- Ideas., **History and the New Age**, The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Toronto, March, 1984.
- Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), **Economic and Social Progress in Latin America**, Report (Washington, D.C.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.

- International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Culture, Spirituality, and Economic Development: Opening a Dialogue, Ottawa, Cananada, 1995.
- Irvin, G. And Xavier Gerostiaga, Towards an Alternative for Central America, London: Allen and Unwin, 1985.
- Jonas, Susanne, "Dangerous Liaison: The U.S. In Guatemala", in Foreign Policy, Summer, 1996.
- Jonas, Susanne, The Battle for Guatemala: Rebels, Death Squads, and U.S. Power. Boulder: Westview Press, 1991
- Keith, Nelson S. W., and Zett Keith eds, New Perspectives on Social Class and Socioeconomic Development in the Periphery, Greenwood Press: New York, 1988.
- Keyes, Grace, The Social Welfare System Environment in Guatemala, 1995.
- Kiely, Ray, Sociology & Development: The Impasse and Beyond, London: UCL Press, 1995.
- Kim Ho, Sung & Walker, W. Thomas, Perspectives on War and Peace in Central America, Ohio University, Center for International Studies, 1992.
- Kirk, John M. & Schuyler, Geroge, V., Central America Democracy, Development and Change, Praeger, 1988.
- Korten, David C., "Sustainable Development", in World Policy Journal, Winter, 1991.
- Krauss, C., "Revolution in Central America", in foreign Affairs, Vol. 65, No. 3, 1987.
- LaFarge, Oliver, Maya Ethnology: The Sequence of Cultures, in The Maya and their Neighbours, Clarence L. Hay et. al (eds), New York: D. Appleton Century, 1940.

- Lambert, J.D. C., **Traditional Agriculture: Its Role in Sustainable Food Production and Resource Management in Africa**, In the Predicament of Africa in Global Society, 1986.
- La Nacion, **Costa Rican News Paper**, January 20, 1997.
- Lecomte, Bernard, **Project Aid: Limitations and Alternatives**, Paris: Development Centre of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), 1986.
- Ledesma, B. J. et al, **350 Million Rural Poor: Where do We Start**: Bangkok: United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, 1980.
- Lee Van, Cott, Donna, **"Projects for Self-Determination of Indigenous Peoples in Latin America: Questions of Law and Practice"**, in Global Coverage, No. 2, 1996.
- Lee Van, Cott, Donna, **Indigenous Peoples and Democracy in Latin America**, New York: St Martin's Press, 1994.
- Lemco, Jonathan, **Canada and the Crisis in Central America**, Praeger, 1991.
- Lewellen, Ted, C., **Development and Dependency and Introduction to the Third World**, Westport: Bergin & Garvey, 1995.
- Lewis, Arthur W., **The Theory of Economic Growth**, George Allen & Unin Ltd: London 1955.
- Lipietz, Alain, **"Imperialism or the Beast of the Apocalypse"**, in Capital and Class, 1993.
- Lovell, W. **A Beauty that Hurts: Life and Death In Guatemala, Between the Lines**, Toronto, Canada, 1995.
- Lovell, W. George, **"Surviving Conquest: The Maya of Guatemala in Historical Conquest"**, in Latin American Research Review, No. 23, 1988.

- Lovell, W., **Conquests and Survival in Colonial Guatemala a Historical Geography of the Cuchumamatan Highlands of Guatemala, 1550-1821**: McGill-Queen's University Press, pp. 163-174, 1983.
- Lovins, Amory, **Soft Energy Paths: Towards a Durable Peace**, Harmondworth: Penguin, 1977.
- MacCall, M. "The Implications of Eastern African Rural Social Structure for Local-Level Development: The Case for Participatory Development based on Indigenous Knowledge systems", in Regional Development Dialogue, Vol. 9, No. 2., Summer, 1988.
- MacBridge, Boyds et al. **Sardovaya Sramadana Movement: A Mid-Term Review**, Ottawa: Canadian International Development Agency, (CIDA), 1988.
- Macdonald, Michael, "Power Politics in the New South Africa", in Journal of South African Studies, Vol. 22, No. 2, 221-1996.
- Macdonald, Laura, "Globalizing Civil Society: Interpreting International NGOs in Central America", in International Studies Quarterly, Vol. 23, No. 2, 1994.
- Macpherson, S. & Midgley, **Comparative Social Policy and the Third World**, Martins Press, 1987.
- Macpherson, Steward, "Social Work and Economic Development in Papa New Guinea", in International Social Work, Vol. 39, 1996.
- Machpherson, S., **Social Policy in The Third World: The Policy Dilemma of Underdevelopment**, Brington: Harvester, 1982.
- MacLeod, Murdo J., **Ethnic Relation and Indian Society in the Province of Guatemala, Spaniards and Indian in Southeastern Mesoamerica: Essay on the History of Ethnic Relations**, Lincolnd and London, University of Nebraska, Press, 1983.

- Macy, Joanne, **Dharma and Development: Religion as Resource in the Sarvodaya Self-Help Movement**, Connecticut: Kumatian Press, 1983.
- Maguire, P., **Women in Development; An Alternative Analysis**, Centre for International Studies, University of Massachusetts, 1984.
- Manoukian, Violeta, **Participatory Development: Paradigm Shift in Theory and Practice**, Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Ottawa: The Norman Paterson School of International Affairs, Carleton University.
- Mandela, Mandela, Boesak, "Tutu, Vision of the Future", in Third World Quarterly, No. 9, April, 1986.
- Mandell, Zoe, "Mayan Culture from Past to Present", in Report on the Americas (NACLA), Vol. 13, No. 2, 1992.
- Marchand, Mariane, "Gender and New Regionalism in Latin America: Inclusion/Exclusion", in Third World Quarterly, March, 1995.
- Mbilinyi, M., "Women in Development Ideology: The Promotion of Competition and Exploitation", in African Review, No. 11, 1984.
- McAfee, Kathy, **Storm Signals: Structural Adjustment and Development Alternatives in the Caribbean**, Zed Books Ltd: London.
- McCleary, Rachel, "Guatemala: Expectations for Peace", in Current History, February, 1996.
- MCneil, Frank, **War and Peace in Central America**, New York, Scribner, 1988.
- McCreery, David, **State Power, Indigenous Communities, and Land in Nineteenth-Century Guatemala, 1820-1920**, in Smith (ed.) **Guatemalan Indian and the State, 1540-1988**, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990.

Meadows, D. H. et al., **The Limits to Growth**, New York; Universe Book, 1972.

Mehta, Vrajenda, Raj, **Beyond Marxism: Towards an Alternative Perspective**, Manoha Pub. 1978.

Meiksins-Wood, Ellen, **"The Use and Abuses of Civil Society"**, in The Socialist Register, 1990.

Melville, Thomas, **Roots of Crisis: Land Tenure in Guatemala**, Guatemala News and Information Bureau, Vol. 7, No. 6: Oakland, California, 1986.

Mies, M., **Women: The Last Colony**, New Delhi, Kali for Women, 1988.

Mies Maria, **Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scene**, Zed Books: London, 1986.

Midgley, James, **"Social Work and Economic Development"**, in International Social Work, Vol. 39, 1996.

Midgley, James, **"Involving Social Work in Economic Development"**, in International Social Work, Vol. 39, 1996.

Miles, Ian & Irvine, John eds., **The Poverty of Progress: Changing Ways of Life in Industrial Societies**, Tokyo: The United Nations University and Science Policy Research Unit, 1982.

Millett, R., **"Guatemala: Progress and Paralysis"**, in Current History, Vol. 84, No. 484, March, 1985.

Moe, Judith, A., **Guatemala: Diversification, Decentralization Equity in the Western Highland**, Unpublished Thessis, Carleton University, 1989.

Momsen, J., **Women and Development in the Third World**, New York, Rotulledge, 1991.

Moreno, Dario, **The Struggle for Peace in Central America**, Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1994.

Morner, Magnus & Svensson, Thommy, **The Transformation of Rural Society in the Third World**, Routledge, 1991.

Muck, Ronald, "South Africa: The Great Economic Debate", in Third World Quarterly, Vol. 15, No. 2, 1994.

Munck, Gerardo, "Beyond Electoralism in El Salvador Conflict Resolution Through Negotiated Compromise", in Canadian Journal of Development Studies, 1993.

Munoz-Paz, Marta-Delia, **Demografia y Desarrollo en Guatemala**, Rafael Landivar University, Centro de Adiestramiento Para Promotores Sociales, 1994.

Myers, Willian, "Urban Working Children in Latin America", in International Labour Review, Vol. 128, No. 3, 1989.

Naess, Arne, **Sustainable Development and Deep Economy**, In Engelk, J. R. and Engel, J.G. eds. **Ethics of Environment and Development: Global Challenge**, International Response. London: Belhaven Press, 1990.

Naim, Moises, "Latin America the Morning After", in Foreign Affairs, Vol. 74, No. 4, 1995.

Naylor Robert A., "Guatemala: Indian Attitudes Toward Land Tenure", in Journal of Inter-America Studies, No.9, 1967.

Nash, June, Sinclair, Minor, **The Politics of Survival; Grassroot Movements in Central America**, New York, N. Y., Montly Review Press, 1995.

Nerfin, Mark ed., **Another Development: Approaches and Strategies**, Uppsala: The Dag Hammarskjold Foundation, 1977.

North, Lisa, **Between War and Peace In Central America Choices for Canada**, Toronto: Between the Lines, 1990.

- North, Lisa, **Relationship among Democratization, Demilitarization, and Structural Adjustment in Latin America**, Canada Policy Alternatives (CAPA), Toronto, Ontario, 1995.
- Nuccio, Richard, **What's Wrong, Who's Right in Central America**, New York, Holmes, 1989.
- Oakley, P., and Marsden, D., **Approaches to Participation in Rural Development**, International Labour Organization, 1984.
- Oakley, P. **Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Challenges of Rural Poverty and How to Meet it**, January 26-31, 1987, Felding, FRG: Druckere: Schrotter, 1988.
- Ojinnaka, A., **"Women and the World Economic Crisis, Women in Crisis"**, in Quarterly Development Journal, No. 6, July-October, 1992.
- Okeyo, A. P., **Definitions of Women and Development: An African Perspective, Women and National Development: The Complexity of Changes**, Chicago, 1977.
- O'Manique, John, **"Development as Self Actualization"**, in PRAXIS, IX, 1992.
- Orkinn, Mark, **"Building Democracy in the New South Africa: Civil Society, Citizenship and Political Ideology in South Africa"**, in Review of African Political Economy, No. 66, 1994.
- Ouedraogo, Bernard Ledea, **Address on the Occasion of Receiving the 1989 African Prize for Leadership for the Sustainable end of Hunger**, Awarded by the Hunger ProJect, 1989.
- Otzoy, Antonio, **"The Struggle for Maya Unity"**, in Report on the Americas (NACLA), Vol. 29, No. 5, March-April, 1996.
- Ozay, Mehmet, **Westernizing the Third World, The Eurocentricity of Economic Development Theories**, Routledge, 1995.

Padilla, Luis-Alberto, "Conflict Transformation: Peace Making and Peace Building in Guatemala", in Peace Research Journal, No. 17-25, 1995.

Paige, J., "Social Theory and Peasant Revolution in Vietnam and Guatemala", in Theory and Society, Vol. 123, 1983.

Painter, James, **Guatemala: False Hope False Freedom**, London: Catholic Institute for International Relations and Latin American Bureau, 1987.

Painter, James., "Guatemala in Civilian Garb", in Third World Quarterly, Vol. 8, No. 3, 1986.

Pansdini, Jude, "Indian Seasonal Plantation Work in Guatemala", in Cultural Survival Quarterly, No. 7, Spring, 1990.

Pal, Leslie, **Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction**, Nelson Canada, 1989.

Pastor, Manuel & Conrpy, Michael, "Distributional Implications of Macroeconomic Policy: Theory and Applications to El Salvador", in World Development, Vol. 23, No. 12, 1995.

Paus, Eva, Export, "Economic Growth and the Consolidation of Peace in El Salvador", in World Development, Vo. 23, No. 12, 1995.

Pelupesty W. & Weeks J., "Economic Maladjustment in Central America", in Report on the Americas (NACLA), Vol. 131, No. 1, 1996.

Petras, J. F., "Anti-Communism in Guatemala", in Socialist Register, 1984.

Petras, James, & Vieux, Steve, "The Transition To Authoritarian Electoral Regimes in Latin America", in Latin American Perspectives, Vol. 21, No. 4. Fall, 1994.

- Petrone, Penny, **First People First Voices**, Toronto, U of Toronto Press, 1991.
- Poostchi, I., **Rural Development and the Developing Countries: An Interdisciplinary Approach**, The Alger Press LTD, 1986.
- Power, Jonathan, **Breaking the Pattern of Hunger and Poverty**, Rome: The International Fund for Agricultural Development, 1989.
- Prensa Grafica, **Salvadorean News Paper**, January 6, 1997.
- Prebisch, R. **Five Stages in My Thinking on Development**, in Meir & Soers, **Paionir in Development**, 1984.
- Pradervand, Pierre, **"Rolling Back the Desert with Bare Hands"**, in Rural Africana, No. 28-29, Spring-Fall, 1987.
- Rabine, Mark, **"Guatemala Redemocratization or Civilian Counterinsurgency?"** in Contemporary Marxism, No. 14, 59-1991.
- Raikes, Philip, **Modernizing Hunger: Famine, Food Surplus & Farm Policy**, in the EEC & Africa, London: Catholic Institute for International Relations, 1988.
- Randall, V., Theobald, R. **Political Change an Underdevelopment, A Critical Introduction to Third World Politics**, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1985.
- Redclift, Michael, **Sustainable Development: Exploring the Contradictions**, London: Routledge, 1987.
- Resnick, R., **"Concientization: An Indigenous Approach to International Social Work"**, in International Social Work, Vol. 19 No. 1. 1976.
- Ribes, Bruno, **Domination or Sharing: Endogenous Development and the Transfer of Knowledge**, Paris: UNESCO Press, 1981.

Rodison, Maxime, **Marxism and the Moslem World**, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1981.

Rodrik, Dani, **"How Should Structural Adjustment Programs be Designed"**, in World Development, Vol. 18, No. 7, 1990.

Rondinelli, Dennis, **Development Projects as Policy Experiments; An Adaptive Approach, to Development**, Routledge, 1983.

Rosenberrn Robin. L., **Spain and Central America: Democracy and Foreign Policy**, Greenwood Press, 1992.

Ross, David O. and Peter J. Usher, **From the Root Up: Development As if Community Mattered**, James Lorimer & co.: Toronto, 1990.

Rossignol, Michael, **Central America the Peace Process**, Library of Parliament, Research Branch, Political and Social Affrairs Division, Canada, 1995.

Rueschemeyer, D., Stephens, Evelyne, Stephens John, **Capitalism Development and Democracy**, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1992.

Ruhl, Mark J., **"Unlikely Candidates for Democracy: The Role of Structural Context in Democratic Development"**, in Studies in Comparative International Development, Vol. 31, No. 1, Spring, 1996.

Sacks, Karen, **"Towards a Unified Theory of Class, Race and Gender"**, in American Ethnologist, August 1989, 1995.

Saenz de Tejada, Maria Eugenia, **"Uneven Development in Western Guatemala"**, in Ethnology, Spring, 1996.

Schlesinger, Stephen, Stephenn Kinzer, **Bitter Fruit**, New York: Double Day and Anchor Books, 1983.

Schumacher, E. F., **Small is Beautiful: A Study of Economics as if People Mattered**, London: Abucus, 1973.

Schwartz, Norman B., "Ethnicity, Politics and Cultural Survival", in Cultural Survival Quarterly, No. 7, Spring 1990.

Schweigert, P., "Commercial Sector Wages and Subsistence Sector Labour Productivity in Guatemalan Agriculture", in World Development, Vol. 21, No. 1, 1993.

Scott, B., Macdonald, Hughes, Jane, Leith, David, **New Tigers and Old Elephants: The Development Game in the 1990s and Beyond**, New Brunswick: Transaction Publisher, 1995.

Seabrook, Jeremy, **Victims of Development: Resistance and Alternatives**, 1993.

SEGEPLAN (Secretaria General de Planificacion Economica)
Socio-Economic Report 1995, Guatemala City, 1995.

Secretaria de Relaciones Publicas Guatemala, **Agrarian Policy A Government Policy Paper**, 1992.

SEGEPLAN, (Secretaria General de Planificacion Economica)
Imagen de La Agroindustria en Guatemala: Ano 2000, Guatemala City, 1991.

Seiligson, Michel, & Booth John, A., **Election and Democracy in Central America**, the University of North Carolina Press, 1995.

Sen, Gita & Caren Grown, **Development, Crises and Alternative Visions**, in Monthly Review Press, 1987.

Seligson, Mitchell A. & John T. Passe-Smith eds, **Development & Underdevelopment: The Political Economy of Inequality**, Lynne Reiner Publisher: Boulder, 1993.

Shafaeddin, S.M., **The Impact of Trade Liberalization on Export and GDP Growth in Least Develop Countries**, UNDP, 1994.

Shain, Yossi & Linz, Juan, **Between States: Interin Governments and Democratic Transitions**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Shaw, Martin, "Civil Society and Global Politics: Beyond a Social Movement Approach", in Journal of International Studies, Vol. 23. No. 3, 1994.

Shelton, H., Davis, "The Social Roots of Political Violence in Guatemala", in Cultural Survival Quarterly, Vol. 7, No. 1, 1983.

Shelton, H., Davis, "The Social Consequences of Development Aid in Guatemala", in Cultural Survival Quarterly, Vol. 7, No. 1, 1983.

Sholk, Stabler, Richard, "El Salvador's Negotiated Transition from Low-Intensity Conflict to Low-Intensity Democracy", in Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs, 1995.

Slater, David, "Power and Social Movements in the Other Occident: Latin America in an International Context", in Latin American Perspectives, Issue 81, No. 2, Spring, 1994.

Smillie, Ian, Sarvodaya Shramafana Movement: An Assessment, Moratuwa, Sri Lanka; Vishva Lekha, 1985.

Smith Ayala, Emili, The Granddaughters of Ixmucanae: Guatemalan Women Speak, Tononto, 1991.

Smith, Carol, Guatemalan Indians and the State, 1540-1988, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990.

———, Destruction of the Material Bases for India Culture: Economic Changes in Totonicapan, in R. Carmarck (ed.), Harvest of Violence, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988.

———, "Local History in a Global Context: Social and Economic Transition in Western Guatemala", in Society for Comparative Study of Society and History, Vol. 26, April, 1984.

———, "Does a Commodity Economy Enrich the Few Whole Ruining the Masses? Differentiation Among Petty Commodity Producers in Guatemala", in Journal of Peasant Studies, Vol. 11, No. 3, April, 1984.

———, "Beyond Dependency Theory: National and Regional Patterns of Underdevelopment in Guatemala", in American Ethnologist, No. 5, March, 1978.

———, Labour and International Capital in the Making of a Peripheral Social Formation: Economic Transformation in Guatemala, 1850-1980, in Charles Berquist, Editor, Labour in the Capitalist World Economy, Berverley Hills: Sage Publications, 1993.

Stasiulis, Daiva K., "Pluralist and Marxist Perspectives on Racial Discrimination in South Africa", in British Journal of Sociology, No. 31, 1980.

Stavenhagen, Rodolfo, Clases, Colonialismo y Aculturacion, Cuaderno del Seminario de Intergarcion Social Guatemalteca, No. 19, Guatemala City, Guatemala: Ministerio de Educacion, 1977.

Stone, Samuel, "Production and Politics in Central American's Convulsions", in Journal of Latin American Studies, 1983.

Stoll, David., Between Two Armies in the Ixil Towns of Guatemala, Columbia University Press, New York, 1993.

Sullivan, Joseph G., "How Peace Came to El Salvador", in Orbis, Winter, 1994.

The World Commission on Environment and Development, Our Common Future, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

The World Bank, in World Development Report 1995, Oxford: University Press, 1995.

Thomas Clive Y., "The Poor and The Powerless: Economic Policy and Change in the Caribbean", in Monthly Review Press, New York, 1988.

Todaro, Michael, Economic Development, edn, Logmans: New York, 1996.

Torres-Rivas, Edelbeto, Gozales-Suares, Mirta, International Center for Human Right and Democratic Development, Obstacles and Hopes Perspectives for Democratic Development in el Salvador, San Jose, Costa Rica, June, 1994.

"The Central American Model of Growth: Crisis for Whom?", in Latin American Perspectives, Translated by Margaret Towner, No. 25, Spring/Summer, 1994.

Torres-Rivas, Edelberto, "The Origin of Crisis and Instability in Central America", in Contemporary Marxism, 14, Fall, 1986.

Seven Keys to Understanding the Central American Crisis, in Jonas Dixon, Revolution and Intervention in Central America, San Francisco: Sysntheis, 1983.

Trudeau Robert, H., Guatemala: Politics the Popular Struggle for Democracy, Lynne Rienner, Publisher, Inc. 1993.

Tulchin, Joseph S. Bland Gary, Is there a Transition to Democracy in El Salvador, Woodrow Wilson Current Studies on Latin America, U. S., 1993.

UCA, Universidad Centro Americana, Diagnostico de Necesidades de Investigacion de la Political Social de Guatemala, Managua, Nicaragua, Junio de 1994.

United State Agency for International Development (USAID), Guatemalan High Land Agricultural Development, Project Number 520-276, Washington, D. C., 1984.

USAC (Universidad de San Carlos de Guatemala) **Analysis de la Situation National: Desafios, Oportunidades y Propuestas de la Universidad de San Carlos de Guatemala al Estado y a la Sociedad Guatemalteca**, Guatemala de la Assuncion, Julio de 1993.

USAC (Universidad de San Carlos de Guatemala, **Constitution Politica de la Republica de Guatemala, Decretada por la Assamblea Nacional Constituyente el 31 mayo de 1985**. Guatemala City, Guatemala, Editorial Piedra Santa, 1985.

Varese, Stefano, **"Think Locally, Act Globally", in Report on the Americas (NACLA)**, Vol. 25, No. 3, 1992.

Venne, Sharon, **"The New Language of Assimilation. Without Prejudice" in The EAFORD: International Review of Racial Discrimination**, Vol. 2, No. 2, 1993.

Vilas, M., Carlos, **"Prospects for Democratisation in Post-Revolutionary Setting: Central America", in Latin American Perspectives**, Vol. 28, No. 2, May, 1996.

Vilas, Carlos, **"A Painful Peace El Salvador After the Accords", in Report on the Americas, (NACLA)**, Vol. 27, No. 6, May-June, 1995.

Vilas, M., Carlos, **Between Earthquakes and Volcanoes: Markets, State, and the Revolutions in Central America**, Monthly Review Press, New York, 1995.

Vondoepp, Peter, **"Political Transition and Civil Society: The Case of Kenya and Zambia", in Studies in Comparative International Development**, Vol. 31, No. 1, Spring, 1996.

Waring, Marilyn, **A Woman's Reckoning, if Women Counted**, Harper Collins: San Francisco, 1988.

Warnock, John W., **The Politics of Hunger**, London: Methun, 1987.

- Warren, D. M., L.j Slikkerver & D. Brokensha (eds), **The Cultural dimension of Development: Indigenous Knowledge System**, London: Intermediate Technological Publication, 1995.
- Wassertom, Robert, "Revolution in Guatemala: Peasants and Politics Under the Arbenz Government", in Comparative Studies in Society and History, Vol. 17, No. 4, Fall, 1975.
- Watanabe, John M. **Maya Saints in a Changing World**, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992.
- Watanabe, John M., "Uimagining the Maya: Anthropologist, Others, and the Inescapable Hubris of Authorship", in Bulletin of Latin American Research, Vol. 14. No. 2, 1990.
- Weaver, Frederick S., **Inside the Volcano: The History and Political Economy of Central America**, Westview Press, 1994.
- Weeks, John, **The Economies of Central America**, New York: Holmes and Meiree, 1985.
- Weeks, John, "An Interpretation of the Central American Crisis", in Latin American Research Review, No. 21, 1986.
- Weiberg, Willian J., **War on the Land: Ecology and Politics in Central America**, London and New Jersey: Zed Books, 1991.
- Whetten, N.L, **Guatemala: The Land and the People**, Yale: University Press, 1965.
- Wiarda, H. J. **Ethnocentrism in Foreign Policy... America** Enterprise Institute, 1985.
- Wiarda, H. J., **Ethnocentrism and Third World Development**, in Society, No. 24, October, 1987.

Wilber, Charles, **The Political Economy of Development and Underdevelopment**, 1989.

Wilmer, Franke, **The Indigenous Voice in World Politics; Since Time Immemorial**, Newburng Park, Calif., Sage, 1993.

Wilson, Fiona, "Women and Agricultural Change in Latin America: Some Concepts Guiding Research", in World Development, Vol. 13, No. 9, 1985.

Winson, Anthony, "Class Structure and Agrarian Transition in Central America", in Latin America Research Review, No, 5, Fall, 1978.

Wood, Elizabeth, & Segovia, Alexander, "Macroeconomic Policy and the Salvadorean Peace Accords", in World Development, Vol. 23 No. 12, 1995.

World Bank, **World Development Report**: New York Oxford University Press, 1995.

World Bank, **Guatemala, Economic and Social Prospective**, World Bank Country Study, Washington D. C. World Bank, 1978.

Wright, R., **Time Among the Maya: Travels in Belize, Guatemala, and Mexico**. Marham, Ont.: Penguin Books, 1989.

Wright, Ronald, **Stolen Continents: The Americas Through Indian Eyes Since 1942**, Boston: Houghton Miffflin Company, 1992.

Yanez, A., **The Struggle for Freedom in Guatemala**, New York: Pathfinder Press, 1985.